

Joanna Szulborska-Łukaszewicz

TRENDS IN CULTURAL POLICY AND CULTURE MANAGEMENT IN POLAND (1989–2014) (II)

Abstract

Setting aside the fact that the lack of a policy is also some kind of policy, while analyzing the events of the last 25 years in cultural policy, from the perspective of the year 2014, can we really say that there is no cultural policy in Poland? The author describes and analyzes the changes in culture management and cultural policy in Poland from the last quarter of a century. The responsibility for cultural policy rests not only with the central authorities, the Ministry of Culture, but also with local governments, which more and more frequently include citizens in the decision-making process. The citizens themselves are becoming more and more aware of their rights. Apart from cultural institutions, non-governmental organizations more and more often become the contractors of public tasks. They co-create and enrich the cultural offer of cities and regions significantly. Not only the number of non-governmental organizations but also their creativity and the professional level of their actions are increasing. Cultural activity is more and more often undertaken by private economic operators (not only art galleries, but also artistic agencies and impresarios). They cannot count on subsidies from local governments any more, but they can become contractors of services at their request under the Public Procurement Law, which, thanks to the last amendment (raising the threshold for public procurement to more than 30,000 EUR), will become a bit easier from the procedural point of view. The role of public cultural institutions is changing. Many of them have redefined their mission and have been successively building new relations with the audience, taking into consideration the changing needs of the consumers and new economic conditions. Despite the underdeveloped sponsorship in Poland, many of them use the conceptions of CSR and CCR, while others diversify their offer, in terms of both the merits and the price, often introducing a commercial offer as a complementary one. The new infrastructure in Poland, in case of many cultural institutions, contributed to a substantial change and improvement of their conditions. After many years of a total investment stagnation in this sphere, together with Poland's accession to EU, the Polish state and local governments started to undertake tasks in this area more bravely. New infrastructure naturally generates the need for innovation. Cultural institutions more willingly and effectively make use of the new media today (communication with the audience, mailing, FB, promotion, marketing, crowdfunding, crowdsourcing). They more often see the importance of spending money on marketing activities, which they used to economize on in case of a shortfall of funds for substantive activities.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: polityka kulturalna, zarządzanie kulturą w Polsce, festiwalizacja kultury, infrastruktura kultury a innowacje, społeczeństwo obywatelskie, NGO

KEY WORDS: cultural policy, cultural management in Poland, festivalisation of culture, infrastructure of culture and innovation, civil society, NGO

Strategic management

The Polish accession to the European Union contributed significantly to the increase of interest in strategic management in the sphere of culture in our country. On 21 September 2004 the Council of Ministers adopted the already mentioned National Strategy for Culture Development for years 2004–2013, prepared under the direction of The Ministry of Culture and prolonged later for the period till the year 2020¹. It was a substantial pioneer achievement in the history of Polish cultural policy. Nobody had tried before to plan the revenue and expenditure in the sphere of culture even in the perspective of several years. The strategy set the basis for the development of the modern state's patronage over culture in the conditions of market economy, and defined the frames of the cultural policy of the state, a member of an European community, based on quite fairly established diagnosis of each sector of culture and the assumption that culture is a substantial factor of the economic development of the country.

Among the priorities of the Strategy was the issue of eliminating disproportions in the access to cultural goods in regions in order to “improve social cohesion”², and also “caring for the development of modern art, readership progress, increasing significance of a book; supporting the role of artistic schools in educating the personnel of modern culture; developing cultural institutions fulfilling important functions in cultural content or, finally, the concern for the cultural national heritage”³. These task were the priorities for B. Zdrojewski, the Minister of culture in years 2007–2014⁴. The perspective, adopted in the Strategy, put culture in a high position, recommending to perceive it and its development “strictly linked to the economic development”⁵, creating at the same time “the basis to treat culture not only as the recipient of the effects of economic growth, but as the stimulator of the development through, among others, growing share of culture sector in GDP”⁶. For the first time on such scale the

¹ *The Update of The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2020*, Warszawa 2005, www.mk.gov.pl [access: 30.03.2014].

² *The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update of The National Strategy for Culture, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage*, http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/polityka-wewnetrzna-i-zagraniczna/programy.php?searchresult=1&sstring=strategia#wb_10 [access: 30.03.2014], p. 110.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 110.

⁴ See: The Readership Support Programme, Education Programmes, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/strona-glowna/finanse/programy-ministra/programy-mkidn-2014.php> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁵ *The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update...*, p. 110.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 110.

influence of culture on the development of the national economy was noticed and appreciated in a ministerial document⁷.

Following the NSCD more strategic plans began to originate at the level of regions⁸, cities⁹, and cultural institutions¹⁰. The strategic documents which included a project submitted to a contest (both ‘soft’ and investment projects), became welcomed from the perspective of Union funds applications.

European funds

Because of the Polish accession to the European Union the resources of European funds became a significant source of culture financing, especially those of the European Union, the EEA Financial Mechanism and Norwegian Financial Mechanism. It is worth remembering that the budget of only the Culture Program 2007–2013 was “400 million EUR (about 43–58 million EUR a year)”¹¹. In the contest “about 800 applications a year” were submitted “from which usually over 250 projects (so about 32%)”¹² received support.

The European funds became not only a source of measurable financial benefits, thanks to which it was possible to carry out a number of investments in the sphere of culture, but also contributed to the development of an effective debate about culture. The best example is the contest for the title of the European Capital of Culture 2016¹³ owing to which many changes in the sphere of culture management took place

⁷ “The share of GDP generated in culture and culture industries is high. In 2002 it was 4,5%, and the share in the gross value added was 5,2%. Similar level of these ratios (average share in PKB and gross value added) occur in the developed European countries”. *The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update...*, p. 70.

⁸ Małopolska voivodeship elaborated the first strategy in 1998; it was adopted in 1999.

⁹ When the Municipality of Kraków was formulating its first strategy for culture development, adopted by the Kraków City Council in 2010, strategies or sectoral programs on culture development were adopted by such Polish cities as: Elbląg (2005), Wałbrzych (2006), Legnica (2006). Kołobrzeg (2008) or Sosnowiec (2009). The strategic document for Warsaw (The program of culture development for Warsaw till 2020, so-called ‘White Paper’) was also being prepared under the direction of D. Ilczuk by the foundation *Pro Cultura*. More: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Czy Kraków ma szansę stać się prężnym europejskim ośrodkiem teatralnym? Rozważania na temat potencjału Krakowa w kontekście gminnego projektu Strategii Rozwoju Kultury w Krakowie*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2010, vol. 11, p. 55–80.

¹⁰ The first cultural institution in Małopolska that I know about, which created a development strategy was the Historical Museum of the City of Krakow (the Development Strategy of the Historical Museum of the City of Krakow for years 2006–2014).

¹¹ J. Bębenkowska, A. Hieropolitańska, *Program Kultura – przewodnik* [in:] J. Bębenkowska, A. Hieropolitańska (ed.), *Kulturalna Unia Europejska Program Kultura pod lupą*, Warszawa 2011.

¹² J. Bębenkowska, A. Hieropolitańska, *Program Kultura – przewodnik*.

¹³ The programme ‘European Capital of Culture’ is a particular example of cities competition for European funds. The European funds are followed not only by prestige. About the results and effects of becoming an European Capital of Culture: D. Glondys, *Europejska Stolica Kultury. Miejsce kul-*

in Polish cities, often as the rank-and file initiative. It is worth mentioning here Szczecin, Bydgoszcz, Lublin and Katowice¹⁴. The idea of the contest became a starting point for a constructive debate about culture, a pretext for changes, and an inspiration for the actions of local politicians¹⁵, discovering, as a result of the debate, the potential of culture and recognizing its role in the development of cities in the 21st century.

Debate about culture

The awareness of the role of culture in the economic development of the country is increasing gradually¹⁶; the views on the subject of the state's responsibilities towards culture and its possible privatization are diversifying. The severe disagreement over the competence and obligations of the state in the sphere of culture revealed itself during the Congress of Polish Culture, which took place in Kraków in 2009 on the initiative of the Minister B. Zdrojewski (which is worth stressing when we write about the state's cultural policy). The disagreement included Waldemar Dąbrowski and Jerzy Hausner¹⁷. Professor J. Hausner and W. Dąbrowski are in favour of totally different models of management in the culture sector. W. Dąbrowski and the supporters of his conception believe that the state's obligation is patronage over culture, similar to the French model. The state depraving itself of too many competences by passing the responsibility to local governments is dangerous for culture. J. Hausner together with his team prepared a conception of culture privatization, assuming that neither the state nor local governments are able to bear too many responsibilities in the sphere of culture and the introduction of the elements of privatization is necessary. However, this idea has never been announced (which was expected during the informal discussions at the Congress).

ture w polityce Unii Europejskiej, Kraków 2010; D. Glondys, *Kraków Europejskie Miasto Kultury. Summa Factorum*, Kraków 2010 and B. Gierat-Bieroń, *Europejskie miasto kultury. Europejska stolica kultury 1985–2008*, Kraków 2009.

¹⁴ In 2011 as many as 9 Polish cities applied to be the European Capital of Culture: Białystok, Bydgoszcz, Katowice, Łódź, Szczecin, Warszawa, Toruń and Wrocław. See more: The report "City DNA: Diagnosis" on the inclusion of public opinion in the cities' preparation for the European Capital of Culture 2016, <http://publica.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/dnamiastadiagnozaraport.pdf> [access: 13.12.2014].

¹⁵ Many years earlier, on 20 November 1995, Krakow received the title for the millenium year together with 8 other cities (Awinion, Bergen, Bolonia, Bruksela, Helsinki, Praga, Rejkiawik, Santiago de Compostela). See: B. Sonik, B. Gierat-Bieroń, *Europejska stolica kultury 10 lat później*, Kraków 2011.

¹⁶ The need to invest in the creativity of human capital is increasing, as well as the understanding of the role of creators and artists as the basis of creative industries.

¹⁷ Plenary Session "How much state in culture: government, local government or civil society?" With the participation of the economists – professor Leszek Balcerowicz (who would expect complete privatization of the culture sector and the state resigning from the function of a patron), professor Jerzy Hausner and professor Andrzej Mencwel. See more: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Kultura to proces dochodzenia do wartości*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2009, vol. 10, p. 345–354.

The discussion on the range of the state's and local government's responsibility for culture concerned also cultural institutions as entities privileged in the access to public resources, in the opinion of, among others, the representatives of the non-governmental organizations. The criticism of the cultural institutions effectiveness later found its reflection in the changes introduced in 2011 in the already mentioned act on organizing and conducting cultural activity¹⁸.

Cultural institutions have undergone a number of changes since the year 1989, even though they were initiated quite late. However, it is worth remembering that despite the often justified criticism cultural institutions are mostly highly professionalized in their actions (compared to non-governmental organizations)¹⁹, and they have competent staff (both in terms of formal and legal knowledge in the field of public funds management and substantial knowledge and experience)²⁰. However, a low level of their work motivation, the lack of the prospects for promotion, and a low salary still remain a problem. The improving base, which is at the disposal of the institutions today, even though it is still underinvested, triggers creativity and gives new hopes for a change²¹.

The managers of cultural institutions do not live separated from reality. They learn. They observe the processes that take place in the environment, and analyze the needs of the audience, even though it is not always based on an outsourced research (as there are often no funds for that). They make choices, and introduce innovations, even though these are not always spectacular revolutions. In many cases they excellently win over the competition with non-governmental organizations for the free time of a potential recipient. However, a long-term cooperation between cultural institutions and non-governmental organizations, and combining their potentials could certainly bring additional benefits. Modern cultural institutions are changing also due to the investments in their infrastructure.

Cultural infrastructure

The expenditure on culture for long time was treated as a kind of bottomless pit – no matter how much you put in it will absorb it, but there are no visible effects. As recently as in 2001 the representatives of the Law and Justice Party (Prawo i Sprawiedliwość) were convincing each other that “Culture is not a ball and chain”²². It was very difficult

¹⁸ Act of 31 August 2011 on amending the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity and certain other acts, Dz.U. of 2011 No. 207 item 1230.

¹⁹ A. Datko, R. Necel, *Nowoczesna instytucja kultury. Raport z badań*, Poznań 2011.

²⁰ Compare: J. Suchan, *Instytucje publiczne, czyli jakie?* [in:] B. Sobieszek (ed.), *Regionalny Kongres Kultury 2011*. Report, Łódź, p. 66–71.

²¹ M. Ćwikła, *Fabryka inicjatyw, kopalnia pomysłów – wykorzystanie obiektów postindustrialnych w działalności kulturalnej jako impuls do twórczego zarządzania* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Zarządzanie kulturą*, Kraków 2010, vol. 3 (3), p. 261–265.

²² “Pact for National Culture PiS” 2001, see: PiS website: <http://www.pis.org.pl/article.php?id=3125> [access: 30.03.2014].

in the 90s of the 20th century, facing the shortage of financial resources, to convince local politicians, even from quite rich at that moment city of Krakow, of the need to invest into culture. The ideas to increase the budget for the subsidies for cultural projects, the resources for the events connected to the European Capital of Culture 2000²³ or the programs of support for Art Galleries and Creative Workshops²⁴ were all pushed with great difficulty. Even though culture and its heritage for centuries have been a significant element for the development of Krakow, only a few people managing the city, for example Jacek Purchla and Krzysztof Goerlich saw a chance of the city development in an investment into culture. However, it is hard to compare their initiatives with what happened in the half of the 90s in a little, declining town Bilbao, today famous all over the world thanks to an excellent decision of placing there an investment – a museum. As Ruth Rowse reports, only during the first year of its activity the museum attracted 1,36 million visitors, from whom 80% were people who came to Bilbao to see the museum. The region authorities got a return on the investment during the first year of the functioning of this new cultural institution²⁵.

In Poland in the 90s of the 20th century nobody was thinking about investing in culture. We were using the often degraded infrastructure from the communist period. In 1998 in Kraków, as a part of Saint Lawrence quarter revitalization, in the space of the former tram depot the Museum of Municipal Engineering was created²⁶. An idea of building an amphitheatre in Zakrzówek appeared (on the occasion of the Festival Krakow 2000)²⁷. The Patron of Kraków Culture program was implemented with great difficulty²⁸.

At the beginning of the 21st century the possibilities to invest in cultural institutions infrastructure were still very limited, mainly because of financial reasons. The declining expenditure from the state's budget²⁹ was not enough to conduct the activity within the existing base, not mention new investments. Katarzyna Jagodzińska, while analyzing the situation of museums, concludes that in the 90s there were only a few new buildings for the museums. She mentions here the Manggha Centre of Japanese Art and Technology and the Museum of Contemporary Sculpture in Orońsko³⁰. However, it is worth noting here that Manggha, opened in 1994, was created on the initiative of Andrzej Wajda, who, together with his wife Krystyna Zachwatowicz, dedicated for this purpose the whole amount of money (\$ 340,000) from the Kyoto Award, which he had received in Japan for his achievements in film and theatre art³¹.

²³ J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Kraków 2009, p. 126.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 183–186.

²⁵ R. Towse, *Ekonomika kultury. Kompendium*, p. 545.

²⁶ It was created in 1998.

²⁷ J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Warszawa 2011, p. 127.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 187–190.

²⁹ The share of expenditure from the state's budget on culture in 1995 – 1,055%, 1998 – 1,13%, 1999 – 0,83%.

³⁰ K. Jagodzińska, *Charakterystyka działalności kulturalnej w Polsce po transformacji ustrojowej* [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds.), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, p. 130.

³¹ The history of the museum: <http://manggha.pl/o-nas/historia/historia-muzeum-manggha> [access: 30.03.2014].

This initiative was joined by the city's and municipality's authorities, as well as the Embassy of Japan in Poland.

Entrusting the local governments with part of the competences in the sphere of culture management required a local debate about culture, and defining local priorities. It became a beginning of slow changes in the awareness of local politicians – in terms of the perception of the role and significance of culture in the development of cities and regions.

First the commune local governments and after 1999 also the new self-governing regions-voivodeships, while defining the priorities in terms of cultural policy, noticed the need of local investments in the cultural infrastructure. However, a shortage of funds for current tasks in the sphere of culture caused disagreements: the lack of unanimity and the lack of concrete decisions of the local government unit's in this field, because, as is stressed by Hanna Trzeciak: “together with the decentralization of competences – no additional resources for the implementation of the tasks were transferred to local government units”³². Even though the local governments turned out to be skillful managers in the field, the key importance for the development of culture infrastructure in Poland became the year 2004, when together with the Polish accession to the European Union new financial possibilities opened for our country. High level of the percentage share of the Union funds in new culture investments was the best argument which overcame the barriers in thinking about culture infrastructure. Members of local governments, believing that this way they will obtain funds for a city or a region, made decisions about new investments in the sphere of culture, which were often deprived of reflection about the consequences for local budget of the necessity of the maintenance of these facilities during the next decades.

K. Jagodzińska mentions over a dozen of investments concerning museum infrastructure, started and finished in the years 2004–2012. If we add to that new cultural centers, opera theatres (Kraków, Białystok), concert and theatre halls, and many new, adapted for this goal, postindustrial spaces – we have to notice the changes. Apart from the investments in the improvement of the standards or the adaptation of existing buildings, completely new ones appeared on the map of Poland. Only with the involvement of the funds from the Priority XI “Culture and Culture Heritage”, of the operational programme *Infrastructure and Environment 2007–2013*, 79 new investments of supra-regional significance were made, for total sum of PLN 3, 93 billion (including over PLN 2,28 billion from European funds)³³. 47 buildings of cultural institutions were built or rebuilt. Money was also invested in promoting culture through new media – 12 virtual museums, galleries, film and record libraries and digital libraries were created. 75 facilities of cultural heritage were supported³⁴. In accord-

³² H. Trzeciak, *Ekonomika teatru*, Warszawa 2011, p. 85.

³³ See: “Union funds in culture”, Announcement of 13.12.2013, the Ministry of Culture website: Events 2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/fundusze-unijne-w-kulturze-4321.php> [access: 13.02.2014].

³⁴ Among the project were: rebuilding of St. I. Witkiewicz Theatre, finishing the modernization of the exterior of the Opole Concert Hall, building the Podlaska Opera and Concert Hall – European Culture Centre in Białystok, building the Copernicus Science Centre in Warsaw, ‘Galicyjski

ance with the information provided by the Minister of Culture and National Heritage, Poland is a leader “among the European Union countries, in terms of allocating and using the funds for culture”³⁵. According to the Minister B. Zdrojewski “achieving this position in Europe was [...] one of the most difficult tasks carried out by the Ministry of Culture. We were able to catch up considerably on the investments in the sphere of culture, which occurred in our country between 1945 and 1989”³⁶. It has certainly changed the cultural map of Poland³⁷. These changes are part of the cultural policy of central and local authorities, reflected in multiannual development plans and strategic documents.

The role of non-governmental organisations in the sphere of culture

After the year 1989, in the age of market economy, together with the abolition of the state control, non-governmental organizations lost the privilege of receiving earmarked subsidies in Poland. I. Cywińska reports: “We stopped controlling and paying administrative costs”³⁸. Despite that, more and more of them began to be established in free Poland; the new Act of 7 April 1989 – Law on Associations³⁹ contributed to that. This way the society united around grassroots ideas, which were translated into concrete cultural and artistic projects. The competitiveness of the non-governmental organizations’ offer compared to the cultural institutions’ one increased substantially, especially in bigger cities. However, the organizations of the third sector felt discriminated in the access to public funds. Local governments most often divided the funds discretionary, not following any competition procedures⁴⁰. In the competitions for funding their projects took part together with cultural institutions’ projects. Local governments were often alleged that selection boards, if they existed, preferred cultural institutions’ projects, more often entrusting them with public tasks in the area of culture. The Act on public benefit activity and volunteerism⁴¹, called “the third sector constitution”⁴² contributed significantly to the changes in terms of the structure of the

Rynek’ – building an urban sector in the ethnographic park in Sanok, see: “Union funds in culture”, Announcement of 13.12.2013, the Ministry of Culture website: Events 2013.

³⁵ “Union funds in culture”, Announcement of 13.12.2013.

³⁶ The Minister B. Zdrojewski’s statement on the conference on 21 November 2013, see: “Union funds in culture”, Announcement of 13.12.2013.

³⁷ In Krakow, among numerous investments, the Museum of Contemporary Art MOCAK was created, the first museum in Poland that was built from scratch.

³⁸ B. Gierat-Bieroń, *Kultura kontraktowa* [in:] *eadem, Ministrowie kultury doby transformacji, 1989–2005 (wywiady)*, Kraków 2009, p. 23.

³⁹ Dz.U. of 1989 No. 20 item 104.

⁴⁰ The Municipality of Krakow, as the first in Poland, already in 1993, introduced an innovative on a national level Municipal Funding Scheme. See: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Kraków 2009.

⁴¹ Dz.U. of 2003 No. 96 item 873 with amendments.

⁴² A. Rymsha, *Eksperti o kondycji sektora pozarządowego w Polsce w latach 2004–2011* [in:] *NGOs – Projekt nadal w budowie?*, „Kwartalnik Trzeci Sektor” 2013, no. 30, p. 9.

entities actively taking part in the creation of cultural offer, and at the same time the cultural policy of cities and regions⁴³. I will mention here only a few most important changes, which were introduced by this Act. It imposed the obligation of cooperation between local governments and NGOs based on year-long and long-term programs of cooperation, created with the participation of the third sector representatives. The intention to delegate part of the public tasks (including the sphere of education and culture) to NGOs was clearly stated. The procedure of awarding grants to NGOs was specified by establishing not only the basic rules of the competitions, and the composition of the selective boards, but also the implementing rules; grant applications and reports forms were standardized on a national level. The obligation of transferring funds to organizations before the implementation of the task became an important regulation from the perspective of NGOs. Previously, it had not often been acceptable for the treasures of many cities and communes. The refund of the costs invested by the organization had been practiced most often. Nobody had been interested where the organization would find money, often very large sums, to present the receipted invoices. In the Act the following notions were defined: a volunteer (the first time in the Polish law), a public benefit activity, which can be conducted by every organization, and a Public Benefit Organization, with special privileges. At the same time the rules of application for the status of PBO were established, as well as the conditions of keeping it and benefits from possessing it (among others the possibility to obtain 1% of the Personal Income Tax from the citizens)⁴⁴. The boards for public benefit activity of different levels were and are set up under this Act.

Today we are entering the next stage of changes. The citizens and NGOs are increasingly aiming at taking over the power, which, in the context of the poorly evaluated role of local-government members in shaping the cultural policy, seems to be justified⁴⁵. Since 2011 more importance has been attached to public consultations and participatory budgets, discussed not only in communes or districts, but at the level of cultural institution⁴⁶.

⁴³ More: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Skutki wejścia w życie Ustawy o Działalności Pożytku Publicznego i o Wolontariacie dla Organizacji Pozarządowych w Krakowie w obszarze współpracy organizacji pozarządowych z samorządem gminnym* [in:] *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*.

⁴⁴ See more: M. Dudkiewicz, M. Rymśa, *Jubileuszowo-refleksyjnie o sektorze pozarządowym* [in:] *NGOs – Projekt...*; A. Rymśa, *Ekspertyza o kondycji sektora pozarządowego w Polsce w latach 2004–2011* [in:] *NGOs – Projekt...*

⁴⁵ The respondents from the interviews conducted for the report 'City DNA – City Cultural Policies' asked who, in their opinion, had the biggest influence in their city on the shape of cultural policy gave quite diversified answers. According to officials – mostly the president/ mayor of the city (55%), and specialized officials (44%); according to NGOs representatives – mostly specialized officials (36%) and the president/ mayor of the city (24%); according to cultural institutions representatives – also mostly officials (44%) and the president/ mayor of the city (25%). What is striking, the least important role was assigned by all the surveyed groups to municipal councils (4% NGO, 5% cultural institutions, 16% officials). A. Celiński, *Miejskie polityki kulturalne*, „Res Publica Nowa” 2012, no. 21, p. 94–95.

⁴⁶ U. Majewska, 'Podzielmy się kulturą'. *Budżet partycypacyjny domu kultury Śródmieście, „Miasta”* (quarterly) 2013, no. 1 (2), p. 35.

The festivalization of culture

Since the 90s the number of festivals has been increasing successively, which is related to the NGOs being more active in the country and the development of the idea of civil society⁴⁷. In the last decade we witnessed a real explosion of festivals, which was influenced by the programs implemented in the framework of the cultural policy of the EU and other European funds.

As it is highlighted by W. Kuligowski, in the Polish calendar there is not a day without a festival: “in Poland at least several festival events take place almost continuously! [...] Only the category of theatre festivals includes over 300 events, the number of music festivals is similar. There are even more film festivals”⁴⁸. “Festivalization and accumulation of events is reaching its limits today” comments Krzysztof Czyżewski⁴⁹. In turn, “festivals excess has to deprive them of the implicit aura of exceptionality”⁵⁰.

When local governments authorities invest in festivals, it is not because of the expectations of local community⁵¹, but rather because of the function the festivals play in the economic development of cities and regions. Local governments authorities expect the festivals: to increase the number of tourists and the revenues of hotel, restaurant and souvenirs industry, which should be translated into the taxes paid to local government budget (but it is not so obvious⁵²), to increase the attractiveness of the region for investors, and finally to build the brand of the city through festivals and to build the prestige of the city itself or the region and the prestige of local authorities⁵³. Among the commonly repeated arguments confirming the legitimacy of the investments in festival policy are: promoting the participation in culture, creating space for fulfilling out-of-work ambitions; supporting the diversity of the cultural offer of the city, and satisfying various tastes of citizens, improving the quality of life by creating a friendly environment for the citizens and their self-fulfillment (which might influence the place other people choose to live), and finally absorption of the available European funds (among others in order to enrich the cultural offer, e.g. applying for the title of the European Capital of Culture); building tourist offer and development of cultural tourism⁵⁴. Martyna Nawrocka highlights also that “Festivals are treated as a form of free promotion of a city”⁵⁵.

⁴⁷ J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Festiwal w kontekście odpowiedzialności biznesu za kulturę*, „Administracja Publiczna. Studia krajowe i międzynarodowe” 2012, no. 2 (20), WSAP Białystok, p. 21–42.

⁴⁸ W. Kuligowski, *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 12.

⁴⁹ Quoted after: W. Kuligowski, *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja...*, p. 5.

⁵⁰ M. Pęczak, *Święto zdesakralizowane*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 24–27.

⁵¹ Article 9 of the Act of 8 March 1990 on commune local government Dz.U. of 2001 No. 142 item 1591 with amendments..

⁵² It is not a rule that the entities engaged in an economic activity in a given area, pay their taxes there. Companies pay their taxes where they are registered.

⁵³ D. Ilczuk, M. Kulikowska, *Festiwal w Europie. Polityka władz publicznych* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Zarządzanie kulturą*, Kraków 2009, vol. 2 (2), p. 269.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 268–269.

⁵⁵ M. Nawrocka, *Fashion week Poland. Beneficjent i ofiara*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 29.

It is worth mentioning, at this point, the opinion of Dragan Klaić, who – due to the lack of concrete evidence in the form of research based on convincing methodology – puts in doubt the range of this impact: “There are many studies on the economic dimension of festivals, but most of them are based on questionable methodology and quickly reach conclusions like: Yes, festivals really have a positive impact on local economy”⁵⁶. As a result of the research conducted within the framework of the already mentioned research project about European festivals it was stated, that: “many cities, regions and governments invest money in festivals, even though they do not know what is the purpose of all that. [...] There are no clearly stated aims or expectations, clearly formulated criteria for financing and a convincing methodology of monitoring and evaluating these ventures”⁵⁷. Klaić believes, that it is quite difficult to create a convincing methodology confirming, in an unquestionable way, the influence of festivals on the development of cities, because quite rarely this impact is on a larger scale – “it happens quite rarely. Not many festivals can pride themselves on unquestionable and clearly positive economic influence on their cities; in many cases we cannot speak of such influence at all”⁵⁸.

After the great fascination with the form of festivals, which led to a specific festivalization of cultural life in Polish cities, we come together to the priorities reevaluation and directing the activities to the development of competences in terms of an active participation in culture, with the stress on the activities including cultural and artistic education. The festivalization of the cultural policy of cities (“following the policy of big events”⁵⁹) is attracting more criticism today. As it is highlighted by Krzysztof Czyżewski: after all it is about “activating inhabitants, drawing them out of their houses, convincing them that contact with art does not have to give them complexes, opening new possibilities of dialogue and understanding”⁶⁰. His resignation from the function of a program director of the European Capital of Culture Wrocław 2016 was a kind of protest against spending public money on actions with short-term effects, as he said: “It is high time to make culture something more important than a fireworks show”⁶¹. Waldemar Kuligowski stresses, that “the medicine, called festival, is not working”⁶² what is more, it causes “side effects in the form of costly and temporary spaces (legal, financial, infrastructural and moral) for tourists and businessmen”⁶³. Meanwhile, we are evolving towards active participation in the cultural events⁶⁴ by the creation of possibilities for a recipient’s direct impact on the course of events.

⁵⁶ D. Klaić, *Kultura a współczesne miasto*, „Res Publica Nowa” 2010, no. 10, on line: <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2011-02-01-klaic-pl.html> *Res Publica Nowa* 10/2010 [access: 28.10.2012] authorized record of the lecture given at the symposium in Maribor in October 2009.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁹ W. Kuligowski, *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, p. 8.

⁶⁰ K. Czyżewski, quoted after: W. Kuligowski, *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, p. 5.

⁶¹ W. Kuligowski, *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, p. 5.

⁶² *Ibidem*, p. 5.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, p. 5, 8.

⁶⁴ E.g. the projects of Łaźnia Nowa Theatre in Krakow.

Conclusions

The way we perceive culture and its role in the economic development of a country has definitely changed over the last 25 years. Local governments, often as a result of the policy of the UE, noticed the power of culture and creative industries in the economic development of cities, communes and regions, and the need to invest in culture as the base of creative and artistic activities, also in the field of education. Its content will depend on the creativity and cooperation of creative environments, cultural institutions, non-governmental organizations and citizens. However, maintaining this infrastructure will be a challenge and a test for local governments' creativity.

New infrastructure presents new challenges, in different dimensions. Public culture institutions noticed the need of using varied and more innovative forms of promotion, PR and marketing, while in the past they had tried to save money on these activities for the budgets of next projects (which negatively influenced the image of many of them and very often caused undeserved negative opinions).

Polish museums have definitely changed over the last quarter of a century. Not only the work of art, which they want to protect from the present viewers for the future ones, is placed in the centre of their interests. Museum managers, acting within the framework of public budgets, while creating the program offer cannot ignore the present stakeholders of museums. The budget of an institution, the future generations interest in the content of museums depend on their passion for the past and their knowledge of cultural heritage. As a result a contemporary recipient and tax-payer became an important perspective in programming the cultural and education offer of most Polish museums.

Museum institutions were not omitted in the discussion about economics. On the one hand museum workers refer to the provisions of the Act on Museums, according to which this institution is "a non-profit organizational unit"⁶⁵. On the other hand museum institutions, properly resourced, can generate revenue, inter alia, by conducting business activity related to the museum. It is worth recalling here the case of the Historical Museum of the City of Kraków, which as the only one cultural institution from Poland in year 2012 and 2013 was placed on the Forbes' Diamonds list, among the enterprises with the fastest growing value⁶⁶. The branches, which generate the profits of the museum are, above all: Oscar Schindler's Factory 'Emalia' and Rynek Underground (controversial, according to some opinions⁶⁷, due to the proportion of authen-

⁶⁵ Article 1 of the Act of 21 November 1996 on museums, Dz.U. of 2012 item 987 with amendments.

⁶⁶ "The Museum, as the only one cultural institution, was placed on the Forbes' Diamonds list, in the category of the enterprises with the turnover from 5 to 50 million and occupied the 90th place in Małopolska and 1153 in the country". Announcement of 14 February 2014, <http://www.mhk.pl/aktualnosci/mhk-na-liscie-diamentow-forbesa-2014> [access: 30.03.2014]; see also: B. Klejbuk-Goździalska, *Muzeum wśród diamentów*, Krakow.pl, 27 February 2013, p. 4–6.

⁶⁷ D. Hajok, *Podziemia Rynku Głównego*, „Gazeta Wyborcza” of 3 July 2010, <http://www.skozk.pl/prasa/podziemia-rynku-glownego-599.html> [access: 30.03.2014].

tic exhibits to multimedia used to create the exhibition). Museum is visited yearly by almost one million visitors⁶⁸.

Taking into consideration the changes taking place in the modern world, Doro­ta Folga-Januszewska, in the report on the state of museums from 2009⁶⁹, suggests a new definition of a museum: “A contemporary museum still happens to be a solid institution, it has to generate revenue to survive; it serves societies and their policy of defining identities and values; it is available to the public, also via the internet; it conducts research on the testimony of human activity and their environment; it gathers collections and simulacra; it preserves and protects the collections or media on which they are stored; it presents them and makes them available; it creates new realities, educational and fictional values; it is for entertainment purposes”⁷⁰.

An important turning point for the reforms in the culture sector in Poland was, in my opinion, the Polish Culture Congress, which took place in Krakow in 2009⁷¹. The starting point of the session were sector reports⁷², created on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Art, and published on the website www.kongreskultury.pl. Nobody among the participants had doubt that the cultural sector demanded reforms, with regard to the mechanisms of culture financing, including the rules for the distribution of financial resources among the beneficiaries (it also applies to institutions), as well as cultural education, or adjusting legislation to the reality of the cultural sector. It was stressed that culture is the only domain of social life which, during the system changes after 1989, was not reformed, not including the changes resulting from the decentralization. All the Congress participants agreed that culture is not a no-return investment, even though the value of profits cannot be viewed in absolute terms and it will not be measured in PLN⁷³. Even though the perfect method of evaluation in the sector of culture has not been found yet, the number of activities and projects,

⁶⁸ B. Klejbuk-Goździalska, *Muzeum wśród diamentów*, p. 5.

⁶⁹ D. Folga-Januszewska, *Muzea w Polsce 1989–2008. Stan, zachodzące zmiany i kierunki rozwoju muzeów w Europie oraz rekomendacje dla muzeów polskich*. (Report on museums), Warszawa 2008.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁷¹ The Congress consisted of 5 plenary session and 26 panels devoted to different areas of the widely understood culture sector. 1,5 thousand artists, actors, authors, people of art and culture, animators, culture managers and economists took part in it. 15 thousand people followed the debates transmitted live on the Internet. More about the Congress see: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Kultura to proces dochodzenia do wartości*, p. 345–354. B. Zdrojewski, in his statement during the ‘Not-Congress of Culture Animators’ in Warsaw (27 March 2014), referred to the Congress, stressing its importance in the debate on culture and reforms of this sector. Animators also referred to it, postulating establishing the Institute of Culture Animation. Personally I find this idea contradictory to the essence of animation. On the other hand I believe that animation tasks lie within the competencies of the existing National Centre for Culture, see: footnote 77.

⁷² 15 reports in the *Raporty o stanie kultury* tab and 2 in the *e-Kongres, Reforma kultury* tab.

⁷³ They referred also to culture/ creative industries, which generate substantial shares in GDP growth: about 2,6% GDP share in the European Union (25 countries), which allows to compare the cultural sector share in GDP growth in Europe to the share of the sector of food and tobacco products manufacturing. In Poland, only in 2009 an agreement with Central Statistical Office was concluded on the calculation of the percentage share of culture industries in GDP growth.

in which their authors make attempts in this area, increased significantly. The debates during the Congress became a basis for social movement in the sphere of culture in regions and also the already mentioned 'Citizens of Culture' movement. The actions of citizens had many positive effects in many dimensions, not only increasing the state's expenditure on cultural education but also in the sphere of building understanding between the state, local governments and citizens.

Local governments are slowly starting to see the power and potential of non-governmental organizations and citizens, perceiving them more often as a partner in activities for common good, and not only an entity making a number of unjustified claims. Accepting and implementing the Act on public benefit activity and volunteerism⁷⁴, which obliged local governments to cooperate with NGOs (with mutual benefits), certainly became a big milestone. We more and more often introduce new tools of the common good management (including its development) – I mean here the already mentioned social consultations and participation budgets.

We are still looking for the resources outside the budget to finance culture by developing the not perfect yet cooperation tools within the framework of public-private⁷⁵ and public-social⁷⁶ partnership. Culture sponsoring barely exists. 1% of the income tax (PIT) is spent by big part of citizens on social purposes, less frequently on culture. Is the Culture Sponsorship Code⁷⁷, developed with the participation of culture and business environments, going to contribute to the development and intensification of the cooperation between both culture and business environments? According to the preamble, the provisions of the Code are to serve developing "a common language in the cooperation based on mutual trust and good faith accompanying all activities undertaken under their partnership" and "reconciling the interests of the private sector entities, public cultural institutions and NGOs acting in support of culture"⁷⁸.

I have been watching for years the changes in the sphere of culture in Poland. I have been evaluating the effectiveness of the designed and implemented tools (concerning not only substantive issues but also new legal solutions). As I have mentioned before, only out of necessity, in the following text, I focused on just a few aspects of the changes taking place in the field of cultural policy, understood as a system of tools used to meet the needs of local community, taking into consideration its needs

⁷⁴ Act of 24 April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism, Dz.U. of 2003 No. 96 item 873 with amendments.

⁷⁵ Act of 19 December 2008 on public-private partnership, Dz.U. of 2009 No. 19 item 100; Dz.U. of 2010 No. 106 item 675 with amendments.

⁷⁶ Act of 24 April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism.

⁷⁷ Culture Sponsorship Code, 2011 was signed on 5 December 2011 during an international conference taking place on the Warsaw Stock Exchange 'Creative Partnerships. Culture in Business and Business in Culture' organized by the National Centre for Culture. In the process of the Code creation the experiences of cultural institutions, NGOs and private entities were used. The document was signed by Ludwik Sobolewski (CEO of the Warsaw Stock Exchange), Lech Piławski (General Director of the Polish Confederation of Private Employers Lewiatan) and B. Zdrojewski (the Minister of Culture and National Heritage), see: *Kodeks Sponsoringu Kultury*, „Animators Kultury” 2011, no. 5, p. 29–31.

⁷⁸ *Kodeks Sponsoringu Kultury*, p. 29–31.

but also using effectively the available resources. Even though the changes are not as fast as we would expect them to be, and the processes of agreeing on the desired state are time-consuming and not always reach consensus, the society, subordinated to the central power before 1989, is increasingly taking the initiative. Not confining ourselves to the decentralization of public tasks from the central stage to local governments, but also to NGOs, we have better understanding of the idea of civil society. We started to notice and appreciate the importance of culture in the development process of cities and countries. The changes are significant. Certainly, we are just at the beginning of the way of building our own democracy and really civil society, which will understand the transparency of decision-making processes literary, all the time, not only when somebody else is concerned. Irrespectively of the imperfection of the Polish system, we must notice the changes, which have taken place in the cultural life of our country, not without the participation of politicians.

Is there really no cultural policy in Poland then? If we understand it as an instrument of social change, then the activities of the Ministry related to cultural education and digitization, including specifically the tools of financial support for the projects of this field, certainly serve this change. If we understand it as “a way of managing the resources in order to meet the citizens’ needs” – then this management is more often carried out with the participation of citizens and with their consent. They are no longer represented only by MPs, senators and councilors. Before criticizing something each of the citizens should ask themselves what they did to make it different.

Bibliography

- Arnstein Sh.R., *A Ladder of Participation*, see: <http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Baumol W., Bowen W., *Performing Arts: the Economic Dilemma*, Twentieth Century Fund, 1966.
- Bendixen P., *Wprowadzenie do ekonomiki kultury i sztuki*, Kraków 2001.
- Bębenkowska J., Hieropolitańska A., *Program Kultura – przewodnik* [in:] J. Bębenkowska, A. Hieropolitańska (eds.), *Kulturalna Unia Europejska Program Kultura pod lupą*, Warszawa 2011.
- Celiński A., *Miejskie polityki kulturalne*, „Res Publica Nowa” 2012, no. 21.
- Chymkowski R., Koryś I., Dawidowicz-Chymkowska O., *Spoleczny zasięg książki w Polsce w 2012 r.*, National Library report, <http://bn.org.pl/download/document/1362741578.pdf> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Ćwikła M., *Fabryka inicjatyw, kopalnia pomysłów – wykorzystanie obiektów postindustrialnych w działalności kulturalnej jako impuls do twórczego zarządzania* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Zarządzanie kulturą*, Kraków 2010, vol. 3 (3), p. 261–265.
- Datko A., Necel R., *Nowoczesna instytucja kultury. Raport z badań*, Poznań 2011.
- Dragičević-Šešić M., Stojković B., *Kultura: zarządzanie, animacja, marketing*, Warszawa 2010.
- Dragojević S., *Definicje polityki kulturalnej* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Zarządzanie kulturą*, Kraków 2008, vol. 1 (1), p. 254.
- Dudkiewicz M., Rymysza M., *Jubileuszowo-refleksyjnie o sektorze pozarządowym* [in:] NGOs – *Projekt nadal w budowie?*, „Kwartalnik Trzeci Sektor” 2013, no. 30.
- Ekonomia kultury. Przewodnik krytyki politycznej*, Warszawa 2010.
- Ekonomia muzeum*, Folga-Januszewska D., Gutowski B. (ed.), Kraków 2011.

- Encyklopedia PWN*, Warszawa 1984.
- Finansowanie kultury i zarządzanie instytucjami kultury*, Głowacki J., Hausner J. i in. (eds.), Kraków 2009, p. 43, http://www.kongreskultury.pl/title,Raport_o_finansowaniu_i_zarzadzaniu_instytucjami_kultury,pid,217.html [access: 30.03.2014].
- Folga-Januszewska D., *Muzea w Polsce 1989–2008. Stan, zachodzące zmiany i kierunki rozwoju muzeów w Europie oraz rekomendacje dla muzeów polskich*. (Report on museums), Warszawa 2008.
- Gerwin M., *Budżet obywatelski: od nowych chodników do lokalnej społeczności*, „Miasto” 2013, no. 1 (2), p. 30.
- Gierat-Bieroń B., *Ministrowie kultury doby transformacji, 1989–2005 (wywiady)*, Kraków 2009.
- Gierat-Bieroń B., *Europejskie miasto kultury. Europejska stolica kultury 1985–2008*, Kraków 2009.
- Glondys D., *Europejska Stolica Kultury. Miejsce kultury w polityce Unii Europejskiej*, Kraków 2010.
- Glondys D., *Kraków Europejskie Miasto Kultury. Summa Factorum*, Kraków 2010.
- Grad J., Kaczmarek U., *Organizacja i upowszechnianie kultury w Polsce. Zmiany modelu*, Poznań 2005, p. 201–205.
- Grzeleńska U., *Ekonomiczny zarys sfery kultury, presented on a scientific seminar of the Institute of Economic Science (Polish Academy of Sciences) on 24 May 2007*; on-line: http://www.inepan.waw.pl/wydarzenia/seminaria_naukowe.html?id_seminarium=48 [access: 31.03.2014].
- Hajok D., *Podziemia Rynku Głównego*, „Gazeta Wyborcza” of 3 July 2010, <http://www.skozk.pl/prasa/podziemia-rynku-glownego-599.html> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Ilczuk D., Kulikowska M., *Festiwal w Europie. Polityka władz publicznych* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Zarządzanie kulturą*, Kraków 2009, no. 2 (2), p. 269.
- Ilczuk D., *Ekonomika kultury*, Warszawa 2012.
- Ilczuk D., *Poland: Chapter 1. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments* [in:] *Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. Compendium*, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/poland.php?aid=1> [access: 31.03.2014].
- Jaurová Z., *Kultura bez polityki, polityka bez kultury* [in:] J. Purchla, M. Vášáryová (eds.), *Modele mecenatu państwa wobec integracji europejskiej*, MCK, Kraków 2008, p. 31–41.
- Jagodzińska K., *Charakterystyka działalności kulturalnej w Polsce po transformacji ustrojowej* [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds.), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, p. 127–159.
- Jung B. (ed.), *Ekonomika kultury. Od teorii do praktyki*, Warszawa 2011.
- Klaić D., *Festivals in focus*, Budapeszt 2014.
- Klaić D., *Kultura a współczesne miasto*, „Res Publica Nowa” 2010, nr 10, <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2011-02-01-klaic-pl.html> *Res Publica Nowa* 10/2010 [access: 28.10.2012] (an authorized record of a lecture given in Maribor in October 2009).
- Klaić D., *Kultura a współczesne miasto*, „Res Publica Nowa” 31.08.2011, <http://publica.pl/teksty/kultura-a-wspolczesne-miasto> (an authorized record of a lecture given in Maribor in October 2009) [access: 28.10.2012].
- Klejbuk-Goździalska B., *Muzeum wśród diamentów*, [Krakow.pl](http://www.krakow.pl), 27 February 2013, p. 4–6.
- Kodeks Sponsoringu Kultury*, „Animator Kultury” 2011, no. 5, p. 29–31.
- Kostera M., Śliwa M., *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2010.
- Kozik R., *Sukcesy i ekscesy 25-lecia*, „Gazeta Wyborcza”, 10 January 2014 r., *Magazyn Krakowski*, p. 10.
- Król K., *Finansowanie społecznościowe jako źródło finansowania przedsięwzięć w Polsce*, Warszawa 2013.
- Kuligowski W., *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 4–15.
- Kultura w okresie przejściowym* [in:] A. Siciński (ed.), *Ministerstwo Kultury i sztuki w dokumentach 1918–1998*, Warszawa 1998, p. 327.
- Majewska U., *‘Podzielmy się kulturą’. Budżet partycypacyjny domu kultury Śródmieście*, „Miasta” (quarterly) 2013, no. 1 (2), p. 35.

- Misiąg W., Ilczuk D., *Finansowanie kultury i organizacja działalności kulturalnej w gospodarce rynkowej*, Gdańsk 2002, Zeszyt IBnGR no. 32.
- Nawrocka M., *Fashion week Poland. Beneficjent i ofiara*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 28–38.
- Orzechowski E., *Dlaczego w Polsce nie jest możliwa sensowna polityka kulturalna?*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2004 vol. 5, p. 7–15.
- Pęczak M., *Święto zdesakralizowane*, „Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, p. 24–27.
- Przybyła M., Sobczak K., *Crowdsourcing – zbiorowa mądrość e-społeczeństwa* [in:] T. Falenciowski, J. Dworak (eds.), *Funkcjonowanie współczesnych przedsiębiorstw*, Prace naukowe WSB w Gdańsku 2010, vol. 8, p. 75–84.
- Purchla J., Rottermund A., *Projekt reformy ustroju publicznych instytucji kultury w Polsce*, „Rocznik Międzynarodowego Centrum Kultury” 1999, R. 8, p. 58–67.
- Rottermund A., *Przedmowa* [in:] J. Purchla, *Dziedzictwo a transformacja*, Kraków 2005, p. 12.
- Rottermund A., *Finansowanie muzealnictwa w Polsce po 1989 roku – historia poszukiwania rozwiązań* [in:] Folga-Januszewska D., Gutowski B., (eds.), *Ekonomia muzeum*, Kraków 2011, p. 19–26.
- Rymsza A., *Eksperti o kondycji sektora pozarządowego w Polsce w latach 2004–2011* [in:] NGOs – *Projekt nadal w budowie?*, „Kwartalnik Trzeci Sektor” 2013, no. 30, p. 9.
- Sonik B., Gierat-Bieroń B., *Europejska stolica kultury 10 lat później*, Kraków 2011.
- Sternal M., *Dobrze wykształcony menedżer kultury? Wyzwania edukacyjne w zarządzaniu kulturą* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Kultura – Gospodarka – Media. Ogólnopolski Kongres*, Kraków 2002, p. 66.
- Suchan J., *Instytucje publiczne, czyli jakie?* [in:] B. Sobieszek (ed.), *Regionalny Kongres Kultury 2011. Report*, Łódź, p. 66–71.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Festiwale w kontekście odpowiedzialności biznesu za kulturę*, „Administracja publiczna. Studia krajowe i międzynarodowe” 2012, no. 2 (20), WSAP Białystok, p. 21–40.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Instytucje kultury w Polsce – specyfika ich organizacji i finansowania*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2012, no. 13, vol. 4, p. 305–328.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Zarządzanie publiczną instytucją kultury w Polsce – misja a ekonomika*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2013, no. 14, vol. 1, p. 19–39.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Kraków 2009.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Realizacja i skutki programu pilotażowego w Krakowie*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2006, vol. 7, p. 39–53.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Czy Kraków ma szansę stać się prężnym europejskim ośrodkiem teatralnym? Rozważania na temat potencjału Krakowa w kontekście gminnego projektu Strategii Rozwoju Kultury w Krakowie*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2010, vol. 11, p. 55–80.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Kultura to proces dochodzenia do wartości*, „Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2009, vol. 10, p. 345–354.
- Throsby D., *Ekonomia i kultura*, Warszawa 2010.
- Towse R., *Ekonomika kultury. Kompendium*, Warszawa 2011.
- Trzeciak H., *Ekonomika teatru*, Warszawa 2011.
- Wąsowska A., *Polityka kulturalna Polski 1989–2012* [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds.), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, p. 107–126.
- Wojciechowski J.S., *Kultura i polityki*, Kraków 2004.
- Wolak U., *Księgarnia Hetmańska przestała być potrzebna*, „Gazeta Krakowska”, 9 January 2014.

Reports and documents:

- “Pact for Culture”, „Animator Kultury” 2011, no. 6, p. 34–35, on-line: <http://obywatelekultury.pl/tresc-paktu/>
- “Pact for National Culture PiS”, 2001, see: PiS website: <http://www.pis.org.pl/article.php?id=3125> [access: 30.03.2014].

The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update of The National Strategy for Culture, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/polityka-wewnetrzna-i-zagraniczna/programy.php?searchresult=1&sstring=strategia#wb_10 [access: 30.03.2014].

The report “City DNA: Diagnosis” on the inclusion of public opinion in the cities’ preparation for the European Capital of Culture 2016, <http://publica.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/dnamiastadiagnozaraport.pdf> [access: 13.12.2014].

The Readership Support Programme, Education Programmes, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/stro-na-glowna/finanse/programy-ministra/programy-mkidn-2014.php> [access: 30.03.2014].

“The Sejm Commission for Culture’s positive opinion on the culture budget for 2014”, MKiDN information of 22.10.2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/sejmowa-komisja-kultury-pozytywnie-o-budzenie-resortu-kultury-na-2014-r-4224.php> [access: 2.04.2014].

The Update of The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2020, Warszawa 2005, www.mk.gov.pl [access: 30.03.2014].

“Union funds in culture”, Announcement of 13.12.2013, the Ministry of Culture website: Events 2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/fundusze-unijne-w-kulturze-4321.php> [access: 13.02.2014].

Legal acts:

Act of 4 May 1982 on The National Culture Council and The Fund for Culture Development, Dz.U. of 1982 No. 14 item 111.

Act of 7 April 1989 – Law of Associations, Dz.U. of 1989 No. 20 item 104.

Act of 14 December 1990 on the cancellation and liquidation of some funds, Dz.U. of 1990 No. 89 item 517.

Act of 8 March 1990 on commune local government, Dz.U. of 2001 No. 142 item 1591 with amendments.

Act of 25 October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity, Dz.U. of 2012 item 406.

Act of 21 November 1996 on museums, Dz.U. of 2012 item 987 with amendments.

Act of 5 June 1998 on district government, Dz.U. of 1998 No. 91 item 578.

Act of 5 June 1998 on voivodeship government, Dz.U. of 2001 No. 142 item 1590.

Act of 5 June 1998 on government administration in voivodeship, Dz.U. of 2001 No. 80 item 872, No. 128 item 1407 with amendments.

Act of 24 July 1998 on a basic three tier division of administration, Dz.U. of 1998 No. 96 item 603.

Act of 24 April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism, Dz.U. of 2003 No. 96 item 873 with amendments.

Act of 29 January 2004 Procurement law, Dz.U. of 2007 No. 223 item 1655 with amendments.

Act of 19 December 2008 on public-private partnership, Dz.U. of 2009 No. 19 item 100, Dz.U. of 2010 No. 106 item 675 with amendments.

Act of 31 August 2011 on amending the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity and certain other acts, Dz.U. of 2011 No. 207 item 1230.

Act of 14 March 2014 on amending the act – Procurement law and certain other acts, Dz.U. of 2014 item 423.

Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997, Dz.U. of 1997 No.78 item 483 with amendments.