

JERZY HAUSNER

How Much Is Culture Worth?

A BROCHURE
to STIMULATE
THE MIND

JERZY HAUSNER

How Much Is Culture Worth?

TRANSLATED BY SØREN GAUGER

Introduction

JOANNA ORLIK

A BROCHURE
to STIMULATE
THE MIND

Introduction

JOANNA ORLIK

Why are cultural institutions in Poland supported by public funding? We all know, after all, that this has not always and everywhere been the case. The argument “for” includes culture in the “common good.” First of all, this does not abide by the laws of the free market, as not everyone can afford it, while everyone should have access to it. Secondly, so it can serve its role, it requires (to some degree) systemic solutions that go beyond the individual and local. Everyone has the right to protect their health. Everyone has the right to study. Everyone has the right to create and use cultural goods. Thus, if we believe that every inhabitant of Poland should have the chance for creative expression and to acquaint themselves with cultural heritage (of other cultures and our own), we need places (institutions) that ensure these opportunities – such as cultural centers, museums, and philharmonics. The state then decides to streamline the pool of public resources to allow all those who need to be immersed in culture and art to do so.

And yet, over the past thirty years, these convictions have not been universal. For years, I (and other managers of cultural institutions) have heard many arguments against: that it does not pay to run courses for five people, that if we want to operate we have to earn our keep, that someone ought to teach us to be effective, and that culture's only chance is in the creative industries, because only they have a real impact on GDP growth. Many of us have squirmed like eels to enter this discussion. We cried out, "Culture matters!"; that development, economic or otherwise, is only possible through creative citizens, only when you have the three Ts: talent, technology, and tolerance. We persuaded others (and ourselves) that we could make culture fit the laws of economics. That it sufficed to list a few terms, turn a blind eye to a few evidently unmarketable phenomena, write some good applications to Creative Europe, and then survive the next few months on a grant, in order to justify the continued existence of cultural institutions.

Meanwhile, 2008 came along and shook the foundations of what had been the economic status quo. The cracks and ruptures that had only just begun appearing in the monolithic agreement on the rules of how the global economy functioned were about to grow and call attention to themselves. A thought that had only recently been controversial now began to be spoken out loud: that culture just might not be a part of economics – economics might be a part of culture. Especially if we take a broader look at culture, as a space of social relations.

What, apart from a moment's satisfaction, could this entail for cultural institutions? In MIK's first "Brochure to Stimulate the Mind," Marek Krajewski wrote about the new roles that cultural institutions ought to adopt: mediating, substantiating, whistleblowing, and being the invisible hand, triggering processes of change. If we combine this process with Jerzy Hausner's incitement to change our optics and look at values as an effect of collective human action produced through communication, in shared discussion and weighing the opinions of others, then cultural institutions are faced with a concrete and important task: the constant negotiation of values that matter to us, individually and as a group, together and separately. Inviting us to discuss and create activities together with those who differ greatly from one another; to seek tools and methods to help us to reach understandings. To be in a constant process of changing the canon. Could we ask for anything more beautiful?

JERZY HAUSNER

How Much Is Culture Worth?

**WHY DOES
ECONOMICS
NEED
CULTURE?**

In a book published at the close of the twentieth century, *The Future of Capitalism: How Today's Economic Forces Shape Tomorrow's World*, American political economist Lester Thurow pondered the possible lines of development of the capitalist system and borrowed a historical analogy: "There were those alive during the Dark Ages who knew that standards of living had been much higher in the Roman Empire and that something better was possible. They had, or could have had, all of the technologies possessed by Rome, but they did not have the values to generate the organizational abilities that would have been necessary to recreate what had previously existed."¹ In this manner, Thurow presented a question central to contemporary economics: Do we know how to make use of our accomplishments in culture and civilization? Are we capable of steering social and economic processes to ensure a good life to present and future generations?

Another outstanding intellectual, Amartya Sen, winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998, stressed in many of his works that, in contemporary economics, there is insufficient balance between two traditions: ethics, which relates economics to the social sciences and philosophy, and engineering, which uses analytical tools and takes economics nearer to the hard sciences. The former has been almost entirely rooted out of mainstream economics. Like many other contemporary economists, Sen has postulated its renewal and restoration. We must return to a balance between the two traditions, which need and should strengthen one another.

The social space-time delimits our capacity to act in a dual fashion. On the one hand, it shows what we can do, in the sense of what we are capable of doing; what we can manage. On the other, it shows what we can do in the sense of what we are at liberty to do – what is permissible; acceptable. Yet the prevailing hegemony for some decades, the neo-liberal economic imaginarium, means that the dominant macroeconomic frameworks have started to fade. They cease to “work”; to do their functions. And thus we are free to do more and more, but there is less and less we *can* do. The market forces do not encounter the counterbalance they need. They generate states of unstable imbalance which are increasingly hard to prevent and control. One symptom of this is the emergence of economic organizations whose capital makes them more powerful than states. They set the rules of the game and even the course of the economic discourse. They help the economy and circulation continue to grow, but not the social effects of economics.

The basic weakness of neoclassical economics is that it excludes social values, reducing value to market estimates. Yet, if we want to cope with global economic and financial processes and modern technologies; with climate change, social anxieties, the erosion of interpersonal bonds, mass-scale migrations, or the threat of border closure; if we want technologies, inventions, and scientific discoveries to serve good and not evil – to serve everyone and not just the privileged – we must tend to values and make certain they can translate into our (quite broadly defined) organizational abilities.

Over the last few decades, mainstream economics has not seen the need to root economics in culture and plant it in the multidimensional world of society. If economists have troubled themselves with culture, it was mainly as creative industries – in other words, what generates income and employment. This instrumental approach is, however, a great and dangerous simplification. Holding on to the neoliberal-market paradigm, we assess the economic value of culture to ascertain if something pays. Value is reduced to market value and cultural goods to commercial and private goods. Meanwhile, what we measure should result from what we, as a society, want to achieve, and only then do the results of the measurements let us see if our actions have been correct. This is our framework for apprehending the ties between culture and economics – not the lens of growth, the market and demand, but much more broadly – through reference to development, economic order, and the production of various forms of cultural capital.

Economics cannot analyze efficiency and growth alone. It must, above all, take quality of life and development into account. The cognitive perspectives and affiliated concepts it adopts should support individuals' and communities' subjectification; in our day, it objectifies them. Only in this way can economics become an economics of values and serve to support man's activities in all of their dimensions.

The social world is a human product. It does not exist because we perceive it, but it does become what we perceive it to be. "What is possible depends heavily on what we believe,"² Thurow writes. This is why it is worth looking at culture from another angle. Not to wonder how to shape culture into the economy, but the reverse – how to make economics a part of culture.

CULTURE AS A COMPASS

“It is [...] quite clear that the age of the New Man, future-oriented manifestos, and calls for a better world all ready to be walked into and lived in is well and truly over. These days, utopia is being lived on a subjective, everyday basis, in the real time of concrete and intentionally fragmentary experiments,”³ French cultural critic, scholar, and art curator Nicolas Bourriaud writes in his brilliant *Relational Aesthetics*. Behind his thoughts on the role of art and culture in producing interpersonal relationships is a reflection on our intellectual and cognitive helplessness synthetically expressed through the “post-” prefix.

We live in an era defined by such concepts as postcapitalism, postdemocracy, posthumanism, postfeminism, and posthistoricism. A description of reality thus contrived shows that we perceive that what has passed is in crisis and decay; we know and feel that we are part of something new, but we cannot define it. “It is this prefix ‘post-’,” Bourriaud writes, “that will ultimately turn out to have

been the great myth of the end of the twentieth century. It points to the nostalgia for a golden age at once admired and hated. It refers to a past event that supposedly cannot be surpassed, an event on which the present depends and whose effects it is a question of managing.”⁴ We have gotten stuck in anticipating a new synthesis, a global vision of the world and a new epoch. Yet, if we cannot name that “new,” neither are we able to cope with the crisis of reimagining. This is not necessarily a single particular crisis, but more like various crisis situations that may concern an individual, local society, or even the entire globe.

In all our aspects of participation in the world in which our lives have begun to change, we try intuitively to choose various operating techniques and strategies meant to weaken the signs and symptoms of the crisis, but in fact we only mollify the tension. We respond to signs of the crisis, but we do not seek a way out; we cannot overcome what is “in-between” or create anything new. Remaining in this spirit, we wash our hands of actively overcoming the crisis. We passively await a breakthrough. It seems to us that the crisis will burn itself out, and things will again be the same; we count on “someone” putting “everything” in order. If we seek a way out, we generally think toward possible spaces for expansion – we try to escape forward. The situation becomes complicated when we do not know which way is forward and who, in our contemporary world, can decide.

What can moving forward mean to us? How to define the way forward, leaving behind what was, through what now

is, toward the future, or what could be? Bourriaud states that “fleeing forward” makes no sense and does not help. Instead, we must reach into the depths, to the roots, to what is at our source. Instead of marching forward, it is more satisfying to dig into the identities of the institutions we know, acknowledge their real content, and give them a thorough, fundamental revision.

To perform significant social changes, we need not reinvent the social world and plan it holistically according to a preset ideology. We can do it safely and effectively by combining and using available resources and means according to formulae unlike those which have held sway. We need not necessarily conquer other people’s lands or explore new territories. It suffices to initiate reflection and dialogue on the creative management of what we have and the institutional conditions that make it possible. And this we can do, in part, through art, and more broadly speaking, culture – for this is a membrane that picks up and processes signals from the depths, giving us a look at what is at the source and what is sought.

A second crucial condition for social change is that, among the multiplicity of works, the multiplicity of approaches, the multiplicity of various forms of artistic or cultural expression, there must exist cultural connectors – interfaces that join various elements of the social world, allowing the transfer and activation of content important to us. They activate what is hidden – what we do not say openly, but what defines our essence. After all, we all carry some kind of cultural heritage; some kind of code, allusions, associations

that are constantly activated. Through the existence of these connectors, a shared space of meanings and culture references is built – we can make what is distinct communal. At the same time, in making them communal, we create new knowledge and release creative energy. This is the role of culture, for culture is also communication – it bestows meaning, creating new reference points.

If we look at culture in this way, we also note that every organization – not only cultural institutions like museums, theater festivals, or foundations, but also companies, schools, and social welfare houses – has a cultural component, a layer of significance, a network of people's references to one another and to what is vital to them, which defines them through the meaning of their presence and activity. Every organization has both a material and a non-material component, one that is hidden and that reveals itself through relations. Without this cultural ingredient – without communication, meaning, references, associations, new interpretations, and an active imagination – no organization can operate. Not a cultural center, university, hospital, or a business.

If, therefore, we are to understand social change as institutional change, it cannot occur outside of culture. Of course, social change concerns not only culture, but civilization as well – it happens in both simultaneously, but will not set without the cultural ingredient. Change occurs through reconceptualizing behavior and social relations, allowing a society to master new ways of operating and adapting to them.

Of course, this road to the future is never linear and straight; it is always somehow labyrinthine, spatially open. This is just why we need references to culture as a compass. “No one is demanding that it forge a Great Design,” writes Bourriaud, “only that it find a route among the old roads, paths of gaining knowledge, that it mark shortcuts, sketch maps on the surface of chaos; in a word, that it create navigational instruments.”⁵

**ISLANDS
AND
ARCHIPELAGOS**

Social change begins when animators of change manage to create a circle of actors that communicate and work together to act in a way that defies routine and pressure from all around. The aim is to break free from the environment's "gravitational pull." To thus act, it is necessary to limit relations with some subjects and bolster relations with other selected partners.

If we look at development from this perspective, we might see that it begins with local impulses, free initiatives that create and reinforce communities driven by shared values and striving for a concrete, practical aim. But, in order to accomplish this, they must communicate and begin working with other communities, thus creating a network of relationships. And this triggers a movement that leads to social change, understood as generating other norms and rules that help create values; in other words, another model to coordinate the groups' actions. In this way, the acting subjects become islands in their surroundings, trying to form an archipelago with other such islands.

This movement is produced by the shared actions of island communities and finding new forms of exchange (the allocation of resources). This is not linear in nature. It is multidirectional and, more importantly, inclusive. Every island can freely choose to join, thus helping to create the archipelago and adding their resources and energy to the movement, bringing about systemic change. This does not mean that every island has to work together with all the others – that they must unite. On the contrary, they should maintain autonomy. The islands are meant to be islands, communities, conscious of being distinct and of the distinctness of others, yet not isolating themselves; they should strive for interactive partner relationships with other islands. To this way of thinking, social animators must become social navigators to reach their goals.

The power of the archipelago to influence and attract depends on every island, not only the largest and best equipped. If we accept that an archipelago is a small gravitational construct, then its power and independence depend on the extent to which peripheral islands are attracted to its center and not repelled by it. We might say the principle in our construct is: if you want to be stronger, make certain that the weaker ones working with you become stronger. The strength of a small gravitational construct, or archipelago, is based on partnership and solidarity. The archipelago is, for the affiliated islands, a way of dealing with the unexpected and hostile. Islands in an archipelago attract but do not absorb each other; they remain in near proximity. Every island must be conscious

of being distinct and different, but also link their actions with what others do and who they are. Only this gives archipelagos independence with regards to their surroundings.

Thus, various sorts of relations may emerge in an archipelago. New possibilities for experimentation and generating new forms of dialogue are always emerging, as are exchanges of resources and production of values – social testing of the suitability of various solutions. An archipelago does not work toward development, however, if a network of ties is imposed upon it. These must be created naturally. There must be many of them, like the opportunities to form others. By the same token, the archipelago also becomes a constantly shared space of communication and generating meanings, essentially a cultural or, indeed, a multicultural space.

We might contrast the vision of an archipelago with a uniformly developing continent. A continent is an empire, and the rulers must constantly prove their imperial power to expand their territory. The moncentrically controlled space of a continent erodes and eliminates diversity and subjectivity. The social space shrinks and tears apart. Even if the ruler of a continent thinks in the long term (seeking to immortalize their reign), in the shrinking social space their practical operations are increasingly reactive. In their continent they mainly strengthen and reinforce strong ties and dependencies, which makes the social space-time lose its elastic and catalytic properties. The continent endures, but it ceases to develop.

Continental players are generally stronger than islands. The former draw strength from weakening others, making them dependent and treating them like clients, while the latter are strengthened by supporting their weaker partners. They must therefore agree to the principle of cooperation, in part in their economic activities and on the market, and ensure it is minded. The continent implies a holistic meaning in history and development. The archipelago works differently: no one conquers or defeats. Here everyone has to work as a partner with others to ensure subjectivity and development.

The continent's pressure on the archipelago can never be negated. This is why the survival of the archipelago and the maintenance of its distinctiveness depends, in the long run, on whether the actors creating the archipelago can find themselves in the "solar system" of other archipelagos keenly interested in maintaining their independence. The alliance of these archipelagos also involves disseminating their models and making them more attractive. Meanwhile, the spread of innovation need not involve turning the archipelago into a continent or imposing solutions on others and subordinating them to oneself. From a developmental perspective, it is more advantageous to spread innovation as a result of creative diffusion.

The concept of cultural islands and the archipelago of living culture is not the same as prescribing and imposing trajectories of development. An archipelago permits many narrative and developmental trajectories. They must come from communities that are subjective and

open to cooperation, capable of jointly producing all sorts of values. It is not only technologies, products, services, and organizations they need, but something much more important – a process of subjectifying islands and forming archipelagos, thus creating many new, unknown, and as-yet-unnamed social roles and mechanisms for producing values. This process cannot be planned, it can only be released and stimulated.

What binds this community is not just immediate advantage or interests. If this were so, the actors would not have had to create an archipelago and hazarded exclusion from their surroundings – they would have simply formed various alliances to gain benefits and gather certain resources. Forming an archipelago and suffering the relevant expenditures only makes sense when there is a long-term goal expressed in the form of an idea. This aim cannot be reached without social change. And, if the actors making the effort to create changes hold onto it, then their operating methods suit it. This in turn means that they not only want to act effectively, but also with a firm intention, which requires them to shape a coherent set of values along with a working structure for their cooperation. And this is what makes them a community.

**BETWEEN
THE GOOD
AND GOODS**

Nicolas Bourriaud, who inspired the metaphor of islands and archipelagos, shifts our attention to the role of autonomous individuals, bound by a network of mutual relationships, seeing in them the strength presently needed to form a new social reality. “Today, after two centuries of struggle for singularity and against group impulses, we must bring in a new synthesis which, alone, will be able to save us from the regressive fantasy that is abroad. (...) In our post-industrial societies, the most pressing thing is no longer the emancipation of individuals, but the freeing-up of inter-human communications, the dimensional emancipation of existence.”⁶ How, then, can we build the foundations of cooperation based on values?

Let us begin with the fact that we must separate existential values (norms, the good, and an institutional order based on shared values) from instrumental ones (capital, assets, goods, and services that make up the organizational structure). The former give meaning to our individual

and collective actions. In other words, they do not respond to the “how?”, only the “why?”. The latter serve as tools to reach concrete goals. Existential values are essential to building in-depth interpersonal relationships that are less about measurable advantages than about shaping a meaningful life.

To visualize the danger lurking in the blurring of boundaries that separate existential and instrumental values, I shall mention an example of the negative consequences of the economization of standards and goods depicted by American political philosopher Michael Sandel. In his excellent book on the moral limits of the market, *What Money Can't Buy*, he describes the effects of American preschools introducing a surcharge for not picking up children at the appointed time. An apparent paradox was observed – when the children’s caretakers had to pay for their children staying longer at preschool, they were clearly more eager to leave them there. Evidently, the parents saw the fee as a payment for a service and decided it was to their benefit. Thus the norm changed, from moral to market-based. The costs eliminated the sense of duty. And, just as crucially, when the fees were later withdrawn, many of the parents continued arriving late. “Once the monetary payment had eroded the moral obligation to show up on time, the old sense of responsibility proved difficult to revive,”⁷ Sandel concludes.

As we see from this example, the subordination of non-economic spheres of life to the economy does not mean that ethical problems and value issues disappear. They remain

present, but a market logic is foisted upon them. Values are thus instrumentalized and inscribed into a utilitarian concept geared toward maximum profit and minimal individual losses. Its overriding aim becomes appeasing material needs, regardless of non-material value.

And vice-versa – the universalization of value means it generates a good available to all, even to those who do not produce the same value. We might take knowledge or trust as examples. In this sense, a good produced in a value-generating process is a new resource of which others can take advantage – whether this be producing other values or instrumentalizing and processing values (such as knowledge) in order to produce concrete goods, or merely to be able to act.

If, then, we look at the quality of our lives as an economic issue, we see the key to success is finding a balance between instrumental and existential values. For this to be achieved, we must see man and the world holistically, taking non-material elements into account, such as spirituality, culture, and emotions. Only in this operating model can we speak of true social trust – a stable point of reference that facilitates further sensible choices in one's life and profession.

To go beyond the narrow, dogmatic thinking of mainstream economics and open our eyes to alternate ways of defining, interpreting, and solving all the problems of the contemporary world, we must change our optics and understand what values are.

Firstly, we should assume that values are produced. We generally speak of or psychologize values, reducing them to individual standpoints or choices or recognizing them as something that ought to be professed. What we need is a deep conviction that values exist because they are produced in the process of human activity.

Secondly, we should recognize that value production is a social process, *i.e.*, that values emerge through communication and collaboration between individuals; they are forged in joint discussions and through weighing different opinions.

Thirdly, the understanding of the distinction between existential and instrumental values is fundamental. The former arise from and support the community, allowing us to survive: as humanity, as a community, as a collective. The latter, however, are of practical significance – they allow us to be active and achieve our aims. The existence of existential values is the basis for producing instrumental values. We need both, but rather than a balance between them, we should find the proper relationship.

Fourthly, if, on the basis of the existential values we produce, we create instrumental values (goods and services), we must make certain they do not overwhelm and destroy existential values.

We must also accept that values are subjective and objective all at once. They are not absolute, for they are produced and, to some degree, changeable (they are given

new interpretations), but they are not freely chosen, as they are the foundation of a (communal) social order that binds individuals. Values are produced in a social process, through the collaboration of many varied actors. As such, we could say that values are an ideal plane of reality, in that they truly exist – in the form of a social community.

THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF VALUES

The community is not merely a collection of individuals. It is not given. It is their product. People less make up a community than produce it, working together and thus generating bonds to communalize them. If their collaboration dies out, so too does the community, as the bonds vanish. Only through upholding the collaboration of individuals does the community emerge and gain subjectivity. No community is an eternal and universal being: it emerges and becomes.

The social order in which people operate and cooperate is given to them, but it is also produced by them through communalizing knowledge and actions. Thus, the basic factor in creating a social space-time is interpersonal relationships. They allow for subjectivization, though they may also cause the objectification of individuals and collectives.

Accepting that values are socially produced and not only individually recognized and related to the surrounding

world means that values cannot be pressed into the framework of any system. They elude these frames, for producing values requires open space, including ones that are purely symbolic or communicative. We may, of course, impede this aspect of the social world, but then the value-producing process weakens. We might impose a binding axionormative order on the social world, through the hegemony of a “value system,” that is, a defined ideology, but in this way we block the social dynamism, and sometimes this order collapses.

The value-producing process is complex. There are many subjects involved, and, furthermore, it is not merely single values being created, but their bundles. Some values condition the production of others. This means, however, we are condemned to associating and reconciling various values – a conflict of values is inevitable. Consequently, we must develop standards to permit the coming together of various values – their reconciliation – and also solve conflicts of values. This is not possible, however, if these values are fundamentally understood and conceived by certain actors – in other words, if they consider them to be absolute and incontrovertible. Fundamentalisms cannot be united. There can only be peaceful coexistence and ecumenism, or open war.

If the hegemony of a value system is imposed, a tyranny is born (regardless of how large a group, whether or not it is the majority of society, believes it is justified). Striving to subordinate the collective to a set ideology, as Adam Węgrzecki correctly emphasized in *Zarys fenomenologii*

podmiotu [*An Outline of the Phenomenology of the Subject*], comes from a conviction that values objectively deserve authority over man; that their origin is “superhuman”. As such, they would not be produced by people, but would reign over them, furnished with the power to guide people.⁸

Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno have also written about how tyranny founded on ideology always leads to instrumentalizing values, using the Nazis to analyze this process: “That the hygienic factory and everything pertaining to it, Volkswagen and the sports palace, are obtusely liquidating metaphysics does not matter in itself, but that these things are themselves becoming metaphysics, an ideological curtain, within the social whole, behind which real doom is gathering, does matter.”⁹ This quite accurate depiction of confusing the good and goods shows clearly how fundamentality and the instrumentalization of values merge. Stanisław Brzozowski, among others, warned against this ideological hegemony in his thoughts on historical maturity, positing that ideas should emerge from life and not be imposed upon it.¹⁰

If, therefore, we are striving to build our social reality based on values, we must recall that only the coexistence and cooperation of independent actors can facilitate the production of values. Otherwise there can be no producing them. There is no social world of singular subjecthood and singular values. Multi-subjectivity and axiological diversity make a social world possible and capable of developing and surviving. In other words, if this process is to take place, it must be grounded in the fact that autonomous

actors exist, in some sense independent of one another. Their autonomy means that they can be independent, which does not mean they cut themselves off and cease to cooperate and create together.

This balance between the production of existential and instrumental values means that individuality does not break apart a community. It is a communalizing individuality. And the social world becomes a community of communities.

THE RELEASE OF CULTURAL ENERGY

Our approach to culture primarily thinks about the state, not the process. Our attention most often focuses on existing and entrenched forms of cultural activity – on institutions and the relationships between them. Meanwhile, culture sponsors development when conceived on a broader canvas, and development is seen in a complementary network of hard and soft resources; in the whole of individual and collective life; in its anthropological and social dimensions.

Culture is an open space whose borders are forever being shifted by the imagination and creativity. It is basically infinitely capacious – new products of human thought can forever appear, different cognitive perspectives that can mingle and intersect in this space. This makes the space of culture a discursive space, the scene of constant debate and dialogue. There are no firm borders, only fluid ones, but they are there – culture can only develop through a set material, a civilizational foundation or infrastructure. Otherwise it disappears. Civilization assists culture and

its development but also limits it materially. Culture, in turn, conditions the social functioning of civilization and its development, gives it social justification and anchors it, while also steering it. The bond between economics and culture should thus be viewed much more broadly, understanding culture as a social substructure and casing of economic activity; an economic resource; an important production factor and essential ingredient of a development mechanism.

Thus, when asking about culture's role in socioeconomic development, we will not find responses in such parameters as individual consumption of cultural goods or the size of the cultural sector (including the creative industries) in the economy. It should more be sought in the impact of culture on the subject, the community, in the culture's potential to build creativity and innovation, its ability to shape cooperative attitudes and root itself in shared values and standards of behavior.

In terms of the impact of culture on socioeconomic development, it can be reduced neither to a supplier of creative fuel for the creative industries, to be used for commodification or consumption, nor to the "guardian of higher values," protecting us from their revision and transformation by securing its autonomy. The desire to expose the relationship between culture and socioeconomic development forces us to build a bridge over a chasm, where, on one side, we have a conviction of the dominance of economics or the market over culture, and, on the other, the splendid isolation of culture from mechanisms that

produce resources, their redistribution, their organizational grounding, etc. To speak more precisely, it requires that we be able to bridge various subjects, placing stress on those that derive from the sphere of social activity. For, ultimately, it is the social element that gives both culture and development their dynamics.

If it is to play this role, culture must be mainly a field of individual actions and individual creativity; and it must become a space of collective communication, discourse, cooperation, and social innovation. We must join what is singular, individual, and absolutely unique with something broader, a space of social relationships; communication; assignment of meaning. We should also regard the space of culture as a debate over values, addressing it in part to issues of responsibility, ethical or otherwise. We must allow a multiplicity of cognitive perspectives and languages of social communication, and, consequently, build a dialogical social debate. In debates, we ought to use open and inclusive concepts, eliminating concepts that close and obstruct (such as the concept of “national heritage,” which has come to replace the much broader “cultural heritage”).

The stimulation of culture produced in a network of diverse subjects requires systemic support to become a vehicle of large-scale social, economic, and political development. For institutional change to occur, its intellectual origin must – in part, at any rate – emerge from outside the existing institutional structure, or at least from outside the sphere of social reality set apart as that which the institutional segment “controls” and stabilizes. This kind

of source has a chance to be “living culture,” conceived as the entirety of cultural practices, based on unleashed imagination and creative energy.

The support for institutions of “living culture,” at present in the form of grants for individual events and projects, is insufficient. We need rationally designed activities which transfer and capitalize on innovation and build synergy between dispersed subjects, a joint use of resources, and fertile connections between the sectors (for example, between “living culture” and public health, sports, and education). Mutual inspiration – the exchange of resources and experiences – should be the aim of all organizations in the cultural sector. Through this kind of cooperation between various subjects, all sorts of “clusters” could arise: places for exchanging knowledge, resources, or ideas, which could bring vast benefits to the entire cultural sector.

If we acknowledge that at present we have a crisis of market civilization, to find a way out we must surely turn toward a culture conceived not in economic categories but in anthropological ones. Only then can alternative thinking gradually emerge that might become the basis for the profound transformation of our civilization.

Taking responsibility for the social space-time we create means individuals and communities must pose the big questions, ones that go beyond the “here and now.” We must keep posing new questions to our past civilization, ones born from the present, to find various paths leading

to the future and to give our cultural reality new and often exploratory meanings.

The responses we give do not bring certainty and cannot be binding once and for all. Questions about the significance of our actions and coexistence will keep coming back to us and even if we answer them an infinite number of times, we will not move closer to certainty, only to an assurance that the response appeases us; in other words, that it gives sense to our existence and actions.

Culture is the tale of our life, of the meaning of our life. This tale cannot be imposed upon us. This is to be a tale which we, the participants, help to create.

WRITTEN ON THE BASIS OF:

- Jerzy Hausner, *Społeczna czasoprzestrzeń gospodarowania. W kierunku ekonomii wartości*, Warsaw 2019.
- *To nigdy nie była utopia. Jerzy Hausner o ekonomii wartości* lecture series (March–June 2020), <https://oees.pl/cykl-wykladow-ekonomiawartosci/>.
- Jerzy Hausner, “Dziwny krajobraz,” in *Kultura i rozwój. Analizy, rekomendacje, studia przypadków*, ed. Jerzy Hausner, Izabela Jasińska et al., Warsaw–Krakow 2016.
- Jerzy Hausner, “Społeczna czasoprzestrzeń wytwarzania wartości ekonomicznych,” in *Open Eyes Book nr 3*, Krakow 2018.

NOTES

- 1 Lester C. Thurow, *The Future of Capitalism: How Today's Economic Forces Shape Tomorrow's World* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 262.
- 2 Ibid., 11.
- 3 Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. Simon Pleasance and Fronza Woods (Dijon: Les presses du réel, 2009), 20.
- 4 Nicolas Bourriaud, *The Radicant* (New York: Lucas and Sternberg, 2009), 183.
- 5 Nicolas Bourriaud, *Estetyka relacyjna* (Kraków: MOCAK, 2012), 28. This segment is missing from the English-language edition, and so we have been forced to translate from the Polish (trans.).
- 6 *Relational Aesthetics*, 27.
- 7 Michael Sandel, *What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets* (New York: FSG 2013), unpaginated web edition.
- 8 Cf. Adam Węgrzecki, *Zarys fenomenologii podmiotu* (Wrocław: Studia Philosophica Wratislaviensia, 1996), 124–25.
- 9 Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, *The Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), xviii.
- 10 Stanisław Brzozowski, *Idee. Wstęp do filozofii dojrzałości dziejowej* (Kraków: Wyd. Literackie, 1990), 96–97.

małopolski
instytut
kultury **mik**

INSTYTUCJA KULTURY
WOJEWÓDZTWA
MAŁOPOLSKIEGO

 MAŁOPOLSKA

Publisher:

The Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow

30-233 Krakow, ul. 28 Lipca 1943 17 C

tel. 12 422 18 84, www.mik.krakow.pl

Director: Joanna Orlik

Editor-in-chief: Elżbieta Kaproń

Proofreader: Steven Hoffman

Series graphic design and typography: Kira Pietrek

Typesetting: Anna Papiernik

ISBN online publication 978-83-61406-31-0

© Jerzy Hausner

© Małopolski Instytut Kultury w Krakowie

This publication is not to be put on sale.

Małopolski Instytut Kultury w Krakowie
[Małopolska Institute of Culture in Krakow,
abbr. MIK] is an independent body set up by the
Małopolska local government. MIK engages in many
activities to study and promote cultural heritage of
the Małopolska region. MIK provides workshops and
training as well as organizes conferences and seminars
for culture sector employees. We also research
the evolution of cultural trends and development
directions.

Three words describe us in short:
Region, React, Rethink!

MIK is a proud member of three international
networks: Culture Action Europe, Interpret Europe,
and the European Network of Observatories in the
Field of Arts and Cultural Education (ENO).

www.mik.krakow.pl



Jerzy Hausner is an economics professor, tied to the University of Economics in Krakow since the start of his career. He has contributed to the creation of a system of economics based on social values. He initiated and has headed the program council for the Open Eyes Economy Summit – an international economics congress gathering together the science, economics, culture, and political communities. He has written many articles, research reports, and books, including *Społeczna czasoprzestrzeń gospodarowania. W kierunku ekonomii wartości* [*The Social Space-time of Management: Toward an Economics of Value*], published in 2019.

ISBN online publication 978-83-61406-31-0