The Report on the State of Culture in Spain (or ICE from its initials in Spanish) is a publication by the Fundación Alternativas Culture and Communication Observatory that systematically monitors our country’s cultural reality. Six editions have been produced since 2011 that have made it possible to focus on our different soft spots and problem issues.

The first part of this edition will be dedicated to Spain’s foreign cultural policy, identifying players, policies and its main achievements. In addition, we run an evaluation and produce a series of proposals to improve efficacy and efficiency, also considering how Covid-19 is affecting traditional models.

As we have maintained in previous editions of the ICE, culture is a mainstay for the Agenda 2030 sustainable development goals and, without it as a tool and a cross-discipline perspective of all policies, the endeavour is bound to fail. We approach the second part of this edition along these lines, addressing fundamental questions such as development and territorial cooperation, sustainability of cultural heritage and artistic education and growth of the audio-visual industry.
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Although all sectors are affected by the pandemic, culture has been, is and will be one of the areas that has most suffered its consequences. Cultural activities need to be in close contact with their audience and closing cinemas, theatres, concert halls and cultural activities in general has opened up an abyss between creators and their audiences. As you might expect, this led to seeking ways of emerging in a new context using other tools that became faithful allies to get through the darkest days of the health crisis. Today, as the month of July comes to a close, it seems that it’s all behind us but we really have no idea how long we’ll have to keep up these new rules and, more importantly, when life as we knew it will return.

In this scenario, cultural cooperation has had to put the brakes on thousands of activities as the virus spread throughout the world and physical borders closed. Simultaneously, digital arenas were flooded with cultural content and encouraged unusual encounters that have made it possible to experiment with new ways of telling stories, enjoying music and keeping in touch with the audience, such a fundamental part of cultural action. These experiments have brought out the strengths and weaknesses of a sector as it goes through major transformation, as a bastion of innovation, in this new reality that we keep on creating.

Without beating around the bush, we can say that the digital environment has been colonised by cultural content. According to Eurostat, over 70% of Internet connections are made with the intention of consuming cultural content. However, this presence is not being recognised, not even by the sector itself, that often wastes its enormous potential to assert its role in the new economy. This is doubtlessly one of the great challenges to tackle, strengthening technological skills among creators and administrators, understanding how new business models work and proposing new cultural cooperation formulas that guarantee cultural content diversity in a digital environment.

On the other hand, the cultural sector’s capacity to connect with other disciplines must be boosted by public powers when designing cooperation strategies for economic and territorial development. We need forums and spaces for inter-sector connection to boost innovation, an inherent part of cultural creation in all its fields.

---

Matters that we have been forced to rethink include our relationship with audiences. The audience has always been a key element in any cultural project. Its role has always been active and has conditioned how action has developed. The conditions caused by the pandemic mean that we have to reformulate how we make contact and interact with everyone beyond the stage. In this respect, the digital medium is a universe to explore, brimming with possibilities that we have to begin to discover. In the new framework of cultural cooperation, we will have to come up with ideas that allow online and offline actions to coexist and work out how to interconnect them.

In Spain, cultural cooperation has been a key element of foreign policy despite the many ways of understanding it. With the recession in 2008, cuts devastated the sector that nevertheless kept on generating networks in less formal environments. Culture professionals working in international cooperation have used all their experience to generate a chain of value that is one of our great strengths to tap. Away from institutional programmes and major events, maybe slightly less ambitious projects have been sprouting, that have nevertheless woven a hybrid and apparently ethereal fabric but that nevertheless form part of our cultural ecosystem. This is one of the issues that we wish to defend in this report and that we think will continue to evolve within the new normal and includes informal networks of professionals who seek out and find each other to implement ideas and proposals that might appear spontaneously in the digital environment or in any space with support from civil society, turned into an active audience that encourages cultural production when deploying their cultural rights.

Our experience tells us that cultural cooperation projects are not intended for individual purposes. They are initiatives that meet a greater goal beyond applause from the audience and the critics. They provide value to foreign policy because they connect people, and they build networks based on trust and shared values. These intangibles are the true value of cultural cooperation because culture is about people, so cultural policy has to revolve around people.

From 21st July of this year, new perspectives have opened up for foreign cultural cooperation. The European Recovery Fund is providing a chance to get very powerful financing for the cultural and creative industries projected abroad. Culture needs an injection, not only of money, but also of real policy. This is an opportunity to make the transformations raised in this report, presented in the in-depth introduction by Enrique Bustamante, its coordinator.

Spain should present the European Commission with an ambitious, wide-reaching project for the Spanish and European strategy for foreign cultural policy. And this should fall within the context of the pandemic crisis, and should never lose sight of public opinion, that this report analyses using an extensive questionnaire.

The Report on the State of Culture in Spain in 2020 intends to help build this great plan on the foreign cultural policy that our country and our industry needs.

We would like to thank the Instituto Cervantes, Acción Cultural Española AC/E and AECID for their work on this project, joining forces in this intention to rethink the foreign cultural cooperation model for our new reality.
INTRODUCTION

SHIPWRECKS AND CULTURAL HOPES
FOR THE NEAR FUTURE

Enrique Bustamante

The death of Luis Eduardo Aute as the COVID-19 epidemic took hold, representing not only an emblematic five decades of music and song, but also painting or poetry or cinema and an entire vision of creative, independent and critical capability, seemed to mark a symbolic milestone in the collapse of Spanish culture during lockdown, in every possible aspect. However, Aute was also the erudite demonstration of an “undisciplined” creator who periodically went through a crisis, reinvented himself and was reborn, who condensed so many registers and nuances that everyone can find something to appreciate from one of his artistic moments or another, or in one of his creative manifestations.

Ever since the democratic transition, Spanish culture has seemed to follow a similar dynamic of crisis and resurrection, artistic drive and economic collapse. This even includes paradoxical destinations swimming against the tide of political expectations, exactly as we saw in the late 70s when, in spite of the role given to the arts on the road to democracy, culture was ignored in the Moncloa Pacts (so often quoted these days) and was treated in some sectors, such as cinema, with blind neoliberalism that took our industry to the brink.

The cultural crisis brought about by the pandemic is another historic paradox. When we finished this publication last March and prepared to present ICE 2020 to the public, many of us analysts were emphasising the hopes and dreams of a situation that, although still affected by the consequences of the recession and the austerity of the “Great Crisis”, might fan the flame of positivity in the light of a new progressive Government that flew the flag of culture with a decisiveness that had not been seen since 2004.

The Survey among cultural agents, who have been traditionally taking part in it for a decade, highlighted precisely this feeling in ICE 2019 which boasted relatively improved scores for the diversity of Spanish culture, although it continued to penalise public policies at all administrative levels and failed all
aspects of projection and cultural strategies abroad. There is a common thread running between Rodríguez Zapatero’s government and the start of the Coalition Government headed by Pedro Sánchez (with all its differentiated nuances) concerning appreciation of culture and a willingness to support its diversity, that the years of Mariano Rajoy’s governments had wiped from our memories.

The lockdown to beat the virus abruptly and painfully shattered these good vibrations because isolation launched a head-on attack right at the heart of society’s symbolic life. Caged creativity was able to develop and even shine from time to time on the internet (with the additional plus of generous creators and companies working for free), although the economic, and also social and symbolic, chain of added value was collapsing above all in distribution and dissemination, penalising cultural activities and sub-sectors the more collective and social their consumption: theatres, concerts, cinemas, museums, bookshops, etc.

The lockdown to beat the virus abruptly and painfully shattered these good vibrations because isolation launched a head-on attack right at the heart of society’s symbolic life. Caged creativity was able to develop and even shine from time to time on the internet (with the additional plus of generous creators and companies working for free), although the economic, and also social and symbolic, chain of added value was collapsing above all in distribution and dissemination, penalising cultural activities and sub-sectors the more collective and social their consumption: theatres, concerts, cinemas, museums, bookshops, etc.

In the case of Spain, this hammer-blow to culture was like sticking a finger in a bleeding wound as Spanish culture was only slowly recovering after what we called in ICE 2019 a “lost decade” due to lack of progress in all social and economic indicators. With 0.4% less GDP than in 2009, a loss of turnover of €4,000 M compared to 2008, 16,000 less cultural jobs and freezing any progress in gender equality, there was a great deal of ground to make up.

The epidemic arrived and the “state of alarm” landed on this shaky ground. Just as a general, economic and health crisis arose, a cultural crisis also came about because most Governments reacted late to the evidence of collapse, despite estimations of losses of over a third of the financial year’s cultural turnover. In the midst of a sea of demands and requests for help by each economic sector, culture was put off once again and it was only considered later when the claims from its multiple sectors threatened a symbolic schism, particularly severe for a Government that claimed to be progressive, but also for the majority of the regional governments and major cities hailing from a very wide range of ideologies, where aid for culture and some of its activities came late and in insufficient quantities.

The reactions from the culture association and business world were generally prudent and positive. Calls to officially consider culture as “a primary need” or as a “strategic sector”, urgent calls from national award winners in culture and the arts who considered that “the current model can dilute responsibilities...at all administrative levels,” thereby calling for “joint action from all administrations” on a sector that is “fragile and vulnerable”, based on the principles of “inter-administrative coordination, cooperation and collaboration.” It is true that cultural economic activities were theoretically covered by the general measures taken to prevent financial collapse, but the specific nature of many of the sector’s needs, particularly due to its unstable and irregular work, left culture out in the cold concerning many of the rescue packages being implemented.

In early April, the Ministries of Culture and Inland Revenue announced a plan of short-term emergency measures, including lowering cultural VAT for online sales of books and digital press, and a future reactivation plan. However, the effective measures only came as a result of the joint meeting called by the Culture Council that brought together the State Administration, autonomous regions and the FEMP in a formal agreement “to rebuild and boost culture in all areas.” And so, finally, the first consequent measures were launched by Central Government (€76.4 M initially) and in the regional and local field, aimed basically at providing aid to the specific nature of the cultural sector in terms of furlough arrangements and assistance for arts workers, and to inject cash flow and funding into cultural companies
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and production companies, vulnerable to economic suffocation.

However, culture has also inevitably been the extraordinary terrain for a flood of populist, and often demagogic, criticism and allegations from people who not so long ago ignored it or gleefully punished the sector. This is the case of prominent politicians from parties and local governments as in Madrid that apathetically stood by as the succession of “Black Fridays” from Rajoy’s Governments affected culture: VAT put up by as much as 13%, accumulated budget cuts, sinking “social projects” run by the banks, repeatedly broken promises regarding the sponsorship law, plummeting foreign projection in every possible way. When two autonomous regions governed by the PP and Ciudadanos with support from Vox try to take advantage of easing the state of alarm to dismantle archaeological heritage protection and stimulate property speculation, with the pretext of speeding up economic recovery, it is inevitable to think that the heralded “new normal” feels too much like a flashback to what we have experienced over and over in the past.

Complaints and criticism have once again emphasised the danger of confusion and distortions that have been surrounding the world of culture over the last few years. For example, complaints raised by the business world around bullfighting, cuisine or tourism that could legitimately claim assistance for their business but instead they continued to question the legitimacy of culture and even absurdly the “cultural industries”. Or the abusive claims from some artists and business owners who invoked eternal copyright (supposedly to boost creativity among creators seventy years after their death) ignoring not only the historical social contract that has surrounded intellectual property rights in Europe but the risk of falling into a copyright that systematically expropriates this right in favour of capital and major players.

However, beyond the necessary extension of the exceptional support measures for culture until the end of the outstanding economic consequences of the pandemic on its business, we need to start thinking about what happens next, about a major reactivation plan and its social profitability, as well as economic benefits.

This type of initiative fits with the goals of the Coalition Government, which came about following the motion of no confidence and the interim government after two general elections, that had made at least some signs of a change in attitude towards culture: restoration of the Ministry of Culture, an attempt to increase the state cultural budget by almost 10%; setting up the Gender Equality Observatory in Culture, with a specific work plan for 2019 and studies planned by sectors; recovery of the PACE (External Action Plan) by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation and Culture (confirmed by the ministers José Guirao and José Borrell, with a new provision of €155 M), a really eloquent, inspirational gesture to strengthen external cultural action, slowing down traditional competence and collusion between the two portfolios that Moratinos and González Sinde signed in 2009, discarded in 2012 with the arrival of Mariano Rajoy.

However, along these lines, we above all prefer to highlight the progressive coalition commitments between the two parties mentioned in the “A new deal for Spain. Government agreements for an entire term of office” (December 2019) document that breaks down proposals reiterated by the ICE and the Observatory from 2011 to 2019:

- Chapter 6 (Culture and Sport) thereby states that “we will promote a state treaty for Culture”, increasing “the budget for culture progressively in the general state budgets.”
- In different sections of this topic, there are promises to act in specific outstand-
ing territories: “Finish drafting the Artist’s Statute”, set up the authorship rights office, support for “Artistic and cultural creations in co-official and own languages”, a “reading deal”, an “Action plan on Equality in the cultural field” that connects with “closing the gender gap in the STEM field” in chapter 7 and with “measures for deserted Spain” in digital access.

- Section 6.4 states that “we will defend a plural RTVE model that is independent, public, transparent and high quality, that might become a centre for production aimed at promoting and broadcasting Spanish culture.”
- Chapter 11 addressed Spain’s external role in the field of cooperation, as a “European Spain that is open to the world”: increasing development aid up to 0.5 % of GDP, strengthening the AECID and reforming the law of Spain’s cooperation abroad, reinforcing relations with Africa, the EU and Latin America and the Caribbean.

This new Cultural Policies Plan must unavoidably and initially start with the greatest weaknesses in Spanish culture(s), that might be summarised as follows:

I. PERSISTENT WEAKNESSES FOR CULTURE IN SPAIN: EARLY 2020

1. Insufficient private spending

Firstly, the total turnover is an emblematic economic figure for the weight of culture in the Spanish economy that in 2018 (latest figures from the Ministry of Culture) rose to 12,714.3 million Euros, a slight setback from the €14,099 M in 2017 (€16,963 M in 2008). This meant 2.4 % of the GDP in 2018, 3.2 % respectively in 2008 (Ministry of Culture. Cultural statistical analysis, 2019).

The general weakness running through this economy is influenced to a large extent by the fact that Spanish people do not spend much on cultural goods and services, overwhelmed by the crisis. So, in 2018, each home spend an average of € 682.5 on culture per year (€718.3 in 2017), despite the Ministry of Culture’s change in accounting to include mobile and Internet-related services in this chapter, which represents 22.5 % of total spending.

Average spending per individual in this section reached €274.6 a year, with a slight drop back on 2016 (€307) and even 2017 (€288.6) without coming close to the maximum level from 2008 (€372).

2. Plummeting public spending

The other factor that decisively determines the situation of Spanish culture and that also thereby conditions its unequal offer from region to region, is cultural public spending, meaning the commitment from the different local and national authorities with that essential segment from the welfare state that, in turn, determines basic correlations for cohesion and social redistribution. In this way, the “cleared”

1. Cleared expenditure: “Obligations recognised by the different public administrations”. 

public expenditure on culture rose in 2017 (last joint figure available) to €5,092 M (€7,090 M in 2008). However, breaking down the figures is even more revealing: in the aforementioned financial year, the Central State spent €678 M (1,135 in 2009), the Autonomous Regions €1,144 M (2046 in 2009) and Local Administration spent €3,270 M (3,837 in 2009). Consequently, in our ICE 2019 report focussing on local cultural policies, we concluded that the administrative level closest to citizens (inclu-
ing provincial governments) had been the last line of resistance against plummeting public cultural policies for almost a decade. And to a certain extent, it continues to play this role (0.28% of GDP compared to 0.16% of spending from the Central State and Autonomous regions) despite the frustrated attempt to increase this central state budget in 2019.

3. Access inequalities

Regarding this unequal offer, it is essential to mention the socio-economic variables that determine severe cultural consumption inequalities among the Spanish population, exacerbated by the crisis: size of home, level of studies, civil status and type of home certainly influence this level of cultural spending, but the most significant parameters remain the job situation and the consequent income level: earning more than 3,000 Euros/month results in €382.7 spent on culture per year while for an income of less than €1,000, this barely amounts to €168.1. This implies that, in the midst of a severe worsening of job insecurity and socioeconomic inequality, this has also widened the inequality of access to paid culture, that creates and aggravates a general fracture. Cultural imbalances thereby slow down upward mobility even more, when it was already quite frankly in poor repair.

4. Intra and inter-sector weaknesses

However, in many cultural sectors such as recorded and digital music, cinema and audiovisual or even books, it is not enough to calculate its turnover because only part of these quantities really feeds the Spanish cultural economy. Although this detailed analysis, that few statistical sources and fewer periodic studies highlight today, eludes the purposes and dimensions of this text, cinema in Spain might be raised as an example, as its turnover in 2019 rose to €624.1 M, almost recovering 2010 levels (€662.3 M) after many years in constant decline and some partial recoveries since 2015. However, it should also be emphasised that Spanish cinema barely made up 15% of this total business, a long way off the 20% that had been considered as the bare minimum to hold out, even in a year with productions by two classic stars, Almodóvar and Amenábar, whilst most of the box office is concentrated on Hollywood stars, and in Spanish cinema on a very small number of films supported by TV chains. In exemplary fashion, this demonstrates market problems that determine imbalances in identity, creativity and diversity of an emblematic cultural industry.

5. Instability and imbalances in production and jobs

At a mercantile level, this cultural economic fabric is moved by 122,673 cultural companies in the different sectors (112,643 in 2008) that represented 3.7% of total Spanish business entities, generating 690,300 jobs in 2018 (latest available figures), 3.6% of the Spanish total (706,300 in 2008).

The prevalence of SMEs and self-employment is clear when we see that 7.2% of business entities have more than six workers and only 0.6% have more than fifty workers (IDEM) but this data that would demonstrate its productive atomisation in any other industry is a positive factor in culture, showing its creative diversity. Temporary work had become the general rule over the last decade, increasing the massive instability of creators and auxiliary workers in culture, including a great deal of bogus self-employment and plummeting salaries and the chance to make a living from their work, despite the very high proportion of further education, 69.3% compared to 42.9% in general. Furthermore, creative work is generally even worse paid by online platforms, despite their remarkable savings in distribution costs.
The endemic concentration of businesses in Madrid and Catalonia is also dangerous (42.1% of the total). This becomes a majority of 64.9% if we add Andalusia and the Valencian Community, leaving a scarce margin for the remaining communities. This conceals desertification of the economy and the offer—and its distribution capacity—for most of Spanish culture.

Gender equality also has unfinished business in Spanish culture, as 54.5% of jobs are taken by men (420,100) compared to 45.5% for women (270,200). A strong imbalance in the percentage over total employment (4% of men compared to 3.1% of women) that has barely changed in a decade (0.62% more women in culture) despite proclamations of equality.

6. Insufficient and imbalanced digitalisation

Another significant field in the state of Spanish culture is its digital transformation, vital for it to survive and become stronger in a world that is increasingly governed by offer and consumption on digital devices and networks, a terrain that is now only mediated by the autonomous entity Red.es and its ONTSI (Information Society Observatory), answering to the Ministry of Industry. Its latest reports on the ICT sector and digital content in Spain (a concept that spans not only cultural industries in the strictest sense, but also creative industries such as advertising) bring out a certain optimism on the progressive digitalisation of this field, already estimated at 54% (2017) although it also owns up to its delays and its unequal evolution among sectors.

Consequently, in 2018 and out of 35,100 information society companies, 10,035 were dedicated to “digital content”, demonstrating constant growth since 2013 (9,471 in 2013). Although sales for this last share had less relative weight, with €23,250 M, compared to the IS total (€115,154 M), its growth was greater (+8.7% compared to a general figure of +5%) but this evolution was reversed in employment with 109,281 positions (an increase of 3.3%) compared to the general for IS (+7.3%).

In any case, the lion’s share of this digital business was encapsulated by the cinema, radio and digital television activities, 34.6% of the total, and programming and broadcasting activities, 29.7%. While the remaining digital cultural sectors appeared with less weight: advertising on-line (11.4%), publishing including books and the press (11%), videogames (6.2%), ...

The great black hole of this progress over the last six years is the flagrant gender inequality, with 64.7% of jobs held by men and only 35.3% by women, which is enormously worrying for the future and made more acute by the glass ceiling in management careers: 2.8% of women compared to 11.4% of men.

II. SOCIAL PACT, BASED ON CIVIL SOCIETY

We have to look back on it, without resentment as a basic democratic clean-up: just like in public health, in education or research, the mud that culture is currently mired in comes from boggy ground, the succession of “Black Fridays” in the days of Rajoy, of cabinet meetings that, with no compassion whatsoever, neither communication nor consensus either with the opposition or the sector, and with no plausible justification that it barely scratched the surface of the deficit, the cultural sector’s crisis was wilfully worsened: brutal VAT rises, amassed budget cuts, biased censors, broken promises (sponsorship law), punishments heaped on culture with a whiff of ideological vendetta.

Now, with a view to the yearned-for release from our imprisonment and opening up public culture again, we thereby cannot limit ourselves to claiming the return to a “golden age” that never even existed in Spain, but we should recall claims from some analysts as for years we have been calling for new cultural public policies that arise from a real deal with civil society revolving around their culture(s), based around the search for diversity and pluralism at its core, and the conviction that culture (and communication) play a key role in the whole development of a society (economic, social, ecological) (Bustamante, 2014). The systematic low scores given in our surveys regarding public policies at all levels are a further reflection that the cultural policies of the past were designed for a model of culture and society that is now old and tired.

However, systematic public policies are essential in culture, on the condition of abandoning all the illustrated despotism, any bureaucratic structure, that can be easily captured by lobbies and media stars, to become grounded, as solidly proposed by the latest UNESCO reports (Re/shaping cultural policies, 2015, 2018), in consultation and participation from the whole wealth of associations that rise up around culture (users, creators, gender, sector-based and territorial entities, producers, etc.); and in transparent application of systematic indicators and assessments that verify its direct and induced effects over time.

It is difficult to imagine that a “State Deal” is on the horizon for culture between all the major political parties. It seems implausible right now after recent ‘crimes against culture’ committed by many right-wing opposition politicians, and from statements that are as brutal as reiterated by the leaders of Vox (“Spain can live without its puppeteers”) or from the then-spokesperson from Ciudadanos, Marcos de Quinto (“Gathering place for well-paid activists who are docile with power”), only offensive for their authors. However, in the wake of the newly recovered Culture Council, it is realistic to demand a major social pact that agrees on and defines a coordinated, joint recovery plan at all levels of the Spanish state.

In other words, culture cannot always live on the edge of the abyss, in a situation that is simply putting out one fire after another, reacting to economic or health disasters, according to the politicians and ideologies unaware of their importance, with increasingly less industrial and economic muscle to keep going.

Consequently, and looking at the main imbalances brought up earlier, we might dare to systematise a few essential lines of this action for the immediate future.

- The first threat to cultural diversity is the symbolic deep inequality that has been installed and normalised in Spanish society, because as we analysed with accurate data in our reports, almost half the adult population in Spain has no access to culture (or communication) that requires payment or they have to devote ridiculous quantities to it, for reasons of instability, and scarce income. This is an often-repeated conclusion in surveys or recent territorial reports in Barcelona or Andalusia, that constitutes a severe danger in democratic terms, increasing citizen “disengagement” that the FA Democracy Reports have been detecting.

- This risk requires a future focus on fair access to culture both socially and territorially (including deserted Spain... deserted by cultural offer). The gesture made by many creators and companies to offer free creations during lockdown is a valuable symbol of this situation, and should be complemented by periodic campaigns in the near future to promote cultural consumption and spending to continue “manufacturing”
audiences. However, in the future, assessments from programmes such as Vale Cultura in Brazil or Argentina offer important experiences to reach out to excluded populations and contribute to a sustainable economy for culture.

- The other great defect of cultural equality evidently involves gender. Its progressive work, begun in 2007, was abruptly stopped from 2012 onwards and now requires a firm, legislative economic plan paying particular attention to digital culture. However, systematic observation should particularly spread to cultural consumption to prevent discriminatory situations to access culture and “digital inequality” (training, skills, uses, added value in on-line communication).

- Effectively, the virus crisis has come to emphasise, as if this were necessary, that the future of a major part of culture and communication is unavoidably digital, which requires a real plan to boost digitalisation from cultural industries. The spontaneous and unequal digital transition of our cultural sectors (strong in audiovisual, weak in books, for example) cannot be maintained without severe risks.

- The shining light of diversity also implies copyright regulation and policy that ensures the concurrence and transparency of authorship societies in all sectors, and that, while protecting creator’s salaries, no longer polarises authorship pay between the few multi-millionaire stars and a mass of poorly paid creators or “volunteers” who cannot make a living from their artistic work. The situation of the “amateurs”, ever more numerous and vital as a reserve of creativity, should be considered in this comprehensive design that should break down and fully apply the Artist’s Statute.

- The fight against media oligopolies and global digital giants requires an antitrust regulation that protects creators’ rights (currently overexploited on many platforms) and for users. On the positive side, fair taxation is required with the traditional economy that allows resources to be amassed to sustain a special support plan for cultural industries and the national and/or European platforms, including the public communication service.

- Fiscal policies take an undeniable starring role in this field: positively, very low cultural VAT which should be rounded down uniformly among cultural activities and transferred to the on-line environment; negatively, fair taxation obligations for major online platforms, regulating its cultural and independent investment and upholding the public service. Exceptional donations are appreciated, but in a rule of law, obligations and duties must be formulated legally, watched over by independent authorities.

- The essential primacy of public spending on cultural policies, fed by the aforementioned sources and other possible sources such as the national lottery, do not exclude the opportunity and urgency of updated legislation that strengthens specific sponsorship of culture, with special attention given to micro-sponsorship, always in a fiscally fair and transparent form and with public guidance on the strategic and particularly vulnerable activities and territories.

- If there is current consensus in the cultural world, it is that Spanish cultural action abroad, ruined by the crisis, is an
urgent and fundamental terrain to project Spanish culture, for international cooperation and for cultural diplomacy and our country’s image throughout the world. A coordinated and coherent strategy is essential in this field as concluded by many renowned experts in this ICE 2020.

Finally, this is a case of thinking and debating, reconstructing a real support strategy for Spanish culture, fleeing from this endemic and nasty action-reaction dynamic that has often been manipulated to qualify culture as a sector of begging acrobats; to legitimise public plans and resources due to the social demands and needs, from the users and from cultural agents, in a fertile dialogue that should rule over any other political and economic consideration.

To start with, whenever possible, drafting a real White Paper for Culture could be and should be addressed, based on systematic consultations with citizen associations and cultural players, a call for “general states of Spanish culture(s)” as a basis for debate and drawing up new public policies.

III. SPANISH CULTURAL ACTION ABROAD

Regarding the last field mentioned in this list, the first ICE back in 2011, devoted to the global projection of Spanish culture, already mentioned that one of our preferential fields of study was our country’s international cultural cooperation, precisely because we are working from a global and interdependent conception of diversity; and we might mention Europe, Latin America and North Africa as priorities, for multiple historic and current reasons, for this inescapable task. In successive reports, this topic has been developed by a wide range of experts and ICE 2018 devoted its central dossier to “Spain and the Ibero-American cultural space” with contributions from top-notch authors such as Néstor García Canclini, Guillermo Orozco, Francisco Rui Cádima, Martín Becerra, Ana Mae Barbosa and Guillermo Mastrini.

The OCC has decided to determine Spanish cultural action as problematic and urgent since the crisis, and so a vital task for the new Government and unfinished business for our cultural agents and sectors as repeatedly demonstrated by our surveys. And, after the effects of the pandemic and its demonstrated consequences (financial and epidemic globalisation, nationalisation of resources, penalisation of international and internal inequalities), this action was revealed to be more important than ever in culture. Our authors have made a massive effort to assay this reality.

On the one hand, symbolic cultural diplomacy (artistic, cultural, intellectual) between nations and countries is becoming increasingly important in a world marked by disordered globalisation and, at the same time, by a clash between exacerbated nationalisms that feed isolationism and unforeseeable regional conflicts. And it is presented today as the essential line of public diplomacy, as the only alternative to relations of force and power, growing on the side-lines of customary international laws that are being revived today in the international arena, causing massive damage to the fight against inequality and poverty (Sadikki, Said, 2009; Montoya, Sandra, 2012). In these circumstances, cultural diplomacy, which has become fashionable in international relations, is perfectly legitimate and valid and is becoming the topic of many studies and academic and political insights. On the condition of nuancing many of its goals, players and tools and incorporating them into a global vision of diversity. Because, as we have upheld in previous ICE editions, culture is a vital mainstay for the 2030 sustainable development goals and without it as a tool and a cross-discipline perspective of all policies, these goals are bound to fail.

Along that line, cultural diplomacy required today by that uncertain international field is
far from the classic vision of unilateral and propaganda instrument of the Nation-States or of their promotional work for mere export of cultural products; and of course, of an omnipresent conception of mercantile public relations that tend to corrupt any understanding between intelligent communities right from the outset. Consequently, we prefer to talk about external cultural action that encompasses all the aforementioned declinations.

Firstly, action requires a position of intercultural dialogue between peoples and their identities, respecting other’s cultures, and not just an instrumental vision of actual national cultural resources. In addition, it must be integrated in the heart of the broadest horizontal and multilateral cooperation seeking out cultural diversity that can only be global. In a time of overflowing and erosion of the States’ monopoly below (local powers, tertiary sector entities, civil society) and above (due to regional integrations such as the European Union or multilateral organisations), diplomacy and joint cultural action from a nation has to be conceived as the result of integrating multiple public and private, national and international, state and substate players (Fernández Leost, José Andrés, 2015). Finally, it should focus on outsider populations and not just the elite, as always happens in the world of culture, and so it must be planned and sustained in the medium/long-term, without expecting immediate results that are incompatible with the slow time required for diffusion and empowerment of the symbolic assets in current plural societies.

Given that diplomacy and the external cultural action within it are necessarily based on social communication, or more simply put, they are “external communicational policy” (Manfredi, Juan, 2011; Badillo, Angel, 2014), it was not easy to complete this magical crusade in a classical world characterised by scarce lines of communication between nations and peoples, often subject to unpredictable collaboration with foreign states and their media resources. However, today’s digital networks and the devices and applications that strengthen their expansion and omnipresence allow a level of universalisation of access to symbolic contents and of porosity in its reception that, when well administered, can overcome these obstacles satisfactorily. On the condition, naturally, of not being planned to flagrantly go against its own ethical principles, and not feeling sorry for “hard” diplomacy of military threats or political and commercial blackmail that unfortunately remain in play today.

The history of external cultural action for some emerging nations, already analysed from time to time by specialist research, shows the difficulties of attaining this complex combination. Either due to the effect of the periodic economic crises or due to the sudden turnaround of national priorities or even due to “soft power” work clashing with the authoritarian impulses of its countries; such as Brazil or Mexico, Turkey, India or China (Rodríguez Echevarría, María del Rocío, 2015; Saute Torrègini, Camila, Chagas, Carolinan and Ruiz, Carina, 2018), that demonstrate as many stunning successes as early disasters in their foreign diplomacy; and that chip away at external efforts over long periods when the distances between their cultural projections and their national interests are revealed, or between their regional leadership and their aspirations to dominate. Donald Trump’s United States can thereby be evaluated from the perspective of an abrupt and massive squandering of capital accumulated over decades, with an accelerated deterioration to that country’s cultural diplomacy efforts to present a friendly image of the world based on its creativity and its cultural potential.

Without looking much further, Spanish cultural action has enjoyed periods of modernisation and rollout, such as the 1980s or the sec-
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The second half of the 90s (de la Riva, Forn, 2012), and stages of regression and deterioration such as in the dark years of the great crisis of the 21st century that, from 2010 to 2018, downgraded development aid in general (Oxfam/Intermón, 2019) and exterior cultural cooperation in particular, right down to a bare minimum (Badillo, Angel, 2014). Beyond the one-off effects of the financial crises, many analysts bring out the lack of a real state policy in this field, the zigzagging succession of plans and institutions, the systematic lack of coordination between a multitude of organisations and the different state and substate levels of public action, the lack of a consistent strategy maintained over time, of a modern model of cultural diplomacy and cultural cooperation capable of facing the challenges of today’s world (Badillo, Angel, 2014; Martín Zamorano, Mariano, and Rius-Uldemolins, 2016; Lamo de Espinosa, Emilio, Badillo, Angel, 2017; Menéndez Reyes, Maria Eugenia, 2018; Alvarez, Joan, 2019).

Furthermore, future challenges in this field for the Spanish State, its languages and diverse cultures are made more difficult, but also more necessary than ever, in its current international context. In neighbouring Africa and Asia, due to their interdependence with immigration and their development cooperation requirements; with Latin America because recovery after the job crisis in favour of that “Ibero-America cultural space” (essentially coordinated with the Portuguese and therefore economically and ideologically, with Brazil and Portugal) is conditioned today by the emergence of China and Russia on that continent and due to a wave of neoliberal governments that shy away from supporting culture (Alvarez, Joan, 2019b). The projection and cooperation of that creativity reserve comprising the 50 million inhabitants of the United States with Hispanic origins has, in turn, become more arduous in an atmosphere that exalts English-speaking culture and privileges, and leave Spanish and its artistic creations out in the cold.

However, in turn, Spanish international cultural action is integrated and strengthened within the European Union that barely ran external action in 2004 and ignored Latin America but began to take off by setting up EUNIC (European National Institutes for Culture) in 2006, in the communication on the “European agenda for culture in a globalising world (COM, 2007 (242 Final)”, implementation of the European External Action Service (EEAS) from 2010, and particularly the “preparatory action”, a broad enquiry urged by the European Parliament in 2014 (Rodríguez Ponga, Rafael, Sánchez Moreno, Eduardo, 2017). With one-off and isolated interventions, and lacking a global and regional strategy, European efforts were not always successful as demonstrated by the audiovisual cooperation programmes with Mercosur, that bragged of a non-existent industrial model similar to the European model and support from the affected States that fell away in no time at all (Vlassis, Antonio, 2016).

In particular, this cooperation made its formal debut in the cultural world with a joint communication in 2016 “Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations” that sought to make the EU a strong global player, promoting cultural diversity and human rights, with action centred on three main axes: supporting culture as an instrument for sustainable social and economic development; promoting culture and intercultural dialogue for peace between communities; and strengthening cooperation on cultural heritage.

This mission, integrated in the Vice-Presidency of the European Union for foreign affairs and security (PESC) now run in the new Brussels commission by Josep Borrell, addresses candidate countries, the EU’s neighbours, 47 developing countries and it includes South-
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ern Asia, Africa and Latin American and the Caribbean, a particularly important regional field for Spain where there is a great deal of unfinished business as shown in recent studies (Bonet, Lluis, Schargorodosky, Héctor, 2019).

The central aim of this ICE 2020 is to analyse and reflect upon this panorama, providing solutions and alternatives grounded in a study of the real world. And to do this, we have called upon academic experts and renowned professionals in the field of culture and cultural diplomacy.

IV. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ICE 2020: FROM EXTERNAL CULTURAL ACTION TO SERIALISED FICTION

ICE 2020 has shone the spotlight on Spain’s external cultural action, with a dossier coordinated by five authors, all renowned experts in this field, boasting wide-reaching research work. Altogether, these texts provide a vibrant gaze, brimming with initiatives and proposals on the present and the future of our international cultural projection. They have all made an additional effort to update the context and the impact of the virus pandemic and the economic repercussions over the last few months.

The initial section on this topic comprises:

• Irene Aláez (Complutense University) dissects the diverse concepts used in this field to analyse the multiple nature of its players, particularly the constellation of public administration organisations and their effective coordination deficits. She concludes with the overwhelming need for a joint work framework and a common road map.

• Mariano Martín Zamorano (University of Barcelona) examines how the cultural diplomacy paradigm has evolved and been transformed by a whole host of players and the mutations of digital communication. He emphasises the role of major cities in this purpose, and the use of social media (particularly Twitter) by public institutions that are committed to external action.

• Juan Luis Manfredi (University of Castilla la Mancha) addresses the role of cultural and information content on the net as cultural cooperation agents. The internet provides cultural and creative industries, including public media, with a growing function in the midst of internationalisation and within the heart of the global ecosystem of digital media.

• Jose Andrés Fernández Leost (Complutense University) focuses on Spanish cultural action in the new scenario of the European Union’s strategies and external cultural agendas that have been forcefully deployed over the last few years, although with a remarkable delay. Our external cultural action and its institutions such as the Instituto Cervantes can draw on remarkable reinforcements and synergies in this framework.

• Finally, Alfons Martinell (University of Girona) suggests a dual panoramic vision of Spanish external cultural action, from its turbulent historic evolution and in the succession of institutions, programmes and actions that have characterised it in democracy. He concludes that we need to revitalise it and adapt it to significant changes in Spanish society and international areas and mentions the urgency of making decisions in this regard.

As has become traditional, the second part of this ICE 2020 addresses a wide array of important current sectors and perspectives of Spanish culture, ranging from preserving classical culture, arts training for young people, plans to boost performing arts to the most re-
recent audiovisual developments from the Over the Top video drive. Here as well, our writers have attempted to analyse and predict the consequences of the pandemic on its respectively fields and problem areas.

- María Angeles Querol (Complutense University) approaches the conceptualisation of archaeological heritage and the history of its management, providing a preventive conception of the urban approach. In particular, she concludes that sustainability of recovery and preservation of the past affects rural environments and their limited resources.

- Jorge Fernández León (Municipal Culture Foundation, Gijón) analyses the situation and the role of culture in the countryside, as a complement to enhance the ICE 2019 dossier on local cultural policies. In the midst of cultural desertification within “Deserted Spain”, highly valuable initiatives and projects emerge to recover and comprehensively develop these communities.

- Raquel Caerols (Antonio de Nebrija University) reviews arts education in general, and how to get culture on the education curriculum for our young people. The long succession of education laws and plans in Spain has thereby subjected arts training to a back and forth, sudden changes that are neither well-grounded nor promise happy endings, although current governmental projects do hold a glimmer of hope for improvement.

- Concepción Cascajosa (Carlos III University) studies the current situation of production and distribution of audiovisual fiction in Spain, from drops in the box office share for Spanish cinema in its own cinema market and the extreme polarisation of its successes and failures, as far as revitalisation of serialised fiction both on classic TV channels and especially regarding video on demand and OTT television. This relaunch nevertheless offers pros and cons and calls for new regulation in the Spanish audiovisual field.

- Arturo Rubio (University of Nebrija) analyses the situation of the Spanish performing arts from new perspectives such as the role of amateurs, closure of theatres or the crisis in major cities such as Barcelona in a global environment. Based on the exhaustion of public cultural policies in this sector, he separates off new proposals.

- Patricia Corredor (Rey Juan Carlos University) draws conclusions from the survey taken by around one hundred Spanish cultural agents with an average score of 5.1 for the current situation of our culture. Two current questions on Spanish cultural action are strongly criticised, in conjunction with some of the worst scores concentrated on foreign projection of our cultures. The role of ICT and diversity in creation and consumption get the best scores.
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FOREIGN CULTURAL ACTION: CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OR FOREIGN CULTURAL POLICY

Irene Aláez Vasconcellos

This article looks at how culture is used by foreign diplomacy to achieve economic and political aims and not as an end in itself. Throughout the text, questions will be raised that demonstrate the need for external cultural policy that firmly backs internationalisation of creators and consolidates production and distribution networks. Ideas are also put forward that might improve the current situation and lead to a common foreign policy that boosts the image of Spain’s culture abroad. The consequences of COVID 19 exacerbate these requirements.
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I. INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTS IN THE FRAY

In March 2020, Spain was affected by a great pandemic with worldwide consequences. We are now in a complex situation with global challenges that require global solutions, meaning that we must devise new formulas for global governance. To do so, multilateral authorities such as UNESCO, the European Council and the European Union should open up to this society and become permeable to new voices, agreeing on their new mandates. History shows us how it is possible to come out of major crises if we stick together, even if the State’s role has to be reconfigured. Even more so when this refers to mobility spaces as we must be aware that this virus has hopped from one country to another by plane.

Over these months, the institutions have attempted to work out how to protect the cultural ecosystem whilst also beaming culture into homes, where the right to take part in cultural life has developed individually. Many decisions have involved backing content digitalisation to ease access, although we should not forget people without access to the internet who fall down the so-called digital gap.

Today’s decisions will be the result of future situations, meaning that we need to start work now, backed by experts and scientists from different areas with a wide range of views, brainstorming possible scenarios, the measures they require and their consequences.

We are still nursing our wounds from the 2008 economic crisis, from which we were
slowly starting to emerge into a recovery of sorts, although leaving a society with high rates of inequality, which is going to be what suffers most in this crisis, with scarce capacity for resilience. As the United Nations has already stated, in reports from the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it is acknowledged that economic cuts are made during periods of severe economic crisis, but it also warns that these measures require a previous impact report and to date, this criterion has not been met. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur for cultural rights raised the need to maintain the cultural ecosystem as a guarantee of rights.

Let’s remember the social value of culture that, beyond its economic dimension, has capacity for social transformation, cohesion, self-esteem and belonging to the community that might help us think about how to rebuild a fairer society based on values. Precisely the main aim of Agenda 2030, although it does not explicitly cover culture, is to be used for sustainable social transformation, with no strings attached for future generations, and therefore with clear current relevance. Culture cooperation can play an essential role in these common values and in building fairer societies all over the world, on the basis that there is a clear interdependence with the planet, among individuals and between different territories.

As we have seen, the changes that are taking place in the globalised society and in the new information society, the change of both paradigms or production processes, and mobility of persons, creators and researchers who work internationally, condition international relations in general and cultural relations in particular.

At a time when borders are permeable and there are multiple channels of communication, the institutions that intervene must bring about and encourage this mobility of creators who carry identities with them and adapt to the transformation of the physical and virtual borders— and world decision centres (Cubeles, 2001).

Internationalisation of culture involves the market and fundamentally the creation and consolidation of production and distribution networks. To do this, innovative, flexible and weightless cultural policies should be drafted that adapt to the globalisation process for the cultural industries and determine new relations between the public and private sectors to position them in this new international-market-network.

The UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity from 2001¹ and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions from 2005² highlight that “While ensuring the free circulation of ideas and works, cultural policies must create conditions conducive to the production and dissemination of diversified cultural goods and services through cultural industries that have the means to assert themselves at the local and global level”. In addition to abiding by their international obligations, each State must define its cultural policy and implement it through the means it considers fit, whether by operational support or appropriate regulations.

Diplomacy has been transforming since the mid-20th century. Classic diplomacy, that Gul- lion (1965) called public diplomacy, was based on the principle of relations between the elites that ran different countries. Subsequently, Leonard (2009) explained that international relations should no longer be an elitist contraption to be used by high level politics to become an instrument that regulates the traffic of national goods and services through the rest of the territories, which meant that it might be performed by experts and professionals and that its recipients would be inhabitants of the market-states (Granados quoting Leonard, 2009).

In 1986, Mitchell already differentiated between cultural relations and cultural diplomacy as while the former are descriptive and refer to private and public initiatives, the latter seeks to present a favourable image. Fernández Leost (2015), however, barely differentiates between concepts such as “cultural diplomacy”, “external cultural action” and “external cultural policy”.

Cultural diplomacy has evolved to become the strategic tool for States to protect cultural values, expressions, meanings and images to guarantee effective their insertion in international order. This concept is bound to the “soft power” defined by Nye (1990). According to the author, this is the capacity to obtain what you want by seducing and persuading others to adopt your goals. Compared to the traditional way of performing international politics, through an established strategy exclusively in politics, economics and military, there would be another way that would involve exchanging ideas, mutual knowledge, and constant transfer of cultural elements. (Bound, Briggs, Holden & Jones, 2007). Although we might have been witnessing a decline in “soft power” over the last few years and the emergence of “sharp power” as mentioned by Álvarez Valencia (2019), the arguments raised by Nye working from the concept of “soft power” have generated a paradigm with great scope in the media and academia.

In this context, cultural diplomacy refers to the source of power that the governments put into action using the cultural resource (and also the values that they prioritise in home policies and the model defended in foreign policy) to gain prestige and win the trust of others in international relations (Álvarez, 2019).

As mentioned in the Report on Spain’s Cultural Action Abroad (2009), the idea that cultural diplomacy only depends on governments is already old hat (Granados, 2009). “[…] public diplomacy should run not only on state or governmental rails but also on free and spontaneous action from the respective civil societies, as many of the problems will persist if we continue to identify the public term with national and governmental”. In this respect, English Cultural Diplomacy states: “we are all diplomats now”.

In the European field, opinions expressed in forums on this issue such as More Europe: External Cultural Relations, point to the idea that classic diplomacy does not meet current needs. The lack of European cultural discourse, exclusion from debates on Cultural Europe of anyone who does not speak English or the lack of interest from political leaders in culture, even though the cultural industry sector is larger than the chemical industry throughout Europe, leads us to question how different states select the culture that they wish to show to the world. In this respect, Frédéric Mártel (2012) questions who must perform the functions.

If we understand cultural action to be the set of procedures that involve human and material resources to implement the goals of a cultural policy, cultural action uses previously trained cultural agents and takes into account specific audiences, aiming to build a bridge between this audience and a work of culture or art. Cultural action can cover all phases of the cultural production system (production, distribution, change and use or consumption), (Coelho, 2009).

In the light of this new global transformation context, it is considered highly relevant to look hard at external cultural policy, the organisations and institutions on which it depends and cultural policies in the international context.

II. CRITICAL ELEMENTS OF THE SPANISH MODEL

Spanish diplomatic representations should provide the required information and backing to ease circulation of cultural agents, using diplomatic and consular support services as if they were part of the same activity. Recently, new instructions have been sent to the Embassies' Cultural Offices indicating the change of role for the “cultural attaché” figure to become “programmers” for agents or facilitators. This recognises the need for an update to adapt to creators’ needs. The major challenge now is to combine freedom of creation with the political interests and contexts of the country in question.

Historically, the diplomatic service held competences for Education, Economy, Policies, Consulates, etc. but over time these areas have been passed on to the sector-based Ministries which have created their own Offices. The Foreign Office has retained diplomatic, consular, cooperation functions and also covers policy and representation.4

In reference to the cultural competences of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation, the Spanish International Cooperation Agency for Development (AECID) is competent in this area, delegated by the Ministry since 2000.5

Article 149 of the Spanish Constitution of 1978 determines that the State’s exclusive competences are international relations, defence of Spanish cultural, artistic and monumental heritage against exportation and spoliation; museums, libraries and archives held by the State, without affecting how they are managed by the Autonomous Regions.

As far as international relations are concerned, the Constitutional Court (henceforth the TC) has been obliged to define them and give them a more precise outline. Ruling 165/1994 had to distinguish between international relations and international projection or relevance activities, the latter likely to be covered by Autonomous Regions. Consequently, international relations that are the exclusive competence of the State are identified as any which imply the possibility of arranging treaties, which affect the State’s foreign policy, and which generate international responsibilities.

Regarding this State reserve, defined as the central core, it is important to highlight that there are already matters that the TC considers to be outside this scope and therefore can be carried out by other organisations and autonomous regions such as International Cooperation. In a ruling in 1994, the TC deemed that this did not form part of the central core of foreign policy. So, Law 23/1998, of 7th July, on International Cooperation for Development, recognises the multitude of players who take part in this area along with the variety of public administrations, and in Article 3, as a principle, it establishes that “the policy of international cooperation for development is part of the State’s foreign action and is based on the action unit principle for the State abroad”. Here, players are actually coordinated, both in negotiating and drafting the cooperation policy, the Spanish Master Plan on Cooperation in force for four years, and in the monitoring structure.

This might be a good coordination model, as there is a policy negotiated by State, Autonomy Regions and Civil Society that is coordinated ad intra and should be coordinated ad extra, based on the aforementioned principle of action unit abroad. Similar work takes place in other areas such as innovation policies; the same road map is negotiated and
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5. This was delegated by including the third additional provision in the Law of International Cooperation for Development, Law 23/1998, of 7th July.
is followed jointly between the State and the Autonomous Regions. This same coherence was recommended to perform the public policies within the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals and to generate alliances.

Regarding the cultural field, the degree of competence that ultimately corresponds to the State and the Autonomous Regions should be highlighted in the Constitutional Court’s interpretation considering that, as has been acknowledged, the matter possesses an inevitable degree of indetermination that should be clarified case by case (Sentence 125/1984).

In 1978, the Spanish Constitution (art.149) transferred the competences to the Autonomous Regions, so there is no state cultural policy, but the Central Government reserves the right to its essential designation. This is an essential aspect of the topic that we are covering, because if culture is a competence assumed by most Autonomous Regions, through their respective Autonomy Statutes and the State, residually maintaining this designation via article 149.2 of the Spanish Constitution, it seems clear that if it projects culture abroad, it does it through the territory’s culture spaces and producers, so it is necessary for the State bodies in charge of international projection to work jointly with the regional and local structures. And they should perhaps expect what some have described as “Euclidean geometry, according to which two parallel lines that run indefinitely will never reach a point of convergence”. In this respect, Esteve (1986) concludes, “this would mean not so much placing a dividing line but finding a closer point to the idea of capacity rather than competence”.

Nor should we gloss over that, according to Statistics from the Ministry of Culture, 90% of public spending intended for culture in the Spanish state comes from the local field, and that, as an example, municipal creative centres are the main players in cultural production.6

Consequently, if we focus on that international projection, Central Government, Autonomous Regions and cities in an international context, it seems logical that the scenario lacks coordination. Authors such as Martin and Uldemolins (2015) outline a new image outlining a federal scenario, although it seems that they have not concluded with a second phase of coordination or coherence between the Autonomous Regions and the State.

The Spanish model comprises a variety of agents who work abroad and, as we will see below, each of them has their own structure, priorities, cross-discipline aspects, their own personnel or their own budget. This explains the lack of coordination, fragmentation of Spain’s image, overlap of functions, duplicity of actions, increase in public spending... which is visible both in Spain and abroad.

This situation has led to a variety of coordination attempts since the 1990s, such as the Government Delegate Commission for Cultural Matters, set up in 1997, as the Government’s delegate body for coordinating and boosting cultural policy or the coordination committee, set up in 2004, using a work methodology that favours synergies between players. Subsequently, an agreement was signed between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation and the Ministry of Culture, dated 19 November 2009, determining a Strengthened Strategy to Promote Spanish Culture Abroad, setting up a Joint Work Commission that initiated the Cultural Action Plan. Last year, the Foreign Cultural Action Plan was approved. This plan had already been presented a few years ago to symbolise the truce between the Ministries
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of Culture and Foreign Affairs of the chosen competences, and was recovered a year ago, although this refers to a Plan that has not been developed until now nor its effects deployed, as it had to specify sector-based and regional strategies (García, 2011). In 2019, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Culture presented, for the first time and jointly, the forecast and planning for actions from their Ministries (Ruiz, 2019).

In trends gleaned from compared analysis of the EU foreign cultural policies, it is seen that most States assign management and coordination of foreign cultural policies to their respective Ministries of Foreign Affairs, many of them with regional organisations and institutions that are dependent on these ministries and the Ministry of Culture. There are institutions for dissemination of language and culture such as the Goethe Institute, with a budget from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs although dependent on the German Ministry of Education, with remarkable autonomy, or the British Council that gathers together schools and strengths internationalisation of its national events and industries.

Regarding the great cultural power of France, it should be mentioned that in 2009 it proposed a reform to its external cultural action system, strengthening the role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through Culture France, to avoid dispersion and taking the Instituto Cervantes as a reference model, considering it to be the ultimate instrument of cultural diplomacy. Recently, everything has been concentrated from the General Board for globalisation, culture, teaching and international development.7

Other countries with “minority” languages have focussed on a strong presence from their cultures and, in many cases, they have set up agencies for this as agile instruments to support their creators to encourage exchange, residencies, mobility, project production in international centres. This would include the case of the Finnish FRAME (Finnish Funds for International Exchange), the Swiss ProHelvetia, IASPIS (Sweden), the Austria Cultural Forum or the Dutch Mondrian Foundation and SICA (Service Center for International Cultural Activities). There are others which specialise in music such as Music Export Denmark or some that encompass tourism and foreign trade such as Sweden.se.

III. THE MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED IN FOREIGN CULTURAL ACTION

A whole host of public organisations work on this issue from central government (graph 1, table 1).

According to Royal Decree 632/1987, of 8th May, the organisation of the State Administration abroad is seen as the functions assigned to promote amicable relations and development of the economic, cultural and scientific relations. (art 12.e). In the case of transferring competences to the Ministry of Culture, the actual text states that “the Offices of Attachés and sector-based Offices will maintain their current functional dependence from the Ministries with sector-based competence that corresponds to its internal organisation and budgetary allowance, as well as its technical inspection and control, without affecting what is stated in article 8 and the competences that correspond to the Ministry for Public Administrations in organisational matters. State Administrations can set up non-representative institutions and services abroad to develop their sector-based activities. The Council of Ministers will have to authorise their set-up, after receiving a prior report from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
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7. https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/le-ministere-et-son-reseau/missions-et-organisation-62169/organigramme-de-l-administration-centrale/article/direction-generale-de-la-mondialisation-de-la-culture-de-l-enseignement-et-du
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In relation to territorial coordination with the Autonomous Regions, although the Ministry continuously works on communication, this is not seen in the form of joint work programmes. In addition, the Sector Conference is not the most effective space, and it does not meet very often, just twice a year. On 10th July 2017, a new Regulation for Organisation and Operation of the Culture Sector Conference was approved, to adapt it to Law 40/2015, that includes the change of name from the Sector Commission. There are two work groups set up to tackle specific questions, which could make this an extra foreign cultural policy, like the Inter-territorial Cinema and Audiovisual Conference-COMICA.

The Ministry of Culture was restructured last May. Its General Sub-Department of Cultural Cooperation disappeared, and its competences were added to the General Sub-Department for Promotion of Cultural Industries.8

On the other hand, within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the General Board of Cultural and Scientific Relations launched for the “Window Programme” for all Embassies and Cultural Centres during the pandemic. This aims to give virtual visibility to national institutions...
## Table 1. INSTITUCIONES QUE INTERVIEVEN EN LA ACCIÓN CULTURAL EXTERIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Faculties of the SECI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Management of foreign policy and international cooperation for development, in compliance with Government directives and applying the action unit abroad principle | • Encourage, manage and perform public policies for cultural development cooperation  
• Management of cultural services for the AECID  
• Cooperation in the field of skills training for human capital.  
• University and scientific cooperation towards development has been carried out since the 1920s but a stable programme emerged from 1940 onwards  
• International relations and agreements in the cultural and Scientific field, such as Spain joining UNESCO in 1953  
• Scientific, Technological and Innovation Diplomacy (DCTI) |

### Organisations that joined SECI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AECID**  
(Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation) | • Planning and assessment of Spain’s foreign relations in the field of culture, science, technology and the environment, with other countries and with international organisations  
• Coordination of Spain’s foreign relations with the different ministerial departments and other Administrations and public and private entities, in the aforementioned fields  
• Preparation, negotiation and proposal of agreements and international conventions, organisation of the mixed commissions that develop them in the field of their competences and management of actions derived from them  
• Assurance and coordination of Spain’s international presence in international cultural or scientific organisations | • 13 Cultural Centres set up as Foreign Cooperation Units  
• 6 Associated Centres with local participation and presence in 16 countries (15 Latin American plus Equatorial Guinea)  
• 1,000,000 visitors every year |
| **Instituto Cervantes**  
Set up by Law (Law 7/1991 to create the Instituto Cervantes and regulated under Royal Decree 1526/1999, dated 1st October) | • Universally promote the teaching, study and use of the Spanish language and encourage measures and actions that help broadcast and improve the quality of these activities  
• Contribute to dissemination of the culture abroad in coordination with the other competent bodies from the State Administration  
• In its activities, the Instituto Cervantes will fundamentally attend to the linguistic and cultural patrimony that is common to the countries and peoples of the Spanish-speaking community | • 86 centres  
• 45 countries from five continents  
• 2 headquarters in Spain, the central headquarters in Madrid and their headquarters in Alcalá de Henares. |
| **Royal Academy in Rome**  
Set up in 1873 | • Contribute to the artistic and humanistic training of creators, restorers and researchers, with the purpose derived from achieving greater Spanish cultural presence in Italy, a better understanding of the cultures of both countries and greater cultural ties between Europe and Ibero-America | It is an institution of the Spanish Central Administration abroad. It depends functionally and organically on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, through the SECI-Board of Cultural and Scientific Relations within the AECID, of which it forms the top management and is regulated by its specific provisions |
FOREIGN CULTURAL ACTION: CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OR FOREIGN CULTURAL POLICY

Ministry of Culture and Sport

Promotion, protection and dissemination of Spanish historical heritage, state museums and the arts, books, reading and literary creation, film and audiovisual activities and state books and libraries, as well as promotion and dissemination of culture in Spanish. The boost of cultural cooperation actions, in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation, international relations in matters of culture, such as the sitting on the Council of Ministers for the European Union, UNESCO, etc.

ACE/Foreign cultural action

(Its Board of Directors includes representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation and the Ministry of Culture and Sport and the Inland Revenue)

- Promote and disseminate the variety of cultural realities in Spain inside and outside our borders.
- Assemble the projects from the different autonomy regions and cultural institutions throughout the national territory.
- Promote projects that involve creators, scientists and cultural and creative industries abroad following the geographic directives of the Cultural Action Plan Abroad (PACE).

ICEX (Affiliated with the Secretary of State for Foreign Trade, depending on the Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade) Royal Decree 6/1982 as the National Export Promotion Institute (INFE), adopted its current name in 1987.

- Increase the base of companies that are starting out on internationalisation, via export or investment.
- Help companies to make the most of the opportunities offered by foreign markets, boosting new business competition factors.
- Improve the knowledge and image of Spanish goods and services abroad.
- Boost institutional cooperation for internationalisation with foreign promotion organisations from the Autonomous Regions, sector-based associations, the Senior Council of Chambers of Commerce, the different bodies of the Spanish Central Administration and other institutions.

- SECTOR-BASE CONFERENCE and Work Groups-COMICA.
- State Council for Performing Arts and Music or the Heritage Council
- Instruments such as assistant for translation, Hispanex grants or Culturex grants in Representations abroad or in International Centres such as Pompidou or Jeu du Paume in Paris, National Gallery in Washington or the Tate Modern in London.
- ICAA: maintains institutional relations both multilaterally - with the European Council, the European Union and the Ibero-American Cinematographic Authorities Conference. Plus participation in decision-making bodies from European and International institutions such as Europa Creativa, Eurimages, the Executive Board of the European Audiovisual Sector Observatory, the Ibero-American Cinematographic Authorities Conference (CACI), Ibermedia, European Film promotion or the European Film Agency Directors (EFADs)

- PICE_Programme for the Internationalisation of Spanish Culture: Mobility/Visitors
- Organisation of cultural activities and international co-production, commemorations
- International Exhibitions

- Board of Fashion, Habitat and Cultural Industries and an Internationalisation strategy for the Spanish Economy 2017-2027.
- Sounds from Spain: ICEX -INAEM, AIE, SGAE, ARTE, -PROMUSICA- -UFI.
- Icex Influencer
- Icext Next
and creators, creating a content archive. In addition, training has been proposed in webinar format or working with PlatformC. Another way of getting involved included supporting initiatives such as ‘Frena la Curva’ (Flatten the Curve), particularly in the Central American region and, over 5000 cultural kits were distributed in Honduras.

In the case of the ACE state company, it also chose to digitalise its contents so that its exhibitions taking place using virtual reality tools. Although the most remarkable aspect is support for the most vulnerable film production sector, by means of a call for one million Euros of funding working with Netflix, the Film Academy and the ICAA. Other calls from the PICE Programme have also made changes to be able to develop programmes for visitors via virtual encounters.

Regarding major international events such as Expo 2020 in Dubai and the Frankfurt Book Fair, changes were made to the scheduled dates, delaying the opening of the Universal Expo to 2021 and Spain will have to wait until 2022 to be the guest country at the Frankfurt Book Fair.

IV. CONTENTS OF FOREIGN CULTURAL ACTION

For some time, the concept of Spain’s presence on international circuits has been approached by questioning whether Spanish art exists abroad. Different players leading Spanish cultural institutions and curators argue that the presence of Spanish artists abroad is not exactly strong. Spain holds major events, but there is a great deficit of international recognition for Spanish artists, even though Spanish curators are well known for their work outside Spain (Espejo, 2011). This problem starts at home and authorities are urged to present good projects at international events, as the Spanish pavilion is rarely among the most highly praised. Spain has been left out of the Latin trend adopted by the major American institutions –such as MoMa–and European institutions, as in Belgium and the United Kingdom. It is considered that the search for international recognition is bound to fail in advance because it is always academic and flexible, and solutions involve strengthening structural weakness.

Spanish culture as we know it is not particularly modern, but tends to revolve around artists such as Murillo, Velazquez, Zurbarán... (Pulido, 2018) although there are isolated cases, such as Rosalía or Almodovar-Banderas, who might reinforce the most traditional image already built up over the years along with the Latin product label, as happened with Hispano-American literature back in the day (Muñoz, 2019). Our country’s transformation process over the last 30 years has radically changed Spain’s profile. The PACE text states that, “external cultural action will make it possible to project an im-
age of Spain that fits our reality”. However, the image that is held of Spanish society in some places tends to reflect the stereotypes of the past, as it is a well-known fact that sometimes images take longer to change that what lies beneath them. Consequently, we might stress that backing modern creation, due to its symbolic weight, would mean updating the country’s image to its own contemporaneity without losing sight of tradition.

Critical voices have emerged over the last few years on how to form relations in the cultural cooperation framework, highlighting the role of cultural management mentioned by Inch (2014), Pao de la Vega (2020) or Yúdice (2012) from the countries where they are acting, or how new triangulated forms of governance are being proposed from international networks, putting centring decision-making around southern partners.

V. PROPOSALS: BUILD COMPLEMENTARY SPACES

The analysis performed brings up the ambivalence of two opposing models: that of cultural diplomacy and foreign cultural policy, that can manage to complement each other, as although it does not seem that cultural diplomacy is going to be discarded, as culture is an element of foreign policy, if we were to move forward towards a foreign cultural policy that would look at what happens in international creation spaces, this might improve the presence of creators in the international field.

A few proposals:

1. **Assess the foreign cultural action that is currently under way** to find out the real results and thereby manage to set new objectives. Consequently, we must be aware of the resources assigned, be they organisational, economic, programmes for different agents involved, etc.

2. **Start a dialogue and establish a joint work framework.** We should highlight that external cultural policy has not had this framework so far, as specific cultural policy has not been drawn up, negotiated among the different agents; this requires narrowing the gap between creation and the agents that configure it with agents from the administration, setting geographic priorities, detecting real needs and the most effective instruments.

3. **Working on a common road map that defines and sifts priorities for each sector**, and interweaves other strategies to determine participation in the most interesting events, the procedures and selection criteria for curators, projects, actions and in selecting management positions for the institutions, thereby following best practices invoked by professionals and civil society. This is not a case of copying foreign models, but designing our own, knowledge-based model. From there on, a common road map can be drawn up showing how necessary resources would be distributed, reinforcing geographic points as required, both with professionals in the different fields and with long term agendas.

4. **Encourage handover from the State to the administrators, creators and productions** from the network of creation and production centres to generate alliances with other international spaces. The professionals running these centres have specific knowledge and valid criteria to programme a wide range of activities that can be subsequently exported to other foreign centres. In addition, by means of working together, it will be possible to get professionals in international networks (both Euro-
pean networks such as IETM, On The Move, We are More and in professional networks such as IKT).

5. **Provide information on international job opportunities and open up calls from major Spanish institutions to foreign talent**, which requires independence and freedom from political changes or its time frames.

In relation to professionalisation, it is clear that spaces run by specialised professionals obtain better results so it is proposed that management and administration positions should be reinforced by qualified personnel with knowledge and experience in the matter, as well as updating State bodies including: Diplomatic service civil servants, State Economists or Commercial Experts, or the optional organisations or Curators of Museums, Archives and Libraries, in addition to working with local professionals to analyse the context.

As previously mentioned, it has been observed that countries where the language is not the central cultural manifestation have flexible, specialised agencies that are used to support its creators’ international mobility.

6. **Specialise Spanish Cultural Action/ACE** as a cultural agency with agility and flexibility. It could take over management of international cultural events such as the Venice Biennale of Art and Architecture, strengthening the entity’s cultural mission and providing the necessary agility and resources to get the best results, with competitive selection according to Best Practices for its management and content selection.

Currently, due to the ACE’s competences after the merger between its state societies, we might question whether this is a cultural or country image project, as it has been commissioned to manage the Spanish Pavilion of the International and Universal Exhibitions (approved by the BIE). Consequently, this matter could be derived to the Secretary of State for economic diplomacy, España Global or to ICEX, as happens in surrounding countries.

7. **It is suggested that ICEX and España Global should focus on the specific characteristics of the sector and/or sub-sectors**, and approach the instruments that might be derived from listening to the actual sector, see the National Board for Performing Arts and Music or the associations representing the industry, as happened with Sounds From Spain and could evaluate the creation, production and distribution, recognising its economic-symbolic contribution and its intrinsic peculiarities.

Beyond the initiative, taken but not performed, from the National Foreign Cultural Action Plan, that comes to life as a national monitoring committee or political-institutional work group and that doubtlessly reflects a willingness to improve coordination between intervening national public agents, but it remains wanting as it does not incorporate the sector and continues to be subject to foreign policy priorities.

8. **Carrying out constant technical coordination**, to achieve stability and the report on completed work, sharing information, schedules and joining forces, while it defines at each extreme how every entity involved should act and its separates their functions to avoid duplication.

9. **Strengthen the Sector-based Culture Conference**, a space where coopera-
tion relations are or can be articulated between the Spanish Central Administration and the Autonomous Regions, particularly relating to defining broad brushstrokes of cultural policy. This will not be effective, unless voluntarily, through the creation of a specific commission or work group; a joint work space is set up for internationalisation of culture and constant communication channels open up for it to be distributed abroad, through figures such as the Government Delegation, depending on the Ministry of Territorial Policy and Public Function, in charge of relations with the autonomous regions and entities that are included in Local Administration.

10. **Analyse the different existing budgetary programmes**, to assign foreign cultural action its own budget and find others regarding country image for these purposes.

Over the next few years, as we perceive the already devastating consequences caused by Covid-19, the Public Administrations and institutions should work towards the goal of structuring a stable culture ecosystem, focussing on the specific characteristics and perhaps incorporating risk management as a practice for cultural policies. The real-life situation in the different sectors should be analysed, and formulas sought to become more competitive internationally.

At this time of reconstruction, when European funds are due to arrive, they should be channelled appropriately to be able to reach even the smallest structures. This is thereby an opportunity to adapt the model to real needs (structure costs, encouraging associations, including social impact criteria, etc.).

11. **Observe trends that are happening in the cultural institutions.** Like the international boom that took place towards decolonisation or the anti-colonial turn in Museums such as MN- CARS, with the idea of southernising the museum and other exhibitions and activities or the Matadero, the work carried out from Artistic Residences, with programmes such as Conciencia Afro (De Diego, 2018). Also abroad: MOMA\(^9\) with activities on native peoples or the arrival of the South to the aforementioned Museum with exhibitions and collections highlight this trend that could be seen at recent art events such as the Berlin Biennial 2018: *We don't need another hero*, with a completely African team of curators, led by Gabi Ngcobo or the Sydney Biennial 2020,\(^10\) focussed on otherness and on native peoples. This year PHotoEspaña features Elvira Dyangani Ose as curator, working from the book *Contra la raza*. Elvira Dyangani is the curator for *The Showroom* in London. More examples such as the Sao Paulo Biennial 2020, *Hace oscuro más yo canto* or the Sao Paulo Triennial, with three African-Brazilian curators (Thiago de Sousa, Diane Lima and Beatriz Lemos), and finally Sonsbeek 2020, with Bonaventura Soh Bejeng Dikung as artistic director. We are witnessing a worldwide social mobilisation to defend many different collectives, such as the *Black Lives Matters* movement, feminist demonstrations, LGTB, etc. that the State cannot ignore, reflecting progress in society.

---

10. https://www.biennaleofsydney.art
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NEW PLAYERS IN CULTURAL DIPLOMACY: CITIES, CIVIL SOCIETY, SOCIAL MEDIA AND DIGITAL ENVIRONMENT

Mariano Martín Zamorano

Spanish cultural diplomacy has evolved from a system revolving around the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Culture to an institutional structure where local governments and Autonomous Regions are highly relevant. This policy has led to forming different sector-based and public-private governance frameworks, that pursue specific identity, social development or business goals. This chapter analyses this complex structural framework, its multiple lines of action and its main digital platforms, from a constructivist perspective to evaluate the capacity of this system to channel territorial needs and demands from the Spanish cultural sector and propose improvement measures in a context dominated by the current global pandemic.

Key words: cultural diplomacy, Spain, social players, urban paradiplomacy, digital cultural diplomacy.

I. CULTURAL DIPLOMACY: DEFINITIONS AND MODELS

Public diplomacy defines relations determined between governments and persons abroad (Mannheim, 1994). It mainly consists of communicative actions, such as TV campaigns on foreign media or major events with international projection, intended to generate positive foreign interest in a nation (Leonard, 1997). Cultural diplomacy is generally located as the greatest sub-area of public diplomacy (Mark, 2009). Named as such in the 1960s, this policy has a variety of focus points, reflected in its differing national models (Wyszomirski, Margaret, Burgess, Christopher, Peila 2003). It has been defined as the official exchange of ideas, information and other forms of cultural heritage between countries and their peoples to “promote mutual understanding” (Cummings 2003, p. 1) or encourage “national interest”, that is so difficult to define” (Arndt 2008, p. 31).

Currently, cultural diplomacy is characterised by a multiple players intervening on different scales and from all levels of government (Mesado i Jardí, 2008). This policy assumes a complex relationship with domestic cultural action. For example, many activities designed as part of cultural diplomacy were formalised in the country of origin, such as the photography exhibition After September, opened in New York, that travelled around 60 countries (Kennedy, 2003). This unclear field
of action, subject to the States’ foreign agenda, welcomes participation from the governments of a nation, its business owners, artists or emigrates. In fact, a record of increasingly important external cultural activity is what is known as cultural paradipomacy, consisting of the international cultural action carried out by regional and local governments (Zamarrano, Mariano Martín and Rodríguez Morató, 2014).

Therefore, this is a field which is a practically extensive as it is theoretically vague (Topić, Martina, Sciortino 2012). However, it should be considered that as international representation, governments prioritise a set of artistic, intellectual and cultural goods and activities considered to be distinctive and easy to disseminate abroad. These foreign cultural exchange policies, framed within a specific strategy, can be defined as cultural (para)diplomacy in a determined historical context.

Among the varying elements that influence cultural diplomacy models, there are its national historical directions - more interventionist and centralist in the French case and narrow (at arm’s length) in the English case - or the productive basis of each territory in the creative field; today highly determined by COVID-19, for example, in the government’s capacity to promote artistic mega events as a strategy for international projection. Cultural diplomacy trends are also prescribed by certain political rationalities that have been prevalent over the last few decades, leading to more corporativist governance frameworks or more open to social participation. They include more instrumental and propagandist perspectives such as focused on generating what is known as soft power or using culture to support the territorial brand (branding), and other constructivist types, that make values and cultural goods primary ends for the political action (Villanueva, 2007).

II. CULTURAL DIPLOMACY IN SPAIN SINCE THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

The decentralisation of public administration that took place during the democratic transition was also demonstrated in the swift diversification of the apparatus of foreign cultural action at both state and sub-state level. Along the same line, this policy gradually abandoned the centralist and racist agenda of Francoist cultural diplomacy, based on the concept of Spanishness (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 1991).

The Ministry of Culture was set up in 1977, soon to become an important player in external cultural policy. Cultural diplomacy broadened its horizons and expanded its bilateral cultural cooperation channels. Further innovation in this period lines in the appearance of a strategic line of foreign relations focused on cultural development cooperation (Huguet, 2010). This, aimed fundamentally at Latin America, replaced the prior Spanishness project. Within this framework, the Spanish International Cooperation Agency (AECID) was set up in 1988, overseen by the Spanish cultural network in Ibero-America.

During the third socialist term of office (1989-1993) and after the country joined the European Community, a new international agenda was drawn up, leaning towards transforming Spain’s image and developing its economy. The Instituto Cervantes (IC) was set up in 1991, given flexibility regarding how it projected national heritage, although always emphasising the Castilian Spanish language and Spanish culture that was produced in this language (Noya, 2003). This would encompass artistic, linguistic and patrimonial dissemination in five continents and in American countries outside the field of the AECID (14 centres).

---

1. This concept defines Latin America as an evangelised socio-political space, civilised by the Spanish Empire, that has been characterised by its historical and religious unity.
Once in the 21st century, Spanish foreign policy was characterised by certain instability, within the framework of the different approximations the different left- and right-wing governments have given it. During the second term of office for the PP government (2000-2004), international cultural policy was redirected towards economic diplomacy and branding (Sánchez Mateos, 2001). With this in mind, three state societies were set up for International Exhibitions (2000), Foreign Cultural Action (2001) and Cultural Commemorations (2002). The “Marca España” (Brand Spain) public diplomacy project was also launched, and its cultural activities were dominated by a Spanish-speaking centralism (Huguet 2010; Rius Ulldemolins, Joaquim, Zamorano 2015).

From 2004 onwards, the socialist government’s foreign cultural action took a new turn towards cultural cooperation, although maintaining its national branding project. However, within the framework of the “austerity” policies that followed the financial crisis in 2008, the system was reconfigured and rationalised. The Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (MAEC) then competed for control of the competences and resources from foreign promotion (Ruiz Mantilla 2008), coming out in favour of the MAEC in 2010. The National Plan for External Cultural Action (PACE) was subsequently drafted and Spanish Cultural Action (AC/E) was set up, as an entity with participation from the Ministry of Culture (MEC) and the MAEC, that merged the three pre-existing companies.

After the early elections in 2011, within the framework of the new PP government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs General Board of the Media and Public Diplomacy (BOE of 31 December 2011) and the National Plan for Foreign Cultural Action was blocked (Fernández Leost, 2012). Relaunch of the Brand Spain project involved going into greater depth on the process of reducing artistic and scientific diplomacy plus cultural cooperation for development (De Benito, 2012).

Currently, cultural diplomacy depends to a large extent on the MAEC which is bound to the High Commissioner for Brand Spain, the IC and the AECID. On the other hand, there is the Ministry of Culture and Sport (MCD) that works on external cultural policy from different departments and also from cultural facilities such as the Prado Museum or the Reina Sofia Museum. In addition, there is the aforementioned AC/E that has input from both Ministries. Finally, there is the ICEX that has an area devoted to exporting the Spanish cultural industry and other public autonomous organisations or public-private agencies. The PSOE, currently in power, has remarked upon the need to develop cultural diplomacy. In the context of COVID-19, the strategy back digital cultural diplomacy, for example, by means of “digitalisation of Cervantes all over the world”.2

III. THE ROLE OF SUB-STATE PLAYERS: CITIES

Over the last few decades, cities have not only been consolidated as top level cultural players on a territorial level but they have taken on a strategic role in international cultural action (Harvey, 1989; Zamorano and Rodríguez Morató, 2014). The growing internationalisation of consumption and cultural production and the importance given to urban branding in creative city projects (Vanolo 2015), are just some factors that have influenced this phenomenon.

In the case of Spain, although “international relations” are a competence of the central government (Art. 149.1.3 of the CE), both the constitutional framework and the foreign ac-

---

tion model determined in 1978 have brought about development of foreign policy for cities and regions (Pérez González 1986). Based on its broad competences in culture and as the Constitutional Court gradually opened its interpretation of Art. 149 (Sarmiento Méndez, 2010), regional and local governments have been setting up their own mechanisms for international cultural policy (Galindo Villoria, Granados Martínez and Gutiérrez del Castillo, 2009).

In this scenario, a variety of cities have developed institutional instruments and specific programmes in international cultural policy. Below we will briefly analyse the foreign cultural policy of four cities with particularly unequal governance frameworks, degrees of development and directions: Barcelona, Seville, Valencia and Bilbao.

1. The cultural paradiplomacy of Barcelona

Barcelona City Hall is a paradigmatic case of local cultural paradiplomacy in Spain (Zamorano and Rodríguez Morató, 2014). This began during the PSC government (1982-1997) and coincided with the preparations for the 1992 Olympic Games. In 1988, the City Hall set up Olimpiada Cultural S.A. (OCSA), a public-private association that organised an ambitious programme of activities with international projection (Moragas i Spa, 2008). The internationalisation process bound to the Olympic urban regeneration project would lead to a variety of transformations in what was known as the “Barcelona Model” of cultural policies, initially characterised by social inclusion.

Since 1995, the Barcelona Culture Institute (ICUB) has taken a central role in international cultural policies. This organisation was designed by a team working to obtain Barcelona’s nomination for “European City of Culture 2001”. From its international promotion area, it worked on projects such as the Fórum de las Culturas (2004) or the many different lines of promoting the cultural industry internationally. Characterised by clear multi-level articulation, the ICUB has worked actively with other state governments, with organisations such as ICEX and with international entities such as UNESCO. It also played a key role in setting up international projects such as Agenda 21 for culture.

The city’s internationalisation model, within the creative city project, adopted in previous decades, is currently being questioned. The coalition led by Barcelona en Comú has continued to redirect this process towards developing local culture (Rius Ulldemolins and Gisbert, 2018).

2. The cultural paradiplomacy of Seville

Seville is another Spanish city with an international brand that has developed specific strategies for foreign cultural projection. Since the Expo in 1992, its artistic and historical heritage, including flamenco, has become even more relevant for international consolidation of the image of Andalusia and the country as a whole (Marzo 2005). The city is also a centre for the regional editorial and audiovisual industry. On this basis, successive PSOE governments in City Hall (1999-2011) proposed Seville as the first City of Music in the context of the UNESCO Cities Network (2006), and flamenco as Intangible Cultural Heritage (2010).

The city’s Institute of Culture and the Arts (ICAS), set up in 2005, has secured internationalisation powers, with specific emphasis on the world of music and the cultural industry in general (ICAS 2016). It has thereby determined different international cycles or programmes such as the Seville Piano International cycle or foreign promotion of the Ancient Music Academy at the University of Seville (AMANT).
City Hall and the state organisations for cultural diplomacy have regularly worked together. For example, through PICE, AC/E supported the Seville European Film Festival 2019 organised by ICAS. Furthermore, the Monkey Week festival—among other events—was assisted by the Andalusian External Promotion Agency and AC/E to enhance its internationalisation task (AC/E, 2017).

3. The cultural paradiplomacy of Valencia

From the PP government (1991-2015), Valencia City Hall deployed a cultural branding and foreign projection strategy based on major international events and new cultural facilities (Linheira, Rius-Ulldemolins and Hernández, 2018). This process revolved around the City of Arts and Sciences, opened in 1998. However, the City Council also helped organise events such as the America’s Cup (2007, 2009) and the Formula 1 world championship (since 2008). This foreign cultural policy with an entrepreneurial leaning would be articulated with the Brand Spain project in the early 21st century (Marzo, 2005).

However, the City Council’s Culture Department has been focussing its work on local resources, including management of museums, libraries and the city’s popular heritage. On the other hand, it has recently backed a model aimed at projecting basic culture by means of reconnecting local policy with regional and state areas. In 2016, after the new government of the Valencian Community came into power, led by the PSOE, the cultural area designed an “Internationalisation Plan for the Cultural and Creative Industries” and forged contacts with the IC, the Institut Ramon Llull (IRL) and AC/E (Viñas, 2016). Within this framework, the City Council, led by Compromís, jointly organised actions such as the “1st International Dramatic Arts Sessions” for Valencia with support from AC/E.

4. The cultural paradiplomacy of Bilbao

The city of Bilbao’s cultural policy has been clearly influenced over the last few years by the PNV governments’ internationalisation project. Building the Guggenheim Museum (1997) was a turning point towards the creative city model in its cultural policies (Martínez de Albeniz, 2012). Currently, the Museum remains a central space for foreign projection in the region (Cultura, 2019, p. 4). In this respect, the foreign cultural policy was intended to strengthen the urban brand in key markets.

Just like in Barcelona, the City Council, that joined the Agenda 21 for Culture in 2005, takes an active part in international forums, including Eurocities or the UNESCO Network of creative cities, among others. It has also continuously taken part in inter-regional collaboration, such as the Pyrenart cross-border cooperation project. Jointly funded by the European Fund for Regional Development, it intends to promote internationalisation of the performing arts in the Pyrenees (Spain, France and Andorra).

The City Council’s culture area has also developed other internationalisation mechanisms locally, such as promoting the town’s mural art, that includes works by internationally known artists. In 2019, the municipal government (PNV and PSE) approved its “International Action Strategy 2030”. It proposes strengthening economic and social development using the city’s cultural assets with global projection, in line with the creative city model.

IV. SOCIAL PLAYERS: CIVIL ORGANISATIONS AND THE DIASPORA

Spanish cultural diplomacy has historically enjoyed dynamic participation from civil society and the diaspora (Lida, 2019). On the one hand, the neo-colonial external cultural policy since the 19th century has backed the Span-
ish language and science by promoting different associations abroad, particularly in Latin America (Delgado Gómez-Escalonilla, 1991). On the other hand, nationalist movements in Galicia, Catalonia and the Basque Country carried out dynamic international cultural action, creating spaces for their communities in other countries.

External cultural action projects have been deeply transformed over the last few decades. These initiatives include a variety of mechanisms and fields relating museums, artists, teams or cultural companies with public administrations. These relations tackle both civic and sector-based diplomacy on Spanish soil and diaspora diplomacy abroad, and they can be divided into four groups.

Firstly, there is a series of associations and internationalisation projects for regional cultures that are developed in each territory under the stamp of identity projection and protection. This framework encompasses vibrant social participation from activists and interest in consolidating the national image abroad (Zamorano, 2016). This also includes organisations intended to strengthen heritage, mainly by promoting the language but also the arts. In the Catalan case, for example, this covers a wide fabric of institutions that have worked with the Catalan Generalitat, including the PEN Català, Patronat Cat Món or UNESCO-CAT.

Secondly, there are many companies and non-governmental organisations that group together artists, cultural or intellectual mediators and whose internationalising activity is established within a rationality bound to sector-based development. This is also framed within a wide range of structures that intend to project the arts or heritage from a social or corporate perspective. These entities oversee disseminating works, facilities and seek to attract cultural consumers. They also determine mechanisms to project the cultural industry in foreign markets following collective criteria with a territorial brand.

The players and entities that make up these networks achieve an unequal degree of articulation with the public administrations. Since 2014, the Programme for Internationalisation of Spanish Culture (PICE) from AC/E has been financially and logistically supporting Spanish companies and artists through financing for visitors and foreign mobility. Analysis of territorial distribution of all the funding assigned to foreign mobility between 2014 and 2019, shows us how they are mainly condensed into the Autonomous Regions of Madrid (1114), Catalonia (861) and Andalusia (495), followed by Galicia, Basque Country, Valencia and Castilla y León (over 150) (graph 1). This distribution of resources bears some correlation with the population density of each Autonomous Region and with territories boasting greater industrial production. However, it also reveals clear asymmetry in sector-based inclusion in different territories throughout the country.

Thirdly, we find a range of non-governmental entities developing international cultural action from a perspective of cultural development cooperation. Diplomats, cultural administrators or artists can all work on the historic Spanish project in this field. They are actively bound to the AECID but also to international cooperation agencies from many autonomous regions, such as Andalusia or the Basque Country, with local and provincial governments. This direction of cultural diplomacy corresponds to specific dynamics for territorial insertion abroad, frequently more exposed to local social participation. In this mould, as an example, in 2019 the AECID financed, the

---

“Parque de España” Cultural Centre in Rosario (Argentina) or the Nicaraguan Spanish Culture Institute.

Finally, diaspora players represent a fundamental dimension of current external cultural policy. Associations for flamenco, collas de diables or literary clubs are just some organisations that historically bring together Spanish people. Significant emigration over the last decade led to generational renewal of these spaces that also presented new demands. However, it should be mentioned that the incidence of foreign cultural policy is limited in cities where there is no representation from either the consulate or the IC/AECID. It is based on the “Spanish Language and Culture Programme” and on subsidies received by Spanish associations from the Ministry of Employment and Social Security (regulated in Order ESS/1613/2012), to encourage national culture. On the other hand, different autonomous regions have used their historical instruments to link themselves to these populations, including the Galician Xunta’s Communities Promotion Service, the Catalan policy with these communities regulated in the Autonomy Statute of 2006 or the funding for the Andalusia Junta given to the Andalusian Communities settled abroad. The scarce generational relief and limited programming updates for these historical spaces have been the main problems addressed by the administrations in their relations with them.

V. DIGITAL CULTURAL DIPLOMACY: ROLE AND SITUATION IN SPAIN

In 2015, the European Parliament emphasised the strategic role of digital cultural diplomacy to develop the EU’s soft power. This follows the distinguishing features set the same year by the Digital Diplomacy Plan developed by the MAEC. The need to back artistic and cul-

cultural activities and events with an online strategy, essential for Spanish cultural action (Exteriores, 2017), has been strengthened due to the current worldwide pandemic.

The diversity of public and private players mentioned in the previous section, developed its own virtual promotion supports in a network with the public administration. In this section, we will present a brief digital ethnography intended to frame the digital cultural diplomacy system. Firstly, we will process the last 600 Tweets published by the IC, AECID and AC/E accounts on 15th January 2020. Examining the online activity of the main institutions from the cultural diplomacy system helped us visualise the axes of its communication strategy, its programming priorities and its recent transformations. Table 1 shows intense activity from the IC and the AECID that have dynamic interaction with its followers.

Table 1. IC, AECID and AC/E Twitter accounts, followers, retweets and likes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Followers (thousands)</th>
<th>Average retweets</th>
<th>Average likes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@InstCervantes</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@AECID_es</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ACECultura</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own work.

Regarding the communicative and discursive direction of each account, Graph 2 shows how, while the IC is focussed on culture in Spanish and the projection of national literary or artistic heritage, AECID has a clearly social profile, where culture is bound transversally to its cooperation work in different fields, such as ecology or gender. Finally, AC/E presents a more operative focus, bound to the projection of Spanish culture from a sector-based perspective.

When analysing the Twitter accounts of the two most important linguistic-cultural projection organisations for the autonomous regions, the IRL and the Instituto Etxepare (IE) (table 2), it is seen that @IRLull and its impact are similar to AC/E, while IE has a more modest profile.

Graph 2. Twenty hashtags and words most used in Twitter by IC, AECID and AC/E
Table 3. IRL and IE Twitter accounts, followers, retweets and likes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Followers (thousands)</th>
<th>Average retweets</th>
<th>Average likes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@IRLlull</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@etxepareES</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own work.

As observed in graph 3, both accounts demonstrate their national nature, focussed on projection and linguistic protection, promotion of major festivals or funding, and exchanging with other sub-state nations.

In terms of networks, whilst the 10 most frequent tags correspond to well-known characters from culture in Castilian Spanish, such as Ismael Serrano or Almudena Grandes, AC/E maintains a more active link with the Ministry of Culture. The accounts for cultural delegations abroad interact assiduously with @InstCervantes and @AECID_es, although this depends on their national character. Consequently, the sub-state accounts being analysed mainly revolve around regional players and institutions or sub-state peers.

Beyond official institutions, many organisations from the tertiary cultural sector, artists or companies with global projection promote their action internationally as a national or territorial concept. Initiatives such as Dance From Spain, developed by the Federación Estatal de Asociaciones de Compañías y Empresas de Danza/ State Federation of Dance Company and Business Associations (FECED), are developed as specific instruments for digital cultural diplomacy. This refers to an online catalogue of Spanish companies and shows that was set up in 2012. The initiative has been supported by the AECID and the Instituto Cervantes, among other organisations. The Dance From Spain Twitter account has AC/E among its three most linked accounts in the period being analysed.

Digital cultural diplomacy has become a crucial instrument for this policy in the current context. The public institutions are seeking to channel the affected live arts activity through its virtual networks. One reference regarding the impact of COVID-19 in this respect is the increase of activity in Twitter between April and June 2020. Using an analysis on Twocharts of tweets sent out by @InstCervantes, @AECID_es and @ACECultura from 2018 to 2020, an exponential increase can be seen over the last quarter. In the case of AECID, it goes from 161 tweets in June 2018 to 195 in June 2019 and 1900 in the same month in 2020. AC/E follows a similar pattern, with 3329

7. Please see: https://twopcharts.com/
tweets in June 2020, 354 in June 2019 and 390 in June 2018. Only the IC shows a minor activity increase, with 520 tweets in June 2020 and a biannual average of 364.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

The structure of Spanish cultural diplomacy is fragmented. The dynamics of collaboration and conflict between the MEC, MAEC, the autonomous regions and diverse local governments and the emphasis from the different right- and left-wing governments regarding external cultural policy, have made their mark on the country’s symbolic projection abroad. In this respect, the constitutional, regulatory and administrative dependence of this activity should be highlighted in relation to the territorial cultural policy system.

Our brief review of the role of cities in cultural paradiplomacy firstly demonstrates a certain asymmetry in institutional development. Whilst some cities, such as Barcelona, have given greater autonomy to international action, other have developed it less systematically or as an axis crossing through local cultural policy. Certain differences are also demonstrated in the international projection model and in the degree of articulation of the vertical governance of this policy. These differences are explained by diverse factors such as each city’s sociocultural inequalities, the national character of some autonomous regions being analysed and their creative city policies, including strategies such as major facilities or spectacular events. While linguistic projection has remained more subject to regional paradiplomacy, cities have directed themselves more decidedly towards creation and the urban brand.

A huge range of social players participate in this framework of cultural diplomacy. Organisations that act under sector-based, nationalist or foreign development cooperation logic have been strengthening specific cooperation networks. Certain social transformations and recent policies have led to its reorganisation. On the one hand, new emigration, ageing among historical communities abroad and new technologies have questioned the model for relations between the administrations and emigrants. On the other hand, locally, there is a noticeably growing internationalising demand from companies and artists who suffered from cuts after 2012. This phenomenon has been partially tackled by AC/E that is refocussing its activity due to COVID-19 although its funding has been relatively centralised in Madrid and Barcelona. The different networks integrated in cultural diplomacy share certain discursive directions and also revolve around certain nodes. In this respect, our digital ethnography reveals a certain atomisation of the digital cultural projection determined by national and market factors and an acceleration of digital diplomacy in the last few months due to the current situation.

In order to address this scenario, the following new political measures have been proposed from a constructivist and federalist focus:

1. Central government

1. Promote federalisation of foreign cultural action by means of a reactivated Sector-based Cultural Conference - with participation from both Ministries (MAEC and MCD), in order to increase the spaces for and means of intergovernmental cooperation, prioritising the social and sector-based demands.

2. Develop strategies to solve the problem of centralisation of the support for cultural internationalisation in Madrid, Seville and Barcelona, such as segmenting the PICE and other programmes to support internation-
alisation of the arts depending on provincial quotas.

Multi-level strategies:

3. Support artists, emigrants and other players from the diaspora by means of diversified strategies abroad. Map the multi-level framework of foreign cultural representation - consulates, centres, actions - in all countries. On this basis, broaden and reconfigure the consulate attention and the cultural service to citizens abroad, also including mechanisms from the autonomous regions and online for this purpose.

4. Strengthen the role of AECID and IC and its foreign networks, in its direct relations with Spanish and non-Spanish communities abroad.

5. Increase digital diplomacy resources for all cultural diplomacy organisations, with a coordinated strategy and a long-term schedule.

6. Develop a training programme for human resources in Spanish cultural diplomacy, working with autonomous regions, cities and State organisations.

2. Autonomous regions and local governments

Set participative and bottom-up mechanisms to define and design local and regional internationalisation programmes.

Use local and regional governments' proximity to the cultural players as a device for identifying needs and political coordination. Create Regional Boards for International Cultural Policy, with representation from the sub-state Culture Departments and foreign action agencies, as well as local governments, social and sector-based entities.

Enable new cities to become members of Agenda 21 for culture—reproducing the experiences from Telde and Sant Cugat de Vallés— and use this network as an international culture cooperation mechanism.

---

8. Complete list of Spanish member cities available on: http://www.agenda21culture.net/who-we-are/members (visited on 2nd February 2020).
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CULTURAL AND CREATIVE INDUSTRIES: CULTURAL CONTENT ON THE INTERNET AS CULTURAL COOPERATION AGENTS

Juan Luis Manfredi Sánchez

Cultural and creative industries contribute to the global imaginary by producing entertainment content and information services, particularly digital activity. In particular, public media emerge as benchmark informative markers by providing context to global news and they are essential agents in cultural diplomacy by providing explicit support for cultural industries. In short, the new ecosystem on the net requires an in-depth review of external cultural action so the new government’s foreign policy can make the most of cultural strength. Because in a global ecosystem, culture in Spanish is a safe asset.

Key words: publicly owned media, Instituto Cervantes, public diplomacy, country brand, image abroad.

I. GENERAL ASSESSMENT: CULTURAL AND COMMUNICATION INDUSTRIES IN THE NEW INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION DISORDER

Advertising, literature and cinema, journalism, travel and tourist experiences, social media, sporting events, museums or mass consumption brands are the instruments of choice to shape international communication and build spheres of influence. The globalisation of trading goods and services has converged on the digital culture of platforms, new media and mobile technology. Consequently, there has been a multiplication of country initiatives to manage the internationalisation of the communication and culture industries.

This dynamic explains the growing professionalisation of public diplomacy and cultural cooperation. The novelty of digital networks lies in systematic use of the instruments in the design and performance of the country’s international strategy in accordance with some pre-set interests and with global scope, in real time. Chinese investment in content for audiovisual platforms, Russia’s art collections that travel all over the world, crowning Mexico’s audiovisual culture with five awards from the Film Academy for best director, the architecture of global construction in Qatar or Spanish and Italian football in Saudi Arabia are current references for how a growing number of countries have joined this dynamic with the acknowledged aim of influencing disorder
and promoting their own interests and values. In terms of information, *Russia Today*, *Canal France International* or the *Xinhua* news agencies have transformed the journalistic ecosystem. Regional governments, cities or private interests have launched themselves into this power dynamic through cultural and symbolic production for a wide range of reasons. In the current scenario, there is no single model for foreign action nor any one dominant player, although cultural industries and publicly owned media hold a relevant position. Here begins the challenge of internationalising the Spanish cultural and creative industries.

II. CURRENT ANALYSIS. CULTURAL CONTENT WHEN CONSTRUCTING THE INTERNATIONAL IMAGINARY

In academic literature, there are a whole host of classifications, typologies or approximations to the phenomenon of public and cultural diplomacy. It consists of excising influence by means of communication strategies, culture, education, new services and entertainment, deployed by an institution that intends to influence public opinion. Culture, educational services and international audiovisual broadcasts are three of the best acknowledged concepts, along with active listening or promotion of interests. Cultural cooperation generates other opportunities through public-private alliances, capturing private investment, participation from non-profit-making international organisations in field projects, the role of the diaspora abroad, educational programmes and other instruments open to third parties.

Cultural industries are the primary element of the imaginary to the extent that they shape country’s tastes, opinions or perceptions. Consumption of audiovisual contents, literature or the digital culture is a social, collective decision, far from conventional political or diplomatic activities. Consequently, cultural diplomacy does not just consist of setting up and opening centres or own spaces, but of integrating cultural products and services into local networks. So, cultural cooperation transfers unique experiences through art, history, architecture, science or gastrostomy beyond the interests of trade relations. The cultural industry’s success abroad revolves around recipient institutions and audiences perceiving the other’s creativity as a value in its own right and mutually beneficial. The creative industries feed an aesthetic sense of cultural diplomacy, a criterion of its own using innovative expressions, including criticism of political power.

The information helps build the imaginary, and not just the political news. The study by the Royal Elcano Institute demonstrates that football represented around 36% of all news that appeared in the international press in 2017 and 2018. The Catalan crisis was relevant, above all in September and November of 2017. News on the arts, shows, music or books falls a long way behind in absolute terms, as can be seen in graph 1. Typical political news is not so relevant, while the category of art and culture suggests room for improvement.

During the Partido Popular’s term of office (2011-2018), international news activity was relegated, and frozen out of news cycles to be able to contain the economic and constitutional crisis. The absence of relevant spokes-persons in influential matters (economic recession, Brexit and Gibraltar, Catalan crisis) is demonstrated by the lack of interviews in the international media, low profile at official summits or apathy towards correspondents authorised in Spain.

The report is completed by assessing the mission of publicly owned media because RTVE, the EFE agency and the FORTA media are instruments for cultural action to the extent that they provide high quality, benchmark information. Faced with growing demand from Spanish speakers, the news offer must be com-
plementary to the English-speaking domain of television and news agencies. However, investment has dropped, along with strategic journalism capability. Delegations in La Havana and Buenos Aires have been merged, and then subsequently separated. FORTA members have closed delegations or outsourced news production.

The contribution would have to involve different elements: information and the cultural content. Firstly, publicly owned brands have to build a reputation as bastions of high quality news, with solid news posts, analysis from a Spanish and European perspective of the global events, interviews in Spanish with world leaders and providing context and analysis of the international news. In terms of production, the international area is expensive and not particularly profitable, but it generates greater reputation. Prestige of the public media is the foundation for other cultural and audiovisual products, insomuch that operators from the Ibero-American region can reference quality information to one of the three brands, RTVE, EFE or FORTA. This line of cooperation through journalistic production is not being exploited properly right now, when it seems that there is a margin in the journalistic formats, chain programmes or radio programmes for podcasting.

The second aspect is the impact of cultural audiovisualisation. Faced with the weakness of the cultural and audiovisual industry fabric, public media can act as sponsors for a network activity. This is not a case of financing or opening up new windows or supports, but acting as an axis for independent distribution, backing Ibero-American networks for co-production and creating an Ibero-American cinema brand. The current dispersion of offers in Spanish reduces the value of the audience, makes industrialisation difficult and weakens foreign expansion. Public media can be the catalyst to curb the cultural industry’s permanent immaturity through regulatory (co-production obligation) or symbolic decisions (broadcasting an experimental film on international channels), but above all through the audience’s demand for content and education. Due to fragmentation of platforms and prior marginal experience, RTVE and FORTA can drive the cultural expansion in accordance with their capacities.
or interests. The institutionalisation of references thereby acts as an archive of audiovisual, musical or cultural products that lengthens the product life cycle, improves positioning in search engines and affects the viewer's final decision. The extensive nature of the patrimonial, architectural, creative or gastronomic assets of the Ibero-American community represents an opportunity for the cultural industry. They are basic assets in creating cultural trends that, when supported in the audiovisual industry, multiply their final value and their cooperation capability in the digital networks.

Ultimately, the plurality represented by FORTA public media should be exploited to show the actual internal linguistic and cultural diversity that opens up new scenarios and markets. The Catalan and Basque languages cannot be limited to the market criteria, but they should be supported as expressions of our own culture with huge cultural weighting. The opportunity of the networks makes sense when exports travel in digital format and are aimed at a foreign audience. In the case of Galicia, it is easier for language to open the door to internationalisation and foreign expansion towards a Portuguese-speaking audience. Other formulas that have been tried and tested in the past to put contents in satellite television formats seem to be less interesting today to the extent that the distribution costs detract from the production, affecting its quality. As budgets drop, backing digital concept should make production and innovation easier in these other languages.

At a time of hyper-consumption of audiovisual and cultural materials, international content expansion can contribute to this new focus on Spanish action with political attributes. Issues regarding climate change, historical memory and identity policies, equality or foreign feminist policy are well received in the international press, if declarations are accompanied by specific measures. This is a strategic narrative construction that is used to explain Spain's position in the international (dis)order, positioning it in the global arena and giving meaning to national political discourse. The skill to handle management of the flows of international news must appear on the foreign cultural action agenda, as an intrinsic part of the task and not as a mere add-on. In terms of journalism, digital communications have multiplied the weight of mediated diplomacy, which is disputed in the sphere of the media. This is not a case of tweeting each decision or foreign political action but including a concatenation of messages in the benchmark international media with spokespersons explicitly authorised to influence public opinion. This is culture, but also economic information, social analysis, methods for ecological and energy transition, among other relevant areas. Awareness of diplomacy is raised on a playing field that combines a global audience with interactivity, dissemination of messages and language frames. This focus steers clear of the institutional advertising to address how messages are constructed, use digital channels, lever presence in top level events (European and Ibero-American summits) and combine it with the presence of other political players and social leaders. This is not a case of imposing a message but facilitating readers' comprehension of the direction taken by Spain's foreign policy and interests.

III. DRAFT OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL GOALS FOR CULTURAL CONTENT

In January 2019, it was announced that the Foreign Cultural Action Plan (PACE), cancelled in 2012, would be reinstated although it has not been specifically updated publicly. Available information indicates that 157 million Euro will be provided by means of coordinated action between the Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Spanish Agenda for International Cooperation and Development
(AECID), the Instituto Cervantes and the public company Acción Cultural Española (AC/E). The Ministry of Culture has the sector-based strategies, while the Foreign Ministry identifies the priority geographic areas. Eleven countries have been highlighted as priority: United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Morocco, Portugal, France, Russia, Japan, China. Mexico and Cuba. It is surprising that Brazil does not appear on this list. The sectors include education, audiovisual communication, performing arts and visual arts, plus books and the press. Digital culture appears as a cross-discipline element.

The economic analysis of the situation expressed in graph 2 offers three lessons to prepare a strategy for cultural industries. Exports have grown systematically, but they have not managed to close the gap from 2012 and 2013. In total, the export account stands at 2,031.7 million Euro, whilst imports represent 2,147.3 million Euro. Secondly, the possibility is perceived of growth in educational services, teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language and content production. The compared study of harmonised European indicators for foreign trade of goods linked to culture per country sheds light on the economic magnitude of similar countries. 0.6% (2016) and 0.7% (2017) of the total percentage of Spain’s exports place this economic activity in a range that is similar to Denmark, Germany, Austria or Greece although far from France (1.8%-1.6%) and Italy (1.8%) or even Poland (1.4%). Universities, arts centres and communication industries with a technological base will have to work together on internationalisation of digital cultural contents and on the net. The third economic function seems to be bound to the review of the tourism model. The total cost of cultural activities (tickets, visits, shows, gifts) stands at 13,341.1 million Euro, 585.5 million Euro less than in 2017. The digital dimension (apps, gamification of experiences, online videos, educational content) is presented as a growth opportunity.

The economic figures are poor for an audiovisual ecosystem that has an increasing number of devices, networks and platforms. There is more demand of all types, but it is not covered by content produced in Spain, ei-
ther because it does not reach the distribution channels or because the size of the cultural company does not allow this expansion. Even worse, public policies for building a culture industry with natural development within the heart of the Ibero-American space, have not caught on in the two recurring dimensions.

In terms of international cooperation, the drought from the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation reduced the catalogue of cultural actions and the production, promotion or distribution initiatives for creative projects. Docfera or Hamaca Media & Video Art have not been successful mechanisms for distribution and exchange of cultural and audiovisual experiences. The former has disappeared while Hamaca remains a non-profit-making association. The second dimension is industrial; with no explicit economic support, proposals do not become centres of cultural production and creation. This lesson should be considered in the new plan. In practice, the digital dimension should be a priority in cultural cooperation as there is margin for substantial growth.

On the horizon, there is the Frankfurt Book Fair 2021, where Spain will be guest of honour. Four million Euros have been allocated to this literary activity. Along with exporting books and press, it is useful to broaden the resources awarded for digital experiences linked to the culture industry. Digital content underpins editorial demand and creates complementary services on a worldwide scale. The digital aspect facilitates innovative backing for formats and products, plus support for actual cultural and linguistic diversity. Digital services are available for global audiences with less restrictions and should create added value for the reading experience.

In the field of cinema, the PACE promises 2.5 million Euro to take part in the usual international festivals and in distribution. Through the Film and Visual Arts Institute (ICAA), there is backing for co-production with Ibero-American partners. This decision is in line with the Spain-Colombia Culture Focus and Spain-Mexico Culture Focus programmes, bilateral projects awarded 20 million Euro. There are new lines of work, such as executive presence in UNESCO, developing a specific plan for scientific diplomacy or heritage management, and other measures (cultural programming, or grants). Audiovisual creativity requires support to industrialise the tasks of promotion, distribution and working in a network, not just the creativity of the script. Without solid audiovisual markets, the cultural content is lost in terms of offer, because it is competing with blockbusters. In terms of demand, because the audience does not have easy access to it or on the same platforms.

Strategic backing from the Instituto Cervantes consists of consolidating the current network and setting up new headquarters in Sub-Saharan Western African and the United States. There is an intention to improve the network of associated universities and ad hoc linguistic certifications. It had a budget of 129 million in 2019, up by 4.9%. The networked collaboration with publicly owned media is the natural window for broadcasting cultural content for global audiences because it combines production with global distribution. RTVE, in particular, should be the archive for educational and cultural resources in Spanish, in the same way as the BBC World Service amasses videos, podcasts or contents in English for its global audience.

The assessment outlines the goals of the PACE in harmony with the actual goals of foreign policy and internationalisation of the economy and business. It would be desirable to see Culture among the priorities of the new cabinet. The following lines of action are proposed for this, in harmony with strengthening the cultural industries and the work of public media.
Discard the country brand focus: Far from the most utilitarian aspects (lists, rankings), cultural cooperation should lever creative industries for their international expansion. Through creative content (fashion, design, architecture, cinema, gastrostomy), innovation and professionalism values are projected towards other economic activities and export of goods and services.

Language as an economic activity: Nine out of the eleven identified countries present an intensive demand for Spanish as a Foreign Language that leads to extending the educational services (physical and digital learning material), internationalisation of universities (attracting foreign students) and creation of fresh digital services (apps, games, translations, promotion or broadcasting content). The data from table 1 indicates that there is a margin of growth in the exports and in the actual balance of trade. France accumulates almost one third of the exports, while other strategic countries are marginal with around 2% or less of the trade balance representation. This starting point requires specific measures.

Exports to Latin America have less relative weight, despite the ease of the language. The educational services sector represents a differentiated opportunity, that includes other economic activities (tourism, consumption). Spanish universities should broaden their programmes and enrolment for Ibero-American students. The United States is a specific market that offers the advantage of contents intended for Latin Americans, that is not demographically or culturally homogeneous. There is the language link, creating a point to enter the market, but this requires explicit adaptation to local uses.

### Table 1. Imports and Exports of Cultural Goods as a Percentage of Their Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled by author with data extracted from the “Annual directory of cultural statistics” (Ministry of Culture and Sport, 2019).
• Naturalise the digital transformation. To date, proposals have been seen with international content that add the digital dimension as a cost centre and not as an actual action axis, whose content is created with international intentions. Platforms, mobiles or new media are examples of how the devices require content with a cultural matrix. Here they should value the role of the singular events (fairs, exhibitions, sporting events) and the digitalisation of the tourism industry to create cultural content and services.

• Cultural cooperation and country values. Deploy actual development cooperation elements and Agenda 2030. These are ideal actions to coordinate the community dreamed up with Portugal and Ibero-America through culture. They are easy audiences to generate economies of scale and scope.

IV. COVID-19 AND ITS EFFECTS

This was where COVID-19 came in. The pandemic has accelerated the restructuring process and change in leisure patterns, cultural consumption and digital screens. Entertainment and culture are digital, not just an extension or a bi-product of the primary activity, but an autonomous structure where the citizen organises his or her cultural diet.

The transformation will have immediate effects. Here are four vectors to explore:

1. In the economic field, the trend towards deglobalisation—reducing flows and commercial exchanges—has become a structural reality. Fewer travellers, fewer visits to museums or theatres, less demand for products and more digitalisation of services. Leisure time is redirected to screens, that will need to renew content. Faced with growing economic nationalism, it is likely that audiovisual cooperation will become a bridge, spanning players from different countries, keen to reduce costs and generate economies of scope.

2. Socially, physical distancing and the drop in ticket sales provides an opportunity to expand digital experiences. Content production deserves an in-depth review by the cultural institutions. Podcasts with interviews and reports on art shows, the virtual reality applied to enjoy the experience at home, videogames, long texts, fun on social media or new narratives (Tik Tok and the like) fatten a list of digital cultural production with specific demands that cover an audience that will not be able to take part in the direct experience of the visit. This digital initiative directed towards the user experience runs alongside the times when public and private institutions work together. Public museums, radio and television stations, private collections, journalists or experts can facilitate transfer from physical to virtual reality.

3. In journalism there is renewed interest in the news business based on facts and new items. Projects have multiplied to disseminate scientific and health-related information regarding the spread of the propaganda virus. The informative marker of publicly owned media, thanks to remaining networks of correspondents, has facilitated informative leadership. This is a clue to how the audience responds when the journalistic mission falls into line with the news and public service. In addition, the pandemic must stimulate - and not delay, European and international journalis-
tic cooperation projects, such as exchange of items, analysis, content and sources. In the digital journalistic expansion, a window has been opened for cooperation in Ibero-America. After a few years in retreat, it is important to recover the vocation providing news in Spanish worldwide.

4. The fourth aspect is the consolidation of the digital tsunami based on facts. Cultural content, already belonging to an experience-based rather than material economy, plays the role of creators, connectors and broadcasters of the digital economy. This would thereby involve abandoning the cultural product or industry focus, over-exposed to the physical link to the territory, to create, produce and distribute service. It implicates re-engineering internal (creative) and external (infrastructures) processes. In both cases, this requires a serious public investment to provide connectivity among territories and citizens with less purchasing power and encourage education with complete digital skills.

To sum up, the pandemic will reduce the conventional economic activity with foreseeable effects on destroying employment in the cultural industries. However, this should be the pretext to reformulate audiovisual and cultural policies on a lasting digital matrix. This is the moment.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

The lost decade is a fact analysed in the successive reports by Fundación Alternativas on the state of culture. Foreign backing has been affected to a greater extent as cultural activity centres have been closed, personnel have been reduced in destinations and the budget has been slashed. This is the starting point, so the best must be made of the situation to redirect the cultural action plan, reinforce cultural industries’ foreign expansion and obtain public resources for this foreign policy goal. These three interlinked goals structure proposals and recommendations so that the cultural and creative industries might become international cooperation agents in line with foreign policy. The new coalition government, that has oft repeated the need to strengthen the economic dimension of diplomacy, will have to define the role played by culture in this project.

The cultural industries represent the practical vehicle to find affinities with new demographic segments, activate purchasing decisions and improve the country image. The return of the investment in cultural contents is extended to other services and increases the value of the exports by means of the “country of origin” effect. Through art, literature or tourism, political diplomacy and exports grow. The commission consists of promoting an industrial content policy with the aim of levering Spain’s reputation in new areas of economic and industrial business.

Promotion of cultural industries, originating from an international vocation, must encourage a framework of companies and services adapted to the digital environment. There are two possible meanings of online cultural content. They are on the net because they work with articulated projects that allow scalability with support from ICEX and similar institutions. And, secondly, they are online because the net is now the global audience connected through digital devices.

A range of proposals are suggested in this dynamic for a strategy of creative cultural content and industries online. They are as follows:

1. The cultural industry is a profitable investment for foreign action. Faced with the dominance of English-speaking
initiatives, there is room for diversification in consumption of audiovisual contents, university and non-regulated teaching, consumption of music and editorial products. From the digital perspective, consumption on platforms gathers together fiction, videogames, literature or journalistic information all on the same device. Not only are digital contents consumed because of their cultural or symbolic nature but because we need to share their contents, recommend them, make expressions viral and extend the product to other economics of scope and scale. Latin America is the natural territory for cultural brands and symbols.

2. In terms of organisation, cultural cooperation online calls for social participation, private initiative and the use of new public entities. Foreign cultural action does not fit the logic of hierarchies or anchors but suits the interest of the recipient audiences that the cultural content and services are intended for. The strategy must be directed towards them with explicit support from the public audiovisual media.

3. The digital experience must make a major bid to extend internationalisation. It is recommended to reinforce the business structure of the cultural producers and of communication. Internationalisation is concentrated on consolidated players and sectors (film producers, journalistic companies). It consists of identifying the markets with the best consumer profile for cultural contents in Spanish (Brazil, France, United Kingdom, China, United States just to mention the five most fundamental) and deploy an internationalisation plan working jointly with the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of the Economy through ICEX.

4. It is urgent to act on internationalisation at source (coming up with ideas and creating cultural products and services), encouraging technological competition, protecting intellectual property rights, forging agreements with educational and cultural institutions to give them specific content for their annual programming and develop a shared graphic communication line of work equivalent to what has been deployed in tourism (I need Spain!).

5. Working together online encourages broadening the catalogue of cultural industries subject to internationalisation: this is not just curricular information on architectural heritage or Don Quijote, but it is advisable to create a visitor experience for both nationals and foreigners by adapting new uses (environment and virtual reality, connection with social media, content on audiovisual platforms). This requires an industrial policy in creating, producing and distributing digital content called on to occupy a preferential space in leisure and communication in other own activities, such as gastrostomy or architecture. The Instituto Cervantes and cultural centres abroad are the natural partners to grow these initiatives, without needing to increase investment in property assets.

6. In relation to the public media, RTVE and the FORTA partners have to contribute to cultural content for cultural diplomacy by sustained production of journalistic information on Spain and its interests, as well as diverse content and experiences (Way of St James, Basque cuisine, Romanic art, folklore, flamenco, wine, just to men-
In the audio-visual distribution networks, high quality content on up-to-the-minute culture, leisure and entertainment is well received, while political news is associated with propaganda values. As far as international information is concerned, the cultural dimension is a positive factor in Spain’s international prestige (cities, art, heritage, museums, Xacobeo), so that it can be used to frame other economic or social policies in accordance with foreign policy interests.
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SPAIN WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE EUROPEAN CULTURAL COOPERATION STRATEGY: POTENTIAL MUTUAL SYNERGIES

José Andrés Fernández Leost

During the 2010s, international politics experienced an abrupt transformation that affected how we understand, create and share culture. The crisis unleashed in early 2020 by the COVID-19 pandemic is probably helping to accelerate the disruptive trends. The European cultural strategy must intensify the agreed work frameworks, based on coordination between cultural institutes, strengthening the EUNIC network and the boost to its cultural diplomacy platform. In addition, horizontal exchange of experiences is profiled as a new method of cooperation inspired by interculturality practices. For Spain, the challenge revolves around refining its own model, where institutional assignments are clearly marked out. Any approach will have to include reformulating new humanism in terms of technology.

Key words: International Cooperation, digitalisation, cultural diplomacy, foreign policy, European Union.

I. THE EUROPEAN AGENDA

A precedent was set for drafting a cultural strategy in the European Union—protected by backing from creative industries, heritage management and intercultural dialogue—in 2005, when the EU signed the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Two years later, the European Commission defined a Common Agenda (2007) that led to the Cultural Programme (2007-2014), followed by the Creative Europe Programme (2014-2020), endowed with 1,462 million Euro.¹

Without forgetting the need to cooperate with third party countries, the aims of these agendas focused on boosting the sector’s economic dimension, adapting to the impact of digital disruption, easing business access to funding, providing intra-European cooperation spaces—to fight fragmentation—and generically, strengthening the EU’s identity, under the slogan: “Unity in diversity.” Along this line, the Commission presented the Communication of a new Agenda in 2018 that gave continuity to previous

¹ Nor should we forget previous initiatives, such as the Kaleidoscope programme in 1996 that included artistic coope-
work, even highlighting the relevance of some relatively new questions, determined by the international context: the repercussion of culture on democratic principles and social cohesion, the push to take on the field of international relations or overlap with further education and innovation (European Commission, 2018a).

This final aspect is worth looking at in closer detail due to an approach that brings arts studies closer to technological-scientific disciplines (STEM), and due to the forecasts for the next budgetary cycle (2021-2027): the Erasmus+ programme would double its current allocation, a total of 14,700 million Euros and the Horizonte Europa research programme would rise from 80,000 to 100,000 million Euros. The new Creative Europe Programme, in turn, would administer an amount of around 1,850 million Euros.2

In parallel, the aforementioned Communication highlighted the sector’s strong performance, reflecting how in 2016, the EU employed 8.4 million people in culture, while the trade excess in cultural goods rose to 8,000 million Euros and, altogether, culture represented 4.2% of the EU’s GDP. However, aside from the figures, jewellery leads cultural trade, while American films still grab two thirds of the film market (European Parliament, 2019), the appeal for a changing global panorama is perhaps the most interesting aspect.

Certainly, during the 2010s, international politics experienced an abrupt transformation that affected not only how we understand, create and share culture, but also the EU’s place in the world. The consequences of the 2007 crisis led to a period marked by a decline in multilateralism, Asian emergence, the return to protectionism, a boom of populist leaderships and perhaps the most remarkable in terms of culture, economic digitalisation. The Internet has actually become the main provider of creative content, intensifying the democratisation of art, modifying its consumption—from buying to renting—or opening new debates between open access and intellectual property rights.3

This process has not been risk-free, as cultural production has been increasingly concentrated in the hands of major technological companies that provide services, applications and contents, subjecting the market to its algorithms and strengthening an oligopoly that often breaches competition and privacy rules. Despite European backwardness, tempered by the Commission’s sanctions on tech giants, its cultural industry grew by 4.6% between 2008 and 2016, and the sector’s links with innovation and knowledge can provide new opportunities or, at least, protection against work automation. Furthermore, the EU still brandishes its democratic culture as the most appropriate for economic development. Doubtlessly, global instability continues to make an impression on a space in “existential crisis” after Brexit, whose societies are also witnessing growing ideological polarisation. The election results from 2018 in France and the Netherlands and the May 2019 elections partly cushioned these trends, and the Commission began a new term of office under the flag of a New Green Deal that reiterated the global goals of Agenda 2030 and the Paris Agreement.

Now, the impact of COVID-19 and the economic repercussion of the “great shut-down” generates a scenario of geo-economic uncertainty that jeopardises the Union’s solidarity.

---

2. As seen below, these quantities should be resized within the framework of the EU’s post-pandemic initiatives after the arrival of the coronavirus (COVID-19) on the continent in late February 2020.

3. In this respect, we should mention the controversy due to taking on the Directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market in March 2019, so that creators might obtain an income from the use of their products on the internet, and contributing to regulatory harmonisation of a single digital market.
After some initial “stuttering”, the crisis—that might represent an 8% drop in the EU’s GDP—is now considered to be a window of opportunity, above all if the Next Generation programme goes ahead. This is a proposal to recover half a billion Euros, suggested in May by Germany and France that—apart from the multi-year budget of 1.1 billion for the 2021-2027 cycle—is added to the pre-approved aid: the ECB package (1.35 billion Euro), the MEDE credits (240,000 million Euros), the SURE loans (100,000 million Euros) and the BEI funds (200,000 million Euros) (Steinberg, 2020).

The relevance of the Next Generation initiative stems from a set of conditions that are a far cry from austerity, linked to the reforms meeting criteria bound to green, digital and inclusive goals. This emphasis, that explicitly leads to a budget increase of 13,000 million for Horizonte Europa could be used by the cultural sector.  

II. THE DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY

The European External Action Service (EEAS) must play a decisive role as it is the home of cultural diplomacy deployment. Shortly after it was set up in 2010, the Parliament appealed for the need to coordinate a common external culture strategy, which led to drafting the report: Preparatory Action for Culture in EU External Relations (2014). Even back then, in the wake of the soft power concept, cultural diplomacy had been consolidated as a key resource for western ministries and it began to spread worldwide. As a reflection of this situation, the Preparatory Action proposed that the EU should set up a strategic framework, funded in coordination with EEAS, the Commission and Delegations outside the EU, to project its values and create and share culture with third party countries (European Commission, 2014).

Two years later, this suggestion took institutional shape with the Joint Communication to the European Parliament and Council from the High Representative (HR) of the EU for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy: “Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations” (European Commission, 2016). Revolving around three axes—socio-economic sustainability, bound to creative industries; promoting peace, connected to intercultural dialogue, and backing heritage—the text encouraged use of “existing cooperation frames and financing instruments” such as the Development Cooperation Instrument, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights or the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace.

This appreciation reveals how, without affecting its purpose of avoiding duplicated tasks, the strategy did not provide more resources than introducing an element of narrative congruency and was still signed up to international cooperation funds. In itself, this remains congruent with the transverse nature of culture, and its inclusion within the notion of development (Sen, 2004). Now, the lack of a Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) dedicated to the sector (Martinell, 2017), along with restructuring of financing exercises for the EU’s external action planned for the 2021-2027 cycle (that merges the aforementioned instruments) opens up a dual reading: the postponement of culture as an external priority, tinged with its potential importance in technical management frameworks. Mutual learning or horizontal exchange of experiences is actually profiled as a new way of cooperation inspired by interculturality practices.

Otherwise, the HR’s Communication kept a final section for proposing an agreed work focus, based on coordination of cultural institutes (Goethe, Camões, Cervantes, Alliance Française…), the consequent strengthening of the EU-NIC network and the activation of an online
cultural diplomacy platform (already up and running: https://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/). While waiting for the progress that might come from the new HR’s management, along with the Von der Leyen Commission, we should remember the recommendations that, in their reports on the matter, were presented by several study centres, still in force despite the hardships of the pandemic.

III. THINKING OF THE FUTURE

Back at the start of 2016, the KEA European Affairs highlighted the need for cultural institutes to work together more closely, partly moving beyond their national profiles, to make up for the EU Delegations’ working limitations (KEA, 2016). This focus, seconded by an infrastructure that covers more than 1,200 centres outside the EU and manages 2,300 million Euro per year, could enlarge the scope of its external action, whenever it has a clear, defined mandate, endorsed by the Commission and the EEAS. However, for the time being, this conjunction has barely made a difference, beyond announcing the opening of French-German cultural headquarters, agreed in the Treaty of Aachen on Cooperation and Integration, signed bilaterally in January 2019 between the two nations.

Along the same line, it is interesting to quote the analysis drawn up by the Goethe Institut and the British Council, *Culture in an Age of Uncertainty* (2018), as a demonstration of a joint paper that, in turn, looks in greater depth at the impact of their activities in the field. The report, based on the repercussions of a series of programmes launched in the Ukraine and Egypt (*Active Citizens, Kulturakademie Ägypten, etc.*), has the virtue of identifying difficulties faced by cultural initiatives depending on each country’s idiosyncrasies. Consequently, among other suggestions, it recommends clearly defining each project’s goals so as not to raise false expectations; planning its future sustainability and precisely introducing a focus on mutual learning that mitigates application of unilateral work frameworks and models.\(^5\)

Finally, from a more generic perspective, it is worth mentioning the report presented by the KEA in September 2019, *Culture and creative sectors in the European Union*, with a view to the 2020-2030 decade. Initially focused on reviewing the state of the creative industries, it acts on aspects we have already mentioned: impact of the Asian emergency and digital disruption, erosion of multilateralism, innovative resilience, cultural concentration in the hands of tech giants, etc. In the same way, it retrieves problems that remain unresolved, referring to the instability of cultural jobs or the difficulties for small companies to get funding, particularly within the aforementioned “technological convergence” context. In turn, it paints a picture of the attention given to the threats from artificial intelligence (AI) in terms of both cultural production and consumption (making habits uniform or prescribing tastes).\(^6\)

However, perhaps the most relevant consists of the prospective panorama that it presents with a view to 2030, opposing ideal and pessimistic scenarios in the economic, technological, work or environmental fields. By simplifying its results, it is possible to think of a competitive cultural Europe on the one hand, that will boost social inclusion and environmental awareness, and will also include *blockchain* in its business model, encouraging financing thanks to the transparency that it guarantees. As a counterposition, one pessimistic trend is profiled whe-

---

5. A focus can also be found on the institutional practices, rather than on the conceptual development of a “European narrative” in Higgot, 2017.

6. Without affecting the opportunities that it generates, particularly in the videogame industry. Even more so, some analysts positively bring up the possibility of a dual cultural filter that combines algorithms and expert judgement, in what they call *smart curation* (Martel, 2015).
The influence of the digital giants will undermine the European legislative framework, the EU’s diversity will lead to social polarisation and even freedom of speech will be in danger. Within the field of international relations, in turn, a vision where a more united Europe will bring about the operation of its cultural diplomacy, exercising intercultural dialogue and pacific resolution of conflicts will come up against a world where European values have lost their clout and artistic mobility has been cut off.

Once again, the effect of COVID-19 has blurred the image of these projections although perhaps above all it acts as a “trend accelerator” (more digitalisation, more business concentration and, for the time being, less mobility), so that the efficacy of the responses will condition the propensity towards one of the two scenarios. No matter how this works out, it is imperative, as the actual report concludes, that professionals intensify their training in technological skills and that there is close interaction between the arts and STEM disciplines.

At the same time, standards must be set that prevent AI from reducing creative diversity. Take heed as well how the relevance given to new technologies also affects the field of information, intimately linked to the cultural terrain and public diplomacy. The transformation of the global communication ecosystem (Badillo, 2019), also led by digital companies, has a direct effect on the EU’s place in the world order and the appeal of its democratic values.

It goes without saying that the invention of the printing press and distribution of the written word shaped the appearance of a public space that helped consolidate European democracies. In the 20th century, mass media, along with the cultural industries, revolutionised this space, to the extent that WWII and the Cold War recognised its ascendency on collective imaginations. Questioning of this power, driven by the mid-century critical thinking, has however spread lack of trust among citizens regarding traditional sources of information, further boosted in the 21st century by social media. Consequently, digitalisation has represented a new revolution of public space, with implications on several planes: i) modification of the business model, as platforms get richer thanks to commercialisation (also political) of their users’ mass data, and ii) the production and consumption of information, turning individuals into customised creators and recipients, increasingly enclosed in fragmented niche markets.

Due to its viral impact, this excessive logic, similar to—or rather more integrated in—what creative industries reproduce, rekindles polarisation and, consequently, the deliberate introduction of fake news presented under the appearance of truth. In a globally interconnected world, this has enlarged the geopolitical battle ground and from there a margin of opportunity, or vulnerability, that the EU might experience. For now, the EASS has drawn up a plan to fight fake news that the Commission adopted in 2018. This lays down recommendations like those mentioned above: promoting best practices, encouraging education and media literacy, etc. (European Commission, 2018b).

IV. THE ROLE OF SPAIN: COMBINE PROJECTION AND COOPERATION

Nobody is hiding the fact that Spanish cultural diplomacy is living through unusual times, as a result of the anomalous political period in the country since halfway through the decade.
After the 2011–2015 term of office, marked by adjustment measures to public spending, the timid strategic boost—presented in the Plan Cultura 2020 (Secretary of State for Culture, 2017)—has lacked continuity, just like the budget increases, which—although reassigned—still depend on the framework laid out in 2018. In this space of time, the sector has undergone similar issues to the rest of Europe: business atomisation, financing difficulties, adapting to the digital environment, etc. (Álvarez, Vázquez and Gutierrez, 2019).

From the institutional point of view, the least encomiastic aspect revolves around blocking a model that still has to be properly configured. Without being entirely dismantled, the operating framework remains disjointed, after abandoning the External Cultural Action Plan (PACE) from 2010. Consequently, coordination between the system’s main players (Instituto Cervantes, AECID and AC/E), both with each other and with the ICEX, Turespaña, RTVE, the academic sphere or the autonomous regions remain unresolved. Let’s not forget that, within this disperse structure, in 2012 the High Commissioner for Brand Spain was brought in, rechristened in 2018 with the name “España Global”, and institutionalised as Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The initiative, inspired by a rebranding strategy—in the short term and aimed at attracting foreign investment—thereby now involves adopting a diplomatic-public perspective, in the medium term, that has gained strength since the Ministry was restructured in January 2020, integrating prospecting and information on foreign matters.

As we wait to see this diplomacy’s new approach, the challenge revolves around orchestrating a system defined according to an autonomous and professionalised architecture, not superimposed on the fluctuations of political cycles. In the same way that the French case is characterised by its rayonnement (radiation), that runs according to a hierarchy, or the British system with its economic self-sufficiency and flexibility, Spain needs to hone its own profile that, moving beyond stereotypes, is identified with a clear (not monolithic) and foreseeable image, clearly marking out institutional assignments. The purpose of recovering the PACE (announced in February 2019), still a good symptom, faces the unknown quality of being tried out ten years after it was designed. From experience, configuration of a model that combines external projection and international cooperation initiatives would be the most logical.

Finally, it is unavoidable to connect analysis of the Spanish case with how it breaks down in Latin America. Progress in construction of an Ibero-American knowledge space gives “Spanish-style” diplomacy some continental span, although its scope is going through critical times. Demographic trends point towards a zenith in the dissemination of the language that might begin to drop off in the next few decades. This is added to a proliferation of national approaches on the continent (Bonet, Négrier and Zamorano, 2019), doubtlessly legitimate although likely to fragment a panhispanic perspective, the same or more than a situation where regionalism (from the CELAC to the Pacific Alliance) has seen better days. At this point, it is worth remembering the lack of progress on the agenda that was outlined in the 22nd Ibero-American Summit (SEGIB, 2012); this paralysis was certainly mitigated by the reactivation—after the Veracruz Summit 2014—of a project intended to boost scientific-academic mobility and reinforce innovation, but border closures due to the pandemic might put this at risk.

In any case, it is advisable for Spain to continue contributing to the articulation of joint initiatives (opening Cervantes/UNAM headquarters in the USA, coordination of the Language Academies, etc.) that are also based on
a common axiological support. Perhaps this is where the country can give the most to the EU, working towards strengthening Euro-Latin American relations. In this respect, the reference document is the Communication from the Commission and the HR: “The European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean: joining forces for a common future” from April 2019, highlighting that it is essential to size up strategic commitments to defend shared values.

V. CONCLUSIONS

As a conclusion, it might be futile to suggest a set of recommendations in circumstances with uncertain politics and economics, doubled down by the repercussions of COVID-19. Almost as soon as her term began, the Von der Leyen Commission has had to address the urgency of a crisis whose future is still uncertain, and close a financial framework (along with the aforementioned instruments) that will only be applied from 2021. Likewise in Spain, the session to open the 14th Legislation took place on 3rd February, less than a month and a half before decreeing a “state of alarm” that lasted until the end of June. In this way, the first general budget to be approved by the Government will already correspond to 2021 and will not be (as planned) the first post-crisis, but it will be determined by the agreements that are reached in the EU, in a context of economic recession that was already being slowed down by deglobalisation and the technological-trade war between China and the USA.

This comes alongside the impact of a ministerial reshuffle that affects the management of several cultural institutions and that will probably influence the direction taken by their programmes. However, this panorama also makes it possible to propose ideas, many of which dredge up purposes from the past: intensifying public-private collaboration, requesting inter-institutional coordination, bracing organisational autonomy or exploiting the international dimension of public media. In all, this proactive outlook should be combined with a reactive approach, coordinated on a European scale, that stands up to the oligopoly of the platforms, the prescription of algorithms or the monetisation of personal data, in accordance with the reformulation of a new technological humanism. The EU’s regulatory and insightful baggage can make it a pioneer in “ethically guiding the human use of smart systems” (Cortina, 2019). From there, cultural strategies are positioned to incorporate reinforced mechanisms for supervision and balance in the light of growing influence from automating digital contents. And this in so much that they have not only come to modify production and business formats but due to their impact on sensitive perception, cognitive capacity or the behaviour of citizens, appropriate to design a technologically predetermined society.8

The decanting of the different ideas dotted throughout the text suggested achieving, in the short and medium term:

1. Immediate activation of financial measures aimed at boosting the sector again (partly already launched),9 accompanied by an approach that is likely to make use of European recovery funds after COVID-19.

2. An institutional update of the PACE that drafts a precise governance system, both from an organic point of

---

8. Far from dystopian speculation, such a possibility is on its way (Zuboff, 2019). Faced with this challenge, on 19th February, the European Commission published a White Paper on artificial intelligence to create a regulatory framework on the subject of data management, that ensures the deployment of reliable AI, focussed on human beings (European Commission, 2020).

9. By means of Royal Decree-Law 17/2020, of 5th May, that approves measures to support the cultural sector and in terms of tax.
view and in terms of time, so that it sets work timelines per period.

3. A new approach in line with the goals for external cultural action, that defines a series of specific and realistic goals, for the 2020-2030 decade.

4. A budgetary boost for the Instituto Cervantes, the AECID and AC/E, that in percentage terms is an approximation to the public investment that is made in countries such as France or Germany.

5. A reinforcement of the positioning of the language in international organisations: the proposal for a multilateral cooperation instrument (Badillo, 2017) should be mentioned in forums such as the Ibero-American Summit.

6. Opening up to agents and operators from the technological-scientific field who are helping reinvent creative industries: Secretary of State for Digitalisation and Artificial Intelligence, CSIC, Ministry of Science, etc.

7. Backing technological training for cultural administrators that updates their skills so they can work agilely, transparently and neutrally in the light of the opportunities, and threats, within the new digital environments.
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This article analyses Spain’s foreign cultural policy, its historical background since Franco’s time and the reality of its current structures as a basis to present a set of proposals and insights to reformulate strategic guidelines. It thereby proposes to adopt the country’s multicultural and linguistic reality and the system of competences among the different public administrations in the field of culture, and address the urgency required to make decisions in this field, to help the country’s cultural life meet the challenges of modern dialogue with other cultural contexts.
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I. BACKGROUND: FROM “SPANISHNESS” TO CULTURAL COOPERATION

When analysing and studying cultural institutionalism, historical evolution becomes greatly important, because there is a certain tendency towards preservation or maintenance of traditional models if there is no willingness to introduce meaty political and legislative change. Cultural action abroad has always been considered a classic tool for foreign policy that can become relatively important depending on the political priorities of left- or right-wing governments, which can lead to conceptual innovations, setting up new institutions and changing the budget to reflect their intentions.

Providing some background will give us a better idea of the current situation. During the dictatorship, traditional diplomacy in the field of culture was limited to activities by diplomatic representations. The institutionalisation process began by setting up the Institute of Hispanic Culture in 1945 to forge a special relationship with Latin American countries thanks to a common language and relations with former colonies. Subsequently, setting up the Spanish Language Academies Association (1951) and the International Congresses of the Spanish Language reflect the predominant role of the Spanish language in cultural relations in this period.

Different elements were included in the concept of Spanishness for a foreign cultural policy, in the very midst of Spain’s isolation and autocracy, that would govern Francoism’s policy in this field for decades. Also, the boost
from an ad hoc regional multilateral organisation provided the incentive to set up the Organisation of Ibero-American States (OEI) in 1949 as a multilateral platform whose goals included culture. In this period, it was managed by the Board of Cultural and Scientific Relations between 1945 and 1951 within the structure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This organisation survived almost entirely throughout Franco’s time, incorporating the Hispanic-Arabic Institute during its later stages in 1974 as another element of the relations with North African countries and broadening spaces with shared historical background. Throughout this stage, Spanish cultural action was greatly limited to promoting the Spanish language and culture and was limited to geographic areas with shared colonial relations or backgrounds.

One of the first actions in the democratic period (1979) was to set up the Ibero-American Cooperation Institute (ICI) that integrated the former organisations into its cultural programmes, and initiated setting up a network of cultural centres abroad (Latin America and Equatorial Guinea) among other new lines of action, giving culture an international development cooperation perspective alongside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Board of Cultural and Scientific Relations with functions leaning more towards promoting culture abroad. The Instituto Cervantes was set up in 1991 as the first act of institutionalisation of the democratic governments in external cultural action to match institutes from other European countries, based on the value of the Spanish language and culture throughout the world.

It was not until the late nineties (1998) that the Spanish International Cooperation Agency (AECI) was set up in accordance with Law 23/1998 on International Cooperation that incorporates culture as an important axis. This is demonstrated in its organisation chart that defines two territorial boards (Ibero-America and Africa) and the General Board of Cultural and Scientific Relations. This structure co-existed for a time alongside similar functions in the Ministry until law 24/2001 that unified the functions of the two units into a single board with two functions: competences in the Ministry’s foreign cultural promotion in coordination with the international structures of other Ministries and culture in development cooperation (Martinell, 2019).

This configuration defines the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’s policy despite how culture was treated in the Spanish Constitution and the Autonomy Statutes (Prieto de Pedro, 1995) with the corresponding decentralisation processes and transfer of culture competences to the autonomous regions. The structure has a clear centralist bias (competence in foreign policy) but it does not determine interaction with the country’s new territorial situation.

II. CONFIGURATION OF ASN OWN MODEL

External cultural action or policy is shaped in each country, as a consequence of its history, its international relations, including the former colonies or the role of its language or other contextual variables.

What we might call the Spanish model has already been analysed in different papers and other articles in this Report. The reality of the Spanish external cultural action structure is the result of the slow evolution of its institutionality with periods of inaction or preservation of the status quo and others that incorporate new values and policies. It is characterised by the conjunction of the three dynamics (Martinell, 2014) reflected in the following graph.

Within the general framework of international relations and cooperation between

States, the cultural dimension can be understood in the three major areas that remain intrinsically linked but that act according to different dynamics and purposes:

External Cultural Action can be considered as the set of programmes and institutions that act within foreign policy to promote generic projection of culture internationally. Run by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and coordinated with other ministries, mainly Culture, it assumes the responsibilities of a foreign cultural policy. Through the attaché offices in diplomatic representations and various specialised organisations, it assumes the responsibility of promoting Spain’s culture (or cultures) throughout the world. It maintains bilateral relations with other diplomatic representations for topics of common interest and mutual recognition and it is present in multilateral organisations related to the field of culture. It is currently related to Cultural Diplomacy, an extremely broad concept with a range of acceptances (E. Marco and J. Otero Roth, 2012).

International Cultural Cooperation is configured within international cooperation as the relationship between countries and societies to assume joint needs and knowledge. It facilitates knowledge and respect between different cultures following the principles of the 1966 UNESCO Declaration2 “The nations shall endeavour to develop the various branches of culture side by side and, as far as possible, simultaneously, so as to establish a harmonious balance between technical progress and the intellectual and moral advancement of mankind”. International cultural cooperation sets much broader goals for States’ external cultural action and claims mobilisation of broad sectors of society for these purposes. It becomes an important value in the processes of international integration and living together. The CCI becomes highly important and an extension of a globalised society, due to widespread mobility of persons and cultural agents in modern contexts.

Cultural Development Cooperation falls within the international commitments in policies for official development assistance (ODA) from the contribution made by different fields of culture to setting up equality systems between cultures. The cultural dimension of the development and the fight against poverty are inserted in the value of cultural life as a condition and contribution to human development. Its function in international cooperation is based on the principle of solidarity between cultures and the defence of cultural diversity as world heritage (UNESCO, 1996). Helping less advantaged countries to consolidate their own cultural systems and their cultural diversity and maintain basic cultural institutionality. All manifestations of cultural life provide elements to governance and social cohesion in its political dimension and contributes to socio-economic development.

The current situation of foreign cultural policy maintains an action unit from these three major conceptual areas that, as we briefly presented, are the result of the actual policies evolving and their institutionalisation processes.

Making the most of the interactions and interdependencies of its contents leads to great efficacy from a joint management of foreign policy funds and official development assistance in accordance with the definition of partner countries in the master plans. This unit makes a more efficient model possible in accordance with the limited resources available. This model maintains some mistrust or criticism, but it has demonstrated its efficacy, plus acknowledgement or innovation from other countries and the European Union.

Among these three areas, we find the economic dimension of culture in international relations due to its impact on GDP, foreign trade of cultural goods, imports, or setting up international companies on Spanish soil; the same goes for all cultural joint-production processes among cultural agents (public, companies with social interest entities) that affect the cultural sector's economic results.

The following table shows us the differences and interdependences between the areas that reflect the complexity of a modern vision of foreign cultural policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Complex dimensions of External Cultural Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Cultural Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foreign Cultural Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of culture in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bilateral cultural relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governmental and territorial coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Country brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presence of multilateral organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specialised institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistance for internationalisation of creation and cultural production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Own research.
III. MYTHS AND REALITIES OF INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL COOPERATION

The traditional function of cultural action to serve official diplomacies for relations and cooperation between States has been affected by including a whole host of cultural agents who act in the sphere of international relations and that question the exclusivity of the State in these responsibilities, as in practice they act on the sidelines or in parallel to the official structures.

This phenomenon has grown due to mobility and societies’ ability to communicate in globalisation, understanding international cultural relations as a vehicle for mutual exchange and recognition between people, countries and their cultures. This new cooperation is shaped from shared actions and the creation of a field of two-way cultural flows aimed at understanding other cultures and cultural relations between civil societies (in the field of business, artistic groups, institutions, non-governmental organisations, etc.). These dynamics are difficult to control and monitor and they create a reasonably chaotic scenario, as reflected by its high complexity when it takes place in democratic environments, with respect for cultural freedom.

In this context, a State policy should be put in place which accepts that it cannot manage or control these processes, but it must create a framework for its circulation and exchanges. This suggests that the foreign cultural policy should accept a new mission to serve the dynamic nature of the cultural sector, the creators, the cultural market and civil society as the major players in promoting culture.

IV. A SECTOR THAT NEEDS CHANGES AND ADAPTATION

Despite changes in Spanish society, and on international stages, the structural model based on Spain’s external cultural action has not changed since competences were unified in 2002. Progress has only been made in setting up new autonomous organisations that are to a greater or lesser extent related to the Instituto Cervantes, Cultural Centres, Houses, etc. but without making the adjustments required by the context. Furthermore, budgetary cuts during the 2008-2014 recession limited international cooperation drastically with strong repercussions on all external cultural action that survived on the bare minimum.

In this respect, we consider it advisable to set some challenges and proposals for the future that are perceived as necessary to improve adaptation to current and future contexts. Some of them have been recurring over the years, and others are arising to tackle political urgencies that should be adopted as soon as possible as they emerge in a period of structural maintenance, poorly adapted to new realities and needs.

Situate foreign cultural policy within the country’s real situation

1. Take an in-depth look at defining the cultural competences included in the Law on State External Action and Service (2014) to provide a better backbone to the work of a range of players who are involved in external cultural action. Analyse the best future model with wide-ranging participation from social agents so that this is not just a distribution of competences. Determine a budget level and a prospective forecast to recover pre-crisis levels as soon as possible.

2. Coordinating cultural action in foreign policy, as a State policy, requires tra-
ditional approaches to be refreshed, considering that most culture competences have been transferred to the Autonomous Regions. This reality requires political structuring, non-existent so far, to relate the action unit abroad and the territories of the country that provide their cultural life and production to the whole function. As maintained in art. 25. 3, “External Action for culture will facilitate defence, promotion and diffusion of cultures of the nationalities and regions that make up the Spanish nation, within the framework given in article 149.2 of the Spanish Constitution”. Circumstances that would require a political agreement to set up coordination mechanisms such as a Territorial Council or Delegate Commission for these topics with participation from all Autonomous Regions. The current structure maintains a centralist outlook without considering the evolution of the competence transfer process proposed in the Autonomy Statutes and a closer look at the aforementioned article 194.2 that proposes the principles of cultural communication in the Carta Magna as a mechanism of territorial agreement.

4. Currently, cities represent top level cultural capital due to their capacity to produce and broadcast culture and as drivers of image creation and suppliers of cultural goods and services for external cultural action. What has been called local diplomacy is an example of its potential, but it could be much greater if wider goals were merged. We should not forget that local administration represents more than 64.2% of public spending on culture in Spain. So, it is essential to include cities in the international cultural cooperation agenda to get better results, as they drive image creation and international appeal. In the same way, as top-level cultural players, they can find acknowledgement and support for culture internationalisation tasks that they are already performing, albeit in their own way and in isolation.

Recognise the importance of participation from social and cultural agents

5. The complexity of the field of international cultural cooperation, in contemporary contexts, requires high participation and implication from social and cultural agents from dif-

---

6. The Constitution’s definition of cultural communication is interesting in the preamble to Law 10/2015 of 26 May to safeguard Intangible Cultural Heritage.
different origins and levels. Mobilisation includes the private sector, civil society and the different levels of administration, as well as the cultural organisations or companies, creators, artists, actors, etc. that interact dynamically in the field of international cultural cooperation action from different positions and interests. Most of these initiatives are run out of their own interest and resources, but these players should be given a written proposal that is clear and explicit regarding available public resources and the different governmental and non-governmental players in this action. Therefore, the need is perceived to have some type of Plan or Strategic Agreement for cultural cooperation and internationalisation that will make it possible to identify assets, design well-defined strategies and a road map for society’s essential participation in this common purpose.

6. Accept that this large number of social players in the international cultural cooperation processes exceeds the State’s traditional function. A change in paradigm is perceived to be necessary to make politics the facilitator of the processes and flows for international cultural cooperation instead of more managerial positions in these processes that are difficult to monitor because of their size. We have to accept that this field works due to energy and multiple exchanges that are impossible to control, as its dynamics generate a certain chaos and disorder in an environment of cultural freedom and democratic respect for cultural participation. Consequently, the State must find a new role in how these processes work in a globalised society.

7. **Remain present in the international community’s major commitments**

7. Maintain a policy of commitment to Human Rights and more specifically applying article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights from 1966 (ICESCR) to defend cultural rights and how they are applied to international cultural cooperation. In this field, Spain ratified the optional ICESCR Protocol in 2010 that commits the country to periodically presenting a report on the application of this Covenant in Spain. These reports require participative processes to increase their content level and show that they reflect the country’s cultural diversity. Along this same line, papers and reports from the United Nations Special Reporter for the sphere of Cultural Rights provide different elements to be incorporated into the consideration and form of international cultural cooperation.

8. Spain was one of the countries that supported the 2005 Convention to protect and promote diversity of cultural expressions with contributions within the framework of multilateral cooperation with UNESCO. The principles and values of this Convention are incredibly important for worldwide cultural governance, bilateral cultural relations and the contents of the international


9. https://www.ohchr.org/SP/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/OPCESCR.aspx

cultural cooperation programmes. Consequently, it is essential that foreign cultural policy plays an active part in the UNESCO International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) and commits to presenting “periodic reports” every four years on the policies and measures that they have adopted, and the challenges found in applying the Convention with broad participation from cultural agents.

9. Regarding a multilateralism policy in the field of culture, it is important to maintain the long-standing priority relationship with the Ibero-American region with major successful programmes in cultural cooperation that have been test benches for organisation methods and cooperation models on other latitudes. And within the field of the European Union, progress should be made in the joint strategy that the Council and the European Parliament set in 2016 that became an important road map for greater synergy and cooperation for EU countries with third parties in matters of culture.

10. Maintain the cultural commitment in development cooperation in accordance with the background and the contributions from the Spanish Strategy for Culture and Cooperation Development (MAEC, 2007) with clear impacts and practices. Situate this dimension among the Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals as an essential axis for the foreign cultural policy. In this direction, it is necessary to raise awareness and encourage the cultural sector to become more involved in this agenda for the international community to move forwards in applying sustainability principles in cultural institutions.

The challenge for more effective and professional management

11. Assuming more responsibilities for making foreign cultural policy more effective requires capabilities adapted to the new needs for international cultural management. Defining professional profiles necessary for the different functions that this policy requires in the current international context. It is essential to plan specialised training at different levels and an access or selection system that will provide civil service or outsourced personnel to suit the chosen goals. It is necessary to overcome the low professional requirements to hold cultural management responsibilities, as if anyone could automatically have these competences in this field of foreign policy. In the same way, it is advisable to provide general and specialised skills training in the private cultural and arts sector in the internationalisation functions of their projects.

12. Devise strategies to define an image of Spain’s culture(s) abroad using various tools for Internet presence and social media that make it possible to show what the country’s cultural life and arts are really like. For this purpose, a more proactive stance is advisable that involves the private sector and civil society in the structures at different levels of public administrations. Achieving greater visibility for our cultural expressions in global

---

11. Summit Programmes such as Ibermedia, Iberescena, Ibermuseos, etc. https://www.segib.org/cooperacion-iberoamericana/cultura/
contexts requires participation from all cultural agents, but the State must provide some channels and support.

13. To better separate political and artistic decisions, it is recommendable to create commissions or councils of experts to assess the artistic and technical decisions in the field of attending international events. In this way, decisions are prioritised and excessive politicisation of opinions on creative projects can be avoided.

14. External cultural action requires a clear position on promoting creation and cultural production so it may be incorporated into international cultural markets. Globalisation and its markets have a positive and negative effect on the actual cultural system, which requires internal and external instruments to be regulated or mitigated. International cultural cooperation involves setting up conditions so that cultural goods and productions can enter international markets with equal opportunities. Continue monitoring the World Trade Organisation agreements to protect cultures and minority cultural forms in the light of extremely broad free market processes. Keep an eye on the free trade treaties, between different parties, so that cultural production is protected. Promoting markets for culture and the circulation of cultural products represents an important factor for the survival of our creativity, affecting sustainable development.

In the post COVID-19 scenario

The Coronavirus pandemic emerged as we were publishing this work, with all its relevant consequences in citizens’ cultural life and repercussions on international relations. Although it is still early days to analyse its effects thoroughly, we might make a few points.

15. It is clear that international cooperation work will be concentrated on getting vaccines and treatments for COVID-19, but these emergencies should not bypass other economic, social and of course cultural impacts. A broad, complementary outlook should promote recovery among all sectors, including culture, by identifying the repercussions of this crisis in the short and medium term.

Most governments act urgently to guarantee citizens’ basic services without considering culture to be an essential public service. However, citizens, from different walks of life and on all continents, have managed to find a way to meet their cultural needs and keep their cultural life active. This demonstrates the importance of cultural and creative activities to coexist with lockdown and loss of mobility. The crisis, in cultural life, was overcome in private: families and communities over the internet and access to local, national and global cultural content. This demonstrated a new social gap between people, collectives and territories that do not have access to information society resources.

This explains why goals and resources must be maintained for the cultural dimension of development in the Official Development Assistance in general and in bilateral and multilateral cooperation when updating the Agenda 2030 and the ODS. In this respect, new needs and problem issues could be spotted and included in international cultural cooperation and culture’s commitment in the post COVID-19 processes.

V. CONCLUSION

A country’s external cultural action is shaped as a broad field of action like its own internal cultural system, as the relationship between
local and global aspects has narrowed greatly over the last few decades. Consequently, it is advisable to come up with thorough foreign cultural policy reforms in our current society.

The complexity of the very fields of culture compounds the internationalisation of all its dimensions that characterise contemporary cultural management.

Accepting the need to coordinate between players is essential to define a cultural policy, as it is impossible to manage from just one part of the system, understanding that the best external cultural action has mechanisms to enable the concurrence of contributions and determine how they might complement each other. This requires acceptance of the diversity of contents and forms of expression that make up a country’s cultural life and it should move in international circles.

In line with these insights, we have presented some proposals to demonstrate the need to bring this field of cultural policies up to date. As can be appreciated, the urgency of decision-making is clear so as not to miss out on events that are always evolving and changing.
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SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PAST: A NEW PROTECTION STRATEGY FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

María Angeles Querol

After clarifying the concept of archaeological heritage within the context of cultural heritage, the history of its management is analysed and the preventive archaeology model is presented, consistent with using territorial planning to declare reserve areas and caution areas and thereby avoid or minimise any surprises or emergencies. This report argues the need to modify the social consideration of archaeology and archaeological heritage, which is reasonably negative right now, and the urgency of devising the right public policies to highlight archaeological sites in rural settings, making it essential for citizens and town councils to actively take part.

Key words: cultural heritage, urban planning, visitable sites, citizen participation, town council.

I. ON THE SPECIAL NATURE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE

As the expression “heritage” and “cultural heritage” is often used right now as a synonym for “culture”, it seems a good place to start by recalling an agreed definition of cultural heritage (Querol 2010, p. 11): movable, immovable or intangible elements inherited from the past (and the past might be yesterday), that we have decided to protect as our distinguishing features, or as tourist resources. They are the result of human activities or the actual human activities: a building, a modified landscape, a city, a former cemetery or the traditional way of braiding corn. No matter how much we like an object or custom, it only becomes cultural heritage if it was invented or declared as such; consequently, out of the millions of tangible and intangible human works, past and present, only a few thousand are cultural heritage.

Archaeological heritage is part of that context, defined as the set of remains whose search, study and research uses archaeological methodology, based on prospecting, discoveries, stratigraphy and excavations.

This makes them quite special cultural goods. They are not living, have little to do with current society, they are not in use and no memory is kept of them, with some exceptions. Time has hidden, buried, submerged them so that, on the whole, they have to be “discovered” to be studied. The search, discovery and excavation are done in a special way, based on observing and recording remains.
in their contexts, and that special method is learnt by studying archaeology. Therefore, archaeology makes archaeological heritage.

In the western world, where it was invented, archaeology is currently defined as the science that reconstructs past societies by means of studying its remains. It is not important if the past is near or far; as long as there is historical interest on one hand and, on the other, remains, then archaeology can work as a science to construct Human History.

Archaeological heritage has many special characteristics which make it stand out from the rest of cultural heritage. The three most important are their public domain, the long series of conditions that the competent administrations determine to comply with the above, and the need, in terms of their protection, for a preventive management policy that is based on territorial planning or urban development.

This last matter is addressed in a section of this paper; regarding the first two, the situation is simple: the 18 laws in force on cultural or historical heritage make it clear that archaeological remains, whether they have been excavated (extracted) or not, are public property. Whether they are found on private or public ground, under territorial waters or under cities, they are therefore public domain.

Complying with this premise means that the competent administrations—18 in total as previously mentioned—have to equip themselves with many coercive measures to prevent poor use or pillaging of archaeological remains, from appropriation, exporting or illegal trade to unauthorised excavations. Today, we know that a dig requires authorisation from the autonomous region where the site is located, and this administration will only provide the permit if sufficient professional guarantees are presented, if the applicants have the appropriate financing and if the intervention is considered to be scientifically necessary—otherwise it would be destruction for destruction’s sake, because even the best performed excavation is always destructive.

In addition, archaeological heritage currently presents many problems and whether these issues are resolved or forgotten will doubtlessly affect its future. In this article, we are only going to address the three most relevant: what we now call preventive archaeology or preventive management, the necessary positive social impact that, as we will see, is tied to a wide spectrum of questions such as dissemination, education and use of archaeological heritage to develop non-urban areas.

To start, and before entering into these aspects, it seems appropriate to present a potted history of archaeological heritage management in our country.

II. A WEIGHTY INHERITANCE FROM THE PAST: EMERGENCY ARCHAEOLOGY

Throughout practically its entire history, the fundamental aim of archaeology has been excavation of new sites to thereby increase both historical knowledge and the wealth of museums and collections. Our fields were thereby filling up with reasonably romantic and ruinous spots, but in the last half a century, the situation has been changing: on the one hand, we realise that archaeological sites are not infinite, although they are numerous in this part of the world, that in many cases opening up these ruins properly to the public contributes, by means of tourism, to the economic development of villages; and on the other hand we also understand that the integrity of the sites is greatly threatened by earth movements caused by the current building works, above all large scale building projects.

The autonomous regions, main administrators of archaeological Heritage through their culture departments, since they took on these
competences in the 80s, have attempted to impose that, before carrying out any work or earth movement in places suspected of containing archaeological remains, an archaeological dig should take place to, at least, “save” the knowledge that these remains could offer; but experience has given the people in charge a dilemma: if a site is excavated, it is destroyed; if it is not excavated, no information is obtained and it is also destroyed because the building work is carried out.

Before that time, there was only one competent administration to oversee authorising, financing and publishing archaeological investigations, carried out by university professors, museum staff or members of the CSIC, almost entirely independently of the heritage needs of cultural goods, the dangers posed by urban development or ever more numerous public building works, with very scarce social incidence. If building work or earth movements exceptionally revealed monumental or highly significant archaeological remains, staff from the provincial Museums oversaw “rescuing them”, always behind the machines and working on what are known as “archaeological emergencies”. Of course, archaeology was a long way from being a business activity; nor was it acknowledged socially as a profession, but as a hobby that anyone—particularly if they were rich—could access.

In 1985, some changes took place: there were now 18 competent administrations; the number of jobs increased related to managing cultural heritage in general, public works and earth movements multiplied and, at the same time, new generations of people trained in archaeology—with History degrees—joined as-sociations and formed colleges to promote the professional archaeological practice.

Another important detail is that cultural heritage standards began to be published by the Autonomous Regions from 1990 onwards and the first of them, for Castilla-La Mancha, now revoked, already provided an interesting new aspect: the company promoting the building work has to pay to draw up a study on the archaeological value of the plot where the work will take place, whenever remains are suspected there. This study will take place prior to awarding the licence, and in the light of its results, the culture administration will determine its conditions.

Practically all the laws that were published since would develop this line, but what we could not see at the time was that this interesting initiative was of no use if the culture administrations were not also capable of modifying the planning, stopping the works, avoiding them or simply compensating the loss of buildability which is the price to pay for preserving the site. Little by little, we began to understand that site’s land had to be protected way ahead of building project approval.

In this context of change, Spain joined the EU in 1986, leading to the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments, where archaeology teams are brought in to prospect the affected land and, when appropriate, carry out the “rescue” excavations before building work destroyed the sites. And although the autonomous regions accelerate making archaeological charts or “risk charts” to find out what they have and even what they suspect, the rate of public and private building work was too great to keep one step ahead. More and more teams were contracted, more and more sites were destroyed, thankfully many of them after excavation. Museum storerooms filled up; there was barely any time or budget for the materials to be restored and exhibited or published, with a few exceptions (Martínez Díaz and Querol, 2013).

Back in those days, a series of labour movements began that, with some difficulty, managed to get archaeology recognised as a specialised professional activity with its own code of ethics. In fact, and as a new educational
aspect that began in 2009, there are currently four Spanish public universities that offer a degree in archaeology, which did not exist before (Ruiz Zapatero, 2010). Archaeology companies and archaeological services multiplied so that archaeological heritage was worked on from three fronts: academic, private companies and public administrations (Querol and Martínez Díaz, 1996).

Nowadays, most archaeological activities—excavations and prospecting—performed on our territories is caused by the need to “save”, “document” or even “release” that land where the existence of sites are suspected and where building work is going to take place and they are financed by the companies promoting this work. These activities are not so much research or academic, they do not obey needs for historical knowledge, but the whims of building work or earth movements. There are still large sites such as Atapuerca or Numancia where they are still digging, not due to a need imposed by building work, but for research purposes; but they are few and far between, although their social repercussions are widespread.

The percentage of “emergency” excavations caused by building works and carried out by archaeology companies was rather impressive in the years before the latest economic crisis. Just in the Region of Madrid, as an example, and to quote published data, 277 interventions took place—digs and prospecting, both in archaeology and in palaeontology—in 2002 and 408 in 2003 (Castillo Mena 2007). It is worth mentioning that an increase in the number of digs, without a consequent increase in publications or exhibitions and so also no increase in historical knowledge, is not exactly a good way for archaeological heritage to win any fans.

This accelerated destruction process had to slow down and even be avoided; we now have a tool to do this: preventive archaeology.

III. PRESENT AND FUTURE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE: PREVENTIVE ARCHAEOLOGY

After considering the previous arguments, we can see that archaeological heritage has been managed in our regions, which is consistent, as we have seen, with increasing the number of excavations to “save” sites before they are destroyed by a building project, a further step is required to modify its goals, strategies and procedures. This is how preventive archaeology emerged, defined as the set of activities intended to avoid or minimise the damage to public or private works in archaeological heritage (Martínez Díaz, 2007; Martínez Díaz and Castillo Mena, 2007; Martínez Díaz and Querol, 2013; Querol, 2010 and 2020; Querol and Castillo Mena, 2013).

The great challenge for competent administrations is twofold: on the one hand, we have to find out about and assess archaeological heritage before planning takes place on its land; this is the only way to avoid intervention and introduce its conservation or its investigation and restoration of value in the planning at the right time. On the other hand, society itself, through education and information must feel positive about conserving remains from the past, seeing it not as an imposed burden but added value.

Preventive archaeology procedures are simple: making the most of the mandatory Environmental Impact Assessment prior to any new territorial planning or modification of the above, archaeological prospecting must be carried out to find and characterise existing or suspected sites, so that the definitive planning clearly states “archaeological reserves”—known sites, partly excavated or not, lacking particular scientific value, that should be treated as natural parks and will not be affected by any building work. The planning should also show, and of course in greater numbers, “archaeological cautions”—that have different names in each Autonomous Region—where, before approving
any building site project that affects them, the Environmental Impact Assessment must provide a more in-depth study on the place so that Culture can make decisions: either it becomes a Reserve and therefore the work is modified—new outlines, inclusion of sites, etc., or it is excavated before the building work to “save” the historical documentation, etc.,—in the old ‘emergency’ style—or nothing is done because the site is not worth it.

It is a great help if this entire process can be performed as quickly as possible, with the lowest costs and the greatest success, and that culture has the archaeological charts or inventories updated, the more important sites already included in the planning and its technical personnel trained in this process; another basic question is to have evaluation and classification systems that can argue for or against conservation. The final decisions will depend on a wide range of questions: informative potential, singularity or significance in the general context, state of conservation or potential degree of deterioration, scientific investment required to use it, level of legal protection, etc. Culture must put forward convincing arguments if they wish to “win the battle” of conserving the archaeological sites that they consider the most important and with the most possibilities for the future.

In all cases, we have experience, negative for archaeological heritage, from past decades—and from the present of course: in the “fight” between public building work and conservation of an archaeological site, the former always wins. Therefore, preventive archaeology attempts to conciliate both questions: conservation of the archaeological sites considered to be more important or singular should be compatible with the building work, modifying the latter or making integrations. And, above all, this new way of managing archaeological heritage claims that there are no surprises, that the construction companies should not have to stop building work or modify projects that were already approved, that society does not receive the negative message from archaeology, concerning building work—so often using public money—that is stopped so that the Archaeological teams can finally remove and liberate the plot from this burden. In short, there should be no more surprises and emergencies, both so expensive for the economy and for how society considers archaeological science.

Regarding this last factor, let’s not forget that the true nature of archaeology is not studied in compulsory education or in most university degrees. Nor is archaeological heritage—or cultural heritage of course—and only in this century have master’s courses emerged to teach these topics in a handful of universities (Querol, 2020).

On the other hand, and secondly, although potentially more importantly, society barely stops to think when it comes to choosing between a new road, train line, station or any installation or building and conserving an archaeological site. This same society protests and demonstrates against interruptions to building work caused by the need to free up plots with an archaeological burden; not to mention the negative idea that the construction companies must have of archaeology, as they have to stop jobs they have already started, with all the cost that this represents.

So, a positive view of archaeological heritage, so necessary for its conservation, involves the design and implantation of a policy agreed between the Autonomous Regions, whose main points we will look at in the conclusions.

IV. THE COUNTRYSIDE: POTENTIAL ECONOMIC DRIVERS

In these fields, the classic formula was “visit-able sites”, meaning, places that may or may not have been adapted or have information
panels, with or without an educational aspect, that usually are free to access. Our fields are packed with these “ruins” that sometimes we understand and sometimes are incomprehensible, depending on our level of training. A lovely, documented history of this topic, in quite an international context, can be seen in Díaz-Andreu, 2014.

In 1986, the Ministry of Culture General Sub-Board for archaeology presented as “Archaeological Parks Plan” (VVAA, 1993). In theory, it was conceived as a support initiative, both technical and economic, for Autonomous Regions to run comprehensive actions on sites declared as Archaeological Cultural Interest Zones, of great interest and well conserved, in order to turn them into visitable areas prepared to get high social profitability. From these conclusions back then, the most difficult and expensive aspect referred to the infrastructure, that needed both personnel and maintenance.

This plan, doubtlessly along with many other phenomena that cultural heritage and its management brought to light at that point, represented an incentive for the Autonomous Regions where initiatives began to multiply: the Archaeological Parks in the Canary Islands—such as Gáldar, the Castilla-La Mancha Network of Archaeological Parks—Segóbriga, Carranque, Alarcos, Recópolis, Minateda; the many varied Castilla y Leon Archaeological Classrooms (Del Val and Escribano, 2004), of which probably the best known as they are also UNESCO World Heritage Sites are Atapuerca and Las Médulas; the archaeological heritage Networks such as in Galicia (Tallón et al., 2004), Andalusia–RECA–(Pazos, 2018) or Madrid; or the so-called “archaeological paths” such as La Plata, from Seville to Astorga...

We should also highlight the six conferences held on museumization of sites, that began in 2002; the last was held in Toledo in 2010 and published in 2013 (VVAA, 2013). The conference reports demonstrate the wealth of initiatives, lack of coordination or some type of general administering master plan and scarcity of studies on the social and economic impact of opening these sites.

What we are seeing is that, in most cases, archaeological tourist resources are located in the middle of nature, so the experience is complemented with what it contributes to rural tourism and ecotourism (Moreno and Sariego, 2017). We thereby enter the field of what is known as “archaeological tourism” or “archaeotourism”, a modality that presents cultural and tourism activities, products and services where archaeology is the main ingredient and the reason for taking the trip (Tresserras, 2004). Trigueros (2016) talks about its advantages as an alternative to seaside holidays and the advantage for developing regions; other papers address this tourism speciality in terms of how it relates to sustainability, complaining about the absence of an active policy so that the income from this type of tourism might improve the tourist experience and finances, or at least completes the financing, of the fundamental tasks of conservation, research and documentation (Moreno and Sariego, o. c.).

There are very few publications that explain the real economic impact of these initiatives. In 2007, Morère and Jiménez published the results of a series of surveys held among the Autonomous Regions on visitable sites, their features and their social and economic consequences. They even managed to distinguish Communities with many initiatives and results, such as Cantabria, and others at the opposite end of the scale such as Valencia. However, their conclusions were not particularly positive: as they stated, this was an incipient, barely understood market, in general poorly structured and not reflected either in strategic plans or the actual standards on Museums or Tourism.

What we can deduce, because we bear the brunt of it, is that the last economic crisis
clearly affected many of the initiatives that it listed: the archaeological parks in Castilla-La Mancha were closed for several years, the archaeological classrooms in Castilla y León suffered from lack of funding for maintenance, the Galicia network never even took shape and management of the archaeological parks in the Canary Islands have had their ups and downs. This leaves one very clear question: if these places had represented a real economic drive for the towns, if the local communities had been really implicated in these initiatives, these problems would not have happened, or at least not so clearly as to cause their closure or deterioration. It remains to be seen if the consequences of the COVID-19 crisis will go the same way or if, making the most of the previous experience, the Autonomous Regions are going to use the occasion to clarify their intentions and coordinate their initiatives.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Although much has already been done in this context, the moment seems to have come for in-depth analysis on the outcome of the initiatives and to rethink the action models, highlighting the fact that, in the chapter on managing archaeological sites, the ideas and use of parallel public policies (environmental assessments, territorial planning, sustainable tourism) are much more important than budget increases. The analysis leads to some important specific proposals:

1. Citizen participation. It is not possible to keep working on archaeological heritage policy—actually cultural heritage as a whole—without including citizens, who should be the force that guarantees the appropriate choice and maintenance of archaeological sites open to the public, both existing sites and any that might emerge in the future. The rules for Cultural or Historical Heritage are careful to give town councils competences, perhaps fearful of initiatives that might be dangerous for the property’s integrity; but this timid formula has already born fruit, good and bad. Now the actual citizens have to get involved directly regarding how their archaeological goods—cultural in general—are managed within the context of use and management of the environment which is home to archaeological sites. Local administrations are closest to the citizens, requiring that, in one way or another, the town councils take on competences and perform them.

2. Modification of public policies regarding management of archaeological heritage, based so far on the existence of “emergencies” and “rescues”. The Autonomous Regions’ cultural heritage Boards should assume the principles of preventive archaeology that have been explained here, making the most of compulsory territorial planning and the equally compulsory environmental assessments to introduce Reserve Zones and Caution Areas in our cities and fields. This will at least manage to rule out any archaeological surprises that so many construction companies get as the affected company, adding negative points to the social impact of archaeology.

3. Design a reasonable structure that the different Autonomous Regions agree on concerning sites open to the public or whose value has been restored. The 1990s saw a multiplication of often-repeated initiatives that then were neither continued nor maintained, disappointing rural societies that had pinned their economic hopes on them.
4. Commitment from the actual competent administrations to provide incentives for periodic jobs to assess initiatives to open sites to the public. This would obtain data that could correct or redesign these initiatives.

5. Introduction in compulsory education of a concept adapted to cultural heritage and, within it, archaeology and archaeological heritage.
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CULTURE AND TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT. 
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES 
FOR THE COUNTRYSIDE

Jorge Fernández León

In the midst of the urgent debate on ‘Deserted Spain’ and depopulation, a general brief examination is made of the current state of existing local cultural capital, its material and human resources and several of its initiatives, finishing off with some indications regarding its possible present and future role in recovering the vital space of the rural world to give its citizens a dignified life.
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PREFACE: CULTURE AND RURAL SPACE AFTER THE PANDEMIC: A FAST-PACED PANORAMA

The pandemic has transfigured everything that crossed its path. Culture, its digital consumption and its value as entertainment, support for learning or knowledge, have found a place for themselves over these last few months as a way of making lockdown bearable, in cities and often in the country, offering products, frequently free of charge, that would have cost time and money to enjoy in real life, from attending live concerts or shows to digital reading. However, this phenomenon has only emphasised the digital gap for people who do not have access to the net from their homes. And many of Spain’s rural communities continue to find good quality access hard to come by.

We are a long way from quantifying the global consequences of COVID-19 for the rural world in economic, social and cultural terms. In any case, the impact is going to seriously affect its entire population, particularly persons and families with fewer resources, multiplying survival needs for thousands of them, making it difficult to access employment, limiting their real rights to access basic services such as food, energy sufficiency, nurseries and care for the elderly.

Security and population control measures brought in after lockdown will remain in force or, in the worst case, they will be strengthened and informal economy sectors or small family businesses will experience the same problems as people who have worked in entire sectors of unstable employment, from hospitality to culture.
The resulting panorama will not bear a great resemblance to the last great crisis a decade ago. Budget tensions and limitations to public resources to address this type of scenario will mean that local institutions will have to severely remodel their priorities and reorganise their functions.

Predictably, temptations will also arise in our surrounding area to make the most of this climate of fear, increasing violence and unease among citizens to determine mechanisms among these priorities for better social control, extension or generalisation of electronic surveillance systems and measures that restrict individual and collective freedoms in force so far.

Consequently, this tension between rights and control finds an unexpected protagonist in the countryside. Depopulation makes social distancing easier, it lowers the cost of living, it is a space for productive sustainability and living longer, it makes living together easier with a less stressful pace of life, it broadens the value of emotions and multiplies opportunities to face up to major transformations that are doubtlessly going to take place in the world of culture with dignity. This goes for the people that live there and people who are going to see themselves expelled from the pre-pandemic cultural system.

It will therefore be necessary to clamour for insight and dialogue from institutions, organisations and activists regarding this future of changes and immediate priorities to make the most of these competitive conditions in the countryside. And this future should either be tackled transversally and inclusively or we will certainly see the wilful attempt to get back to normal fail, breaking up former cultural services and initiatives, whether they were financed with public money or not. Some of the proposals put forward in this text point to possible ways of making this possible.

I. INTRODUCTION: MARKING OUT INVISIBLE SPAIN

The great transformations of the productive systems and their implantation in the territory make it possible to talk authoritatively in Spain today about an environment that is partly increasingly agropolitan (Izquierdo, 2019) and partly dangerously empty, where culture plays a barely relevant role in the GDP although it is occasionally significant in community practices and in citizens’ quality of life.

This text is neither long enough nor its scope wide enough to give a detailed analysis of the complex situation of life in rural Spain, but a human and material framework should be determined for the work, and fields should be marked out to emphasise when approaching the state and the impact of cultural matters in the life of communities that are not dominantly urban.

To firstly determine the population that is affected, several sources have been used that do not exactly agree with each other. The Countryside Report by the Economic and Social Council (CES, 2018) states that, according to the National Statistics Institute, rural towns are towns with less than 10,000 inhabitants; we have also consulted the standard that establishes population minimums to define a territory as rural, Law 45/2007 for sustainable development of the countryside, which in article 3, determines that the countryside refers to territories with less than 30,000 inhabitants and a density of less than 100 inhabitants per km².

Article 29 of this standard also provides a series of proposals to encourage networks of cultural spaces, protection and reuse of heritage, encouraging the creation of new public libraries and favouring public-private plans for

cultural action. The same Law determines that a small town has less than 5,000 inhabitants, a dimension that coincides with what is included in the Local Regime Bases Law, which in article 26 determines that the minimum cultural service for populations over 5,000 inhabitants is a public library. However, when defining the population limit, it was decided to use an intermediate factor due to its importance, also determined by the aforementioned law, due to the Provincial governments’ obligation to equip towns with under 20,000 inhabitants with minimum cultural services (libraries). This measure includes almost fourteen and a half million people.

The study population thus determined, having very concisely mentioned the general conditions for developing cultural life in the countryside, data is examined relating to the dimension and functioning of these basic services, libraries and rural reading programmes, the phenomenon of rural museums and the weight of heritage resources, the diversity of the initiatives for live creation and some of the other processes to reactivate cultural life linked to artistic creation and sustainable development of the territories, to conclude with a series of proposals to help improve the role of culture in recovering rural communities.

II. PRODUCTIVE MODELS VERSUS TERRITORIAL BALANCING

According to a recent paper by J. Recaño, in 2016, 60% of our towns had fewer than 1,001 inhabitants, took up 40% of the surface area and barely amassed 3.1% of the population. 19 provinces were among the least dense in

the European Union in 2015. As summarised in their study on the Spanish situation, F. Goyeritz (2015, pp. 293 and beyond) states that our demography is spasmodic in that while the large towns are growing, smaller towns tend to disappear; inland, with the exception of Madrid, is emptying and the peripheries are becoming saturated, even crossing over municipal limits and generating worrying territorial imbalances.

These imbalances are a great present and future dilemma for a large part of the centre and north of Spain; a situation that is worsened by ageing populations, scarcity of women and immigration that does not make up for these losses on its own. The future of rural towns, due to the great diversity of sustainability conditions that can be detected, therefore raises a challenge for public policies where cultural policies can play an important role due to their plasticity and resilience.

Spain’s adaptation policies after entering the European Union have brought about a change that has far from benefited the equilibrium of non-urban territories; in addition, the last great recession widened the town-country cultural gap, encouraging an economic image of rural life as devoted to urban masses to enjoy cultural constructions such as the “countryside” or “nature”, subsidising hospitality and turning culture and ecosystems into heritage. Rural and urban are nowadays further ways of giving meaning and fresh meaning to roles for a productive model based on assigning idyllic functions to the former, as goods that compensate the sometimes-unbearable flow and pace of city life.

The culture created and disseminated by the media from urban spaces through its different supports, from painting and literature to cinema or differentiated gastronomy, with their messages multiplied on screens, has made an active contribution to generating that collective imagination that is, in turn, an effec-
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3. https://ced.uab.cat/PD/PerspectivesDemografiques_007_CAST.pdf
tive factor for localised production of wealth, through providing incentives, even subsidised, for new forms of tourism as “experiences” and also as a distinction.

This culture often reproduces the classic roles of heterodominant societies, disregarding the specific weight of gender and its imbalances in rural economies. Furthermore, it moves between the growing flow of affluence among young families in peri-urban environments in the large and medium-sized Spanish cities and the continuous regression of data on deserted Spain, from the north in Galicia, Asturias or Cantabria and including both Castilla regions and what is known as the Iberian Siberia, far from dynamic cities and in need of solutions for basic issues concerning education services, health, communications, jobs and access to the actual land, if they want to live off it. In the words of Elisa Oteros-Rozas, this “is not going to just be solved among the daughters and grand-daughters in the villages. Even if they all wanted to come back, which is not the case, this would require a lot more “neo-rural” people and “deep cultural and political changes.” She goes on to mention that it will be necessary to transform ways of life and living together, as the urgent recovery of “local / traditional agrofood and land management wisdom, respecting each person’s pace of adaptation and with a great deal of generosity.”

III. FORGOTTEN, RESILIENT, UNEQUAL CULTURAL SERVICES

The quantitative data on cultural services for small and medium-sized towns is lost when we want to look at detailed figures. The Survey of Cultural Habits and Practices in Spain, corresponding to the 2018-2019 period, groups together many different types of town that might be semi-urban with twenty to fifty thousand inhabitants, often boasting a library, one or more theatres or cultural centres, a museum and art schools, along with over 6,800 town councils that do not exceed 5,000 inhabitants and so do not even have to be provided with cultural services. The SGAE studies do not provided a detailed breakdown of their results. Details of the smaller towns are not accessible and therefore it is practically impossible to perform a quantitative analysis. We have no record of Cultural Centres or municipal cultural facilities, or any data on their use. To get at least a record of the number of museums and local visitors centres, we have to enquire in the Ministry of Culture and Sport’s General Directory of Museums and Collections. However, it is possible to find a detailed territorial breakdown of the network of fixed and mobile public libraries, whose conditions and shortfalls will be mentioned later.

This lack of specific information from small and medium-sized towns makes it ever more necessary to draw up an accurate overview of cultural matters in rural Spain that affects more than 60% of the national territory and almost fourteen and a half million people in our country, to work together more effectively to address urgent solutions from public cultural policies to the serious problems of these at-risk territories.

However, it might be concluded that these invisible networks continue to sustain living cultural activities throughout almost all of Spain. Nevertheless, as we mentioned, it is undeniable that separate data on cultural con-
sumption for the 2018-2019 period only manages to differentiate the block of towns with under 50,000 inhabitants, constant data if we compare it with data for provincial capitals and major cities. There are therefore clearly growing difficulties to access the internet and the digital environment, inversely proportional to the number of inhabitants in a town, difficulties that affect both access to service platforms and digital libraries and digital consumption of culture. In addition, these populations find it more difficult to visit museums, libraries, exhibitions or concerts and they demonstrate this by doubling the number of people in urban spaces who argue that they do not participate in culture because there is no accessible offer of cultural services nearby.

There is a negative difference of more than 5% (20.7% as opposed to 26.4%) among users of public reading services in rural areas and urban areas. 53.5% of these potential rural users do not even enter a library once a year, compared to 46.8% of people living in cities. We can see this same difference in the data on attending performing arts shows where people living in rural environments score 9 points less (27.3% compared to 36.4%).

The same happens in all categories of the study of cultural habits and consumption, but despite major difficulties, people who live in this deserted Spain continue demanding and consuming in quantities that are not so far off the urban communities. And they would consume much more if more resources were accessible. Unequal networks that are upheld or switched off depending on the priorities and sensitivity of the current government and that maintain activity in many small populations thanks to the efforts of thousands of public and private professionals from cultural intermediation, that assume culture as a personal commitment to the communities where they live together.

IV. CULTURAL LIFE STARTS WITH BOOKS

Only data from libraries allows us to take a more detailed look at the state of the cultural offer and its deficiencies among the 7,719 towns of this other country where more than 30% of the Spanish population lives. Data from the national network of libraries and reading centres corresponding to 2017 indicate that there are at least 3,065 towns that do not even have direct library service points and that a total of 1,498,840 inhabitants do not have either fixed or mobile access to any reading sources. In other words, more than 3.2% of the Spanish population still does not have a basic cultural service. Out of these 3,065 towns, 759 are in Castilla y León, 509 in Aragon and 504 in Catalonia.

However, the reading services in that other Spain cannot be understood without the existence of the network of library buses, mobile public libraries, created during Spain’s Second Republic(*) as part of a pioneering cultural policy for dissemination and democratisation, that has sustained and widened its services in many of these territories, managing to reach more than eleven million potential users in 1,956 of these towns. This network, with a total of 76 units on the road, is distributed unequally through the affected communities, present in ten autonomous regions and managed either by regional governments or by provincial governments or some town councils. Castilla y León leads the effort in number of services with 30 units on the road, followed by Catalonia with 12, Madrid with 10, Castilla-La Mancha with 10 and Murcia with 5. It is telling that dominantly rural communities in the north such as Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria, the Basque Country, Rioja or Navarra do not have a single unit of this service.

Despite all this, the chance to access reading remains denied for a significant number of citizens. Cuts in the culture budget after the 2008 recession have seriously affected provisions for library funds, particularly purchasing new items. Data from the FESABID report (2019) on the situation in the public libraries in Spain indicates that collection renewal was significantly set back between 2010 and 2016, as by the end of this period only 3.4 million documents had been added to libraries, 35.8% less than in the first year of the study. This drop particularly affected audiovisual, electronic and sound material but also book purchases. As stated in its executive summary (page 6) “In the chapter on running costs, it is the purchases that are facing the greatest impact during the economic crisis. Between 2010 and 2016, a drop of 47.7% was seen in this spending chapter, going from 55.7 million in 2010 to 29.1 in 2016”. Public libraries in rural Spain have doubtlessly been the most affected by this situation and this weakness in the offer is affecting their future.

The same document also refers to the great change that took place in these basic services: the arrival of the growing use of social media in the libraries and the multiplication of the portfolio of new services through channels such as Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp or Instagram. However, it indicates that the undoubted use of these tools, that have helped to generate dynamics among readers and institutions creating ties and active reading and exchange communities, generating more personalised answers and flows of intercommunication between libraries and their users, is dragged down by the clear lack of general and separate data that would help assess and improve the lending service both for usual tasks and for these new local services “... There is no useful data in these media, which leads to a serious call for redefining the official indicators that we are using. Indicators that (...) might have shown us a friendlier face of the great job that our library professionals have performed to be able to get better results, and not just state in their annual reports how the budget cuts, for example, had reduced the growth of their collections”, as mentioned by (FESABID, p. 3) Gloria Pérez-Salmerón, president of Stitching IFLA Global Libraries.

V. LOCAL MUSEUMS AND ENDANGERED HERITAGE

Our country has made an enormous effort over the last few decades to save its tangible and intangible heritage. However, just as this situation in urban areas has benefited from investments and attention from the best resources from administrations and institutions, rural heritage still leaves a lot to be desired in many cases of cataloguing and sufficient preservation. The historical heritage protection laws and the new standards that include industrial heritage alone cannot stop the damage to many endangered elements and traditions. However, despite all this, a growing network of initiatives covers, albeit unequally, the cultural goals throughout the countryside.

From the list of around one thousand five hundred museums and heritage centres in the Directory of Museums and Collections in Spain, almost half, 742, are located in towns with a population under 20,000 inhabitants, 130 of them in Castilla-La Mancha, 109 in Castilla y León, 104 in the Valencian Community, 52 in Aragon, 43 in Catalonia and 40 in Asturias and a few more in Galicia. The majority sprang from institutional initiatives, but they also maintain a healthy number, over one hundred, that came about thanks to citizen initiatives or private sponsorship. This includes centres devoted to anthropology and ethnography, culture and popular traditions, artistic creation, historic and industrial heritage care, preserving the memory of outstanding collec-
tives and people, music, books, scientific culture, natural heritage, crafts..., dozens of topics often addressed by people who care deeply about it but lack the greater endowment of material and human resources.

The activity programmes and the recovery work developed by this informal network of institutions maintain and, in many cases, feed the symbolic collective imagination and local pride in their communities. They invent and renew their discourses through growing activity, with scarce funds available and often appealing for collaboration from citizens and attracting visitors to keep them going. However, the lack of material conditions for sustainability occasionally obliges them to make their mission public to the pressure of tourism, becoming small theme or leisure parks and often betraying their initial goals. The actual trends of the developmentalist discourse, so pressured by the immediacy, puts the public service mission at risk and the sense of these valuable facilities for the territory’s sustainable future.

Spain, with 47 acknowledgements, was the third country in the world in 2019 with the most places catalogued as UNESCO World Heritage Sites and Castilla y León was the region with the highest number in the world (8). However, if we take a look at the List of Movable and Immovable Goods declared to be of cultural interest, picking the Regions with the greatest proportion of rural territories, the figures multiply exponentially. Independently of the different criteria used by the territorial authorities to define degrees of local or regional protection, data from the protected heritage places is overwhelming.

Out of a national total of 28,821 goods registered in Spain (2015), these are the Autonomous Regions with the largest rural territory (Table 1).

Table 1. Goods declared to be of cultural interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Movable</th>
<th>Immovable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>8,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragón</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asturias</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantabria</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla y León</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castilla-La Mancha</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>2,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galicia</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MCD, Dirección General de Bellas Artes y Bienes Culturales. No data for La Rioja, Ceuta and Melilla.

This heritage includes monuments and museum elements, languages and forms of expression and oral tradition, documentary collections, etc. with very fragile tangible and intangible wealth. A large part of it is located outside the cities and, despite wide-reaching state and regional regulations to protect and catalogue it, irrespective of whether it is in private hands or not, its maintenance is expensive and requires resources that often do not arrive as swiftly as needed. As denounced by organisations that are barely suspected of activism such as Hispania Nostra through elements such as the Heritage Red List, there are constant cases reported of endangered heritage in all territories, although especially affecting elements located in rural areas that are less visible to the media.

If protection of the material heritage is insufficient, the survival of intangible culture, protected and recognised after the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intan-
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gible Cultural Heritage in 2003,\(^9\) it is even further endangered. The Spanish list of intangible cultural heritage recognised by UNESCO comprises 19 elements and there is a wide-reaching regulation to define and protect intangible cultural heritage that includes many elements of that cultural capital nationally, regionally and even locally. However, it will be the citizen organisations closest to the communities that will make them possible, in a context of recovering local cultures and helping them survive. As stated by Professor González Cambeiro (2017), “the presence of favourable regulations is the cause and, in turn, the consequence of many of these projects but we can be sure that, even in an appropriate context, the initiatives from all these groups, and fundamentally from the protagonists of intangible heritage (...), are often one step ahead of the legislation”.

VI. LIVE ARTS: COLLABORATION AS OPPOSED TO FESTIVALISATION

Recognising the existence of a small number of resilient professional cultural projects, stage or music productions with undeniable links to their communities, located for decades in Spanish rural environments, their singular nature makes it hard to analyse their impact in terms of cultural capital. Instead, it is necessary to mention a phenomenon that has been widely reported in the media: artistic festivals linked to rural environments and/or natural spaces. As mentioned in its introduction (page 1) the authors of a detailed study on the function and efficacy in the territory (Bennet et al. 2014), “Historically festivals, carnivals and fairs have been an important part of social and cultural participation, used to articulate and communicate shared values, ideologies and mythologies central to the visions of the world in small communities (...), they are conceived as ritual or repeated short term events where members of the community take part to assert and celebrate different social, religious, ethnic, national, linguistic or historical ties.” However, since the end of the last century this original function has given way to the global process of festivalisation, conceived as a purely commercial appropriation and resignification that transforms these community rituals into goods designed solely to vitalise tourism and the service economy.

This unifying mechanism has come across a more transforming and inclusive response in many Spanish festivals held in rural environments, just like many places in Europe and in the rest of the world over the last two decades. As mentioned by Gibson and Connell (2012), these events might be extremely important to sustainably revitalise their environment, as well as promoting flows of visits. They have therefore become a phenomenon with a certain economic importance for the places where they are held and they form part of the cultural landscape of many Spanish towns today, creating ties and developing community bonds, in addition to business, generating appropriate environments to recover other forms of cultural expression and attracting the attention of creators who often find ideal working conditions in these territories with more sustainable production costs than in cities.

In this way, some events have been created and consolidated on the cultural agenda that exceed traditional dissemination in their concept and function and that, with varying degrees of success, delve deeper into insights and shared processes. These are initiatives that usually include music and often theatre, cinema and the visual arts, gastronomy, craftsmanship and traditions that highlight everything that is good about the rural world and they are being used to breathe life into the local economy in the areas where they are held.

Suggestive projects such as the Razón Valle festival / Music for depopulation, that promotes the El Hueco collective in Soria, an active group of anti-depopulation supporters, or the BoinaFest in Arenillas in Soria, are just two of hundreds of living and growing initiatives on a busy map of events that go from well-established events such as Sonorama Ribera in Aranda de Duero, or the megafestival ResurrectionFest in Viveiro (Lugo) to other more modest events such as DemandaFolk in Tolbaños de Arriba in Burgos, LeturAlma in Letur (Albacete), AbabolFestival in Aladrén (Zaragoza), Poborina Folk in el Pobo (Teruel) or Biosegura, in Beas del Segura (Jaén), to name just a few. New cultural assets resolve around them bound to visions of the rural world that are increasingly far from the colonising urban gaze.

VII. NEW ARTISTIC PRACTICES AND THE RURAL WORLD

Traditional criticism and insight around the role of art in the rural environment has been seeping into Spain around a growing bubbling pot of initiatives that come from insight and action that, since the end of the last century, have been promoted by different countryside organisations and institutional initiatives. The recovery of proximity values in an increasingly global environment, along with increasingly greater access to the internet, has multiplied the presence of cultural activists in rural environments who, using a definition by Félix Guattari (1991), assume their presence in the territory as a commitment to something similar to a “new type of eco-philosophy, both practical and speculative, ethical-political and aesthetic, (that) must substitute the old forms of religious, political, associative commitment, etc.”.

Many of them are bound to a strong environmentalist conviction, concerned about sustainability and with different degrees of implication in their environmental commitment, developing projects in networks, many of them collaborative, where they seek to explore and experiment with bonds and transfer knowledge between the values of the traditional culture and the initiatives of modern creation. An important group of these collectives and institutions are brought together in a recent publication, *Creative Responses to Sustainability. Spain* (2019), with multidisciplinary projects as diverse as the Fundación Cerezales Antonino y Cinia in León, one of its best known dialogue and meeting spaces, festivals such as Langaia in Lanzarote and Madrid, Paca Proyectos Artísticos in Asturias, or El Arreciado in Toledo. They are all linked through an informal network of 54 centres, El Cubo Verde, that amasses initiatives and promotes encounters and exchanges of knowledge around different ways of living through artistic practices.

One of its most constant members and diffusers, Fernando García-Dory, founder and promoter of the Campo Adentro strategy, describes it as follows, “Ours is not a bucolic philosophy based on a return to the landscape, to Nature, but a conceptual manoeuvre to give art a real use and that is transformed into a tool that backs ecological balance and social change. This inevitably involves recovering the relationship with the countryside.”

With this same commitment, we can highlight the continued work of small institutions committed to art and rural life, such as the Museu de la Vida Rural from the Fundación Carulla en L’Esplugue de Francolí (Tarragona), whose programming constant includes projects from this perspective. Also urban spaces such as MediaLab Prado, the CDAN in Huesca and other institutional initiatives maintain growing links with this innovative current.
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: NEW ROLE OF CULTURE IN THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT

The presence and functions of culture and creation in the rural environment form part of a debate that remains marginal in Spain and in the European Union. However, an increasing number of projects linked to them have found funding in programmes allocated funds for the countryside (FEDER and others). Both European and Spanish institutions have begun to observe, at least, what the present and future role of culture will be in sustaining and recovering the assets that might make it possible for the countryside to survive a recession. These ever-growing concerns and interests will become more acute after the predictable conflicts derived from Brexit and new financing of the Common Agricultural Policy, so relevant to increase the presence of culture in the reconfiguration of a decreasing or adjusting model that should not damage any more communities and should stop the demographic bleed-out.

However, there is some middle ground to explore. In its Cork Declaration 2.0, in 2016\textsuperscript{10}, “A Better Life in Rural Areas”, the European Union highlights two highly relevant goals for culture. The first is that “Particular attention must be given to overcoming the digital divide and developing the potential offered by connectivity and digitisation of rural areas” and the second determines that “Policies must incentivise the delivery of environmental public goods, including the preservation of Europe’s natural and cultural heritage”. This interest is perceived in works such as what Culture Action Europe (2019) is developing through its project Beyond the Obvious, a European platform for exchange of thoughts, pooling ideas and creative experiences in non-urban environments; in Spain, institutions such as the Ombudsmen (2017) or the Economic and Social Council (2018) have examined the state of the countryside and its problems, identifying some cultural initiatives that might bring some alleviation. The same happens within the framework of the Spanish Government’s general action, particularly in work begun four years ago by the current Ministry of Culture and Sport with the Culture/Countryside Encounters\textsuperscript{11} within the framework of the Culture/Citizenship programme that brought together hundreds of representatives from institutions and projects that tie culture in with rural areas. This context gives importance to the conclusions\textsuperscript{12} reached in the First Forum on Culture and Rural Areas, that took place three years ago under the “Processes for social, economic and demographic transformation” section at the Cerezales Foundation and that has been the work guide for successive ministerial Encounters to date.

This commitment, plus the efforts of citizen platforms linked to the countryside and its people’s protests such as the Spanish Rural Development Network\textsuperscript{13} or the Rural Platform and its Art and Rural Medium Commission,\textsuperscript{14} to name just a few, as well as the commitments made by tertiary sector Foundations such as Cerezales, Carasso\textsuperscript{15} and others laid out in their activity and financing programmes, leads us to imagine that this is a decisive moment to boost a new role for culture in the context of an ageing rural environment, depopulated and at risk of losing its balancing role in a new territory economy.


\textsuperscript{11} https://culturayciudadania.culturaydeporte.gob.es/cultura-medio-rural.html

\textsuperscript{12} https://culturayciudadania.culturaydeporte.gob.es/dam/jcr:ca30ac69-734a-47e5-b867-b07c7c9a343c/Conclusiones%20I%20Foro.pdf

\textsuperscript{13} http://www.redr.es/es/portal.do

\textsuperscript{14} http://www.espaciotangente.net/CArteycultura.pdf

\textsuperscript{15} https://www.fondationcarasso.org/es/
And to move forward in this direction, here are just a few possible strategies:

1. Guarantee a State policy that ensures the effective universal right to digital networks and improves conditions of access to basic services in rural areas, with an institutional policy in the long term that will reduce the current imbalances with regard to cities. Even in services, local and district provision of equipment and local and virtual cultural resources that allow citizens to fully develop their cultural rights.

2. Growth of consumption and collaborative digital participation and creation resulting from the pandemic, along with execution of an effective right of access, will create a more favourable environment to expand networks, generate projects, etc. Using the financial mechanisms planned to address the crisis, community production tools should be made available to communities and anyone taking part in creative processes, to make the most of this new scenario and its opportunities.

3. Promote local management models that open the door to participation from civil organisations in the actual communities in public-private management of the programmes, particularly any that create collaboration platforms and generate cultural identity and capital for the pro-common economy, so well understood in traditional rural cultures and forgotten in post-Fordian production.

4. Women and the new generations are called on to take a central role in these processes, contributing their own visions of the world. It is thereby necessary to include organisations and collectives in the debate and insight for action that represent their interests, with commitment to equality and cooperation.

5. Culture is a space for living together and helps to drive social change. Consequently, public institutions’ projects should prioritise the fact it is a right, in addition to its undeniable and necessary capacity to generate economic resources by exploiting tourism, heritage or identity as goods for leisure. Only sustainable use of these values in entertainment industry processes will guarantee its continuity as transforming factors.

6. Open rural schools, putting across values of identity and criticism is an element that, along with culture, works actively to generate communities. Institutional formulas must be provided that link up both processes in district or local programmes that, in turn, bring about inter-generational transfer and make innovative cultural production possible.

7. The immense tangible and intangible heritage of our rural communities is, in turn, a backbone element and an important resource generator. It is necessary to legally facilitate local communities with a more active role in management of this heritage, bringing about mechanisms to work together with property owners, institutions from the tertiary sector and companies specialised in fair commercial management of it.

8. Culture must find its place in integral policies to revitalise the rural world, without incentivising ways of idealising the countryside with gentrifying discourse. Consequently, it will be necessary for it to take part in the promotion policies for the current flows to the rural areas, from returns.
or dual residences to new concepts of the countryside that emerge between collectives who are disenchanted with urban forms of production.

9. The forms of cultural creation not only recover the depreciated identities or re-read the history of the communities, but they also update it and give it new meaning. The side-lines are also places for innovation and experimentation and a decisive gaze supporting contemporary creation must be incorporated into the active policies for culture in rural areas, always making the most of the resources provided by the reality of local communities and their traditions. Prioritising, if possible, any whose programmes reflect greater sensitivity regarding rural sustainability processes and forms of working together assisted by techno-scientific teams.
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INCLUDING CULTURE AND THE ARTS IN THE EDUCATION CURRICULUM: AN UNRESOLVED, URGENT TASK

Raquel Caerols Mateo

This study tackles the presence, role and meaning of culture and the arts on the Spanish education curriculum, initially addressing an analysis of the laws that have made up the history of democratic in this field, up to our latest education law in force. This context puts us in a privileged position to analyse the present and future lines of action concerning the latest education law designed by the new government that was on the brink of being approved when the COVID-19 pandemic slammed into our lives. The analysis can also be performed by consecutively proposing assessment of a compared study of what is being achieved in this regard in the European panorama, and internationally in general. However, speaking from this new reality, we are first-hand witnesses of the remarkable aspects of this analysis regarding the importance of the arts and culture, made all the more relevant by the health crisis, strengthening the need to protect this education as essential and consequently, the requirement of grounding education.

Key words: educational reforms, culture, arts, arts education, STEAM.

I. EDUCATIONAL REFORMS IN SPANISH DEMOCRACY: PRESENCE OF ARTS EDUCATION

As a starting point on this current question, we must emphasise the numerous education reforms—eight to be precise—that the Spanish democracy has suffered from its beginnings to the present day. These circumstances doubtlessly have a direct effect on the presence, weight and focus of culture, the arts and arts education in each change brought about by the aforementioned laws. However, in this respect it is important to mention that not all changes have carried the same weight, as stated by Tiana Ferrer (2013): “There have actually been just two major models for the Spanish educational system over the last 50 years, the EGB implemented by the LGE and the ESO implemented by the LOGSE. The rest merely rework the LOGSE. I do not mean to use ‘rework’ disdainfully but the model is the same”.1

However, although this is true from the point of view of transformations in the institutional structure, in terms of addressing culture and the arts, there certainly have been some

1. https://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2013/05/17/espafia/1368776806.html
significant turnarounds that we can use to mirror changes in Spanish society: socio-cultural, economic, that write our very own history, the history of the role of culture and the arts in our society, in more than 40 years of democracy.

To do this, we will study each and every law, searching for keywords in each one: culture, arts education, arts teaching and arts, which will show us not only their value and meaning but also if they have even been included or are present in each of the laws.

From this starting point, initial appreciation and differentiation must focus on defining a clear distinction between culture, arts and arts education, due to the implications and weighting in each sense, and basis of an education system that makes this distinction.

In this respect, we must point out that highlighting the value of culture in an education system does not implicitly imply inclusion per se or highlighting the arts and arts education as areas of curricular knowledge in their own right. Culture would be the dimension that encompasses them and it would be multidimensional compared to the whole as mentioned by Ariño (2000) (ontological, phenomenological, charismatic and socio-historical) while the arts partly conserve this cultural heritage, and arts education represents a step beyond technical skills in developing its praxis, it represents awareness-raising, critical evaluation of distinguishing features that make up a cultural progression, the convergence between arts and cultural uses of the arts.

This differentiation between the two is demonstrated in how our education system elapses, because as we can see in the path ahead of us, culture has not always been valued as a fundamental principle of education, the arts and, more specifically, arts education and artistic teaching had a low profile.

This question is even clearer if we take a look at the educational laws for the first two decades of our democracy, demonstrating that arts, arts education and teaching were not considered or played a very minor role. From this transcendent shortfall compared to other European countries, we can set an insightful starting point on the path and the presence of culture and the arts in our education system, where the education system fails in terms of these knowledge areas.

Finally, in these paragraphs, as a means of introduction, we must mention that we are going to pay particular attention to the context of compulsory education, as it will only be possible to contribute to the social worth of culture if its grounding starts right there, and only there or essentially there, will it be possible to awaken vocations that propel citizens towards further education in the arts.

A concise analysis of these laws (table 1).

As the final part of this analysis, we must mention that in addition to this general framework, educational reform has taken place in the following Autonomous Regions: Andalusia, Canarias, Cantabria, Castilla-La Mancha, Catalonia, Extremadura, Basque Country. Logically, due to the study context and the space required for it, detailed analysis is unfeasible.

II. DOMINANT PERSPECTIVE OF THE SPANISH EDUCATIONAL MODEL: THE ROLE OF ARTS EDUCATION

After detailed analysis of each law passed in the history of our democracy, on the specific question of culture and the arts, we have sufficient perspective to draft an evaluation and map out the dominant educational model, the focus, the paradigm and the present and future lines of work to follow and to be followed in the future in education in Spain and, more specifically, referring to the value and weight of culture and arts in the educational curriculum.
Table 1. Analysis of education laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGE</strong></td>
<td>14/1970, of 4 August</td>
<td>General Education and Financing of the Educational Reform. Published in State Gazette (BOE) no. 187 on 6 August</td>
<td>The references to culture are focused on: home or patriotic culture, cultural heritage of Spain, scientific, social, cultural development, cultural activities, cultural funds, religious culture, knowledge of social and cultural reality, cultural progress, cultural promotion, cultural institutions, creation of cultural circles, cultural associations, control of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOECE</strong></td>
<td>5/1980, of 19 June</td>
<td>Art education is NOT considered.</td>
<td>After the coup d’état and the victory of the PSOE, it was never applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LODE</strong></td>
<td>8/1985, of 3 July</td>
<td>Art education is NOT considered.</td>
<td>Art education is NOT considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOGSE</strong></td>
<td>1/1990, of 3 October</td>
<td>Art education is NOT considered.</td>
<td>Art education is NOT considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOPEG</strong></td>
<td>9/1995, of 20 November</td>
<td>• Allusion to culture for training European citizens</td>
<td>Full freedom for School Boards to establish joint work agreements with cultural associations for after-school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It considers cultural, production and technological changes, for a democratically organised society (education+technology)</td>
<td>• The School Boards dedicated to training in plastic arts and design could have a representative proposed by the business organisations or labour institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Versatile and long-lasting training (lifelong learning)</td>
<td>• Further artistic teaching centres are encouraged to promote research programmes in their disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decentralisation, educational competences for the Autonomous Regions, which meant a change in the cultural dimension, including linguistic plurality</td>
<td>• Specialist teachers could be employed in the field of the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For the first time, the role of culture was valued in relation to gender equality</td>
<td>• The figure of the Professor Emeritus is considered for higher level artistic teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCE</strong></td>
<td>10/2002, of 23 December</td>
<td>This law modifies both the LODE from 1985 and the LOGSE from 1990, it was published on 24 December 2002 and came into force, but was not developed according to regulations and was replaced by the LOE in 2006</td>
<td>This law modifies both the LODE from 1985 and the LOGSE from 1990, it was published on 24 December 2002 and came into force, but was not developed according to regulations and was replaced by the LOE in 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By undertaking a critical evaluation of the analysis performed on this basis, we can highlight firstly that, in relation to the objective data that is generated by analysing the laws, inclusion of culture has been a matter that has been present since the law of 1970 although with very different nuances, which gives us the measure of the current situation. Although the 1985 law refers to our country’s linguistic plurality, it only mentions it in article two, with no further reference to its cultural plurality. It would not be until the 1990 law when the question of the autonomous regions was explicitly developed in relation to cultural and linguistic diversity, to coincide with the transfer of competences.
In addition, even this law does not refer to culture with a gaze looking outwards, meaning, education and culture as guarantors in training European citizens, therefore a society and, with it an education system that opens up its gaze to the outside world, that considers a changing world with important technological weighting. Thereby, regarding culture in our education system, we have barely been acting on it for a few decades, moving along very narrow side-lines, as in the previous laws all references to culture involved patriotic values and Spanish cultural heritage. This reached a point that, as stated in the actual law, mechanisms were set up to “overcome the residual surviving authoritarianism in the ruling approved in 1970 and open up the education system to the new dynamic in diverse fields” (Preamble).

In fact, until the law of 2006, there was no sign of the emotional side of the person and the concept of creativity as dimensions of education and integral development of the person, as well as development of the artistic sense. This context provides the backdrop for the progression of arts education in our education system's curriculum.

Consequently, based on the analysis of education laws within the history of our country's democracy, we are in a position to state that in over more than 40 years of democracy, arts education was only included as a compulsory knowledge area with a global and integrating nature for just 13 years. We say compulsory because in the 2013 law, all education in arts, all the subjects concerning this area, became eligible subjects for each of the education systems in each autonomous region and therefore were pushed into the background.

Faced with this situation regarding our education system's arts education, we might ask: Which education models might explain this situation for the arts? Which education model protects them? From a general perspective, we find that the first glimpse of including arts education took place in the law of 1990, and we can highlight that this leap was taken because the law is articulated within a change in the education model, from the conductivist model that had governed so far to a constructivist or participative model.

Consequently, once arts education had been included in the education system, from what educational focus can we justify its minuscule presence in relation to all other subjects, its undefined grounding in relation to its goal and its poorly defined hierarchy and systematisation?

As professor Rubio Arostegui states, “the justification of the benefits and importance of arts education in the academic context runs in parallel to a crisis of the humanities and arts in a world tormented by neoliberal ideology.” (2016: 324)

This helps us understand the whys and wherefores of the dominant grounding of the arts in our educational laws. Although the focus points that have guided arts education over the 20th century centred on understanding art as an aesthetic experience, or as technical or procedural learning, or art as a way of knowing about the world, there has been a predominant discourse in our education laws focussed on technical training and procedures.

On the other hand, there is an important deficit in terms of systematisation and hierarchical organisation, regarding the discrepancies measured between cultural uses of the arts and their development as a discipline in the classrooms. As stated by Aguirre and Giráldez, “We have to resolve the contradiction represented by maintaining dual criteria: cultural and school. The cultural way, that points us towards a common consideration of all subjects as art, or the disciplinary approach, that is derived from school practice and that pushes us towards separate subjects when designing and developing the curriculum.” (2010: 84).

In other words, this can be seen in the fact that the concept of arts education only in-
cludes the visual arts, plastic and audiovisual and music, leaving out theatre, dance and literature from an arts focus. In addition, these (included) subjects, although considered from an integrating focus when they were included as compulsory, in practice were developed as subjects that are given separately and, in many cases, given by teachers with a general profile.

Therefore, if we were already working from a delayed, scarce presence of arts education in the education curriculum, in addition to a lack of definition in its grounding, systematisation and hierarchical organisation, the law of 2013 stepped backwards in time. And this essentially happened because this standard was aligned within margins described by professor Rubio Arostegui, “The academic discourse on the benefits of arts education goes against the neo-liberal current and the framework of definition by competences and results of learning from the curriculum contents. Arts education does not present quality indicators or standards that could be compared between countries. On the other hand, although there is scientific literature on the intrinsic (essentialist) and extrinsic (contextualism) benefits, some publications question this optimistic and justifying attitude that is adopted by many research projects in this education and cultural field (2016: 338).

However, the aforementioned law from 2013 and the current neoliberal approach might lead us to think that its goal aims to promote scientific vocations, but its curriculum proposal is a long way from new scientific vocation focus points that are emerging in this first decade of the 21st century, referring to STEM vocations (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics), whose main characteristic focuses on an interdisciplinary approach in teaching and learning processes, meeting points and feedback from these four subjects.

Despite the fact that according to Eurostat data, in Spain only 15 out of every 1,000 people study these branches, this focus was not compiled in the law of 2013, when in the United States, or most European countries, particularly the United Kingdom or Finland, STEM focuses had become a priority. Such is the case that in the 2014-2020 framework programme, the European Commission budgeted more than 13 million Euros to subsidise these initiatives (Muñoz, 2015).

However, although this innovative approach was not included in our last education law, we were left even further behind when, around these same dates, a transformation began to be shaped relating to the STEM focus, including the new area of ART knowledge, turning this combination into STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics).

The first school to develop this initiative was the Rhode Island School of Design, and South Korea has also developed its own model of STEAM education. Closer to home, on 17 and 18 April 2015, in Barcelona, the first International STEAM conference was held to “bring to Barcelona some of the most outstanding and best evaluated projects in the field of research, methodology and very particularly, practice relating to applications of STEM and STEAM, both in Europe and in the United States”. Examples of these diverse activities demonstrating this relationship between art and STEM subjects can be the scientific monologues and micro-play contest “Scripts for science” run by the University of Extremadura, or the Tinkering-zone at the Museo Nazionale della Scienza e della Tecnologia Leonardo da Vinci, in Milan (Muñoz, 2015).

Other initiatives in Spain were implemented by EducaCaixa, Fundación Telefónica, the

Canary Island Government since the 2017-2018 academic year; University of Oviedo along with the University of Deusto to encourage STEAM vocations in primary⁴ or the Basque Government.⁵ And among other international and research-based initiatives, that also point in this direction, we find the European initiative H2020 STARTS (=Science, Technology + ARTS)⁶ or the American project From STEM to STEAM.⁷

The turnover is so obvious that the ever-controversial PISA report, as a reaction to the results that we usually get, is going to introduce this focus in its next call in 2021, meaning that as well as maths, science and reading skills, it plans to include creative skills, although it has yet to determine how this will be evaluated. Perhaps, it might refer to some of the few publications that exist in relation to the influence of arts education, beyond the actual field of the arts, such as Art for art’s sake? The Impact of Arts Education published in 2014 and that shines a light on the five fields of the arts: theatre, music, dance, visual arts and multi-arts education (Winter, Goldstein, Vincent Lacrin, 2013).

Following the new COVID-19 pandemic situation, we are wondering how PISA will approach its report. We can nevertheless demonstrate, after our experience, that the role of arts and culture in an exceptional period such as lockdown is a primary need, and that it has provided our safety net. This leads us not only to think about the transcendental importance of PISA making this turn-around but even wondering from whom this evaluation of the education shipment should come: from a business organisation? or from education professionals?

This all necessarily points to a changing world, to models that make a sustainable world in which culture and the arts play a central role.

### III. FUTURE SCENARIOS: INCLUSION OF ARTS EDUCATION FROM A TRANSDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVE

So then, working from the education law of 2013, and aware of where we would have to go according to what we mentioned earlier, we can note that great commitment and consensus is required from all political parties. However, if we can see that the master strokes of the bill for the next education law in the document uploaded on the Moncloa website, for the law that was designed in 2019 by the Education Minister Celaá, before the elections had to be repeated, seems that they are going in the direction of what was previously studied⁸ (LOMLOE), which means that this vital and necessary turn-around must take place so we are not left behind.

One of these significant lines of work, found among the new challenges of the Spanish education system that this document compiles: 7. Increase STEAM vocations, particularly among girls.

Although it is true that the LOMCE does not contemplate STEM vocations, and of course STEAM even less so, and in turn neither are particularly centred on girls, so we have to build on this terrain together to meet this challenge. In addition, we want it to be noted that, the primary international push for girls has been and remains to encourage scientific vocations (STEM), a challenge that should be included in the next law we are analysing, and subsequently also include the STEAM focus in all curricular design. So, we are beginning to wonder if challenge 7 really refers to STEM.

---

The summary of the future challenges raised by the new education law, that plans to repeal the LOMCE, is compiled in the following graph 1.

**Graph 1. Challenges raised by the new education law**

The reference to Agenda 2030, in relation to the education goal (number 4) out of the 17 is centred on the focus points, goals and strategies and initiatives essentially leading to “guaranteeing an inclusive and fair quality education and promoting permanent learning opportunities for all”.

However, what interests us most in this study is what refers to arts education and therefore, beyond the goals set by the UNESCO on Agenda 2030, we are interested in the conclusions that were amassed at the World Conference on Arts Education: Building Creative Capacities for the 21st century (Lisbon, 6-9 March 2006). The UNESCO Office in Santiago. The website for the Regional Education Office for Latin America and the Caribbean summarises the lines of work and focus proposed by the UNESCO in terms of Arts Education, “Education uses the arts and cultural practices and traditions as a means of teaching general curriculum subjects to achieve better comprehension, but it also understands art as a form of knowledge that is bound to scientific research and pedagogic practice”.

Arts education must deploy an important function in education system transformation. It can provide a direct contribution to the solution for social and cultural problems facing the modern world explaining why UNESCO promotes arts education in education environments (formal and non-formal) to contribute to determining a solid frame for decisions and actions that must be undertaken in this field with a view to the future in the Latin America and Caribbean region.

As we can see, the arts as an area of transdisciplinary knowledge and as a means of knowledge fit the lines of the STEAM approaches and are therefore drivers of a change in education paradigm. Furthermore, *Education & Training* is taken as a reference, referring to European Union cooperation in the field of education and training (ET 2020), whose document is a “report that measures the progress in countries towards goals from the Education and Training strategic framework 2020 (ET 2020) for European cooperation in these fields”.

It also mentions the *G20 Leaders’ declaration Building consensus for fair and sustainable development*, whose document points to central references in matters of education to learn, lifelong learning, pedagogies and innovative methods, and digital skills.

The *Education Policy Outlook 2018* (published by the OECD), (already in the text for 2019), is a report that includes around 200 policies addressing education and early years care (ECEC) to higher education and lifelong

---


learning.\textsuperscript{13} And, finally, we refer to 2021 Metas Educativas. La educación que queremos para la generación de los bicentenarios\textsuperscript{14} (Educational goals 2021: The education that we want for the bicentennial generation) as a text was published in relation to these goals centred on arts education entitled Educación Artística, cultura y ciudadanía (Arts education, culture and citizenship), coordinated by Lucina Jiménez, Imanol Aguirre and Lucía G. Pimentel, an initiative from the Organisation of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OEI), working with the Santillana publishing house and funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the AECID.\textsuperscript{15}

This text has been used as reference in this study, precisely because it emphasises the gaps in arts education, in relation to its grounding and its action goal, as well as the acute problems related to systematisation and hierarchical organisation of contents. This means that if these guidelines, insights and road map are in the new law, not only will it consider the fact that arts education is present in the education policies as compulsory content, but that it is also supposed that it will be opening the doors, from the transverse and transdisciplinary focus, to a new model and education paradigm.

IV. CONCLUSIONS: COMMITMENTS AND PROPOSALS FROM THE EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL BENCHMARK

On the basis of the analysis carried out in this text, the relevant question is how are we going to achieve it or if we are preceded by just 13 years of arts education in our education laws, even worse after these last seven years, particularly since 2013, when the arts have just entailed one eligible arts subject for each Autonomous Region. After such an obvious loss of value for culture and the arts, not only do we need laws that lay foundations but also a commitment to agree on a law, and use all the public and private initiative tools, to weave the value of culture and the arts in our present and future society.

To do this, we can point to the following measures, that would represent important legislative changes and that would seek commitment from all autonomous regions:

1. Government Agreement for inclusion of arts education in the education law as an integrating, transversal and transdisciplinary knowledge subject.

2. Rethink and set the grounding that justifies the presence of the arts in the education curriculum, which involves resolving divergences between cultural uses of the arts and the disciplinary development of school practices, that has occurred in all education laws that included arts as a compulsory subject.

3. With this, go beyond the limits of the approaches from education laws that have gone before, including not only arts education subjects such as visual and plastic arts and music but also dance, theatre and literature.

4. Raise the inclusion of these subjects as integrated, related subjects in convergence with cultural use of the arts.

5. Set training goals for arts education, therefore: make a clear difference between arts education and arts training as specialist and professional teaching of the arts.

6. Systematisation and hierarchical organisation of its contents and, with
that, development of its methodologies: Art as an aesthetic experience, as a means of knowledge or “know how”? If we suggest a transdisciplinary focus, we should combine the three versions and, therefore, we will need a change in the education model.

7. This focus connects directly with the European framework and directives in the education field, encouraging STEM vocations and the STEAM education focus. Therefore, weaving a STEAM culture by means of programmes integrated in the schools, also open to all external collaboration with specialist centres.
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PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUDIOVISUAL FICTION IN SPAIN: BETWEEN TRADITIONAL OPERATORS AND THE EMERGENCE OF VIDEO ON DEMAND SERVICES

Concepción Cascajosa Virino

In the current international context, analysis is run on production and distribution of audiovisual contents after the emergence of subscription video on demand (SVOD) services, in three inter-related fields. Firstly, the "two-speed" model which features Spanish cinema and the gradual intervention of SVOD services. Secondly, the explosion of serialised fiction and the prominence of these services in its production. Thirdly, Spanish audiovisual content in video on demand services will be evaluated. Finally, the impact of the COVID-19 health crisis on audiovisual production will be analysed.

Key words: Spanish cinema, serialised fiction, video on demand services, audiovisual production, audiovisual distribution.

I. INTRODUCTION: A CHANGING AUDIOVISUAL PANORAMA

Audiovisual systems are experienced a transformation period within the framework of digitalisation. On the one hand, traditional operators with a national base (public and private) are looking for ways to adapt to a new, excessively fragmented context that questions some of the industry’s concepts (such as measuring audiences and traditional business models). On the other hand, new transnational technology operators, such as those known as FAANG (Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix and Google), are leading the industry’s conversion towards video on demand consumption and are exploiting new ways of monetising it by making the most of non-existent or, in the best cases, slow regulation.1

However, regulations have been boosted within Europe. The most visible consequence was the approval of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive 2018/1808. This Directive enforces that content from audiovisual media service providers should be at least 30% European, and these service providers should
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1. The FAANG acronym was created by the investor and economic commentator Jim Cramer to refer to the most profitable tech companies on the stock market.
invest in European productions. In addition, it allows Member States to impose a fee that is proportional to the income level.\footnote{2} However, while this Directive is being transposed to the full range of national legislations, its consequences on production ecosystems are becoming visible. In the case of the United Kingdom (whose application of the Directive remains in question once it has left the EU), the House of Lords warned that subscription video on demand (SVOD) operators such as Netflix were increasing their average budgets and making public media less competitive in the production field (House of Lords, 2019, p. 76). The possibility that public operators might no longer lead audiovisual content production is particularly relevant in the world of TV fiction because it provided 73% of the programmes produced between 2015 and 2016 (Fontaine, 2017, p. 17).

There are several aspects to confirm the relevance of this transformation. One is the fast penetration of VOD services that were present in an average of 25% of European homes with a broadband connection in 2017 (Ene, 2019, p. 17). Some estimations predict that this might reach 69% of homes in Western Europe by 2023 (McDonald, 2018). This growth has revolved around concentration instead of diversity. Despite the numerous VOD services operating in Europe, 89% of the estimated 6,000 million in revenue in 2018 went to 5 companies: Netflix, Amazon Prime Video, Sky, HBO and Viaplay. Netflix's weight in the market, with 51% of the revenue, is particularly relevant, also Amazon Prime Video with 21% (Meier, 2019).

This concentration is obvious in some markets. According to data from Ampere Analysis, in 2018 Netflix and Amazon together held 97% of the subscribers to SVOD in France, 89% in the United Kingdom, 84% in Germany and 81% in Spain (Fontaine, 2019, p.9). This is relevant considering that SVOD international services account for barely 24% of European films (Fontaine, 2019, p. 16). The dominance of these video on demand services in some markets has led to collaborations between competitors such as the case of the alliance between the BBC and ITV for the BritBox service in the United Kingdom or between RTVE, Atresmedia and Mediaset in Spain for the free platform with HbbTV tech, LOVEStv.

This disruption takes place at a time when production is booming. Although VOD services’ contribution might have been considered marginal until 2016, with barely 1.5% of the TV fiction programmes (Fontaine, 2017, p. 23), the rate of production has accelerated ever since. Netflix’s strategic bid in Spain (mentioned in subsequent sections) runs in parallel to actions intended to increase its presence in other European markets such as the Nordic region, United Kingdom, Germany, France and Italy. There can be no doubt that this increase in production is related to the imminent implementation of Directive 2018/1808 and Netflix’s decisive bid for markets where its margin is still growing. However, the appearance of new competitors cannot be overlooked with the emergence of Disney+, HBO Max, Peacock and Apple TV+. Anticipating its arrival on markets that are showing signs of saturation, and considering that they represent a new loss of autonomy for the national creative industries, some countries have begun to reinforce their protectionist measures, as in the case of France (Wood, 2020).

Over the following pages, we will look over the recent situation of the Spanish audiovisual market, with particular emphasis on variations directly related to VOD service activity.
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II. SPANISH CINEMA: A QUESTIONABLE MODEL

Over the last few years, Spanish cinema has been determined by a “two speed” system with more commercial type productions that benefit from promotion by TV operators who finance them and another more experimental, script-based type that, except in specific cases, has a short lifespan in the cinemas and obtains scarce visibility. The distance between the two models has been expanding as a consequence of malfunction in the two main mechanisms for promoting Spanish cinema.

On the one hand, grants from the Institute of Cinema and Audiovisual Arts (ICAA), that holds two calls, one general where the “solvency” of the production company or co-producer scores higher and one selective, aimed at artistic or social interest films, that might be experimental, documentary and directorial debuts, with a much lower budget. The unequal investment between the two calls is clear: 35 million compared to 7 in 2019. On the other hand, application of article 5.3 of Law 7/2010 determined the audiovisual communication service providers’ obligation to invest 5% of the European production revenue.

Direct management of this obligation led to transferring the decision-making for this type of films to major television groups: in the latest report on meeting this obligation for the National Markets and Competition Commission (2019), out of the €44,656,000 established as an obligation for financing cinema produced in official languages in Spain, €42,125,711 came from RTVE, Atresmedia, Mediaset and Telefónica (94%). In fact, in its part of the report, the Cinema and Audiovisual Arts Institute (ICAA) warned of high concentration among a small number: out of the 329 production companies that had taken part in producing feature films, only 4 of them had produced five or more films, 43 companies had taken part in producing between two and four films and 282 companies had produced just one feature film (CNMC, 2019, p. 58).

This “two speed” model extends to the box office: in 2019, the 20 most watched films took 86.6% of the box office for Spanish cinema as a whole. The items produced by the two private operators with generalist chains, Atresmedia and Mediaset, tend to concentrate their investment on a few items (12 and 6 respectively in 2018) which they promote intensely as they come out. These tend to be thrillers or comedies and feature extremely few female directors: one feature film in Atresmedia and in Mediaset in 2018 (CIMA, 2019, p.60). Regarding its performance in the actual cinemas, Spanish films continue to keep a low profile, with a screen share quota between the minimum of 13.86% (in 2013) and the maximum of 25.43% (in 2014, the year of The Spanish Affair). In 2019, the percentage stood at 15%, more than two points below the previous years (see table 1).

In his contribution to the Report on the state of Culture in Spain 2018, José Vicente García Santamaría (2018, pp. 116-117) already anticipated that the arrival of video on demand services on the cinema market presented as many opportunities (such as expanding markets, particularly for independent production) as it did threats (many companies in the sector...
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4. The percentage is slightly lower, 92%, when considering the assigned spending: €69,440,015 invested by RTVE, Mediaset, Atresmedia and Telefónica, out of the €75,306,386 invested by all state operators that have to invest.
were falling by the wayside), although the real impact was as yet unknown.

The sector is still living at the will of a legislative boost that helps to regulate some of the gaps in the current funding system, particularly the absence of international VOD services in obligations to finance European content. However, these services have begun to invest in cinema. Netflix began with Siete años in 2016 and has subsequently explored the main formula of purchasing the exclusive international distribution rights (except in markets corresponding to joint productions). It therefore took part in around thirty productions between 2016 and 2019, with award-winning and high grossing films such as El autor (2017), La enfermedad del domingo (2018), El cuaderno de Sara (2018) and La trinchera infinita (2019).

In some cases, it purchased the exclusive rights which meant the films did not have to be shown in the cinemas or just for a short time to allow them to apply for film awards. Although it was a one-off formula after Siete años, in 2019 Netflix took a significant chance on these “Netflix originals” with ¿A quién te llevarías a una isla desierta?, A pesar de todo, Elisa y Marcela, Diecisiete and Klaus, the latter nominated for the Best Animation Oscar. This strategy is criticised by exhibitors, who had imposed a 16-week period between windows until then. For the time being, film investments by Amazon Prime Video and other services are limited and have maintained the traditional window for playing at cinemas.

III. THE PRODUCTION BOOST FOR SERIALISED FICTION

One of the most significant transformations in the audiovisual market over the last few years has been the growth in production of fiction series, revolving around the arrival of new operators and internationalisation of contents (see graph 1). The acute crisis in the advertising market from 2010 onwards affected production in many ways. On the one hand, there was a drop in costs of around 20%, which sounded the death toll for smaller production companies (Álvarez Monzoncillo and López Villanueva, 2016, p. 48). One consequence was that a model was maintained based on atomisation and vertical concentration: only 5% of production companies (12 companies) have taken part in more than 10 fiction releases since 1990 (Lacalle and Sánchez-Ares, 2019, p. 6).

The significant reduction of fiction production on regional channels and freezing initial efforts from paying channels put fiction producers in a position where they clearly depended on just three operators: TVE, Mediaset and Atresmedia. However, since 2016, the serialised fiction production market has opened up significantly. One relevant factor to understand this increase is that the Audiovisual Communication Law only enforces that 60% of the audiovisual content operators’ investment is in cinema, and from this percentage, 60% in some of the official languages in Spain. The percentage of the total investment in Spanish cinema...
has been losing ground over the years, down to a historical minimum of 18.81% in 2017, compared to 53.13% in TV series. One of the most significant cases is Telefónica, owner of the Movistar+ platform. According to CNMC data, in 2018, its investment in Spanish films was 7.5 million Euros, compared to almost 72 million invested in series.\(^5\) In the case of Fox, the margin given by the law to investing in specific content in the case of thematic channels has led to centring investment on series and documentaries, up to 2.5 million Euros in 2018.\(^6\) In that period, Fox produced its first original series, the third and fourth seasons of *Vis a vis* (Antena 3: 2015-2016; Fox: 2018-2019).

In its project selection, Movistar+ backed broadening the spectrum of production companies to companies with a cinematographic base or limited experience in fiction for state operators, such as the case of Atípica Films (*La Peste*), Portocabo (*Hierro*), Apache Films (*Vergüenza*), VerandaTV (*Merlí: Sapere Aude*), Escándalo Films (*Matar al padre*), Andy Joke (*Arde Madrid*) and Corte y confeción de películas (*Vida Perfecta*). *Merlí: Sapere Aude* is the only original series that was originally produced in Catalan (it was released in a dual version that included dubbing into Spanish), but many of these productions have been shot and use creative teams from different Spanish regions, breaking with the traditional centralism of serialised Spanish fiction. To exploit its series, Movistar+ has prioritised the model of releasing complete seasons as video on demand, demonstrating its bid to encourage migration of consumption of this method over and above the linear broadcasting on its own channels (Cascajosa Virino, 2018). Finally, in 2019 Movistar+ launched an OTT (over the top) service called Movistar+ Life that can be contracted separately from its integrated telecommunications services (see graph 2).

The production strategy for Movistar+ in original content (including nonfiction and entertainment via the #0 brand) coincided with the arrival of international video on demand
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5. CNMC resolution available on: https://www.cnmc.es/sites/default/files/2823507.pdf
6. CNMC resolution available on: https://www.cnmc.es/sites/default/files/2827953_2.pdf
services in Spain in the OTT method. Netflix has doubtlessly been the most active company in OTT, particularly after opening offices and a production centre in Madrid. As in the case of cinematographic activity, Netflix has backed a range of strategies, from taking part in projects led by other operators (such as *El Ministerio del Tiempo*, *La catedral del mar* or *Vivir sin permiso*) to continuing to produce series after they were cancelled, such as *Paquita Salas* and *La Casa de Papel*. It also became the first national window for regional channels’ series such as *La víctima número 8* (ETB and Telemadrid) and *El sabor de las margaritas* (TVG), the latter is content in a co-official language.

In 2017, it released its first original series in Spain, *Las chicas del cable*, and its backing for Spanish fiction has expanded ever since: from releasing 3 seasons in 2018 to 10 in 2019. Amazon Prime Video has also begun original production, as a service included within the Amazon Prime subscription. The company chose to produce fewer series on its own (its first release will not come until 2020), and instead it is taking part in projects from other operators as a primary window such as the series with Atresmedia *Pequeñas coincidencias* in 2018 and the Mediset fiction *El pueblo* in 2019. In turn, HBO España began to produce original fiction series in 2019 (only one was released that year, *Foodie Love*) and it has three projects planned for 2020, including the adaptation of the novel *Patria*.

Traditional operators have made production models more flexible for their fiction, whose audience has been deeply eroded. Consequently, while they began to surrender the first window of exploitation to international VOD services, they have also strengthened their offer in this field. In the case of RTVE and Atresmedia, the Playz and Floozer services respectively have been used to create content for youth audiences. Atresmedia has pushed Atresplayer with a low-cost subscription mode that includes the release (before anyone else or exclusively) of its fiction.

**Graph 2. Number of series seasons released in primary sale by type of operator**

![Graph showing the number of series seasons released in primary sale by type of operator.

Source: own work using data compiled by the author. This includes series with episodes lasting more than 20 minutes.**
The penetration of video on demand services commercialised in OTT form has grown remarkably over the last few years. Before it stopped providing data via its Home Panel, the CNMC observed the increase in access to this type of service, led by Netflix, that went from 1.8% of users in 2016 to 12.5% two years later. In addition, the CNMC has certified the importance of payment platforms for consumption of audiovisual content (see graph 3).

In turn, according to data from the directory of the Media Research Association (AIMC, 2020, p. 44) 41% of individuals declared that they had access to OTT services (either as customers or free of charge). This positioning of the video on demand services on the Spanish audiovisual scene makes it necessary to consider not only its investment in cinema or television production, as reviewed in previous sections, but also the presence of Spanish production content in catalogues.

According to data from the European Audiovisual Observatory, Spanish cinema only provided 4% of the Netflix España catalogue in the period between December 2017 and January 2018 (Nikoltchev, 2018, p. 112). This percentage has grown in the last few years, but it remains low. The search for Spanish cinema in the Netflix catalogue on 15 January 2020 only offered 125 fiction and documentary films, out of 1,200 in total. In other words, approximately just one in ten films was classified as Spanish by the actual service. Practically all the films had been released from 2009 onwards, with a few exceptions, such as a Pedro Almodóvar collection.

Spanish cinema seems to have a limited presence not only in quantitative terms but also regarding the period from which the films come. In this respect, a comparison can be determined with the independent video on demand service, Filmin, that on the same date in January 2020 had more than 2,000 Span-
ish films in its catalogue (20% of the total). The catalogue gives access to less commercial Spanish films which are therefore less well known, but it maintains something in common with Netflix: the major of the films came out in the last ten years. Except for the items mentioned, the history of Spanish cinema is only available on the FlixOlé video on demand service, launched in 2017 as OTT and integrated in the Orange TV paid television platform since 2018. On this point, it should be highlighted that FlixOlé is joint owner of Dinamedi, whose manager Enrique Cerezo controls broadcasting rights for a significant share of Spanish cinema heritage, over 70% according to their own estimations (Mucha, 2015).

V. FICTION IN TIMES OF THE COVID-19 CRISIS

The start of the COVID-19 crisis in March 2020 had significant repercussions on the fiction industry as cinemas closed and film shoots ground to a halt. The losses are difficult to calculate, but the National Film Association offered an initial figure of 2,500 million Euros if lockdown were to continue for four months, as it finally did. This crisis marks an acceleration in the transformation of exhibition and consumption models, encouraging video on demand services above traditional cinematographic exhibition. According to a study by Nielsen and Dynata, the percentage of Spaniards who admitted to watching films and series through these services went from 53% in 2019 to 72% during lock-down (ABC, 2020).

This was pushed along by the launch of Disney+ on 24 March that, like other international services, came in dual format: as an OTT service that could be contracted separately and as a value added product on existing platforms, in this case Movistar+. The uncertainty around reopening cinemas and doubts that reduced capacity could meet the fast pay-back model required by modern cinema’s blockbusters led distributors to immediately postpone premieres and, in some cases, call them off and choose to show them exclusively on demand. Ofrenda a la tormenta (2020, Fernando González Molina), the third part of the Baztán Trilogy, cancelled its cinema release, planned for April and finally went directly to the Netflix catalogue at the end of July, a strategy also followed by Orígenes secretos (2020, David Galán Galindo) in August. However, services that still do not have production in Spain could only follow this strategy with international releases, such as the case of Apple TV+ with Greyhound (2020, Aaron Schneider) and Disney+ with Onward (2020, Dan Scanlon). In turn, the Filmin video on demand service made the most of the physical suspension of film festivals to reinforce alliances and become a platform for exhibiting its content, as was the case for the D’A Film Festival Barcelona in April.

This situation was also exploited by the national video on demand services to bring releases forwards, such as the case of the first chapter of Veneno in Atresplayer Premium (whose shooting was interrupted by the pandemic) and the series La línea invisible, which became the most-watched original content in the history of Movistar+ according to the company (Audiovisual 451, 2020). In fact, despite an increase in audience, traditional operators did not use the lockdown period to launch their major fiction releases, but reinforced the position of their own video on demand service such as (Atresplayer Premium) or external services as a primary window for their content. As an example of the latter case, there is the strengthened collaboration between Mediaset and Amazon Video, that allowed the on-demand service to release the Caronte and De-
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8. Filmin has also specifically backed co-official languages, especially through its Filmin.CAT version, that holds more than 2,200 films dubbed or subtitled in Catalan, and it incorporates other languages such as the Basque language.
The decline of cinemas seems to be running in parallel to serialised fiction on generalist channels. Despite this, lockdown arrived during an important boom in the series in Spain, as discussed in previous sections, and stopping shooting (which could only be resumed in a staggered way due to overlapping schedules) threatened to create a bottleneck that jeopardised the development of new projects over the next few years.

Whilst all film sets were on hold, however, initiatives emerged to develop audiovisual works on the lockdown experience. The fastest to be developed was Diarios de la cuarentena, which came out on 7 April, just three weeks into the State of Alarm. This comprised a comedy ensemble recorded by the actors themselves following remote instructions from the creative team. This was the most outstanding initiative from RTVE in the period as it helped enable the audiovisual sector, although the series had a low budget and poor viewing figures. Despite its limited audience success, the Diarios de la cuarentena format was sold internationally. Diarios de la cuarentena was followed by other projects with a noteworthy structure and a more scripted basis, such as En casa on HBO España and Relatos con-fin-a-dos on Amazon Video. All these series have been added to a particular sub-genre made up of tales created during the strictest weeks of lockdown, as was the case of the film Madrid, interior by Juan Cavestany, that was released on the El País newspaper website on 8 May.

This type of experience did not help alleviate the generalised crisis in the audiovisual creation sector. According to a study by the copyright management entity DAMA, only 37.6% of professionals kept their job during lockdown, as 34.1% had no work and 24.3% were on furlough (Cabrera, 2020). This audiovisual sector crisis received a delayed response from public powers, which led to rallying professionals and creating platforms such as the Audiovisual Associations Group on a national level and the Andalusia Audiovisual Platform at a regional level. Leaving cultural industries out of the primary stimulus measures and lack of support from the State government brought about a letter of protest from 38 associations and the call for a “cultural switch off” for 48 hours on the 10 and 11 April (Barranco, 2020). In fact, regional measures were brought in earlier in places such as Madrid and Catalonia. These measures finally came in with the Royal Decree-Law 17/2020 of 5 May, that strengthened the line of endorsements from the Reciprocal Guarantee Society CREA and opening up specific lines of funding for SMEs. Regarding the cinema, a line of direct subsidies was activated providing 13.2 million Euros for cinemas, the tax incentives were raised slightly relating to cinema production and the requirements related to obtaining aid were made more flexible. The most relevant of all was exempting release in commercial cinemas to maintain ICAA assistance. The ICAA also joined the Spanish Cinema and Cultural Action Academy (AC/E) to apply the global assistance line from Netflix in Spain, financed with 100 million dollars (Petski, 2020). The speed of Netflix’s reaction contrasted with the lack of relevance from RTVE and exemplified the way in which the new operators are making the most of the space left by the public powers to offer stimulus packages and lead the industry. In fact, in the Ruling from the Commission for Social and Economic Reconstruction of the Congress, sent to the Plenary Session in July 2020 for approval, the references to the audiovisual sector are presented as excessively indeterminate or generalist. As an example, a strategic R+D+i plan on digital culture and a Plan to Attract and Promote Spanish Audiovisual were proposed but did not determine which fields should promote these plans and which should be priorities.
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

This review of the current situation of cinema and serialised fiction in Spain can draw a series of conclusions:

- The repercussion on the Spanish cinema box office remains at a medium-low level, depending on films supported by TV operators and releases by some particularly relevant directors.
- The concentration level is high regarding the items and production companies.
- The investment in both Spanish cinema and independent production by the operators who are legally obliged to do so is higher than set by the law, indicating that these operators are getting quantifiable advantages from this investment.
- The new video on demand services with a transnational base are not obliged to make this investment in European audiovisual production right now. However, Netflix is making a significant investment both in cinema and in series.
- Public investment in cinema with non-commercial aspirations is low: the call for selective grants from the ICAA is equivalent to 20% of the general aid.
- A significant increase has been made in production of serialised fiction over the last three years, particularly thanks to investments from Movistar+ and Netflix.
- Alliances between on demand services and traditional operators have advantages (increase in production) but they generate doubts in aspects such as access to contents (the SVOD services often keep the shows exclusive to them).
- Backing of diversity is variable: there are more shoots outside Madrid, but the presence of women in creative teams remains low. In turn, instability in productions limits access from professionals with a low socio-economic profile.
- The presence of Spanish cinema in the catalogue of video on demand services is low, and particularly concentrated on the last ten years.
- The historical heritage of Spanish cinema is concentrated on subscription catalogues with scarce presence on the market such as FlixOlé.

Therefore, here are some possible measures to eliminate or alleviate some of the malfunctions in the Spanish audiovisual model.

1. Imminent modification of the General Law of Audiovisual Communication to adapt to Directive 2018/1808 of the European Parliament and Council must increase the percentage required in cinematographic production in official languages (from 60% to 70%) and in independent production (from 60% to 70%).

2. This modification should incorporate additional obligations in relation to production to films directed by women, directorial debuts and films in co-official languages, and avoid concentrating investment on just a few productions (a minimum range between 10 and 15).

3. Modifications to the General Law of Audiovisual Communication should also establish a separate fee regarding this 5% of a minimum of 1% to give the ICAA additional financing for selective aid and other types of measures for promoting audiovisual to strengthen its diversity.

4. Among the type of measures that the ICAA might accomplish with this additional financing, we might mention support for video on demand services that offer content that is subtitled or dubbed into co-official languages, restoration and digitalisation of Spanish audiovisual heritage and strengthening the use of Spanish cinema for audiovisual literacy.
5. The General Law of Audiovisual Communication should incorporate international video on demand services under entirely equivalent conditions to the rest of the operators of audiovisual services.

6. The RTVE Corporation must assume its leadership in the production and promotion of audiovisual content, incorporating specific commitments regarding percentages for the production of films and series directed and written by women, one of the priorities set in the agreement for a Progressive Coalition (point 6.7).

7. In the same way, RTVE must go back to past collaborations with the regional operators to produce content in co-official languages and produce cinema and television outside Madrid and in places with less audiovisual development. In this respect, we are reminded of the role that audiovisual production can play to coordinate the priorities set in the agreement for a Progressive Coalition regarding territorial cohesion and support for “deserted Spain” (points 6.5 and 8.2).

8. Both RTVE and the other public operators must improve the transparency of their agreements with video on demand services, guaranteeing citizens access to the audiovisual contents they have produced, particularly any with didactic and educational potential.

9. Measures should be coordinated to reduce instability in audiovisual production. In particular, the appropriate competitive fields should consider prohibiting unpaid grants that restrict access to persons from lower-middle and lower classes.

10. In addition to boosting audiovisual literacy programmes, including teaching through Spanish cinema should be strengthened during compulsory education. This requires curriculum paths set by the Ministry of Education to be modified.

In relation to the situation created by the COVID-19 crisis, more specific measures are required to allow the Spanish audiovisual industry to escape the current crisis as deftly as possible. The main conclusion of the analysis on the reaction to bringing the industry to a halt conforms the slow reaction of the public powers and the scarce relevance of RTVE in this period, compared to the leadership adopted by state media in other countries. To do this, it is necessary to strengthen some measures that have already been adopted and implement others that are explained below.

11. Extension of support measures to companies and professionals whose business has dropped to consider the gradual restart of business. Furloughs, assistance for freelancers and combining aid and work in temporary contracts...

12. Determining an extraordinary provision for RTVE in the General State Budget to stimulate original production both for series and films.

13. Urgent implementation of measures from the Artist’s Statute, particularly any relating to the particular aspects of the income of audiovisual professionals and their differentiated taxation.

14. Immediate payment of aid awarded at all levels of the administration and strengthening the lines of cash flow, to prevent independent production companies from going under.

15. Extension of the support programme for cinemas, with a particular emphasis on measures to bring back audiences and encourage diversity in its programming.
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INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND THE VALUE OF STAGE HERITAGE IN GLOBALISATION: CHALLENGES FOR CULTURAL POLICY IN THE STAGE SECTOR

Juan Arturo Rubio Arostegui

When analysing the sector, a set of measures is considered that should herald cultural policy on the performing sector arts in the near future. Some of them have been hotly debated by the theatre sector and have not been split into themes in the previous annual reports: the legal and tax-related reorganisation of the sector, institutional coordination and the effects of globalisation on the private sector for stage exhibition. Others, such as recovering and revitalising stage heritage are necessary, given their weak presence in cultural policy and their important relationship with theatrical and musicological research.

**Key words:** Cultural policy, cultural management, stage heritage, globalisation, performing arts, new public management.

PREFACE: THE DRAMATIC EFFECTS OF COVID-19 ON THE STAGE SECTOR

This chapter was drafted just a few days before the pandemic and before the State of Alarm was declared in Spain in March 2020. Afterwards, stage activity came to a general standstill during this period. As lockdown measures have been lifted, schedules have timidly adapted to the health measures that can only be carried out at some international summer festivals (such as Granada or Merida) and some publicly owned theatrical grounds.

Although the sector’s associations published a set of extraordinary measures¹ in April, framed within the different fields of sector activity related to taxation, social security, subsidies, financing agents, public contracting - as the multi-level State remains the main contractor for stage exhibition and other promotion measures that provide incentives for the stage sector - the governments’ measures have been limited and obviously they have not reached the wide range of stage agents and sub-sectors. The Darwinist effects of the crisis can still not be evaluated because the theatre business has still not gone back to normal.

The question is: Is the content of the subsequent sections of this chapter still valid in this new pandemic scenario? The blunt answer is yes. The priority question for the public administration obviously has to point towards accompanying all the measures that are possible.

from the public administrations to alleviate a new wave of fragility over the sector’s actual structural fragility. Now, in the near future, cultural policy needs to be rethought from a perspective that goes beyond the sector’s employment and financial emergencies, as published a couple of years ago in an article in *El País* newspaper.²

This was the aim of the chapter before the pandemic and remains so afterwards. The stage sector in particular and cultural sector in general need a larger public budget, but not everything revolves around being assigned more money as we analysed in the first decade of the 21st century before the 2008 crisis (Rubio Arostegui, Rius-Ulldemolins and Martínez Illa, 2014).

I. INTRODUCTION

The structural problems of the performing arts sector have been analysed from the social sciences perspective in different reports on the sector. In successive chapters of the Fundación Alternativas Culture Report (Rubio Arostegui, 2017 and 2015, and Alberto Fernández Torres, 2014) as well as in publications from other institutions. We might also mention a more extensive report from the Academy of the Performing Arts written by Colomer (2016) which not only provides focus and data but also summarises many of the reports published in Spain on the stage sector.

After the global crisis, consumption data for the performing arts began to show some subtle improvements that still did not manage to alleviate sudden slumps during the worst years of the financial crisis for culture (Rubio Arostegui, Rius-Ulldemolins and Martínez Illa, 2014). In this state of affairs, the diagnosis for the performing arts sector did not change significantly over the next few years. A common denominator for the structural deficits shared by the different reports and studies, dominated by investment policies for culture, were rehabilitation and construction of the publicly owned stage grounds. And subsequently, setting up the Theatre Networks. After the investments made by all the public administrations (including the National Theatre Restoration Plan for the 1980s and 1990s) in concrete and infrastructure on the whole by local governments did not turn into the dynamic that was intended for the stage sector: “The lack of planning for how it would work, specialised managers and appropriate management models mean that it was not possible to turn a profit on the investments. [...] the management of stage spaces has changed from an opportunity into a problem” (Colomer, 2016, 98).

A derived problem, added to the absence of control mechanisms, political intrusion, the public theatre networks’ lack of transparency and accountability demonstrated a fragmented internal market where production companies and distributors demonstrate remarkable difficulty in planning tours of their shows around Spain. In this respect, we should mention the erratic cultural policy at INAEM at the end of the 20th century that left ownership and management of the then National Theatre Network to finance the Association that became the National Network, today known as Redescena through a registered grant that does not require any accountability, if we are to believe the public information available on the website, in the annual reports for this organisation from the Ministry of Culture or on the actual National Theatre Network. Consequently, in the light of the public theatre networks’ crisis, the solution did not come from INAEM in the sense of putting together a new policy intended to improve public theatre networks’ coordination but to suggest a new palliative programme with the Federation of Municipali-
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ties and Provinces (Platea), given the sudden drop in the stage market after the 2008 crisis.

The SGAE directory for 2019 shows slight audience increases in consumption of the performing arts, 1.9% in 2018 over the previous year, that is translated as a consequent increase in income of 1.5% over what was made in 2017. Far from pre-2008 crisis indicators in absolute terms, however (235 million spectators in 2018 compared to 260 million in 2008). The concentration of the theatre offer (in Madrid and Catalonia, Madrid and Barcelona) has remained stable over the last few years between 51 and 55%, exceeding 60% (between 61 and 64% in the 2013-18 period) in both metropolitan cities and their surrounding area. The dance sector also made a slight recovery in 2018, compared to previous years although we are talking about figures that do not reach one million annual spectators in this year (0.90 from 2018 compared to 1.63 in 2008) and a greater concentration than the theatre (over 60%) in large cities. This data is the consequence of an uncoordinated cultural policy as mentioned throughout this report.

Opera presents a very similar situation to dance with slight increases in the offer and the number of spectators with 0.74 million spectators in 2018 although far from the 1.27 of 2008. Similar numbers to dance, with an even greater metropolitan concentration, exceeding 80% although the two sectors differ widely in terms of structure and dynamics.

Beyond the evolution of the latest data on consumption and offer and distribution and exhibition of the Spanish performing arts sector, the aim of this report is therefore not to reiterate prior diagnoses, in line with data from the market activity, as the sector’s general structural problems have not changed since the period prior to the global crisis. On the contrary, we attempt to suggest aspects and dimensions that have not been split into topics in previous studies and reports and that might make up a good part of the political agenda for the performing arts sector at the start of the second decade of the 21st century, settling on the sector’s previously analysed structural weaknesses.

II. THE AMATEUR-PROFESSIONAL CONCEPT AND HOW IT FITS INTO THE LEGAL AND TAX-RELATED FRAMEWORK: PROPOSALS FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY IN PERFORMING ARTS MANAGEMENT

One of the few interesting documents ever generated by the State Council for Performing Arts and Music, a collegiate organisation depending on the INAEM, is the publication of “El Tercer Sector Profesional de las Artes Escénicas y de la Música” (“The Professional Tertiary Sector of Performing Arts and Music”). The document analyses the historically difficult fit for agents from the stage in their relations with public administrations in Spain as they are considered to be profit-making organisations to be able to apply for subsidies, above all in cases of independent creation and production, compared to other countries in Europe (Portugal, France, United Kingdom) with more appropriate taxation and legal flexibility to match the specific features of performing arts and music.

It specifically analyses the public administration’s relations with the professional sector that does not easily fit into the tertiary sector as it is identified with amateurism. In addition, the null impact of the current Sponsorship Law in the theatre sector, given the restrictions from the 2002 standard in the chain of value of the performing arts (Rubio Arostegui and Villarroya Planas, 2019). Regarding the document’s proposals, we might highlight setting up a legal-fiscal mechanism that allows tertiary sector professionals to have the same conditions as the private sector in their relations with the public administrations, and
thereby allow them to compete for subsidies, public contracting, the taxation regime and working conditions. The effect of implanting this mechanism would provide a better fit for the social function of actors and choreographers from independent companies and their artisanal nature with the mercantile dimension depending on public subsidies.

III. THE THEATRE BUSINESS SECTOR CRISIS IN MAJOR CITIES: THE CASE OF BARCELONA AS AN EFFECT OF GLOBALISATION

As mentioned by Walliser and Sorando (2019), the effects of globalisation in cities refers to gentrification, touristification and financialization. These global phenomena not only affect citizens’ daily life and their conditions for mobility, the environment and income capability to pay for their homes, but it also ends up affecting the actual infrastructure of the theatre system. In the case of Barcelona, in late 2019 and the beginning of this year, the media warned that historical private sector stages might have to close or were inactive as a consequence of the effects of globalisation.

Different media emphasise the difficulty to address the complex local phenomena of globalisation from local governance that, until recently, did not affect major cultural capitals (Charle, 2009). Real estate speculation is cornering the private business sector in the city centre, despite uncoordinated efforts by local government, the non-profitmaking and business sector and the Generalitat (Catalan Government). In this respect, the Antic Teatre has become a paradigm of the contradictions of a weak cultural policy (El punt Avui, 17/2/2020) in which public administration has invested €519,000 over the last few years to use this building as a theatre, without currently clarifying whether this renovation is going to have a cultural use in the near future. Similar cases with sustainability problems are Salas Muntaner, la Vilella and the club Capitol. Others, however, such as the Teatro Tantarantana have been bought up by the City Council to safeguard its feasibility and cultural mission, adding it to the creation factory project. This theatre also receives public funding from the Ministry of Culture and the Generalitat de Cataluña. In any case, it seems that the sustainability of the theatre buildings in the major metropolitan cities also requires coordinated policy between the public, private and tertiary sectors to fight real estate speculation.3

IV. END OF THE CULTURAL POLITICS CYCLE IN THE DANCE SECTOR

Despite the fact that European cultural policies since the mid-20th century have been supported in their offer (Menger, 2016) and in their attempt to provide an appropriate environment to commercialise culture in failing market conditions in the case of the performing arts (Baumol & Bowen 1966), this policy presents symptoms of non-sustainability and running out of steam, particularly since the

---


“La gentrificació ataca els teatres de Barcelona: El tancament del Club Capitol i La Vilella alerta de la desaparició de sales al centre de la ciutat”, Ara.cat. Disponible en: https://m.ara.cat/cultura/gentrificacio-ataca-teatres-barcelona-club-capitol-la-vilella-tancament_0_2366163578.amp.html?_twitter_impression=true
culture funding crisis (Rubio Arostegui, Rius-Ulldemolins and Martínez-Illa, 2014). If we compare the support and public funding on the offer side of the choreographic field with classical music or public production for state-owned or regional theatres and some of the large theatres owned by towns, data shows a convincing weakness in the dance sector.

Consequently, on the one hand while the Spanish Association of Symphony Orchestras (AEOS), that groups together thirty five Spanish symphony orchestras spread all over the country, in thirteen autonomous regions, offers a panorama with some national equilibrium in the classical music offer and on the other hand, in the field of theatre, there is a greater offer from the regional and local administrations, the actual INAEM and the dynamism of the private theatre sector, the Spanish dance sector offer has not managed to find its footing particularly when compared to the panorama of the offer of companies in France, Great Britain and Germany.

However, it is paradoxical that as a consequence of the lack of coordination between cultural and educational policies and the necessary public coordination, dance has had a greater boost in the regional funding of educational policy, through professional and advanced artistic teaching. Regional governments have mainly deployed dance conservatories’ offer, assigning an important part of the sector’s economic resources to regulated training (Rubio Arostegui 2016). This leads directly to the situation where there is an increase in professionals ready to begin a professional career in the world of dance, and the consequent bottleneck for Spanish dancers to be able to develop as Spain cannot offer them stable dance companies in their different styles.

Despite the offer’s weak bases underpinning the dance sector since democracy was recovered, the cultural policy in this field shows signs of running out of steam and the need to change cycle. The closure of Victor Ullate’s companies in late 2019, with a registered grant from the Government of the Madrid Region and one-off subsidies from INAEM on one hand, and Ananda Dansa, a company based in the Valencian Community more focussed on modern dance, with a smaller company format than the former example, on the other, represent highly relevant losses of the choreography capital built up over the last four decades.4

However, this critical situation not only affects creation in the Spanish choreography field but also distribution in public theatre networks and festivals that have given structure to dissemination of Spanish dance in the democratic period. Dance month or El mes de Danza in Seville thereby also recently announced its closure at the 2020 edition after 26 years of continuous offer, because it had become impossible to manage. As the press remarked: “The context’s financial suffocation, due to non-payments from the Administrations - led by Seville City Council, the Andalusia regional government and the Ministry of Culture - has led its management to throw in the towel after taking too many “unacceptable” economic risks”.5

The cultural policy for dance needs a whole new approach from offer and demand, coor-


V. A STATE POLICY ON STAGE-MUSICAL HERITAGE. THE ZARZUELA THEATRE ZARZA PROJECT

1. The need for a policy on theatrical-musical heritage

One of the main directions taken by cultural policies that emerged in Europe in the mid-20th century is protection and appreciation of cultural heritage. Although the State has expressed its interest in historical-artistic heritage ever since the Enlightenment, it is through institutionalising the first national museums, publication of legal rulings and creation and regulation of professions with expertise in art conservation and of part of academia (art historians) when the foundations were laid to determine a cultural policy that appreciates artistic heritage.

In the case of southern European countries that have devised their own cultural policy model (Rubio Arostegui, Rius-Ulldemolins, 2020, 2020; Rius-Ulldemolins, Pizzi and Rubio Arostegui, 2019), public administration spending on cultural heritage is one of the most characteristic and measured aspects, specifically regarding its sustainability and reach. Back in post-modern societies, turning culture into heritage reached civil society and a set of players who reinterpreted and redefined the notion of heritage itself, who go further than the experts, the academics and the actual public culture institutions. Consequently, some national cultural policies on artistic heritage, such as in the case of Canada, have been redesigned from an enquiry sent out to citizens as a survey. As mentioned by Ariño (2009), cultural heritage has passed from a definition of uniformity that appears in modernity (as top-down logic), to the heterogeneity of definitions and uses in complex societies today, above all in its pragmatic aspect (on the uses and subjects) and its financial sustainability.

We can see this in the latest European Eurobarometer from 2017 (Special Eurobarometer 466, Cultural Heritage). It is true that a majority of European citizens (84 %) generally think that cultural heritage is important both personally and at a community level in their respective cities, regions or countries, although there are differences between the different heritage sectors. The European survey thereby demonstrated greater participation from Europeans in visits to museums or monuments than attending music, opera or dance concerts characterised as traditional or belonging to stage-musical heritage (43% compared to 61%).

In the case of musical heritage, it is paradoxical to observe how in southern European countries, where people significantly value their architectural and archaeological heritage more than the European average, and its link with the economic and tourism dimension, this value is not correlated with appreciation and participation in stage-musical heritage. So, some countries such as Sweden stand out for their participation - defined as attending music-stage concerts at least once a year, far above southern countries that have very low indicators (14% in Greece, 19% in Portugal and 27% for Spain, in all cases below the EU-28 aver-
age of 35). Furthermore, the European survey makes it possible to measure Europeans’ attitude to cultural heritage public funding: most Europeans believe that public administrations (including the actual EU) should assign more resources to conservation and enhancement of European cultural heritage, particularly Spain with 81%, above the EU-28 average.

Therefore, we can see that cultural policies on heritage have been democratising, widening their social horizon, reaching as far as actual individual attitudes and becoming more complex among players in civil society in their different dimensions. However, in the case of Spanish stage-musical heritage, data shows that there is room for improvement in participation and consumption. In this respect, Spain a substantial policy on theatrical-musical heritage where not only people implicated in the artistic field should be represented in design and formulation but also people from academia: research and appreciation of stage-musical heritage needs research in humanities and social sciences. There are currently European, national and regional research projects led by research groups with recognised prestige.

One of the players that is necessarily implicated in the design of a heritage policy for the stage-music sector should be the INAEM that, although its functions include the “inventory”, cataloguing and dissemination of the music and stage heritage” (INAEM, 2018, 4) throughout its history it has not maintained a substantial consistent policy to carry out this entrusted function.

2. The Zarza Project from the Zarzuela Theatre

However, paradoxically, it is a centre that depending on the INAEM, the Zarzuela Theatre, that we wish to mention for its work in recovering and restoring the value of Spanish lyrical heritage. The Zarza Project aims to encourage youth audiences for the Spanish lyrical genre through production, distribution and exhibition of a set of works from Spanish lyrical heritage performed by musicians, singers, theatre directors and young stage designers. The project that began in the 16/17 season puts on a production adapted to the youth audience every year that is presented in the Zarzuela Theatre, although some productions began to tour other theatres outside the capital (Seville, Aviles, among others). In addition to the lyrical production, this project stands out for the quality of the educational aspect, providing a Teacher’s Guide. Participation from schools is very high and the project is well received. The project is a personal pet project for the Zarzuela Theatre director, Daniel Bianco.

Diluting the offer in Madrid and reaching more theatres throughout Spain working with other public theatres is perhaps the only way possible for Zarzuela to renew its audiences as necessary and it should address the project in the near future. It is true to say that this is the only INAEM production unit that has a project of these dimensions regarding its artistic and didactic quality and participation from new audiences, in this case in the lyrical genre.

---

6. In the Madrid Region, in the autonomous region’s latest call for research groups projects, two projects from around twenty were funded with the aim of recovering and restoring value to lyric and stage heritage: Cartografía digital, conservación y difusión del patrimonio teatral del Madrid contemporáneo (Digital mapping, conservation and dissemination of the theatrical heritage of Contemporary Madrid), coordinated by Julio Vélez Sainz (UCM) and Espacios, Géneros y Públicos de la Música en Madrid (ss. XVII-XX) (Spaces, Genres and Audiences for Music in Madrid [17th to 20th centuries]) coordinated by Alvaro Torrente Sánchez Guisande (ICCMU). ORDER 66/2019, of 12 December, from the Board of Science, Universities and Innovation, settling the call for funding to carry out R+D activity programmes among research groups from the Madrid Region in Social Sciences and Humanities, jointly financed with the European Social Fund. BOCM No. 302 20/12/2019, p. 97.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

We are going to summarise a set of proposals as a consequence of the sector’s data and evolution plus the analysis from this report and previous studies:

1. A new approach to the INAEM functional and organic coordination policy given the deficiencies in the public theatre networks. Activation of the Law of the National Institute of the Performing Arts and Music, a priority for 2020, according to the socialist government, has still not been disseminated. However, given the agents who have been working on the new law, it is difficult to think that this is an important reform that addressed multi-level public coordination at both organic and functional level. In this respect, as we suggested in the text, this requires accountability and greater transparency for the results from the national and regional theatre networks. The fact that the mission for these networks has not been completed makes it necessary to evaluate its performance and account for the public funding that they receive. From the New Public Management focus, it is not sustainable that INAEM’s annual registered grant to the National Theatre Network is not paired up with an evaluation of the mission performance and this association’s goals.

2. Create a legal-fiscal mechanism that gives tertiary sector professionals the same conditions as the private sector in how they relate to public administrations, and thereby allow them to compete for grants, public contracting, the taxation regime and working conditions. The continuity of independent companies from allocation to the private sector is unsustainable, given the artisanal nature of the performing arts.

3. Determine coordination mechanisms to safeguard theatre buildings in metropolitan cities against the effects of globalisation and property speculation, as we discussed using the case study of the city of Barcelona.

4. Reformulate a new policy from the offer and from the training of dance professionals in the terms analysed in all public administrations working together and taking into account the mechanism for professional qualifications from the non-profit-making sector. Dance needs to reformulate its policies and reallocate public investment.

5. Implant a comprehensive policy to recover and restore the value of stage-music heritage beyond individual proposals from public theatres working with cultural administrators and the academic and research field. Some actions such as the Zarza Project show that it is possible to combine youth participation, recovery of Spanish musical heritage and pedagogic best practices, all necessary to create new audiences and new forms of binding us to the Spanish stage-music heritage.
INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND THE VALUE OF STAGE HERITAGE IN GLOBALISATION: CHALLENGES FOR CULTURAL POLICY...
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REPORT ON THE STATE OF CULTURE IN SPAIN (2020): TWO SURVEYS, TWO COMPLEMENTARY SNAPSHOTS ON THE SITUATION OF CULTURE

Patricia Corredor Lanas

INTRODUCTION: FROM THE NEW COALITION GOVERNMENT TO POST COVID-19 “NORMAL”

Our seventh periodic Survey among Spanish cultural agents was about to be published in the Report on the State of Culture in Spain 2020, produced by the Fundación Alternativas Culture and Communication Observatory. On the Foundation website, we even announced its public presentation to the media in March at the Instituto Cervantes that, unfortunately, had to be called off, just like many other cultural activities, when the state of alarm was declared.

By reworking this edition, we have made an effort to update it, put it into the context of the new, unusual circumstances of this COVID-19 pandemic that we are living through and, above all, discuss how we can weigh up its effects so far.

Along this line, we think that the results of the completed Survey remain entirely valid, as they offer a snapshot of the start of the year concerning the awareness and opinion of the 96 Spanish cultural agents from seven sectors at that time, as a new Government had just been formed, arousing inevitable expectation. Furthermore, these results have the added value of a ten-year comparison with results from our first survey (late 2010 and early 2011) as the financial crisis developed, the beginning of the end for Rodríguez Zapatero’s Government. Its data thereby reflects the final stage of an entire decade of unyielding economic and political upheaval but also technological commotion in the cultural world, portrayed in the seven Reports published so far.

However, the tough consequences of this pandemic on the economy in general and on culture in particular logically require an update regarding the outlook from cultural agents, who have experienced how the fragility caused and maintained by austerity policies has been badly affected by shutting down social activities, particularly any taking place in public and collective spaces, but in general, all cultural activities, their financing and sustainability, and particularly SMEs, self-employed workers and creators (and the world of technicians, industries and auxiliary workers in the background who keep it going).

Consequently, we have drawn up a simple questionnaire to complement the previous one, in an attempt to discern between the support measures already announced or implemented not only by the Central Government, but also by the regional administrations; and suggest the most necessary instruments and goals for an imminent action plan to reinstate the cultural sector. It intends to add the voice of Spanish culture’s main players to the design and implementation of these new public poli-
cies who can only be successful if they take part. So that this new survey might complement the previous one, we sent it to the same sample as the survey run in early 2020. Out of the 96 people who answered the initial questionnaire, 52 have also filled in the new survey.

The COVID-19 and Culture Survey contains two short sections, with nineteen questions in total: the first on the aid measures adopted: the levels of the state administration and the adaptation and sufficiency of their decisions, the effectiveness of their instruments; the second section looks at the general outlines of the Plan to Relaunch Culture, to weigh up the importance given to each of the support tools for the immediate future. In both sections, the score must be given on a scale from 1 (completely disagree) to 10 (completely agree). The questionnaire was common for all cultural activities and therefore gives a comprehensive view of Culture, although it is understood that each respondent answered the survey from their own specific experiences depending on their professional tasks and specialisations.

CULTURAL AGENTS’ ASSESSMENT. FIRST QUARTER 2020: APPROVAL WITH A LITTLE HOPE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The seventh survey that we sent to Spanish cultural agents, making a considerable effort to increase representation from professional and civic associations in this field, has given an overall pass with a score that was 0.1 higher than in 2019, a very modest plus that nevertheless signifies that there is still hope, growing slightly, for the situation of Spanish culture. After almost one decade of cultural economic depression caused by the great recession but also and especially due to governments’ apathy to invest in culture, reflected in variable and yet reiterated failing grades in four successive reports, not only is last year’s pass confirmed but increased to exactly match the average initial score from 2011, taken in the final stage of Rodríguez Zapatero’s Government.

In last year’s edition, after the success of the motion of no confidence on 1st June 2018, the cultural atmosphere reflected that agents had regained considerable confidence in the light of aspects such as reinstating the Ministry of Culture, parliament’s unanimous support for creators’ rights or reinstating lower VAT for culture referring to the main off-line cultural activities. Although this faith was substantially limited by political uncertainty, confirmed by freezing the new budget (and its consequent failure to increase state cultural spending by almost ten percent) and the subsequent dissolution of parliament.

After the tumultuous political period of 2019, from the general elections on 28th April to repeated elections on 10th November, to the complex process of forming the new Government and the success of investiture, our survey among around one hundred cultural agents, representatives from its major business sectors and its diverse professional roles, at least had to reflect this difficult balance between hope regarding greater public attention for culture and an improvement of its general diagnosis and the inevitable weaknesses and difficulties presented by the new government.

Average score for Culture in Spain: 5.1

Although the general average score for Spanish culture never dropped below 4.4 even in the worst days of the recession, despite the collapse of public and private culture spending, this prudence among cultural agents is also expressed at times of optimism, that was correct in 2011 in terms of moderating any past euphoria, foreseeing the imminent collapse on the horizon. Now, in a renewed atmosphere of hope in the light of economic recovery and of-
ficial promises by the two coalition parties for a renewed public cultural policy, many questions have also been raised around approving the budget, on increased state spending on culture in an always unfair fight against deficit pressure and on the duration and actual stability of the coalition government. From there, closing this cycle, lasting almost a decade, brings relatively good news between the restrained hope at the start of the 2010 decade and the tempered eagerness of the end of the decade (see Graph 1).

**Current issues**

Although proclamations from the petitions, associations and cultural events (even the Goya awards ceremony despite its extreme political prudence in 2020) have urged the State to recover its essential role in promoting and projecting cultural activities, in this context most media specifically state the extreme urgency to relaunch–renew–cultural action abroad. This ICE 2020 has taken on this concern as a central theme for its insights.

Consequently, our survey included two questions relating to this vibrant universe of topics and concerns, logically summarised in apparently basic questions although intended to gauge the agents’ opinion on two vital and complementary aspects: the situation and image of Spain’s international cultural action. The results undeniably call for a need to rethink, update, relaunch this multiple action, because it addresses diverse cultures and languages but also different agents and petitions, from public to private, mercantile to the tertiary sector, and different although complementary aims: external projection for prestige or trade, cooperation with other strong or weak cultures, spiritual supplement for political diplomacy, forming closer ties with societies and creativities, strengthening diversity elsewhere and enriching our own.

In this way, the survey respondents give a poor score of 4.2 on average to “the clear and coherent strategy” from Spain’s cultural action abroad, which might be understood as a value judgement on the scars left by the crisis on our international cultural action, both public and private; but also as a consideration that these strategies are out-of-sync with this last decade’s international political changes and culture’s remarkable transformation over those years.

However, the score is much lower for the practical results in terms of the global mental image of that external cultural action, with a
score of just 3.8 when assessing whether it is “in line with its wealth and diversity” when referring to Spanish culture. Because this clear failure would not only affect governmental policies at all levels of the Spanish state but also export and circulation of our cultural goods and services in every way.

**EXTERNAL CULTURAL ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain’s Cultural Action abroad has a clear and coherent strategy</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain’s cultural image abroad matches its wealth and diversity</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third current issue links in here with an essential topic that we have addressed from different perspectives in our reports, dedicating a specific chapter to it in this ICE report: general arts and cultural education for young Spanish people, that not only affects the quantity and quality of our future creators but also training the future audiences of our cultural production. The average evaluation is very poor for this question, scoring 4.1 for its effect on “the social evaluation of culture”, a result that can be related not only to cultural consumption and spending but also to how much creators are paid.

**CULTURAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our young people’s arts and cultural education contributes to the social evaluation of culture</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, we quizzed our survey participants on a cultural and media matter that has been brought intensely to the fore in recently times: the relaunch of Spanish audiovisual fiction, also penalised by the crisis and that now seems to benefit not only the relative recovery of advertising but particularly, according to the press, of the emergence of international and national payment platforms. So then, the world of culture’s opinion leaves us in no doubt that the general assessment is positive, by scoring it with 5.5, although it does not celebrate in the same way with the corresponding chapter of our report on this topic that looks at these processes with greater nuances, as they differ widely between film and TV fiction, and weighs up their pros and cons.

**SPANISH AUDIOVISUAL FICTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish audiovisual fiction is benefiting from the new competitive multiplatform and multimedia climate</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORES**

**By activity spheres: improvements to production/editing and public policies**

Creation and consumption of culture maintains its primacy in the scores per cultural sphere and the scores are equally good for the distribution/commercialisation although higher for production/editing, reflecting greater economic optimism. There is also a significant increase in esteem for public policies that almost pass muster, while the worst scored activity remains external projection and cultural cooperation that, while improving by 0.3, clearly still fails to make the grade.

**By sector: videogames jump into first position**

The score by sector ranking was turned on its head in 2020, as videogames’ previous healthy pace really took off, grabbing top spot from
advertising creativity and design that dropped to second. This is followed in third place by Visual Arts and, in fourth place, the music and the record industry that goes up from fifth to fourth place (from 4.7 to 5).

The Performing Arts now stand in fifth place while the book and library sector that shared the same score and position with music in 2019, drops down the ranking to sixth. The most worrying case revolves around the cinema and audiovisual production, that stood fourth in 2019 and has now dropped to seventh and last position.

**By professional role: administrators impose greater optimism**

Once again, administrators express greater optimism in their answers and improve their average scores, up to 5.6 for 2020, well above the general average. On the other hand, creators are usually the most pessimistic and, on this occasion, they are clinging to the poor average culture score they received in 2019, 0.5 below the general average score. Finally, experts and critics are generally loyal to the balance between the former roles.

**Maximum and minimum scores: ICT and diversity versus external cultural projection**

The top ten scores are maintained, like every year, concentrated on questions regarding the effect and potential of new digital networks, as well as the constancy of pluralism and creativity of Spanish culture towards its audiences, almost in equal parts.

Specifically, four of the top scores refer to the direct effect of ICT on creativity or consumption of culture, with the highest scores of the survey, although fewer of them (seven out of ten in 2019): the new networks allow creators to connect better with their audiences (a strong score of 7.5), strengthen “word of mouth” among users (6.9), increase authors’ creativity (6.7) and guarantee pluralism of creation and voices available to users (5.8). However, enthusiasm clearly drops due to the automatic effects of technologies and digital networks with regard to previous results.

On the other hand, another six top scores are related to the diversity available for creators and users, taking for granted some social parameters where intervention of devices and digital networks might also be presumed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of the <strong>10 top scores</strong>, 4 refer to ICT and 6 to Spanish cultural diversity.</td>
<td>Out of the <strong>10 worst scores</strong>, 6 allude to external cultural projection and 3 to creators’ salaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 10 worst scores, six continue to accumulate on the external projection of Spanish culture, either in terms of cooperation and exchange or export and international presence. This low score for the presence of our culture, and its relative drop on previous years, complemented and confirmed by the aforementioned two current issues, provides a serious basis to consider the central topic of this ICE on Spain’s cultural action abroad. Furthermore, it marks the urgency to formulate and implement a powerful new strategy for the future.

**I. INTRODUCTION. SEVENTH SURVEY AMONG CULTURAL AGENTS**

Our seventh survey sent out to around one hundred Spanish cultural agents for the purpose that drove us to start the first edition of the Report on Spanish Culture almost a decade ago: testing the opinions and evaluations regarding the cultural atmosphere in Spain regarding the situation and evolution of the
state of these activities, as a counterpoint to the usual surveys on purchasing and consumption of cultural goods and services (sometimes mixed up with each other). Far from any corporativist vision (culture for creators), we worked from the basis that their experience and knowledge was vital for our culture’s strategies and progress, and they unyieldingly contribute to shaping them. Consequently, these numerical scores representing the opinions of the widely varying social agents from the offer (creation, production, dissemination, critics) in the diverse and complex sectors of symbolic activity (from performing arts and music to books, audiovisual or multimedia) constitute a vital thermometer to gauge the situation and future strategies.

These evaluations in particular are most important when designing and adopting public cultural policies, where historic state-enlightened despotism, the pressure from trade lobbies or from media stars are currently emphasised as paths that do not meet social needs. Because if its goals and budgets are obliged to take an increasing part in civic society (demonstrated by a tendency towards public debate on local budgets), the consultation and participation of cultural agents is imposed as a 

sine qua non condition for any chance of success. Dialogue and the balance between these two interrelated terms, agents and audiences, is as vital as it is complex, because culture transcends the market and the industry to also become a binding part of civic society (associations, charity work by artists, SMEs, etc.). However, it is essential to shape these White Papers whose deep insights on the role of culture in a democratic society should always be put ahead of major cultural plans to give them a firm and realistic basis. This is even more pertinent in the recession hangover that, as now, calls for a review of public policies due to the dual requirements of social changes to culture and actual mutations of culture in digital networks.

Consequently, our survey also rotates and combines its goals to demonstrate and represent the complex universe of Spanish culture, which translates into a sustained effort to address the maximum gender balance possible due to its inherited numerical shortfalls, adding this requirement to all the rest and maintaining focus on SMEs and large business groups or on balancing out city centres and the outskirts. And in this edition, precisely due to the aforementioned circumstances, we have made an additional effort to address not only the accumulated database of more than 350 agents of all types but to make the multiple associations that coordinate Spanish culture more present in it: general or territorial associations, sector-based by activities, economic and business, for creators and amateurs, partial or general recognition, etc.

The results are still modest, demonstrating not only our limitations but also national shortfalls, because although this sociocultural fabric is starting to thicken up as it should in an economically and socially developed country, it maintains a highly atomised structure that occasionally still lacks clear awareness of its overlap with culture as a whole and with society in general. Relevant cultural entities and associations in Spanish culture as a whole, that periodically call on the public to support its cause, have declined or omitted to answer our questionnaire. However, many others answered quickly and acknowledged this implied responsibility, giving the survey greater representativity and, therefore, providing better knowledge of cultural agents’ perception of culture in Spain, as can be seen in the final panel of the experts who have shared their accurate vision on the state of this field which is so vital for our democracy (see Appendix II).

Working from a stable questionnaire of 54 questions and four current issues on each occasion, always stated in positive terms and scored from 1 to 10, this survey aimed to quan-
tify opinions that address the culture’s main parameters in terms of diversity, which necessarily implies economic and industrial questions but also questions the decline of democratic rights and public policies that can and must strengthen both sides of culture.

The survey took place in the first two months of 2020, when the new Coalition Government had just been inaugurated and was taking its first steps.

II. GENERAL RESULTS (ICE 2020)

1. Average total score for culture in Spain: a slightly higher pass

The average general result from all our scores and questions this year scraped over the pass mark with an additional 0.1 on last year. This increase might seem minimal but it reflects emerging excitement in the midst of political uncertainty surrounding the first coalition Government in Spanish history since the 2nd Republic, and the tension sustained by the opposition regarding its ability to govern the country.

For the third consecutive year, scores have risen from the low point of the 4.4 after dropping for three years running during the toughest times of the crisis for culture (2017). In such a way that we summarised “restrained hopes and careful eagerness” in 2019, this contained optimism is back in 2020 with all the timidity imposed by the political and economic situation, from a new Government with unknown strength and duration, and whose proposals for the world of culture were on shaky ground right back in the months of the survey: solid goals in the electoral promises, but the transfer of the Ministry of Culture (change from a proven administrator to a politician), promises of important cultural actions but wary of the fight against the deficit, etc.

3. New current issues: coherent external action and Spanish culture

As reflected by the Culture and Communication Observatory in a wide range of recent activities and chorused in media information and editorials, Spain’s cultural action abroad is surely the most damaged and deteriorated chapter in our culture panorama as a consequence of the fiscal crisis but also down to lack of direction from governmental actions over seven years. This not only refers to the traditional lack of State policy in this field, but also important transformations of international relations over the last decade and the very mutation of culture, not only due to the change of habits brought on by digital devices and networks but also due to increasingly incisive action from many social players, including the cultural agents themselves and their associations. This shows an growing need for insights on Spanish strategies at all levels in the projection and interaction of Spanish culture with international cultures.

In an attempt to tackle these problem issues, along with the central dossier of this ICE 2020, we have included two current issues in
our questionnaire, that aim to positively and concisely ask two major questions hanging over Spanish international cultural action regarding which external strategy to pick (with what degree of clarity and coherence) and what global image to present regarding its perceived wealth and diversity.

The scores corresponding to these questions are poor in both cases, clearly showing that there is a significant problem in the opinion of all the cultural agents in the survey.

**External cultural action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Spain's Cultural Action abroad has a clear and coherent strategy</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Spain's cultural image abroad matches its wealth and diversity</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 4.2 given to Spain’s external cultural action already seems like quite a low score compared to the general average, but this is further confirmed in other related questions. The 3.8 given to Spain’s cultural “image” abroad, in relation to its wealth and diversity, considerably worsens the perception of this situation and of the Spain “brand” seen from the inside.

The other two current issues raised in ICE 2020 are related to two new chapters for this edition of the Report. Firstly, cultural education (and artistic, creative education, etc.) for our young people that constitutes an outstanding factor for all cultural insights, because it is decisive in forming new creators, including people nowadays who span their work between new technology and the arts, but also in general for the level of culture consumers (their money and time budget). So then, the diagnosis from the survey respondents is clear, giving 4.1, a fail, to this situation.

**Cultural education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Our young people’s arts and cultural education contributes to the social evaluation of culture</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other one-off contribution from the questionnaire revolves around the situation of the production (and creation) of Spanish fiction. While previous reports had prioritised the cinema, ICE 2020 explores Spanish fictional audiovisual creativity, which is becoming increasingly complex due to the boost from major television and audiovisual changes, particularly paid and on demand television, on digital terrestrial networks, cable or Internet, from national companies or global platforms. The general positive opinion on these processes among the respondents, giving a good passing score, at least confirms that this is an important phenomenon that analysis of Spanish cultural creativity and its dialogue with worldwide audiovisual will have to take seriously, also in the regulations and public policies.

**Spanish audiovisual fiction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Spanish audiovisual fiction is benefiting from the new competitive multiplatform and multimedia climate</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Top scores for culture: Effects of ICT and diversity available for creators and users

Like every year, the top scores revolve around questions on the effect and the potential of new digital networks, plus the pluralism and creativity of Spanish culture towards its audiences, almost in equal parts.

Specifically, four of the top scores refer to the direct effect of ICT on creativity or con-
assumption of culture, with the highest scores of the survey, although fewer of them (seven out of ten in 2019): the new networks allow creators to connect better with their audiences (a strong score of 7.5), strengthen “word of mouth” among users (6.9), increase creativity of the authors (6.7) and guarantee pluralism of creation and voices available to users (5.8). However, enthusiasm clearly drops due to the automatic effects of technologies and digital networks regarding previous results (see chart 1).

On the other hand, another six top scores are related to creator and user diversity, taking for granted some social parameters where we can also presume involvement of digital devices and networks: the innovative trends and styles can reach their audiences (6.5), SMEs play an essential role as “innovation reserves” (6.7), creation expresses Spanish society’s ideological “range” (6.5), users have a “great capacity to choose” (6.4) and - at the lower end, the cultural offer “reflects” the diversity of our cultural identity (5.9) and users have a “wide” range of offer available (5.8).

5. Spain’s culture black holes: cooperation and external projection

The worst scores continue to accumulate this time on the external projection of Spanish culture, either in terms of cooperation and exchange or export and international presence. To the point of concentrating six of the lowest scores that include, from the bottom up, “sufficient” projection of SMEs (3.6), “sufficient and effective” public cooperation policies (3.7), “fair” external trade exchanges (3.9), “sufficient and balanced” exchanges with the EU (4.1), “accurate” trade strategies from major groups for external expansion (4.3) or exchanges with Latin America that respond “sufficiently” to linguistic and cultural ties (4.3) (see chart 2).

Chart 1. The greatest strengths of Culture in Spain 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top scores</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04. Creators are making the most of new networks to connect with their audiences</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Digital networks strengthen user word of mouth (labelled and recommendation)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. SMEs play an essential role as innovation reserves</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Authors are benefiting from new technologies to increase their creativity</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01. Innovative trends and styles can be expressed and seek out their audience</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Cultural creation expresses the range of ideological values present in Spanish society</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Users have a wide choice on the Internet</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. The cultural offer reflects the diversity of our cultural identity.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Users have a truly diverse offer available</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Digital networks guarantee pluralism of creations and voices available to users</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This low score for the presence of our culture, and its relative drop on previous years, complemented and confirmed by the aforementioned two current issues, provides a serious basis to consider the central topic of this ICE on Spain’s cultural action abroad. Furthermore, it marks the urgency to formulate and implement a powerful new strategy for the future.

On the other hand, questions relating to internal cultural public policies that made a great splash in the early editions among the list of the worst scores have been gradually clawing their way out of this negative ranking, but they are still not known to shine. The lowest scores remain for its work on defending “fair pay” for authors (4.2), touching on a section that also appears in another two more broadly negative questions: “fair” pay for creators (3.4) and remuneration for editing/production SMEs that is “sufficient for sustainability” (3.9).

The tenth worst score refers to traditional media whose promotion of “cultural identity” is penalised with a 4.3.

III. CULTURAL SPHERES: IMPROVEMENTS TO PRODUCTION/EDITING AND PUBLIC POLICIES

Creation maintains its traditional primacy in these scores by cultural sphere, but it sticks at the same good pass (6) as last year. The same happens with use and consumption of culture, with the second highest score of 5.6.
(same as 2019), and the distribution/commercialisation mark hovers around the pass mark (5).

On the other hand, production/editing goes up 0.2 to 5.3 (from 5.1 in 2019), reflecting certain economic optimism. And public policies also go up in their estimation and almost pass the test with 4.9 (4.6 last year) (see chart 3 and graphs 2 and 3).

Once again, the worst scoring activity is external projection and cultural cooperation; even though it does improve by 0.3, it is still a clear fail (4.3).

**Chart 3. Score for the spheres of the cultural world in 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sphere</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Production/editing</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Distribution/commercialisation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use and consumption of culture</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public policies and commercial strategies</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>External projection and cooperation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 2. Score for the spheres of the cultural world in 2020**

**Graph 3. Score for the spheres of the cultural world Comparison 2019-2020**
1. Creation [score: 6]

Creation continues to lead the ranking by spheres, but it has not budged from 2019, in a combined effect of the six questions in this section that demonstrate quite irregular up and down behaviour, that seem significant above all when the difference is more than 0.2 as a result of many combined opinions.

The only considerable increase, by 0.4, is the score to express the range of “ideological values” (6.5), by 0.3 although still failing badly there is “fair pay” for creators (3.4) and minimally the estimated improvement of the “medium term creative diversity” (5.4 from 5.3 in 2019).

On the other hand, scores worsen concerning the capability for expression in innovative trends and styles (from 6.7 to 6.5) and the benefit of increasing creativity brought to creators by ICT (drops from 6.9 to 6.7). Remaining steady, although very high, is the estimation on whether creators are making the most of new networks “to connect with their audiences” (7.5). Although it seems to be early days to draw any conclusions from these highly nuanced evolutions, it seems to indicate a certain drop in the optimistic opinion on ICT’s impact on cultural creation (see chart 4).

2. Production/editing [score: 5.3]

Cultural production/editing, that only scraped a passing score in 2019, improves its mark significantly from the prior 5.1, as a result of generalised gain in many of its 10 questions. Despite this, the pluralism of the offer to major cultural groups is still deemed too low (4.6) just like the future “sustainable economy” that new networks will bring (4.8).

Consequently, there is a rise in the representation of a “plural range of voices and interests” (from 5.4 to 5.7), the correspondence between the diversity of the offer and our cultural identity (from 5.6 to 5.9) and, most particularly, despite maintaining a low score, the “plural” range of products and services offered by the major groups (from 4 to 4.6).

There is a smaller rise for the decentralisation of cultural production as a reflection of Spain from the autonomous regions (from 5.4 to 5.6), the balanced development of the offer in languages recognised in the Spanish
state (from 4.8 to 5), the chance of a “sustainable economy” in the future for new networks (from 4.7 to 4.8) and even signs of diversity and five-year profitability for cultural production (5.2 to 5.4). On the other hand, paradoxically, the possibility of financially diversifying culture and increasing profitability thanks to new networks remains steady (at 5.2) and the role of SMEs drops slightly as “innovation reserves” (from 6.8 to 6.7) (see chart 5).

3. Distribution/commercialisation [score: 5]

Last year, distribution made the leap from repeatedly failing to scraping a pass, although it remains stuck on this score again this year. This average effect is the result of a standstill for several of its 9 questions, but also small rises and falls among different scores.

There is an outstanding rise in two questions related to public media with the promotion of cultural diversity (going from 4.9 to 5.3) and with the boost to independent production (from 4.6 to 4.7). There is also a small-scale rise in the media’s general boost to creation and promotion of culture (from 4.3 to 4.4) and the pluralism of voices available to users on digital networks (from 5.7 to 5.8).

On the other hand, scores are maintained on the wide-ranging offer from analogue networks (failing with 4.7), promotion of cultural diversity of traditional media (with 4.1) and the right to access culture on digital networks (5.49). And there is a 0.1 drop for the approved provision for greater diversity and medium-term profitability “on all channels” (from 5.8 to 5.7) (see chart 6).

**Chart 5. Score per sphere: 2. Production/Edition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07. Producers-editors are a plural range of voices and interests</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08. SMEs play an essential role as innovation reserves</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09. The cultural offer reflects the diversity of our cultural identity.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decentralisation of cultural production reflects the autonomous regions of Spain</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The major cultural groups offer a plural range of products and services</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The available offer reflects a balance of the languages recognised in the Spanish State</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Editing/production SMEs receive sufficient pay for their sustainability</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. New networks help diversify financial sources and increase profitability</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. New networks provide a sustainable economy for the future</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cultural production will increase its diversity and profitability in the medium term (five years)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Use and consumption of culture [score: 5.6]

Estimations on the use and consumption of culture, traditionally well over the pass mark even in the middle of a crisis, has barely gone up by 0.1 on average after it remained steady last year on 5.5. However, most of the scores increase although only slightly which seems to indicate a consensus on its moderate improvement. The only clear exceptions are the question on the users’ wisdom in their choice that drops 0.4 (from 5.4 to 5) and the reduction of costs and corresponding cultural democratisation (from 5.7 to 5.4).

However, the complementary question on the user’s “great freedom of choice” goes up (from 5.5 to 5.6), also its “great diversity of available offer” (from 5.6 to 5.8), its “affordable access” (from 5 to 5.3), its “word of mouth” capacity (5.5 to 5.7), its great freedom of choice on the Internet (6.2 to 6.4) and the increase in the medium term freedom of choice (from 5.6 to 5.7). There is also a 0.4 rise in payment of a “fair price” for cultural creation although it remains below the pass mark (4.7) (see chart 7).

5. Public policies and commercial strategies: almost passing [score: 4.9]

The climate of certain optimism among cultural agents, that back in 2019 increased the average score for this section by 0.8, has increased again to 4.9, almost making the pass mark. Although prudently, this confirms the expectations of all the cultural agents regarding the public actions promised by the new Government that exceed the extended collapse that began in 2012. Four out of the seven questions in this section thereby make the grade.
This is particularly true for questions that seem to formulate clear positions with regard to cultural public action and its aims, positions that are always split in a survey between taking a theoretical position or principle and the reality of the respondent’s experience. In this respect, scores are particularly interesting on public policies and how they stimulate creative innovation (from 4.9 to 5.2), its strengthening of the industrial fabric of production (from 5 to 5.1), its boost for diversity of offer (from 4.7 to 5) and particularly its support for digital transformation (from 5 to 5.4). Although it has still not passed, scores are on the rise for the public stimulus for the economic sustainability of culture (from 4.5 to 4.9) and even the defence of fair pay for authors (from 4 to 4.2), always the most severely punished question in this section (see chart 8).

6. External projection and cooperation: slight rises but still a fail [score: 4.3]

Despite growing optimism over the last two years, Spanish external cultural projection is rising very moderately although still showing poor scores in relation to all other cultural spheres: from 3.8 in 2018 to 4 in 2019, and then 4.3 in 2020.

This very relative improvement comes from slightly better scores in eight out of the ten questions in this section: from taking initial positions that Spanish culture occupies “its rightful place in the world” (going from 4.3 to 4.6), to the consideration that trade exchanges are “fair” (from 3.5 to 3.9). There are slight improvements regarding more specific questions such as “sufficient and balanced” exchanges with the EU (from 3.6 to 4.1) or regarding “lin-
guistic and cultural ties" with Latin America (from 4.1 to 4.3) and evaluation of the trade strategies from major groups (from 4.1 to 4.3). The direct opinion on the public policies for external action also slightly improves regarding whether they provide an incentive for exchange and intercultural diversity (from 4.2 to 4.49) or promote the presence of Ibero-America culture in Spain (from 4.3 to 4.6).

On the contrary, opinions worsen on “sufficient and effective” cooperation policies (from 4 to 3.7) and there is a considerable drop in the evaluation of the capacity to create “new audiences” for Spanish culture (5.2 to 4.6) (see chart 9).

IV. CUL TURE SEEN BY SECTORS: VIDEOGAMES AT THE HEAD

The average scores recorded by agents in each of the seven main cultural sectors has allowed us to traditionally make an indirect diagnosis of the activity situation, with preference over direct questions that might distort perceptions on other sectors. Because it would be difficult for all types of cultural agents to give abstract scores in a context that affects them personally and professionally.

The ranking of scores per sector experienced a turn-around in 2020 as the previous rise of videogames gathered pace, increasing their score by 0.7 over one year, plus the 0.6 increase of the previous year (from 4.5 to 5.1 and not to 5.8), to take top spot. And this sector thereby beats advertising creativity and design that had been top of the list for several years.

The optimism of the cultural agents evaluating these sectors cannot be logically separated from the circumstances surrounding each sector, and videogames present two-digit growth in 2019 and promise to exceed the book publishing industry in a few years. Advertising, in turn, is recovering pre-crisis investment rates at a strong pace, although directing its structure mainly towards online advertising as opposed to television.

They are followed in third place by the Visual Arts, going from 4.9 to 5.3, easing over
the pass mark, as a demonstration of their relative recovery. And in fourth place, the music and record industry that goes up from fifth to fourth place (from 4.7 to 5) where all sources point towards significant growth—relative since its collapse prior to the economic crisis—particularly due to the rise of streaming thanks to both subscriptions and advertising investment.

This is the last sector that actually passes in our questionnaire because in fifth place this year, the Performing Arts seem to have hit rock bottom in their fall from the beginning of the crisis in practically all parameters of offer, consumption and turnover and in all its subsectors. Nevertheless, its average scores have risen slightly from 4.5 to 4.9.

In turn, the book and library sector that shared music’s score and fifth place in 2019, drops down the ranking to sixth place despite going up 0.1 in its general average evaluation of culture (from 4.7 to 4.8). This certainly reflects the improvement in turnover announced in the sector-based reports, at the expense of few new items and control of the runs, but also accumulated uncertainties in an activity that has not found its place in a digital world.

However, the most worrying case revolves around the cinema and audiovisual production that stood fourth in 2019 and has now plummeted to seventh place, despite celebrating its box office recovery and the effect of the Goya awards, which coincided with our survey. This inevitably makes us think of the worrying col-
lapse of the share of Spanish cinema down to barely 15% of total takings, a long way from the lowest level traditionally set at 20% (25.4% in 2014), less than €100M of the €624M of general turnover from cinemas. The development of feature films on online networks and the emergence of televised fiction do not seem to have alleviated this negative perception of Spanish audiovisual agents (see chart 10 and graph 4).

From the ranking by cultural sectors, we always take away the answers and scores given by cross-discipline experts, critics, researchers, etc. because their inclusion or mixture would distort the answers and their comprehension and because, traditionally, they show a level of optimism that is greater than most agents in creative sectors.

However, on this occasion, the average scores from the cross-discipline experts drop by 0.2, from 5.5 in 2019 to 5.3, showing relative pessimism. Even so, they would put the Visual Arts third in the ranking by sectors, giving a better mark for the average state of culture in Spain (see graph 5).

V. CULTURE SEEN BY TYPES OF AGENT: OPTIMISTIC ADMINISTRATORS

The professional origin of the people answering the survey also determines their opinions and evaluations to a large extent, as we have seen over our successive surveys, although occasionally, it is paradoxically countered by the evaluation from the aforementioned cultural spheres.

In this way, once again, administrators express greater optimism in their answers and
improve their average scores faster, from 5.3 from 2019 to 5.6 for 2020, well above the general average for all respondents.

Creators are usually the most pessimistic and, on this occasion, they are clinging to the poor average culture score that they received in 2019: 4.6, which is 0.5 below the general average score.

Finally, experts and critics are generally loyal to the balance between the former roles and their scores in this case corroborate it at 5.2, which is 0.2 higher than scores from 2019 (see chart 11 and graph 6).
1. Creators: systematic pessimism [score: 4.6]

Pessimism (or realism in their view) among creators to consider general culture is expressed in all their evaluations, but it comes into its own when crossed with cultural spheres.

So they give a poor score to the actual situation of creation compared to the general average (6) and they have shaved another 0.1 off the 2019 score (from 5.4 to 5.3); they penalise production/editing still further this year with 4.5 (4.8 in 2019, 5.3 in the general average) and the same happens with distribution/commercialisation: that went from 4.7 in 2019 to 4.3 in 2020. Nor have they improved their score for the use and consumption of culture (dropping from 5.3 to 5 compared to the general 5.6). And they improve their estimation of public policies (from 4.2 to 4.6) and more slightly regarding external projection and cultural cooperation (from 3.6 to 3.8) (see chart 12).

2. Administrators: steady optimism [score: 5.6]

The optimism among cultural administrators is also expressed on this occasion in its appreciation of cultural spheres, including their own profession. In such a way that they give 6.5 to creation (6 in the general average), 0.1 more than in 2019; they give themselves a 6 for production/edition (5.4 last year) and 5.6 for distribution/commercialisation: (5.2 in 2019) and raise their score for cultural consumption to 6.1 (5.9 last year).

Within the framework of this relative enthusiasm, administrators actually approve the cultural policies with a 5 (4.8 in 2019) and they only fail the external projection and cooperation with a 4.5 (4.3 the past year) (see chart 13).

3. Experts/critics: prudence and balance [score: 5.2]

Scores from the experts and critics on the cultural spheres are extremely interesting because once again they appear to be the most resistant to current stimuli but also generally the closest to the general averages. In this way, the average score of 5.2 from this collective is also the closest to the general average for the survey in all its questions and interviewees.

Chart 12. Scores from creators vs total cultural agents in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Sphere</th>
<th>Creators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production/editing</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution/commercialisation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and consumption of culture</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policies and commercial strategies</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External projection and cooperation</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again, experts are spot on when evaluating creation with a 6.1 (same as in 2019) compared to the average of 6; by giving production/editing a 5.3, exactly like the average (slight increase from the 5.1 they gave last year) and distribution/commercialisation with the exact 5 of the average (same as in 2019). They also give the same score for the use and consumption of culture with a 5.6, going up by 0.2 this year on 2019.

On the other hand, they exceed the general average by awarding 0.2 more for cultural policies (4.9 in the general average) and 0.4 to external projection up to 4.5 (4.3 in the general average) (see chart 14).
VI. ALMOST A DECADE OF CULTURAL RECOVERY: CHANGES IN CONSUMPTION

The sequence of seven surveys among cultural agents over a period of ten years (2011-2020) gives us an extraordinary perspective to test transformations on the perceptions of the Spanish cultural agents.

Consequently, regarding cultural spheres, it is seen that creation, production and distribution have recovered 2011 scores almost exactly, except for a partial 0.1 which is barely significant. And that the public policies and external projection have gained 0.4 and 0.3 respectively.

As a singular exception to these encouraging dynamics, there is the case of the use and consumption of culture that has 0.5 along the way. This depression was maintained after the crisis, verified by the acute drop in private spending from the Spanish on culture, without a clear solution on the horizon, and that points towards one of the greatest weaknesses of Spanish culture for the near future (see graph 7).

Another outstanding point in this comparison over time is the strong difference in scores per sector that indirectly demonstrate their economic situation ranking: while cinema and audiovisual and books have seriously lower scores (0.4 and 0.3 respectively), the performing and visual arts practically remain steady (at 4.9 for the former and between 5.4 and 5.3 for the latter), two typical sectors from what are known as the creative arts stand out clearly: Videogames and multimedia rise from 5 to 5.8 and advertising and design increase from 5.1 to 5.5. These two sectors took the top spots in the 2020 ranking by scores and sectors, clearly taking the place of the classic sectors, particularly books that historically have been the main Spanish cultural industry sector for decades.

Finally, it can be highlighted that regarding the scores per agent and their evolution over this decade, there is remarkable stability for scores between such different situations as the end of Rodríguez Zapatero’s Government (2011) and the start of Pedro Sánchez’s coalition government (2020): The average scores

Graph 7. Score for the spheres of the cultural world Comparison 2020-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creation</th>
<th>Production/editing</th>
<th>Distribution/commercialisation</th>
<th>Use and consumption of culture</th>
<th>Public policies and commercial strategies</th>
<th>External projection and cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the creators barely drop 0.2 between the aforementioned years (from 4.8 to 4.6), the administrators' scores remain exactly the same (5.6) and only the experts change by increasing their scores by 0.4 (from 4.8 to 5.2) (see graph 8).

VII. OPEN COMMENTS 2020

Our survey always provides an open comments space for opinions and proposals from our interviewees that, although in the minority over the survey as a whole, are neverthe-less revealing in terms of current concerns and sensitivities. Here is a summary based on the major sectors covered:

1. Cultural consumption

- “There are barely any indicators to measure the media-based and cultural diet of citizens. We should have more indicators on what citizens consume in terms of culture, both quantitatively and qualitatively, including the cultural diet of the different population groups regarding...
diverse cultural products. Democracy cannot be improved without improving the media-based and cultural diet”.

- “We need more studies and a permanent observatory for cultural consumption. Furthermore, quantitative measurement is not enough, such as hours of consumption, hours of reading, etc. We have to specify what we see, what we read and also relate it to population groups to be able to adjust the creation and development of public policies that affect the cultural demand and not only to the cultural offer”.
- “We should move beyond the industrial and economic concepts of culture (highly important) to also treat culture as the fourth pillar of welfare, always from the perspective of relational governance, meaning from the point of view of citizens, not just producers, creators, programmers and distributors”.

2. Cultural and artistic training

- “Arts and cultural education contribute to social valuation of culture. True. However, the current education system limits art and creativity subjects a great deal. So, this culture or training barely reaches the young people”.
- “Arts education for young people could contribute, if it existed, to this education that is non-existent. The Spain’s cultural image abroad falls short. Not only is it often not appropriate but often just non-existent”.

3. Gender and culture

- “Although ICE 2017 took the central theme of Equality and Diversity in the digital era, the fact is that article 26 of the General Equality Law of 2007 is still a far-off dream. And this is a topic where it would be fundamental to continue acting, transversally, on all matters from the ICE, until real and effective equality has been achieved”.

4. The audiovisual situation

- “Multiplatform competition is beneficial in the short-term, but it is not danger-free. I don’t know if it is good to create excessive dependence on emerging companies with a high risk of disappearing and, in almost all cases, using North American capital”.
- “Spanish audiovisual fiction that works with the platforms sees a benefit but the audiovisual sector is very broad”.

5. External cultural projection

- “Obviously, and in my opinion, there is a lack of greater implication between Spain and Latin America in all aspects of culture, aiming to counter current globalisation centring on the English-speaking North”.

6. Cultural public policies

- “Cultural public policies in Spain still do not include the strategic focus of human rights. Beyond the paradigm of cultural management, public and private, it is urgent to promote public debate on the relationship between protection of cultural rights and democratic strengthening”.
- “There is very little assistance for creation in this country of ours. It only promotes rubbish television, rubbish music, rubbish food, rubbish clothing...authors have to emigrate or make our living from something other than creation”.
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• “It will be interesting to see how the España Global strategy (MAEC) pans out in the near future”.

VIII. PRINCIPLES, GOALS AND METHODOLOGY

1. The sample: structure and composition

To be able to gather these opinions, a broad database of Spanish cultural agents was put together, based on amassing surveys performed by the ICE over the last decade, updated and purified to better combine private activities and public institutions, major companies and SMES and self-employed agents. Thanks to our experience from the six previous editions, this purified database has reached almost three hundred and fifty confirmed addresses with the aim of receiving around one hundred completed surveys, a foreseeable proportion in a highly atomised field, where individual work and volunteering have often taken priority over collective efforts. An important share of the respondents (around 70%) had already taken part in previous editions.

On this occasion in particular, we have made an effort to get greater participation from sector-based and general cultural associations of all types, not always easy to access or to receive an answer, without neglecting the representativity of women in culture and the maximum possible balance between the two major cities concentrating the cultural offer and other Spanish communities.

The enquiry method, performed online on a professional Internet platform (e-encuesta.com), has made it easier to collect and tabulate the results, although it has also shown, sometimes in real time, the difficulties that many cultural agents encounter to tackle the long questionnaire.

However, the complete sample and the effective answers have not been undifferentiated but balanced between productive roles deployed in culture and between central cultural sectors, not only to gain representativity for culture as a whole but also to be able to coordinate the results according to the very different activities performed in such a broad and diverse field.

In this way, we have systematically sought out a weighting for the survey respondents in 3 major categories:

1. Creators
2. Public and private administrators
3. Researchers and Critics

And we have segmented 7 major activity sectors in a balanced way that summarise the major cultural processes in our society (in social projection and in economic weight):

1. Performing arts
2. Plastic arts
3. Music and record industry
4. Cinema and audiovisual production
5. Books and libraries
6. Videogames and multimedia
7. Advertising creativity and design

In addition, although excluded from the calculation of average marks in the results per sector, to avoid an external bias for these professional roles, we have added an eighth multi-purpose category, due to the existence of academic experts and professionals that, depending on their career, had valuable experience that crossed the different sectors and activities and that we could not ignore:

8. Cross-discipline experts (administrators, researchers)
2. Questionnaire premises

a. Logic and goals

The set of 54 questions remained identical to the Surveys from 2011-2014-2015-2017, 2018 and 2019 to make it easier to make comparisons during this period. This is an exhaustive questionnaire, with a view to long-term comparison that consequently addresses the main problem areas in the cultural field. However, we have added four current issues on specific topics that are important to this Report, particularly regarding Spanish cultural action abroad, the central theme of this ICE 2020, artistic and cultural training for young Spaniards and the state of Spanish audiovisual fiction.

All the questions are stated in positive terms to avoid conditioning the respondents, who are asked to score each question from 1 to 10 (maximum disagreement to maximum agreement).

Full comprehension of the questionnaire and therefore of the results requires emphasising its essential philosophy: a central perspective on Diversity, traditionally cultivated by the Fundación Alternativas in all its studies on Culture but also endorsed by the actual Spanish state in its ratification of the UNESCO Diversity Convention (October 2007). This explains why we break the questionnaire down in terms of cultural pluralism and public policies, of economy and industry but also democracy, intercultural cooperation but also export or projection of our cultural creations.

To represent all the major phases of the chain of value of Culture and the Cultural and Creative industries, both in their classic analogue version and in their transfer to the digital world, 6 spheres are defined that structure the Questionnaire entirely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Creative pluralism</th>
<th>Ideological pluralism</th>
<th>Fair pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Creation</td>
<td>Pluralism of voices</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Diversity of the offer</td>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Production/editing</td>
<td>Diversity of the offer</td>
<td>Pluralism of voices</td>
<td>Financial sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Distribution/commercialisation</td>
<td>Use and consumption of culture</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Public policies and commercial strategies</td>
<td>Support for diversity and pluralism</td>
<td>Support for financial sustainability</td>
<td>Independence of culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 La proyección exterior y la cooperación</td>
<td>Strong trade</td>
<td>Intercultural diversity</td>
<td>Economic sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And it sought to state the questions, guiding them by axial areas for evaluating culture, that should explicitly transfer their fundamental democratic values and the economic conditions necessary to uphold them, with a flexible number of questions and capable of apprehending the fundamental aspects of each area in each sphere:
b. Questionnaire [ICE 2020]

1. Creation:
   01. Innovative trends and styles can be expressed and seek their audience
   02. Cultural creation expresses the range of ideological values present in Spanish society.
   03. Authors are benefiting from new technologies to increase their creativity
   04. Creators are making the most of new networks to connect with their audiences
   05. Creators receive fair pay to maintain their work
   06. Creative diversity is tending to improve in the medium term (five years)

2. Production/editing:
   07. Producers-editors are a plural range of voices and interests
   08. SMEs play an essential role as innovation reserves
   09. The cultural offer reflects the diversity of our cultural identity.
   10. Decentralisation of cultural production reflects the autonomous regions of Spain
   11. The major cultural groups offer a plural range of products and services
   12. The available offer reflects a balance of the languages recognised in the Spanish State
   13. Editing/production SMEs receive sufficient pay for their sustainability
   14. New networks help diversify financial sources and increase profitability
   15. New networks provide a sustainable economy for the future
   16. Cultural production will increase its diversity and profitability in the medium term (five years)

3. Distribution/commercialisation:
   17. Analogue distribution networks offer a sufficiently diverse offer
   18. Traditional media promotes cultural diversity
   19. The media boosts creation and promotion of culture
   20. Public media promotes cultural diversity
   21. Public media boosts independent production
   22. Commercialisation of cultural products and services gives the user a wide choice
   23. Digital networks guarantee pluralism of creations and voices available to users.
   24. Digital networks guarantee the general access right to culture
   25. Distribution through all channels will allow greater diversity and profitability in the medium term (five years)

4. Use and consumption of culture:
   26. Users have great freedom of cultural choice
   27. Users know what they want to choose
   28. Users have great diversity of offer available
   29. Users have affordable access to culture
   30. New networks allow great user participation in cultural creation
   31. Digital networks strengthen the users’ word of mouth capability (labelled and recommendation)
32. Digital networks drastically reduce the costs of culture and make it more democratic
33. Users have a wide choice on the Internet
34. Users pay a fair price for cultural creation
35. Users can choose the appropriate culture for their cultural identity (national, regional, local)
36. Citizens/consumers will have a wider choice in the medium term

5. Public policies and commercial strategies:
37. Cultural public policies stimulate creative innovation
38. Public policies strengthen the industrial fabric of edition/production
39. Public policies boost the diversity of the offer and user’s choice
40. Public policies stimulate the economic sustainability of culture
41. Public powers respect the autonomy of culture
42. Public policies support digital transformation
43. Public policies defend fair pay for authors

6. External projection and cooperation:
44. Spanish culture occupies its rightful place in the world
45. Commercial exchanges abroad are fair
46. Cultural exchanges with the EU are sufficient and balanced
47. Cultural exchanges with Latin America respond sufficiently to linguistic and cultural ties
48. The major groups’ commercial strategies are correct for external expansion
49. External projection of cultural SMEs is sufficient
50. Public policies for external cooperation are sufficient and effective
51. Public cooperation policies create an incentive for intercultural exchange and diversity
52. Cooperation policies promote the presence of Latin American culture in Spain.
53. Public cooperation policies create new audiences for Spanish culture
54. Cooperation and trade will generate greater diversity in the medium term

7. Current issues:
55. Spain’s Cultural Action abroad has a clear and coherent strategy.
56. Spain’s cultural image abroad matches its wealth and diversity
57. Our young people’s arts and cultural education contributes to the social evaluation of culture
58. Spanish audiovisual fiction is benefiting from the new competitive multiplatform and multimedia climate

8. Open remarks:
59. If you would like to add a free comment, particularly in relation to the Current Annex, please use this section (maximum 10 lines)
APPENDIX I. General results [ICE 2020]

01. Innovative trends and styles can be expressed and seek out their audience
02. Cultural creation expresses the range of ideological values present in Spanish society
03. Authors are benefiting from new technologies to increase their creativity
04. Creators are making the most of new networks to connect with their audiences
05. Creators receive fair pay to maintain their work
06. Creative diversity is tending to improve in the medium term (five years)
07. Producers-editors are a plural range of voices and interests
08. SMEs play an essential role as innovation reserves
09. The cultural offer reflects the diversity of our cultural identity
10. Decentralisation of cultural production reflects the autonomous regions of Spain
11. The major cultural groups offer a plural range of products and services
12. The available offer reflects a balance of the languages recognised in the Spanish State
13. Editing/production SMEs receive sufficient pay for their sustainability
14. New networks help diversify financial sources and increase profitability
15. New networks provide a sustainable economy for the future
16. Cultural production will increase its diversity and profitability in the medium term (five years)
17. Analogue distribution networks offer a sufficiently diverse offer
18. Traditional media promotes cultural diversity
19. The media boosts creation and promotion of culture
20. Public media promotes cultural diversity
21. Public media boosts independent production
22. Commercialisation of cultural products and services gives users a wide choice
23. Digital networks guarantee pluralism of creations and voices available to users
24. Digital networks guarantee the general access right to culture
25. Distribution through all channels will allow greater diversity and profitability in the medium term (five years)
26. Users have great freedom of cultural choice
27. Users know what they want to choose
28. Users have a truly diverse offer available

29. Users have affordable access to culture

30. New networks allow good user participation in cultural creation

31. Digital networks strengthen user word of mouth (labelled and recommendation)

32. Digital networks drastically reduce culture costs and make it more democratic

33. Users have a wide choice on the Internet

34. Users pay a fair price for cultural creation

35. Users can choose the appropriate culture for their cultural identity (national, regional, local)

36. Citizens/consumers will have a wider choice in the medium term

37. Cultural public policies stimulate creative innovation

38. Public policies strengthen the industrial fabric of editing/production

39. Public policies boost the diversity of the offer and user’s choice

40. Public policies stimulate the economic sustainability of culture

41. Public powers respect the autonomy of culture

42. Public policies support digital transformation

43. Public policies defend fair pay for authors

44. Spanish culture occupies its rightful place in the world

45. Commercial exchanges abroad are fair

46. Cultural exchanges with the EU are sufficient and balanced

47. Cultural exchanges with Latin America respond sufficiently to linguistic and cultural ties

48. The major groups’ commercial strategies are correct for external expansion

49. External projection of cultural SMEs is sufficient

50. Public policies for external cooperation are sufficient and effective

51. Public cooperation policies create an incentive for intercultural exchange and diversity

52. Cooperation policies promote the presence of Latin American culture in Spain

53. Public cooperation policies create new audiences for Spanish culture

54. Cooperation and trade will generate greater diversity in the medium term
# APPENDIX II. List of experts taking part in the survey [ICE 2020]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Abuín Vences</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Miguel Aguado Terrón</td>
<td>Lecturer at the University of Murcia, UMU. Former director general of the Murcia Regional Television Station (RTRM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Aláez Vasconcellos</td>
<td>Partner in Una más Una, cultural management and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis A. Albornoz</td>
<td>Professor at the Carlos III University of Madrid, UC3M. Leader of the research group “Audiovisual Diversity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icíar Alzaga Ruiz</td>
<td>Lecturer at the National Distance Learning University, UNED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Andrés Pérez</td>
<td>Curator and cultural administrator. Management assistant for the Spanish Royal Academy in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Manuel Anta Carabias</td>
<td>Director General of the Federation of National Associations of Publishing Distributors (FANDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estela Artacho García-Moreno</td>
<td>President and Director General of the Federation of Film Distributors (FEDICINE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Mª Ávila Álvarez</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Spanish Federation of Editors (FGEE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmaculada Ballesteros Martín</td>
<td>Director of the Fundación Alternativas Culture and Communication Observatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagario Beceiro</td>
<td>Professor at the Carlos III University of Madrid, UC3M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniela Bosé</td>
<td>Director General of the Vistalegre Palace in Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Bustamante Ramírez</td>
<td>Lecturer at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel Caerols Mateo</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Caffarel Serra</td>
<td>Lecturer and Director of the Department of Communication Sciences and Sociology at the Rey Juan Carlos University, URJC. Former director of the Instituto Cervantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Callejo Gallego</td>
<td>Professor at the National Distance Learning University, UNED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Campos Freire</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Santiago de Compostela, USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Caro Almela</td>
<td>Retired Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM President of the Ibero-American Network of Advertising Researchers (REDIPUB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepción Cascajosa Virino</td>
<td>Professor at the Carlos III University of Madrid, UC3M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Chaparro Escudero</td>
<td>Lecturer at the University of Malaga, UMA. Director of the Andalusia Association of Municipal and Citizen Radio and Television Broadcasters (EMA RTV). IP for the Andalusia Communication and Culture Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesús Cimarro</td>
<td>President of the State Federation of Associations of Theatre and Dance Companies (FAETEDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ángel Codón Ramos</td>
<td>Narrative Director &amp; Game Designer at Fakto Studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Corrales Corrales</td>
<td>Director General of the Spanish Centre of Reprography Rights (CEDRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Cuadros Soto</td>
<td>Director General of the Niemeyer Centre in Avilés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel de Luque Tavie de Andrade</td>
<td>Director of the journal Anuncios, Publicaciones Profesionales S.L.U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idoia Fernández</td>
<td>President of the Consortium of Contemporary Art Galleries. Director of the NF/NIIVES FERNANDEZ Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Fernández León</td>
<td>Director of Programmes for the Gijon Town Council Municipal Foundation for Culture, Education and the People’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Andrés Fernández Leost</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position and Additional Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emelina Fernández Soriano</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Malaga, UMA. Former president of the Andalusia Audiovisual Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonia Fernández Trujillo</td>
<td>Visual artist. Director of the 13 ESPACIOarte Artistic Creation Centre. General Secretary of the Women's Association in Visual Arts (MAV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Fouce</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Gago Mariño</td>
<td>Cultural journalist at the Consello da Cultura Galega. Adjunct Professor at the University of Santiago de Compostela, USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolás García</td>
<td>Executive Producer at Catorce Comunicación, S.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Antonio García Galindo</td>
<td>Lecturer at the University of Malaga, UMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mª Trinidad García Leiva</td>
<td>Professor at the Carlos III University of Madrid, UC3M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belén Gil Jiménez</td>
<td>Partner in Una más Una, cultural management and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo González-Barros Camba</td>
<td>University Professor. Game Design Instructor at the University CEU San Pablo and the TecnoCampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael González Alvarado</td>
<td>Plastic Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco González Fernández</td>
<td>Director of adfphoto.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloma González Rubio</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana García D'Atri</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stéphane M. Grueso</td>
<td>Documentary filmmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Guillot Hevia</td>
<td>Artistic Director of the Mostra de València-Cinema del Mediterrani festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María Lamuedra Graván</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Seville, US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susana Lanas</td>
<td>Director of the TIMELESS digital platform Photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tíscar Lara</td>
<td>Director of Communication and Marketing at the Industrial Organisation School EOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita Ledo Andión</td>
<td>Lecturer at the University of Santiago de Compostela, USC Filmmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald B. Lehn</td>
<td>Director of the Carampa Circus School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xosé López</td>
<td>Professor and Director of the Department of Communication Sciences at the University of Santiago de Compostela, USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecla Lumbrares Krauel</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor of Culture at the University of Malaga, UMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Madinaveitia Foronda</td>
<td>Strategy Services for Zenith España</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomás Mallo Gutiérrez</td>
<td>Head of the Studies and Analysis Area of the Carolina Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Luis Manfredi Sánchez</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Castilla-La Mancha, UCLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Margallo</td>
<td>Actor, Director and Playwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Martín Prieto</td>
<td>Journalist Assistant director of the “Aquí la tierra” programme on TVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfons Martinell</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus at the University of Girona. Director of honour for the “Cultural Policies and Cooperation” UNESCO Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmaculada J. Martínez Martínez</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Murcia, UMU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Marzal Felci</td>
<td>Lecturer and Director of the Department of Communication Sciences at the University Jaume I, UJI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Megías López</td>
<td>Freelance composer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés Mérida Guzmán</td>
<td>Plastic Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arancha Mielgo Álvarez</td>
<td>Professor and Director of the Degree in Marketing at the University CEU San Pablo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Minguella Rubió</td>
<td>President of Honour of the Culture and Alliances association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Montañés García</td>
<td>Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid (UAM) and Nebrija University. Communication consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT ON THE STATE OF CULTURE IN SPAIN (2020): TWO SURVEYS, TWO COMPLEMENTARY SNAPSHOTSHOTS ON THE SITUATION OF CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Morales Corral</td>
<td>Professor at U-TAD University Technology and Digital Art Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Muro Abad</td>
<td>Director of ELMURO, Consultancy and Cultural Management General Secretary of the Spanish Performing Arts Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlota Navarrete Barreiro</td>
<td>Director General of the Coalition of Creators and Content Industries (LA COALICIÓN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Navia Atienza</td>
<td>Administrator and Founder of DIGITAL CORNUCOPIA S.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad Núñez Domínguez</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Seville, US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charo Otegui Pascual</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Palacio Arranz</td>
<td>Lecturer at the Carlos III University of Madrid, UC3M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Ignacio Pastor Pérez</td>
<td>President of the Associació Ciutadania i Comunicació (ACICOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Peñafiel Saiz</td>
<td>Lecturer of the department of Journalism at the University of the Basque Country/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Pérez Vicente</td>
<td>Cultural journalist Director and presenter of “Fluido Rosa” on RNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Pérez Ibáñez</td>
<td>President of the Institute of Modern Art (IAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Pividal García</td>
<td>Artist. Management of publishing projects in the Underbau design studio and artistic projects at Ogami Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emili Prado</td>
<td>Lecturer at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, UAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Raigada Fernández</td>
<td>Creative Director at Aheartfulofgames S.L., Videogame development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Raznovich</td>
<td>Dramatist and author of graphic humour books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Resines</td>
<td>Actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Reyes Sánchez</td>
<td>Professor at the Complutense University of Madrid, UCM Director of the programme “Ritmo Urbano” (La 2 from TVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Rico Rego</td>
<td>Writer and literary critic. President of the Collegiate Association of Writers (ACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilar Rius Fortea</td>
<td>President of the Women in Music Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía Rodero Sanz</td>
<td>Culture Sociologist. CEPAIM Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Rodríguez Bedate</td>
<td>Producer of video games at Aheartfulofgames S.L., Videogame development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Roig Prats</td>
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INTRODUCTION: COVID-19, ALSO A CULTURAL PANDEMIC

More than half the people surveyed in early 2019 answered our complementary survey on the effects of the virus on Spanish culture. Its contrast with the regular 2020 survey demonstrates the remarkable economic and symbolic impact of the pandemic on cultural agents and on their previous opinions.

The results of the survey carried out on the effects of the pandemic and the measures and actions adopted to alleviate its consequences firstly show what a traumatic experience this has been for cultural activities in Spain over these one hundred days of lockdown and the heartfelt disappointment among cultural agents concerning the (poor) speed and efficacy of the authorities’ reaction at all three state levels, Central Government, regional government and local entities. On the other hand, scores from the second part of the survey, on priority tools for a comprehensive public policy regarding immediate recovery, are high for instruments that Spanish tradition has barely used in this field or where its response was incoherent and non-systematic, with highly remarkable clarity and consensus.

I. EMERGENCY AID: SUFFICIENCY AND ADAPTATION

- The Central Government’s reaction, with “appropriate and sufficient” aid to ensure the survival of cultural structures, is clearly given a poor score, just 3.36 out of 10.
- In the same terms, measures by the autonomous regions regarding their broad culture competences get an even worse score of 3.24.
- Local administrations which are so important in general cultural public spending also score a mere 3.26, barely better than the regional authorities.

The general discontent seems clear regarding the speed and sufficiency of the state’s...
actions, at all levels, compared to the tough economic and social repercussions that the epidemic caused on culture, much harsher than in many other economic sectors.

The most important measures adopted by these public administrations to support culture in such adverse circumstances were generally considered by cultural agents as insufficient in nature and amount:

- The worst scored are the general and exceptional unemployment benefits (2.96) in their response to the singular nature of artistic work; or the reduction of online VAT for some cultural activities (press, books) as “sufficient” (2.96).
- The other measures get slightly better scores: from best to worst, considering that women are more greatly affected (3.68), taxation measures for culture (3.02), the relaunch of online cultural consumption (3.28), aid to finance this (3.04), furlough and unemployment benefit (3.12).

II. RELAUNCH: IMMEDIATE TOOLS

The result of the nine remaining questions on the bases and essential tools to approach culture’s necessary relaunch plan, not only to recover its economic and social bearings but above all to achieve a sustainable status where market dynamics and public policies receive high scores, but with nuances that reveal the conceptions of cultural agents:

- The best scores went to general reduction of cultural VAT (8.74); a new standard that is more encouraging for sponsorship (7.84); legal development of the artist statute (8.62). Almost all of them almost unanimously receive excellent scores.
- Good scores are given to special financial support for SMEs (7.78); a support plan for gender equality in employment (7.8); a substantial increase in public spending on culture (7.76); promotion and subsidy of cultural users (7.64); special taxes and regulation of culture on major platforms (7.6); strengthening of digital commercialisation (7.34).
Relaunch plan. It should be based on

Although these tools certainly do not exhaust the arsenal of basic tools for a systematic cultural policy in the immediate future, that should be combined according to the sectors’ goals and needs, they doubtlessly make up its fundamental basis. And the cultural agents’ perception of usefulness already allows an initial approach to analysis.

As for the rest, this complementary survey is highly illustrative of the Spanish cultural world’s hopes and frustrations in times of a health crisis. Disappointment due to the governments’ slow and deficient reaction in the light of the severity of the crisis and consequently regarding the secondary social and democratic role that Spanish politics really attributes to this essential facet of our social life. And, in parallel, it demonstrates collective awareness of the irreplaceable public action in this field to recover the lost social and economic fabric and high consensus on drafting a coherent, sustained policy capable of constructing sustainable culture.
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The Report on the State of Culture in Spain (or ICE from its initials in Spanish) is a publication by the Fundación Alternativas Culture and Communication Observatory that systematically monitors our country’s cultural reality. Six editions have been produced since 2011 that have made it possible to focus on our different soft spots and problem issues.

The first part of this edition will be dedicated to Spain’s foreign cultural policy, identifying players, policies and its main achievements. In addition, we run an evaluation and produce a series of proposals to improve efficacy and efficiency, also considering how Covid-19 is affecting traditional models.

As we have maintained in previous editions of the ICE, culture is a mainstay for the Agenda 2030 sustainable development goals and, without it as a tool and a cross-discipline perspective of all policies, the endeavour is bound to fail. We approach the second part of this edition along these lines, addressing fundamental questions such as development and territorial cooperation, sustainability of cultural heritage and artistic education and growth of the audiovisual industry.