

The Macrotheme Review

A multidisciplinary journal of global macro trends

Cultural Policy, Theatre Related Legislation and “Quality of Life”

Markéta Klusoňová, Martina Urbanová

Department of Legal Theory, Law faculty, Masaryk University, Czech Republic

Abstract

This paper examines how an argument of “quality of life” is reflected in cultural policy concerning theatres and consequently in theatre legislation. It is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the growing importance of cultural and creative industries to the world economy. Therefore, in recent years, there has been an increasing interest in cultural policy and its social, economic and legal effects. Based on studies of Florida (2002), the aim is to identify intersections between “quality of life”, positive theatre legislation and current macro-trends in cultural policies. Even the EU stresses the importance of state cultural function (Sassatelli, 2002) and proclaims its essential role in constituting coherent European community. Furthermore, creative and cultural industries gain crucial importance in global economy as a highly perspective field (with long-term social impact). It is argued (Nekolný, 2006) that nowadays social role of culture including strengthening social coherence is emphasized. Comparative analysis of theatre policies and legislation of several European countries is used as primary research method and also national, European and international legislation is analysed. This paper shows that nowadays, the argument concerning the “quality of life” is present and it influences the theatre policies and theatre legislation - the same applies in general to European cultural policy - in order to achieve harmony of “unity in diversity”.

Keywords: Culture, art, theatre, law, cultural policy, theatre legislation, creativity, Creative Europe

1. Introduction

One of the basic questions in every person's life is where he is going to live. In which country, which city, which neighborhood or on which street. He is trying to find out where he could the highest quality of his life. Politicians are trying to convince every potential or current resident that their specific location is the best choice of all. What do the art or the state has to do with this, or even the law?

It is believed that the improvement of quality of life shall be the goal of politics so that people could satisfy their needs. Yet, an obligatory part of those needs is the creative and emotional expression of an individual or the entire community (Constanza et al., 2007: 270). The state can and should create conditions to satisfy this need by the means of its policies (Constanza et al., 2007: 275).

Cultural needs are reflected in how an individual spends his time. It is the task of the state while performing its cultural function to make it possible for those needs to be satisfied. The state

fulfills this function by defining and implementing its cultural policy which includes legal regulatory instruments for regulating the cultural life of society. This regulation must be based on a certain attitude of the state towards the role of art and culture in society. Such attitudes differed remarkably in different historical periods, different geographic areas; they also depended on the political development. Nowadays, most states have their own cultural policy by the means of which, either explicitly or implicitly, recognize the influence of art on society.

One of the authors of this article has chosen the city in which she lives because she is passionately fond of one local theater. Although it may sound crazy, according to the contexts of the opinions of the contemporary academics (e.g. Florida, Peck) and cultural policy makers, her decision is quite reasonable. The aim of this article is to explain the contemporary trends in the approach of the state to art as an object of its cultural policy.

This article is designed as a case study of the attitude of the Czech Republic to the regulation of theatre, while it investigates the reflection of cultural policy concerning theatres and theatre related legislation on “quality of life.” Comparative analysis of theatre policies and legislation of several European countries is used as primary research method. Aside from that, the national, European and international legislation and policy were also analysed. This paper shows that nowadays, the argument concerning the “quality of life” is present and it influences the theatre policies and theatre legislation; the same applies in general to European cultural policy. The end is to achieve harmony of “unity in diversity“.

2. Background

This article is based on several assumptions which should be explained right at the beginning. It logically relates to the definitions of terms which will have a uniform meaning throughout the text, unless stated otherwise.

The first assumption is that a case study aimed on the analysis of one of the Union member states, may, with necessary degree of abstraction, provide sufficient knowledge for generalization of the leading conclusions about the existence of a general rule that applies to all the Union member states and, consequently, for the states which are interconnected by the Western culture. This implies that if we apply the generality of this rule to all countries globally, this statement should be understood in the context of Western European cultural tradition.

The second assumption is the existence of the cultural function of the state. It is beyond the scope of this paper to deal with profound theoretical and legal basis of the existence of the state’s cultural function and its empirical validation. Therefore, this assumption will be treated as a legal presumption which is considered valid until it is disproved. The cultural function of the state in this meaning will be perceived by us as a right and an obligation of the state to take care of both its tangible and intangible cultural heritage (Filip, J., et al., 2006). This perception is consistent with the stance taken by the European Union which has been expressed in its own legislation and international treaties where the European Union is one of the signatories (for example, the UNESCO Convention of 2005).

In the context of this perception of cultural function of the state, we will interpret the concept of culture in the strict sense as art in its institutional meaning (Belfiore and Bennett, 2008). This means that we will consider as art only such art which is considered to be art by the competent, specialized institutions. There are many definitions of culture and art. The reason why we prefer this meaning is not our personal preference, but the approach of the European Union to this issue which is set up in such a way (Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2014 to 2020)).

Another term which should be defined is the quality of life, since one of the aims of this article is to interconnect the trends of cultural policy with this magnitude. For the purposes of this article, we will interpret it in an integrative way as the combination of „measures of human needs with subjective well-being or happiness“ and „as a multi-scale, multi-dimensional concept that contains interacting objective and subjective elements“ (Constanza et al., 2006:1).

3. The Creative Europe

It is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore the growing importance of cultural and creative industries to the world economy. Therefore, in recent years, there has been an increasing interest in cultural policy and its social, economic and legal effects. Even the EU stresses the importance of state cultural function (Sassatelli, 2002) and proclaims its essential role in constituting coherent European community. Furthermore, creative and cultural industries gain crucial importance in global economy as a highly perspective field (with long-term social impact).

It is argued (Nekolný, 2006) that nowadays social role of culture including strengthening social coherence is emphasized. The question is whether this attitude was adopted also by the European Union which has, considering its authority over the member states and its importance in the international scene, the power to influence the general trends in politics and law.

On December 11, 2013, the European Union adapted Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council, which established the Creative Europe Programme for the member states. It is a tool for supporting art and culture in the EU. In the following chapter, we will analyze this regulation trying to identify the main trends and position of the European Union concerning its cultural functions.

The Creative Europe Programme was strongly criticized (Bruell, 2013). The reasons are as follows. The aim of the Programme is to solve the market fragmentation and digital shift and globalization concerning art. In the Programme, there are used words like “competitiveness”, “service” and “added value”, which are connected with rather economic approach to culture than understanding of culture in its full width including its non-commercial value. The Creative Europe Programme is grounded on regulation embodied into the Lisbon Treaty, in Article 167 which introduced the so-called “cultural compatibility clause” (Paragraph 4 of Article 167, ABl C 83). It sets forth that the Union shall take cultural aspects into account in its action concerning other Union’s policies. In the area of creative industries, EU is connected with the member states via a so-called open method of coordination (OMC). It means that the particular member states send to EU wide expert groups on this issue their representatives who represent their interest in these groups. Moreover, there is cooperation within the platforms that work on political recommendations, with the involvement of European associations and networks, e.g. the platform for the cultural and creative industries, the European Culture Forum.

Prior to this Programme, the cultural policy of the EU did not practically use such objectives as growth, employment of competitiveness. On the contrary, attention was paid to ‘cross-border mobility’, ‘transnational circulation’, and ‘intercultural dialogue’, and in areas of action ‘cultural projects’, ‘cultural institutions on the European level’, and ‘analysis and dissemination actions’. Nowadays, the abovementioned objectives are no longer emphasized; identically to the aspect of European citizenry. Bruell points out that the Programme lacks discussion of social components which was replaced by a vague concept of ‘real needs’ (Bruell, 2013:14).

One of the main differences between the new Programme and the original one is different vocabulary. The original cultural sector is now called the “cultural and creative sector”. This approach leaves the projects that are not profit-oriented or that do not promote competitiveness to member states, and the EU focuses on economic benefits of culture, increasing audience as

consumers of art and supporting artists only in the role of producers of certain services or goods. Bruell concludes that in the new Programme, the subjective aspects of culture were eliminated and culture became an object of measuring economic growth (Bruell, 2013: 23). He argues that there is nothing bad about supporting economy, but if it is the only approach which cultural policy follows, one should not agree with that. Such an approach lacks inner value of art and the synergic effects of art, and therefore, it basically destroys the freedom of art which is a necessary condition for its real existence (Bruell, 2013: 47).

The common denominator of the changes is the concept of “creativity”. This concept was given a lot of attention by academics over the last years, and thus, we will focus more on it, because as for the EU and the Creative Europe Programme it seems that this concept was not fully understood.

4. Creativity

Creativity is the magnitude which is often connected with culture and art. Despite that, according to Florida’s approach (2004), creativity does not necessarily have to be connected with art. It is, however, a condition of economic growth and a feature of creative capita which is grounded on the work of so-called creative class. In this class, there are all the creative people open to innovative and untraditional solutions of problems. What they have in common is tolerance, positive approach to technologies and talent; therefore, this class covers many more people than just artists. As for the artists, they may also be found in the Florida’s theory, but we need to have a look at the so-called bohemian index. It is one of the indices for measuring the power of creative class and, therefore, it indirectly helps measure the influence of art on economic growth.

If the Creative Europe Programme considers the influence of art on society as a mere economic contribution of creative industry, we may argue that although it is based on the theory of creative class, it changes it upside down. Florida understands creativity as a general quality which is not given only to artists, but the artists have ideal qualification for it. The EU understands “creative industry” as “art industry”; it considers them to be the same. This approach, however, looks as creativity in much stricter sense. Florida understands creativity as an inner value which precious by itself. It is its secondary function to support economic growth. Therefore, supporting creativity deserves support generally, not just in connection with the expected economic benefits. Such an approach is in contrary with the logic of creativity, which is unpredictable, risky and innovative. If we apply this to cultural policy, the state has to support art so that art could support creativity via the bohemian index, and consequently creativity creates conditions for the economic growth. Therefore, leaving out these stages and focusing merely on economic contribution of art is incorrect. It is most obvious in the sectors with low economic productivity.

Thus, in the following chapter, we will analyze the bonds between cultural policy, quality of life and creativity using an example of theatre which, as performative art and part of intangible cultural heritage, is a part of creative industries and an object of cultural policies although it is irrespective from the point of view of direct economic contribution.

5. Regulation of theatres in the Czech Republic

The contemporary regulation of culture in the Czech Republic is based on the National cultural policy which was repeatedly included in the programs of most of the governments since the Velvet revolution. The most recent one applies to the period 2009 – 2014. It was approved by the government’s resolution No 1452 of November 19, 2008. The Czech cultural policy includes an explicit announcement that culture shall not be understood as “a superstructure, i.e. something that uses the sources created in other more productive sectors.” (Ministerstvo kultury, 2009:

10). It is rather explained here that with respect to all economic indicators, the economy of culture is very strong in Europe and, thus, its contribution, such as social cohesiveness, should be taken into consideration. This is one of the reasons why cultural policy is so important from the point of view of the state. Naturally, material support for maintaining cultural values is one of the goals of cultural policy. With regard to the achieved reform of public administration, a non-governmental support of culture should be added; it includes the financial support in the amount of 1 per cent from the state budget, funds from the European Union and tax or budget policy. As for theatres, cultural policy in the Czech Republic is affected by absence of a theatre act, most of theatres are operated by municipalities and regions; only small part of them is operated by ministries (Nekolný, 2006). The Act on some types of supporting culture is the Czech answer to the European requirements expressed in the White Paper on services of general interest, because the activities of theatres are of public interest and, as a public cultural service, they are directly connected with quality of life (Nekolný, 2006: 79-82). It outlined the status of a public cultural service (Nekolný and Žáková, 2011: 26-27), but it does not include the originally proposed budget quota (it is similar to the Ministry of Defense or Ministry of Agriculture). Both regions and the state have to form the cultural policy but not the content of it. As opposed to the proposal, the principle of possible contractual cooperation between public budgets and the definition of the criteria of support are not included in the Act. Transformation of the theatre-related state-funded organizations was left out of the Act and it is not considered as priority anymore.

In 2010, the Czech Republic ratified the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, by which the Czech Republic is bound to protect and support cultural activities, goods and services which have both economic and cultural nature, because under the convention, they preserve identity, values and meanings. This means that by ratifying the Convention, the Czech legislators accepted the fact that cultural expressions should not be treated as a mere commercial value.

Aside from the abovementioned Act on some types of supporting culture, we should mention some of the particular laws affecting theatres and the area of culture in general. Firstly, we should focus on the laws on regional self-governing units and on regional development. The Act on Municipalities prescribes that municipalities shall ensure the cultural development of a municipality; they also have right to maintain cultural facilities. This also means that municipalities have an obligation to make decisions about granting subsidies to cultural institutions. A decision about the particular form of this financing, the relevant criteria of selection and the total amount of funds is, however, made by the self-governing units themselves. This applies accordingly to the City of Prague and the regions. Laws concerning labor law issues, social security issues, intellectual property have very close connection with theatres. The legal forms of theatre organizations comply with the new Civil Code. The possibility to finance culture may be deduced from the Act on budgetary rules of territorial budgets and the Act on regional development although they do not mention culture openly. Aside from that, we should take into consideration also the Building Act, which concerns decision making about buildings and changes in a territory in connection with culture (Vojík, 2008). For more details see Patočková et al. (2012)

Summarizing the contemporary situation of regulation of theatres in the Czech Republic, we may say that although there was determined a status of public cultural service, the practical benefits of this regulation are minimal, because of the act on the status of public benefits, which is related to the new Civil Code, has not been adapted, yet. Further, non-complexity of the particular norms regarding theatre, which is even supported by uncertainty of interpretation of NCC, remains to be a problem. It should not be omitted that the freedom of the regional self-governing units

regarding organization of theatre, financing and regulation might be misused (or not understood properly by the public). This may be considered a large weakness of the contemporary Czech solution to this matter.

Therefore, applying this to the abovementioned Creative Europe Programme, we learn that with respect to theatre, the Czech Republic is grounded on the cultural policy of the EU, but it rather avoids special regulation. With respect to the lack of legislation, the relationship between the state and theatre is open to such changes that took place prior to the Creative Europe Programme. Economization of culture is, therefore, an issue of interpretation of cultural policy in cases when there is a lack of theatre-related legislation which would recognize theatre as a public service supported by the state in order to increase the quality of citizens' lives and to support social coherence. In the Czech Republic, economization of theatre is not obvious at the first sight, but considering its openness to the European influence, we may deduce that in practice the economization is present. Comparing this approach to other countries, we may find out whether it is common and it could be understood as a macro trend.

6. Comparing the czech theatre-related regulation with the selected eu member states

The first state we selected for the comparison is the Netherlands, because it is the Dutch regulation of theatres that was announced to be the inspiration of the Czech legislation concerning theatres. According to the Dutch legislation, responsibility over theatres is divided between the state and local administration evenly; financing is ensured via earnings from television and radio broadcasting licenses. The principle of so-called "long arm" applies, i.e. decisions regarding theatres are not made by politicians but rather by specialized professional bodies. However, in order to be entitled to receive public funds, a theatre has to achieve self-sufficiency of at least 15 per cent (Nekolný, 2006:91). Laws neither establish, nor exclude economization of theatres. In this case, it depends on interpretation of conditions according to which the distribution of funds for culture is managed.

Secondly, we will focus on France, because it is a country with the longest tradition of theatre-related legislation reaching all the way back to the French revolution. In the French legislation, the principles of decentralization and deconcentration are applied thoroughly. The state directly supports only seven theatres. Aside from that, the theatres in France are financed from grants and they are indirectly supported by certain tax advantages. As opposed to other states, in France they emphasize the social function that theatre has within the cultural policy (Nekolný, 2006: 90). In this case, we may assume that economization of culture is not present. Nevertheless, the question is whether the Creative Europe Programme won't change it.

Next, we will compare Austria, as it is a nation with which our legislation has same roots in the nineteenth century. Austria spends more than 1 per cent of public money on culture; it has a special Act on Theatres and an Act on Actors. The state keeps its significant influence on both financing and operation of theatres. Here, we could trace the same paternalistic model that is similar to the Czech (Nekolný, 2006: 98). It is likely that due to the relatively clear laws and the strong role of the state in financing theatres, economization of theatres won't be too strong, notwithstanding the Creative Europe Programme.

Further, we compared the legislation of the Great Britain. The British model is often used as an argument of those who promote reduction of the funds flowing into theatres from the state. This model strictly divides two types of theatres: commercial and non-profit. There is a requirement that the non-profit theatres have to attain at least 50 per cent self-sufficiency. The principle of "long arm" applies; the decision making body is the Arts Council (Nekolný, 2006, 103-104). As for commercial theatres, economization of culture is obvious.

In Slovakian legislation, there is no definition of culture. They do not have any act on protection of culture, let alone an act on theatres. There is similar situation in Poland, but they have an act on organization and managing of cultural activities (Nekolný and Žáková, 2011: 17).

The analysis of regulation of theatre in the Czech Republic and the comparative analysis of theatre-related regulation in other legislations show that economization is an omnipresent argument concerning the relationship between the state and theatre; however, it is not the only argument. This regulation was based on the existing direction of the European cultural policy which preferred social contribution of art in general to the economic aspect of cultural and creative industries. With respect to the today's discussions about the Creative Europe Programme, we can expect that economization of culture will afflict theatre and the theatre-related legislation, too.

7. Economization of culture as a macro trend

Looking for the reasons of economization of culture and theatre, we have to start with capitalism, as a system from which the economization wells up. The contemporary economics tends to consider capitalism and free market as a natural order of things (Samuelson, 2008). Economics considers regulation and planning as a diversion from normal state created by free market. This leads to popularization of economics and to tendency to express definite statements. Economization of any area of society, including culture, is always connected with the monetary issues.

Every year there are less and less funds for culture. If there are austerity measures, the resort of culture is always considered first, often without any professional discussion. This is detrimental to creative culture, such as theatre, music, movie, fine arts, but also to the protection of cultural heritage which often attracts tourism, which brings money for public budgets and creates jobs. The whole cultural sector offers employment opportunities although the professionals, who are often university graduates, earn less than what is standard. Culture is inextricably intertwined with education, ethics and one's relation to his country and its nations. Therefore, it is necessary to support culture in a transparent way.

“Demand” for culture depends on the consumer's preferences and his financial situation. The meaning of consumers' preferences in culture is as important as it is in other areas. However, the biggest difference is in the possibility to have free culture which strongly influences the preferences of consumers. As for demand, we may differentiate between demand over the short run and over the long run. The difference between the two is in consumer's flexibility resulting from raise in price of a certain good.

However, motivation of a consumer often plays the crucial role. It may be promoted not only by marketing strategies, including commercials, but also by education and all socialization factors which influence the value scales. The higher a certain value ranks, the more want to have it.

Let's return to economization. It is defined by the fact that economics is at the top of our society's values. This can be clearly seen if we compare economics with other non-exact scientific disciplines. Economics, whether in the form of all kinds of prognoses or explanations of the functioning of the world, it gives every man – regardless of their profession – the opportunity to understand, either by means of newspapers, radio, television or internet, what is going on around us. It also enables us to take a stand and have an opinion. However, this luxury that we let ourselves to have, has also its dark side: there is total economization of human life and all its spheres (Mohnert, 2012). Everything is measured against the category of profit and the theories that free hand of market solves everything, and that everything that is successful will make enough money to cover its costs. Free market is considered to be the natural order of things.

Regulation or planning, on the other hand, is understood as diversions from the normal state, i.e. from free market. This simplification prevents us from learning the real causes of things, because it is oriented rather at the consequences, not the causes. Therefore, economization trivializes and plays down the world, which is surrounding us and whose diversity keeps surprising us. The economic mainstream avoids the criticism of capitalist economy by arguing that the existing problems may be solved by applying certain measures. However, they reject to admit that capitalism, as any other system, may have certain imperfections.

In the contemporary society, the core parameter is 'profit for any price'. These trends are accompanied by massive ideological offensive whose key terms are a 'firm' and 'competitiveness' (Keller, 2011: 57). Everything is considered from the view of a well-functioning company. The concept of a company is extended from the economic entities to the entire state and public sphere. Thus, we may talk about family as a firm, school as a firm, hospital as a firm, prison as a firm and of course about theatre as a firm, etc. Keller argues that: "Those who were not able to succeed in competitiveness and did not prove their ability in the light of the market requirements should be offered help by exposing them to the harsh market competition. They are asked to mobilize all their energy, following the example of successful firms, and succeeded in the light of the requirements of that market on which they had failed..." (Keller, 2011: 58). Economization is still developing.

We will outline now how the excessive economization in society occurred. Social changes are a condition of the qualitative and quantitative changes that took place and led to the boom of economics. These changes could be characterized as transformation of the elements of culture and social institutions in time (Grana et al., 2002: 157). Social changes are results of many factors.

Anthony Giddens (1999) characterized the two most influential general approaches explaining social change. The first one is social evolutionism, which is often presented as social Darwinism, and which interconnects the biological and social changes. The second one is historical materialism, which was originally defined by Marx and later elaborated by many other authors; it connects social change with material environment, especially with the development of production forces and production relationships. Giddens summed up the multifactor view at the process of social changes into three main categories of impulses leading to social changes. According to him, these factors are physical environment, political organization and cultural factors. Physical environment covers not only the environmental conditions of life in the broad sense, but also the material conditions of production systems. Political organization means the concentration of political and military power. Giddens outlines the cultural factors in a relatively narrow way (1999: 490). He included there: religion, ways of communication and the role of the leading persons.

The multifactorial theories do not consider a social change to be just a mere question of an industrial area, but it materializes in all areas of human life, i.e. also the spiritual area and understanding of values.

The changes in a social life are noticeable if we recall the division of society into traditional, modern and postmodern; aside from that we mention their mutual relationship and economization.

In the traditional societies, including the most developed ones, trade was only used for bartering of a relatively small part of products. There were certain products which were consumed directly in the households of the producers. These products, together with labor force and land, as the dominant means of production of these agrarian societies, stood away from the market. The particular markets were isolated. The fundamental principles of human action were based on

reciprocity, redistribution and autarchy (self-sufficiency). The economy of a society was subjected to the efforts to produce for one's own group, not just for bartering. The economy was often a product of other institutions – family, religious, cultural, etc. Economization, as it is known today, did not exist. Art of that time was mainly “consumed” during social rituals, such as feasts, services, concerts or visiting galleries. It was also influenced by the social status of an individual, especially in the relationship nobility vs. serfs.

The transition from the traditional society to modern society was marked by new technical inventions, new knowledge, and new forms of economic and political power, which strengthened social mobility and separated certain groups and established new life patterns. The industrial revolution caused a massive social turn. Among the fundamental concepts explaining the origination of modern society there is definitely the volume by Karl Polányi called *The Great Transformation* (1962), which was published in 1944. According to Polányi, the real border between the traditional and modern society is relatively sharp and it is defined by a radical change in the market.

In Polányi's opinion, the “great transformation” destroyed the traditional circumstances. The core of the transition is found in the first half of the nineteenth century. The invention of “large machines”, which brought with them a change in the motives of behavior of the society's members, had had a great impact on the change. The original motive which was to ensure one's living was replaced by the motive of profits. In the industrial system, man was overrun by economic motives. Polányi argued that the machine production brought transformation of natural and human substance into goods; it breaks human relationships and poses threat to the natural human place of man. The industrial revolution caused a massive social turn. Economization of social life, thus, became more obvious.

The transition of art of the traditional society to art of modern (and today's) society is also outlined in the essay by Walter Benjamin (2007) called *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Revolution*, which was published in 1936. In this volume, the author tried to identify what happens with a piece of art if it becomes an object of mechanical reproduction. Benjamin argued that, in particular, the relationship between the reproduced piece of art and the creation of it “here” and “now”. To a large extent, reproduction is independent on an original and, thus, it may enter into such situations in which the original could never appear; for instance, a recording of a concert may be used as a background for other activities than listening to music. Therefore, the magic or “aura”, which was originally created by a ritual essence of experiencing the piece of art and which significantly helped to understand the piece of art, disappear. This transition is connected also with the emergence of mass culture where there is so-called consumption of culture, as this term is included in the term consumer society. Consumer society and mass culture are often understood as synonyms; the differences between the two go beyond the extent of this paper.

8. Conclusion

The contemporary economization of culture, aimed at support of creative industry is grounded on understanding of culture as a cultural industry. It is a term which was used by Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno in their book *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, which was published in 1947. The term describes the character of modern cultural production by means of large industrial organizations which produce only the goods which may be used commercially and which are regulated by the state. As a result of this, modern culture conforms to the political and economic interests. Horkheimer's and Adorno's goal was to show the danger that is hidden in the approach to rationality of Enlightenment (Horkheimer, Adorno, 2009). On the one side, this means

liberation of thinking from the chains of tradition, myths and institutionalized religion. Aside from that, it is also to lead us to the efforts to be effective without any bounds to any particular values. With help of the modern technologies, it is able to manipulate and control masses in service of totalitarian ideologies or profit. The cultural industry is one of the manifestations of this trend: it is highly rational, but it does not contribute to more freedom. Adorno creates methods which help us to recognize (analyze) a product of the cultural industry (Walton, 2008: 62).

With respect to the arrival of modernity, Daniel Bell (1973) offers explanation of the scheme of modernity (in his terminology he anticipated the arrival of postindustrial society) in the form of “economizing” and “sociologizing” mode. The “economizing” mode is oriented on the functional effectivity and management of things controlled by the principles of maximization and optimization; even people are treated as things in this concept. On the other hand, the “sociologizing” mode introduces broader social criteria, which means, however, that there is a decrease of effectivity, limitation of production and further expenses arising from the establishment of non-economic values. One of the most important tasks of the post-industrial society is to find a balanced state between the “sociologizing” and “economizing” modes (Bell, 1973).

This applies accordingly to the position of the state concerning regulation of culture, including theatres.

Although it is not possible to deduce the influence of economization on culture from the analysis of regulation of theatres, it can be expected due to the rhetoric of the Creative Europe Programme. Even there where it is not present in the position of the state towards culture, it is very likely that it will be soon manifested in the state cultural policy, which, due to its determining effects on financing of culture, has more influence on the nature of the relationship of the state and culture than a mere positive regulation. The question about the influence of culture on the quality of life was an important argument in the cultural policies, but now it rather yields to economization. Therefore, it is evident that the harmony between the sociologizing and economizing modes is rather diverted in favor of the economic point of view, which results in origination of a new macro trend.

References

- Adorno, T., Horkheimer, M., 2009. *Dialektika osvícenství*. Oikoymenh, Praha.
- Bell, D., 1973. *The coming of post-industrial society: a venture in social forecasting*. Basic Books, New York.
- Belfiore, E., Bennett, O., 2008. *The social impact of the arts: An intellectual history*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Benjamin, W., Arendt, H., 2007. *Illuminations*. Schocken Books, New York.
- Bruell, C., 2013. *Creative Europe 2014–2020 A new programme – a new cultural policy as well?* Second ed. Institute for Foreign Cultural Relations, Stuttgart.
- Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Ali, S., Beer, C., Bond, L., Boumans, R., Snapp, R., 2007. Quality of life: An approach integrating opportunities, human needs, and subjective well-being. *Ecological economics*. 61(2), 267-276.
- Filip, J., Svatoň, J., Zimek, J., 2006. *Základy státovědy*, fourth ed. Masarykova univerzita, Brno.
- Florida, R., 2004. *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. Basic Books, New York.
- Giddens, A., 1999. *Sociologie*. Argo, Praha.
- Grana, Sh. J., Ollenburger, J., C., Nicholas, M., 2002. *The Social Context of Law*. Prentice Hal, New Jersey.
- Keller, J., 2011. *Nová sociální rizika a proč se jim nevyhneme*. Sociologické nakladatelství, Praha.

- Ministerstvo kultury České republiky, 2009. Státní kulturní politika České republiky 2009-2014: National cultural policy Czech Republic 2009-2014. Ministerstvo kultury, Praha.
- Mohnert, J., 2012. Problém ekonomizace pohledu na společnost. Problém současné Evropy [online] available at: <http://mohnert.blog.idnes.cz/c/244587/Problem-ekonomizace-pohledu-na-spolecnost-problem-soucasne-Evropy.html> [4 June 2014].
- Nekolný, B., 2006. Divadelní systémy a kulturní politika. Divadelní ústav, Praha.
- Nekolný, B., Žáková, E., 2011. Studie současného stavu podpory umění. Institut umění - Divadelní ústav, Praha.
- Patočková, V., Čermák, D., Vojtíšková, K., Bernard, J., 2012. Kultura v krajích České republiky. Sociologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky, Praha.
- Polányi, K., 1962. The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Beacon Paperback, Boston.
- Sassatelli, M., 2002. Imagined Europe The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity Through EU Cultural Policy. European journal of social theory. 5(4), 435-451.
- Vojík, V., 2008. Podnikání v kultuře a umění: Arts management. ASPI, Praha.
- Walton, D., 2008. Introducing Cultural Studies. SAGE Publications, London, Singapur, New Delhi.