

UDC [82:7.079]:[338:7]

Ганс Ебельзгаузен, доцент, Інститут інформатики і культурних комунікацій, Університет Копенгаген, Данія

ВЕЛИКИЙ СЕНС ПРИЧЕТНОСТИ — ЛИТЕРАТУРНИ ФЕСТИВАЛИ I КУЛЬТУРНЕ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВО

Інноваційні культурні проекти є надто ціннісними для тих, хто організовує і бере участь у них. Утім, для політика, відповідального за сферу культури, такі проекти мають значення тільки в тому разі, коли забезпечують економічне чи соціальне середовище. Перетворення культури і мистецтва на економічний інструмент не є новою ідеєю в політиці культури. Підприємець, менеджер з мистецтва і адміністратор закладів культури стають ключовими фігурами, коли сектор культури професіоналізує, перетворює на економічну систему.

Ключові слова: літературні фестивалі, підприємництво, майстерний практик, цінність.

Ганс Эбельсгаузен, доцент, Институт информатики и культурных коммуникаций, Университет Копенгаген, Дания

БОЛЬШИЙ СМЫСЛ ПРИЧАСТНОСТИ — ЛИТЕРАТУРНЫЕ ФЕСТИВАЛИ И КУЛЬТУРНОЕ ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВО

Инновационные культурные проекты представляют ценность для тех, кто организует и участвует в них. Тем не менее, для политика, ответственного за область культуры, такие проекты имеют значение только в том случае, когда обеспечивают экономическую или социальную среду. Превращение культуры и искусства в экономический инструмент не является новой идеей в политике культуры. Предприниматель, менеджер по искусству и администратор учреждений культуры становятся ключевыми фигурами, когда сектор культуры профессионализируют и превращают в экономическую систему.

Ключевые слова: литературные фестивали, предпринимательство, искусный практик, ценность.

Hans Elbeshausen, Associate Professor, Institute of Information Science and Cultural Communication, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

THE GREATER SENSE OF INVOLVEMENT — LITERARY FESTIVALS AND CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Innovative projects of a cultural nature provide value for those who organize and participate in them. However, for the politician in charge of the culture file, such projects gain value only when they deliver economic or social impact. Turning culture and art into an economic instrument is not a new idea in the politics of culture. The entrepreneur, the arts manager, and the administrator of cultural institutions become key figures when the cultural sector is professionalized and made into an economic engine.

Key words: *Literary festivals, entrepreneuring, skillful practitioner, valuation.*

The entrepreneur and the use of culture as an instrument.

In this paper, entrepreneurship in general and cultural entrepreneurship in particular play a central role. I use entrepreneurship as a theoretical framework for examining two projects in which literature, books, and reading are the subject. That said, I expect readers will anticipate a look at the projects' contribution to the generation of economic value; that is a matter for the economists.

My presupposition or a priori prejudices are likely based on the fact that *entrepreneurship* as a concept combines business, innovation, and economic progress in a fixation on economic value: Human interaction and action appear worthwhile only when their economic value has become clear. "Everything appears to revolve around the so-called values of profit, wealth, income, economic growth or, more simply, money" (Klamer 2003). In the United States, entrepreneurship and small business research are topics associated with David Birch and his "gazelle theory" for high-growth small firms (Aronsson 2004). In the German language, entrepreneurship is equated to "foundation research" or "foundation management" (Achleitner et al. 2005). The Dutch Secretary of Culture views cultural entrepreneurship as a skill combining knowledge about and understanding of art and creativity with the ability to foster business acumen on the part of artists (Klamer 2011).

The economic measuring stick applied to culture and to cultural policy can be illustrated by three examples.

Shorthose (2004) describes the development of cultural policy during the Thatcher and Blair tenures as a "shift towards a commercial agenda ... accompanied by policy changes in public organisations ... from policies that emphasise the support of the arts as a public good to those concerned with 'value for money'". In Germany, discussion has intensified during the last decade as to how to strike the appropriate balance between government, markets, and civil society. The anti-government faction is less dominant in Germany's cultural policy ranks than it is in those of the UK.

Subsequent to the publication of the "Culture in Germany" report by a parliamentary commission (Bundestag 2008), the concept of governance became prominent as a tool in cultural policies. The ensuing debate focused on finding an answer to the question 'how do we define a cultural policy that generates activity?'. Knoblich (2008) argues for reducing the influence of the marketplace and placing a greater emphasis on social and cultural democracy in cultural policy. On the other hand, public policy for culture is criticized for being insufficiently flexible and for lacking in social sensitivity (Mandel 2007, Mandel 2013, Föhl 2012). It favors

existing established groups; it is non-inclusive; and it is incapable of detecting new trends and age group related shifts in cultural requirements. An alternative cultural policy is suggested – not one characterized by a greater degree of democracy but rather one characterized by professionalization. The fact that “the management of the fine arts takes place within a broader context of cultural policy and administration” (Dewey 2004) leads to greater complexity in cultural policy and to an expanded file of projects for the ‘culture manager’. If the current cultural policy is regarded as rigid, paternalistic, and elitist ... then art and culture are expected to be emancipated once the professional managers take the reins.

In Denmark, a similar trend and the related critical discussion can be seen. Since the 1980s, the culture-as-economic-instrument notion has been promoted with the slogan “culture pays”. One prominent goal of cultural policy has been and still is to deliver a contribution to economic growth in the creative occupations and in cultural life through coordinated political initiatives. Such political initiatives (in 2007 and in 2013) were intended to strengthen the cultural economy and the experience economy of Denmark by removing structural barriers. It is noteworthy that the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Business and Growth are sharing the file. The intent is to enhance the exploitation of Denmark’s business and professional potential and the residents’ creative competencies. Innovative and entrepreneurial skills, especially in small enterprises, are to be developed through research and learning; barriers to growth are to be removed; and the creative occupations are to be nurtured for growth (Erhvervs- og Vækstministeriet 2012/13). Danish cultural economist Bille Hansen has pointed to certain erroneous conclusions behind the “culture pays” slogan. Her main objection is that no attention is being paid to whether growth in the cultural sector produces overall societal improvement (Bille 2012).

The instrumentalization of culture and art is not a new concept within cultural policy (Skot-Hansen & Elbeshausen 2007). The article “Convergence in British Cultural Policy” illustrates how deeply politicians desire to use art and culture for extrinsic purposes. Stevenson et al. (2010) however reach the conclusion that the complexity of the cultural sector is the best protection against politicians’ and managers’ strategic calculations. Culture remains unmanageable. The “fixation on economic values, practical as it may be, does not make a great deal of sense” (Klamer 2003). With all this in mind, I attempt to liberate the entrepreneur – especially the social and cultural entrepreneur – from the role and task of orchestrating economic logic in cultural projects. Using two specific events, I illustrate “how entrepreneurs contribute to reconfiguring the practices of their society” (Spinosa, Flores & Dreyfus 1997).

Project based studies as investigational method

The analytical strategy used in the work described below is the project based study. The concept of the project based study provides greater precision to what is usually thought of as case studies. Case studies produce context based and practical knowledge through a thorough analysis of individual instances of a certain group of phenomena. Case studies have been criticized for their dependence on context and for not affording the ability to generalize. Flyvbjerg (2006) refutes the criticism by referring to Kuhn. According to Kuhn, case studies have an important function as generators of insight. "A discipline without a large number of thoroughly executed case studies is a discipline without systematic production of exemplars."

The fact that project based study appears to be a more suitable designation for the present case study is a result of the fact that two projects are being analyzed. Typically, a project is defined as a standalone and time limited activity spanning several subject domains and requiring a specific organizational model. Copenhagen Reads and Berlin Language and Reading Week are wide ranging projects involving interested parties and active participants who offer knowledge, experience, and skills from such domains as literature, art, science, and music. The organizational model resembles festivals or events. The projects engage and activate participants and provide instructional value, but above all they are focused on effecting change. That is why it is natural to extend the project model by adding an extra dimension. The concept of dialogic projection into the future derives from the Russian philosopher Bakhtin. Bakhtin interprets a project to mean an assigned task and an activity that creates its own significance in a forward looking process. A project is shared being and co-production (Holquist 1990).

The purpose of the present study is to examine two innovative projects aimed at urban residents from the point of view of their driving forces, their intent, and their interrelationships between cultural and social practice. The framework for the projects is provided by the heterogeneous goals of late modern cultural policy, goals supported by pillars of cultural, social, or economic values. The analysis is based on the concept of entrepreneurship, though not as a contribution to cultural or social incubation. Rather, I am looking more closely at the concept of entrepre-
neuring (Young 2013) understood as the opportunity to establish future oriented and change agent focused practice and to create social environments through cultural creativity and instruction. Hence a supplemental purpose for the analysis is to discuss and – if possible – further define the concept of cultural and social entrepreneurship.

The openness, future orientation, and multifaceted aspects of the projects make a project based study a suitable method, especially for the purpose of examining entrepreneurial concepts such as effectuation. Sarasvathy (2008) defines effectuation as "a logic of non-predictive control to construct the so-called opportunity ...". The concept of effectuation is distinguished from the approach of neoclassical or Schumpeterian entrepreneurs who exploit specific opportunities by controlling markets and predicting future developments. Non-predictive control opens the door to contingent processes, that is to say understanding and exploiting the opportunities those processes bring.

That said, there is a difference between non-predictive control and the deliberate rejection of control characteristic of social experiments, transformative learning, or creative innovation. The entrepreneur's ability to act, his or her agentic quality, appears not only in the ability to master non-predictive control but also in the ability to co-create social environments, get involved in productive social relationships, and let the diversity of opinion flourish in the inclusiveness of dialogue. Bakhtin views diversifying energies as the driving force for open and non-hierarchical social and cultural transformations. I base my analysis of the above mentioned projects on this non-predictive and dialogic perspective.

With respect to Copenhagen Reads, data collection derived from qualitative sources such as observation, interviews, and conversations, and from interpretation of documentation. A list of such sources is provided in Elbeshausen (2009, 2011). As for the Berlin Language and Reading Week, the analysis is based on publicly available information objects including video clips, interviews, reports, statistical data, and articles in scientific publications.

Theoretical perspectives

Traditionally, entrepreneurship is considered to belong within the domain of economics. However, economists and non-economists alike have contributed to the development of the theory. By now, entrepreneurship is regarded as a cross-disciplinary field to which many scientific disciplines contribute (Bjerke 2007).

When other domains over and above economics are included in entrepreneurship related discourse, the most frequent purpose is to emphasize the economic or social potential within culture. It is a prominent argument that the entrepreneur's strategic skill and innovative competencies will liberate the potential of culture – to the benefit of society and its institutions, art itself, and the individual artist and resident. A hierarchy of values is quickly established in which external or secondary values are attributed to culture:

- culture and art as “an instrument to affect economic development” (Klamer 2002);
- culture and art as an aid in achieving “a number of social policy objectives” (Stevenson et al. 2010);
- culture and art as a self-emancipatory project alleviating — through effective cultural managers — the most extreme distortions in government cultural policy (Mandel 2013).

In effect, culture is seen as an economic, social, or cultural-policy instrument. In the present context, culture is regarded as being subject to an economic, social, or cultural-policy rationale. Instrumentalist thinking is often followed by an orientation toward outcomes — the number of new jobs in the cultural industries, greater societal cohesiveness, or an increase in the number of young people visiting museums or libraries. Such goals are worthy, of course. Social cohesion, meaningful employment, and an egalitarian policy for culture are important — but must innovative cultural and social projects be justified by secondary objectives?

Given that the two projects discussed here belong in the third sector, civil society, it is tempting to describe, from the perspective of the methodology of entrepreneurship, whether and how much the projects contributed to economic value creation. Rather than considering the secondary objectives, I focus on the skillful practitioner and characterize the entrepreneur as a skillful practitioner from the vantage point of a general, social, and cultural view of entrepreneurship. Spinosa, Flores, and Dreyfus (SFD) were the first to describe such a view in “Disclosing New Worlds” in 1997.

SFD emphasize the role of the entrepreneur as a cultural seismographer and creator of language and opinion. SFD see the entrepreneur as offering not specific economic contributions but rather general attributes such as decisiveness, proactivity, and engagement — attributes entrepreneurs have in common with virtuous citizens or cultural personalities. According to SFD, their shared activity is to disclose new worlds or to make history. As is probably clear, the book and the authors’ thinking reflect the pathos and ideological thrust of the time.

The entrepreneur as skillful practitioner possesses a heightened sensitivity. “Skillful comportment responds to solicitations in the environment. That receptivity is what makes skillful behavior as nuanced and flexible as it is. Skilled practitioners respond appropriately to small perturbations that rule-followers miss” (SFD 179). Entrepreneurship is liberated from the strategic rationality of the economy and from the world of management and is brought into the realm of real life. An entrepreneur’s attitude and ability to act are characterized by “holding on to an

anomaly, making it appear in various parts of one's life so that its truth comes out, and seeing how others respond to it" (SFD 67). The skillful practitioner is not a detached observer nor a postmodern who, at home in multiple worlds, is engaged in multiple projects and acts out different identities. Skillfulness is acquired in on-going activity, and it requires practice and captivation. Entrepreneurs are called upon to "contribute to reconfiguring the practices of their society." (SFD 68).

A common definition of social entrepreneurship is to "catalyze social transformations well beyond solutions to the initial problems" (Alvord et al. 2004) and thus to stimulate long term change in social systems. Dennis Young, one of the pioneers in social entrepreneurship, echoes the interest of SFD in entrepreneurial skills.

Young's book *If not for profit, For What?* was published in 1983 and reissued in 2013. As SFD are, Young is interested in mapping the motivation and driving force behind the actions of the entrepreneur. As it is in the view of SFD, entrepreneurship is seen by Young as a universal process present in all sectors and industries – at least in Western societies. His systematic and differentiated description of the entrepreneur's generic tasks is a necessary supplement to the focus of SFD on the ontological skill of disclosing new worlds.

As Young sees it, the entrepreneur remains within the universe of economics. His theory is developed from a point of departure in Schumpeter's concept of the entrepreneur. Schumpeter distinguishes between the capitalist and the entrepreneur; the entrepreneur's creativity and decisiveness produce innovative solutions for enterprises and organizations. In Young's three-sector theory, the non-profit sector and civil society are essential for society's institutional development and social transformation. Dissatisfaction with existing rules or structural limitations spurs the entrepreneur's energy and action.

The driving force and energy of social entrepreneurship are not explained by a desire for profit but rather by the reach for new legislation or by the struggle for a just society. Among Young's archetypes, the artist, the believer, and the searcher are most closely analogous to the energies shown in the subject projects: creativity, commitment, recognition, and a clearer sense of identity.

From the vantage point of cultural economics, one might claim as does Klamer (2003) that the concept of value is not limited to the domain of economics. Assessing and valuating are an integral part of human life. A concept of value based on economics is insufficient when entrepreneurial practice is viewed from within an individual's life context. Social and cultural values constitute the good life and a democratic society. That is not

to argue against economic values and the market but rather against the dominant role neoliberalism gave them. Klamer (2011) indicates that the cultural entrepreneur possesses characteristics we recognize from SFD and Young. "The artistic content is their passion and commitment; everything else, including the economics, is subsidiary. They are prudent and exhibit courage, hope, and faith in their actions." Klamer defines the cultural entrepreneur this way: "Cultural entrepreneurs are cultural because they are about the cultural. Being focused on the (cultural) content, being about the art itself and the creative process is a moral attribute of the cultural entrepreneur. The economics has to be an instrument for them in order to realize cultural values." (Klamer 2011, p. 154).

Literary festivals

Europe's large cities feature a multitude of reading festivals, book related events, writing workshops, and author readings. In Copenhagen, interested participants recently had the opportunity to attend at least three events: The Royal Library's International Authors on the Stage, The Copenhagen International Literary Festival, and the less academic Copenhagen Reads.

In the case of Berlin, a literature related event occurs approximately once a week year round. International events such as "Berlin International Literature Festival" are staged along with regional arrangements like "Berlin Story Days" or local activities like "Tempelhof Reads" or "Book Night in Moabit". In other words, cities brand themselves through culture, books, and reading.

The two festivals examined here were selected due to their special programs. Berlin Language and Reading Week provides for the city's various age groups, cultures, and speakers of many languages to find common ground in experiencing the richness and depth of reading. Copenhagen Reads features literature in environments not usually associated with reading. While the two festivals aim to empower participants and target all residents, they are different in terms of organizational structure, breadth of reach, and secondary objectives. The analysis focuses on the skilled practitioner and on the entrepreneurial spirit of the two festivals.

Berlin Language and Reading Week

September 2012 saw the event spread all over Berlin as a cultural mega-event focusing on language, literature, and reading. For one week, young people, adults, and seniors got together to read, tell and listen to stories in public, write poems and fairy tales, sing and act, attend interesting and entertaining instructional lectures – and party. The first Berlin Language and Reading Week was well received; the media praised it as a successful and progressive cultural event. The week was all about creat-

ing and designing spaces for language and speech, reading and writing, and culture and education to flourish. An impressive program offered about 1,000 different events in 2012. Language Week became a model for the experience of culture, for social inclusiveness, and for literary creativity. Other large cities have emulated the model.

The Berlin Language and Reading Week event was originally named the Neukölln Language and Reading Week in a 2006 local project in Neukölln. Along with Wedding and Tiergarten, Neukölln is among the Berlin districts in which the proportion of immigrants is high and in which unemployment, economic privation, and child poverty are more prevalent than in the rest of the city. A 2008 report (Kurzbericht) stresses that an educational strategy encompassing preschool through vocational school is essential. It is suggested that model schools, attractive to all resident groups, be established to counteract the existing tendency for schools to segregate students. The Neukölln Language and Reading Week was a spontaneous reaction to social and cultural poverty: Something must be done. The documents covering the 2006 (Dokumentation 2006) event reflect such goals: We must stage a week in which everything revolves around language and reading, in which Neukölln's linguistic diversity is seen as a positive feature, in which the desire to read is stimulated, and in which the hesitation to use books is reduced.

The spirit of Berlin Language Week is inclusive and multicultural and serves to break down educational barriers. Several examples illustrate that spirit; in my opinion the most creative and innovative event is Read Me ... Then Give Me Away! An army of volunteers set up Berlin's largest outdoor library in four inner city parks. Ten thousand books are hung in trees, hidden under benches or bushes, and otherwise made accessible in the parks. The books are donated by Berliner B chertisch, a non-profit bookstore. The idea is that the books are to be picked up by park visitors, read, and then passed on to friends. (RBB- Berlin 09.08.2012. Sprachwoche Berlin)

The organizers wish to make the book a public good, a gift for everyone, and a means of communication. The outdoor library is meant to simplify access to reading and to literature. No ID is required; no well-meaning librarians are encountered. The principle of "free" is paramount. Serendipitous placement arranges books in such a way that the library and the book itself lose their aura as cultural institutions. The organizers hope that reading will become an everyday activity.

Who conceived and implemented the project? His name is Kazim Erdogan. His experience with language (or the lack thereof) inspired him. He hails from a small village in Anatolia. His father could not read but en-

sured Erdogan received an education. Erdogan was the first person in his village to graduate from high school and passed the Ankara University entrance exams. Poverty, however, forced him to leave Turkey, and he arrived in Germany in 1974 without knowing a word of German. Not holding any valid passport, he was arrested and scheduled for deportation. Then, the Free University of Berlin offered him a course in German, and on that basis he was released from prison. Later, he studied psychology and sociology, graduating in 1979. Today, Kazim Erdogan works as a school psychologist.

Silence, isolation, and lack of recognition were the greatest challenges in his life. They inspired him to found "Aufbruch Neukölln" (New Beginning Neukölln), a volunteer association to assist at-risk youth, adults, and immigrant seniors in building independent, active, and socially integrated lives. Erdogan and Aufbruch Neukölln are the organizational operators of Berlin Language Week.

For Erdogan, language became a symbol of freedom, recognition, and integration into society. He parlayed that symbol into the READ event during the 2012 Berlin Language Week. Approximately 2,300 students attended. They came from schools in parts of town where the educational level is not high. The event took place at Bebelplatz, a public square that chillingly symbolizes the contradictions in German culture and history. In 1933, the square came to represent a Germany in which students burned books not deemed to be within the Nazi-defined literary heritage. In 2012, the square showcased the ways in which literature provides a creative, collective, and unifying force. The students presented their poems to each other and formed a human chain of poets.

Kazim Erdogan speaks about the event: Today, I stood on the balcony to view the poetry contest. I almost cried with joy. Just think, back in 1974 I knew not one word of German. Today, I watch students from the schools of Berlin form a chain of poets on the very square where books were burned. Such feelings are almost impossible to describe in words. (Interview with Kazim Erdogan. Radio Berlin Brandenburg 30.8.2012)

The driving force behind Erdogan's innovative project to support cultural, social, and linguistic empowerment derives from his journey out of silence, isolation, and rejection toward freedom, recognition, and integration. The individual events during last year's Berlin Language Week were all designed to ...

- support empowerment of specific social and ethnic groups
- contribute to a process of destigmatization in public discourse
- integrate cultural activities and institutions into the daily lives of residents

– create awareness and understanding of cross-cultural dialogue.

Events like the Berlin Language Week point to a necessity in cultural policy: When interpersonal and social relations are no longer based in culture, those relations must be deliberately created with care and mutual respect. Cross-cultural dialogue requires skills in language and communication and insight into cultural and social phenomena.

Copenhagen Reads

Copenhagen Reads is an annual literary festival at which residents from all over the city may enjoy consuming literature and engaging in related activities. Last held in March 2014, Copenhagen Reads has become a festival built on a specific theme selected for each year. For 2014, the theme was “the body in the books”. The organizers felt the human body had lately been a prominent feature in literary works and in discussions of culture. Hence, the human body was a topical thread for the individual activities, and education was the underlying strategy for communication.

The festival’s website presents the theme using an analytical vocabulary. The festival was about “examining why the body is such a key element and why we are so fascinated by it”. Readers are directed to literary history and to learned writings about health and beauty. Books for children and teens were similarly included in the festival. The theme was a focus for talks by Danish and international authors in environments such as museums, parks, gardens, cemeteries, hotel rooms, or swimming pools. The sensual, meditative, or kinetic approach to and experience of literature is a subject of study. “Instructional Journey” could be a metaphor for the 2014 Copenhagen Reads.

The previous year saw the introduction of the thematic approach. The 2012 theme was Copenhagen in Literature. Here, too, the metaphor of the journey was prominent. A literature bus was offered for sightseeing to view literary landmarks in Copenhagen. In addition to the actual journey on that bus, attendees were shown the city’s topography as described in literature and oriented about changes to that topography over time. The organizers were less concerned about instruction as they focused on the experience and production of literature in writing workshops.

Copenhagen Reads began in 2008 as an innovative project to disseminate culture, spearheaded by the public libraries in Copenhagen. At its start, the project was focused on dissemination. The organizers attempted to present literature and reading in non-academic environments or to introduce literature and reading in a new way so as to replace the standard institutional dissemination methods. By so doing, the organizers hoped to provoke a fresh view of the book. “When literature and reading are

removed from familiar contexts and inserted into new ones, such removal creates a contextual shift and a form of alienation. Environments devoid of poetry become stages for sophisticated cultural and ritual activities. Jørgen Leth's sports based poems, for example, were just now (2010) presented in their natural habitat, locker rooms" (Elbeshausen 2011).

Such a staged contextual shift draws attention to the next innovation, downplaying the ideal of a homogeneous literary society. Experience and experiential environments were to take the place of that ideal. "Literature is presented as hybrid experience objects: Poetry by prescription is used as a metaphor illustrating the therapeutic potential of the book Book dating becomes a unique opportunity for bibliophiles to meet. Literary flea markets poke fun at the library's functionalistic aura" (Elbeshausen 2011). Based on Schulze's five social and class environments or life styles (Schulze 1992), the organizers have focused on quality and given priority to education, stages of self realization, and degrees of social integration (Elbeshausen 2009).

The third innovation is the organizational structure: Copenhagen Reads is an 'open network' in the sense that the program is offered to everyone – contributors or attendees – with an interest in reading or books. Such diversity is reflected in the range of contributors. Schools, libraries, museums, and theatres are obvious, but sports clubs, swimming pools, churches, or bicycle shops are more exotic sites for presentation of literature, just as literary walks are a new type of event. The benefit of the open network is the flexibility and the low barrier to entry; the disadvantage is the difficulty of managing quality and cohesiveness for the festival. It is reasonable to assume that the thematic principle introduced in 2012 was inspired by the need to coordinate the individual activities and strengthen the festival's internal consistency.

The project was motivated by public libraries' experience that books, reading, and literature do not attract an audience the way they did 30 years ago. In public opinion, public libraries are viewed as effective means of procuring and distributing informational materials. Public libraries do not rank high on the list of destination spaces, however.

Copenhagen Reads is an institutional experiment launched by a progressive team. Reading, literature, and books are to be a shared experience for all residents of Copenhagen through strategic partnerships and a modified scheme for dissemination. The experience economy element is intended to boost the public library's attractiveness as an educational institution – somewhat paradoxically. The cultural-policy aspect of the project therefore alternates between cultural education and engagement using literature as a common good on the one hand and on the other hand

providing personal enjoyment of literature as a fragmented object. There is a third aspect: Branding Copenhagen as a city rich in culture.

The skillful practitioner

The method used in this paper is that of a project based study. It was selected because projects by definition are dialogic projections into the future and create their significance in a forward looking process. These characteristics were certainly true of the Copenhagen Reads and Berlin Language Week projects. The two festivals have each undergone a metamorphosis. Their organizational structure, operational partners, and means of dissemination have changed over time.

Language Week went from being a local initiative to being a project for all of Berlin. Similarly, the lineup of partners and supporters has been extended. Today, that lineup reflects a wide spectrum of political views and values. Language Week created its own cultural-policy significance by being an animating, socially integrating, and critically educational literary festival. From the beginning, the project was "people-oriented" as opposed to "market-oriented" (Young 2013). The organizers focused on the concepts of resident participation, social responsibility, and engagement in civil society. Those concepts constituted the symbolic capital of the event. Confidence in the project was generated by the person of Kazim Erdogan and by the 'New Beginning Neukölln' association. It is noteworthy that cultural policy and social policy were not separate. It was a goal to improve the quality of life and the enjoyment of life through inclusive cultural activities.

Copenhagen Reads, as a library-led project, initially targeted those with an interest in reading and literature. The organizers intended to give visibility to literature and reading in unexpected places. Unlike the Berlin Language Week project, Copenhagen Reads does not define a distinct social target group. The literature festival is used to promote the book and draw attention to institutions whose business it is to disseminate education, knowledge, and information. Appealing to attendees and being "market-oriented" was a necessity to some degree as the festival, though it is conceived as a non-profit event, had to compete with other events for funding and audiences. The cultural-policy objective has been to 1) animate participants in the context of literary experience and education, 2) include all potential contributors and co-organizers via the open network platform, and 3) avoid being seen as culturally elitist by being attractive to everyone. That wide appeal has been the festival's greatest symbolic capital.

Looking more closely at ontologies of opportunities, i.e. at the question where the entrepreneurial opportunities come from, we note some differences between the two festivals (Bager et al. 2010). If it is assumed

that such opportunities do not already exist, they can be created. That is very much the case for Berlin Language Week. Documentation from 2006 bears witness to the fact that opportunities were created – to begin with as an idea and then as a concrete activity. The process took two years. The individuals who conceived the idea are family therapists by profession and were active in a multicultural social environment. Their experience and professional expertise were used to give new meaning to the well-known activities of reading, storytelling, and debate. In the process of opportunity enactment, Kazim Erdogan's experience of the significance of language was a catalyst. However, it was not clear until the first festival had been held that it is possible to organize a festival with a unique multicultural and social profile.

If, on the other hand, it is assumed that the above mentioned opportunities do already exist, the concrete possibility of realizing them must be discovered, described, and implemented. We could call this line of thinking the analytical approach. The organizers of Copenhagen Reads took advantage of such an approach. The library managers knew from similar events in other cities that the festival was a real possibility. In addition, books and reading were at the top of the list of priorities for the Minister of Culture; hence the framework was set. Subsequently, the task was to find a niche in the existing market for culture and reading related festivals. The unexploited opportunity was defined as arising from the local character of the event, from its non-elitist quality, and from the fact that the venues were all across Copenhagen. An environmental analysis and a precise definition of the objectives for a new festival were among the means for implementing it.

The skillful practitioner, in addition to providing direction for the forward-looking project, instilling confidence, and creating or discovering opportunities, must disclose new worlds. SFD define disclosing new worlds as doing things in new ways, experimenting with new roles, and developing new definitions of self. Discovering or creating opportunities is a practice based on economic or strategic thinking. Being able to disclose new worlds is a practice based on mutual recognition, dialogue, and responsibility. It is characteristic of the skillful practitioner that he or she is able to hold on to an anomaly, to be receptive, and to develop heightened sensitivity.

The two projects were realized by using such abilities, and at the same time these abilities were further developed as a result of the projects. The librarians in Copenhagen battled what they felt was an anomaly – a lack of interest in reading, books, and literary education. The organizers in Berlin were preoccupied by the cultural and social poverty in Neukölln.

For Kazim Erdogan, receptivity developed from his life experience and his work experience as a psychologist in socially challenged and multi-cultural districts. For the librarians, receptivity is a part of their professional self definition. Copenhagen Reads and Berlin Language Week each responded with heightened sensitivity to what was deemed necessary in the situation at hand – taking action to create opportunities and reconfigure existing social and cultural practice.

Conclusion

There are times when highly educated people come to the realization that additional learned analyses will not accomplish anything tangible or worthwhile. They set aside the books, reports, and statistical tables they have relied on and discussed for so long ... and get out there to “just do it” (as an athletic wear manufacturer put it so pithily). To a considerable extent, the two festivals’ organizers exemplify that realization when they summoned their determination and made it happen, come what may.

Are Copenhagen’s and Berlin’s residents better off as a result of the festivals? What does “better off” mean? If any number of city residents and visitors – fifty, five hundred, twenty thousand – experienced wonder, discovery, and delight in their lives by attending ... would the effort of staging the festival have been “worth it”? The organizers would likely say yes.

The politicians in charge of culture in the two cities would, if they couldn’t quite reply with a resounding ‘yes’, likely feel quite proud for a while; but they would then ask themselves if indeed it is their remit – and the remit of cultural policy in general – to reduce social inequality and foster cross-cultural integration. They would certainly ask their staff economists to prepare a cost-benefit analysis. In so doing, they would inadvertently contribute to a management practice in which events are approved in light of the revenues the festival goes drop into the coffers of the city or region.

The paper’s intent was to liberate the entrepreneur from the burden of being an economist or cultural event manager so that he or she might undertake entrepreneurship within the realm of personal life experience. Engaged agency (C. Taylor), entrepreneuring, dialogism, receptivity, and cultural practice are among the tools used to perform such a liberation. The agency and practice of the entrepreneur as a model for cultural policy in engaging citizens – that is the normative agenda, which needs to be discussed.

In the end, any society decides what is “worth it” by providing the latitude (if not the funding) for enterprising souls to do their thing. But what might this mean for cultural entrepreneurship? “Whether people

qualify as cultural entrepreneurs always depends on the circumstances in which they operate. Cultural conditions matter.” (Klamer 2011)

Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful for the valuable support being provided by Ulla de Stricker.

References

1. Achleitner, A. K., H. Klandt, L.T. Koch and K.I. Voigt. 2005. Jahrbuch Entrepreneurship 2004/05. Gründungsforschung und Gründungsmanagement, Berlin/Heidelberg.
2. Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation An Exploratory Study. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 40(3), p. 260-282.
3. Aronsson, M. 2004. Education matters—but does entrepreneurship education? An interview with David Birch. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(3), p. 289-292.
4. Bager, L. T., P. Blenker, P. Rasmussen, and C. Thrane. 2010. Entreprenørskabsundervisning—proces, refleksion og handling.
5. Bille, T. 2011. Danske kulturpolitiske erfaringer: Oplevelsesøkonomi—den nye vin? In: KulturRikets tilstand 2011, 40.
6. Bjerke, B. 2007. Understanding entrepreneurship. Edward Elgar Publishing.
7. Bundestag, D. 2008. Kultur in Deutschland—Abschlussbericht der Enquete-Kommission. Schriftenreihe der Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung Bd, 69.
8. Dewey, P. 2004. From arts management to cultural administration. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 6, p. 13-23.
9. Elbeshausen, H. 2009. Med byen som mulighedsrum for læsning og litteratur: En fremadrettet evaluering af netværksprojektet København læser. Danmarks Biblioteksskole.
10. Elbeshausen, H. 2011. København læser og flanørens skildpadde. In: Nielsen, H. J., Høyrup, H., & Krist, H. D. (2011). Nye vidensmedier. Samfundslitteratur.
11. Erhvervs- og Vækstministeriet 2012/13. Danmark i arbejde. Vækstplan for kreative erhverv · design.
12. Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(2), p. 219-245.
13. Föhl, P.S. (2012) Governance im Kulturbereich — Neue Konzepte braucht das Land? Sicherheit und Unsicherheit — Wie weiter mit der kulturellen Infrastruktur? In: Institut für Kulturpolitik der Kulturpolitischen Gesellschaft E.V. Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2012. Band 12 p.
14. Holquist, M. 2002. Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world. Psychology Press.
15. Young, D. R. 2013. If not for profit, for what?. (1983 Print Edition) Lexington Books.
16. Klamer, A. 2002. Social, cultural and economic values of cultural goods. In Conference of the Association for Cultural Economics International, Rotterdam. p. 13-15.
17. Klamer, A. 2003. A pragmatic view on values in economics. *Journal of economic methodology*, 10(2), p. 191-212.
18. Klamer, A. 2011. Cultural entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 24(2), p. 141-156.
19. Knoblich, T. 2008. Aktivierende Kulturpolitik als Gemeinschafts- und Querschnittsaufgabe. Vortrag auf der Tagung „Kultur bewegt“ am 22.02.2008 in der Evangelischen Akademie Tutzing.

20. Kurzbericht über die Trendanalyse der Entwicklung von Neukölln und Neukölln-Nord im Vergleich zu Berlin insgesamt und zu anderen Teilgebieten in Berlin. Viewed 20.06.2014. https://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/baneukoelln/allgemeingoedecke/neuk__lner_trendanalyse_kurz.pdf?start&ts=1227795919&file=neuk__lner_trendanalyse_kurz.pdf
21. Mandel, B. 2007. Die neuen Kulturunternehmer: ihre Motive, Visionen und Erfolgsstrategien. transcript Verlag.
22. Mandel, B. 2013. Kulturmanagement: zentraler Akteur einer konzeptbasierten Kulturpolitik. Zum Verhältnis von Kulturmanagement und Kulturpolitik. Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen • Nr. 143 • IV/2013, 30-34.
23. Sarasvathy, S. D. 2008. Effectuation: Elements of entrepreneurial expertise. Edward Elgar Publishing.
24. Schulze, G. 1992. Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart. Frankfurt/M. New York.
25. Shorthose, J. 2004. A more critical view of the creative industries: production, consumption and resistance. *Capital and Class*, 1-10.
26. Skot-Hansen, D. and H. Elbeshausen. 2007. Zwischen Einheitskultur und kultureller Vielfalt. Kulturpolitische Strategien in Dänemark. In: Kulturpolitische Gesellschaft (Germany). Institut für Kulturpolitik. (2007). Beheimatung durch Kultur: Kulturore als Lernorte interkultureller Kompetenz (Vol. 66). Kulturpolitische Gesellschaft eV.
27. Spinoza, C., F. Flores and H.L. Dreyfus. 1997. *Disclosing new worlds: Entrepreneurship, democratic action, and the cultivation of solidarity*. MIT Press.
28. Stevenson, D., D. Rowe and K. McKay. 2010. Convergence in British cultural policy: The social, the cultural, and the economic. *The journal of arts management, law, and society*, 40(4), p. 248-265.
29. Woche der Sprache und des Lesens in Neukölln. Dokumentation 2006. Viewed 25.06.2014 <http://www.sprachwoche-neukoelln.de/2006/wsln-dok.pdf>
30. Woche der Sprache und des Lesens in Neukölln. Dokumentation 2008. Viewed 25.06.2014 <http://www.sprachwoche-neukoelln.de/Dokumente/Doku2008.pdf>
31. Woche der Sprache und des Lesens in Neukölln. Dokumentation 2010. Viewed 25.06.2014 <http://www.sprachwoche-neukoelln.de/Dokumente/Doku2010.pdf>
32. Interview with Kazim Erdogan. RBB-Berlin 30.8.2012. Viewed 25.06.2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LBMnEn3FW0o#t=230>
33. Read Me ... Then Give me Away! RBB- Berlin 09.08.2012. Sprachwoche Berlin. Viewed 25.06.2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZbFo3B4nPLE#t=79>
34. he@iva.dk; Birketinget 6, DK-2300

Надійшла до редколегії 28.04.2015 р.