

# BERLIN CULTURAL FUNDING REPORT 2014



# BERLIN CULTURAL FUNDING REPORT, 2014

---

The Governing Mayor of Berlin /  
Senate Chancellery - Cultural Affairs

<b>PREFACE</b>	4
<b>EMPHASES OF BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY</b>	6
<b>LOCATIONS</b>	10
Overview / Activities	12
Outside Perspective	14
<b>EXCELLENCE &amp; UNDERGROUND (E&amp;U)</b>	
Overview / Activities	18
Outside Perspective	19
<b>TRANSPARENCY</b>	
Overview / Activities	24
Outside Perspective	26
<b>FREEDOM &amp; DIVERSITY</b>	
Overview / Activities	30
Outside Perspective	32
<b>PEOPLE / INFORMATION / NUMBERS</b>	
Staffing Decisions	36
Funding Statistics	38
Theatre	39
Dance	40
Music	40
Literature	41
Museums and Fine Art	41
Memorials and Remembrance Culture	42
Libraries and Archives	42
Interdisciplinary Institutions and Programmes	43
Projektfonds Kulturelle Bildung	43
<b>APPENDIX</b>	44
<b>ILLUSTRATION CREDITS</b>	47
<b>ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION</b>	48

## PREFACE

Culture enriches us in several ways: aesthetically, intellectually, and economically. This is especially true in Berlin. Opera houses and theatres, museums and memorials provide pleasure and communicate knowledge and values. Along with a strong alternative cultural landscape, our art institutions represent the artistic independence, the surprising and wonderfully unfinished quality of Berlin as a city. This attracts not just Berliners, but also an increasing number of guests from Germany and abroad. Artists from all over the world come to Berlin because this city is constantly freeing creativity and producing new ideas.

We realize the importance of culture to our city. The Berlin city government thus has a cultural budget of ca. 400 million Euros, making us the envy of many other major cities. In addition, the local district governments contribute 120 million Euros and the Federal Government another 360 million Euros as part of the capital cultural funding programme, with a trend towards increasing funding. We invest a great deal, and receive a great deal in return.

A wonderful thing: art and culture, which enrich our minds and please our senses, also generate jobs, increase economic power, and provide an growing number of Berliners with a livelihood.

But our success poses new challenges. Not only do we need to insure that our top-notch cultural institutions are equipped in an appropriate way financially and artistically: we also have to be careful to keep from displacing the artists to whom we owe our good reputation and a great deal of economic power to the margins of the city due to the increasing price of housing. Culturally speaking, Berlin is in an excellent position. Our opera houses, theatres, museums, and memorials are outstanding top notch when seen in international comparison. This provides us with the space to do more for others. In this cultural funding report, we have placed our focus on new, additional tasks where we think it is urgent to find a solution. For an all-encompassing overview of all our activities and all relevant data, please visit our website:

<http://www.berlin.de/sen/kultur/>.

This culture funding report is not only intended to present the numbers. Beside the usual statistics gathered at the end of this volume, the report contains an overview of the four cultural policy emphases we will be pursuing until the end of the legislative period in 2016. We have identified these points as key fields of work to continue the positive developments of recent years and thus take up several demands from the realms of culture and politics:

- LOCATIONS
- EXCELLENCE & UNDERGROUND (E&U)
- TRANSPARENCY
- FREEDOM AND DIVERSITY

A chapter is dedicated to each area of emphasis, presenting the activities of the Department of Cultural Affairs in the area in question. Furthermore, guest authors have been asked to critically comment on the emphases in a contribution. This external point of view, which we do not always share, is intended to open conceptual spaces and start a debate on the future of our cultural policy. In this sense we look forward to advice, additions, critique and many new ideas.



**MICHAEL MÜLLER**  
Governing Mayor, Berlin



**TIM RENNER**  
State Secretary for Cultural Affairs



**EMPHASES  
OF BERLIN'S  
CULTURAL POLICY**

## EMPHASES OF BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY

---

### LOCATIONS

Physical locations are the prerequisite for cultural production, presentation, and networking. For a long time, there was an excess of them in Berlin. But due to an increasing demand for apartments and workspaces and the resulting increase in rental prices, space is now becoming increasingly rare. Art and creativity are now threatened with being displaced to the margins of the city.

Securing existing locations thus has top priority. In a growing city, new free spaces for culture need to be established. The Senate Department of Cultural Affairs seeks to insure that appropriate locations are provided for cultural use in the framework of the management of publicly owned real estate, and finances their expansion and use if possible and worthwhile. It examines, as in the development of city neighbourhoods, spaces can be planned for cultural use. Cultural sites that develop from civil society or private economic initiatives are supported to the extent possible. This raises the question of how existing cultural locations can be better utilized by being redesigned for mixed use.

### EXCELLENCE & UNDERGROUND (E&U)

The funds available for cultural funding are limited, and this is true of Berlin in particular, a city that is consolidating its debt. The funding needs to be organized in such a way that it can develop its greatest impact. On the one hand, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs bears a special responsibility to our city's outstanding cultural institutions and for projects ("excellence"), which it supports in their top level achievements. On the other hand, it is responsible for young initiatives (underground) that need to be given the chance to develop through a several-tiered funding system. It needs to be permeable and to adapt constantly to new developments within the cultural scene.

In order to develop cultural funding in an optimal way, our cultural institutions are required to develop their profiles and to set goals accordingly. In the framework of regular agreements, these goals are agreed upon and achievements are then monitored. Project, basis, and concept funding are awarded anew each funding cycle. Expert juries are explicitly instructed not to distribute any "funding subscriptions". Divisions between the disciplines in the arts are disappearing; this trend is reflected in the choice of jury members and the development of interdisciplinary funding instruments. Increasingly, fellowships and prizes are used as a non-bureaucratic form of artistic funding.

### TRANSPARENCY

The Berlin Senate Department of Cultural Affairs awards 400 million Euros of public funding each year. The goal is to make the processes behind this distribution of funding more visible. Transparency will also help to make funding decisions more plausible. We seek to increase the transparency of decisions in the realm of cultural funding by way of the following: the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs informs currently and extensively on its funding activities and offerings. For example, in this cultural funding report, but also on its website, where data is made accessible to the public, in future with open formats. It should be clear to everyone what art costs. Funding programmes, criteria, and forms will be placed online for examination and/or for filling out.

Over the next few years, funding status and the decision making process should be made visible online. The Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs will thus open itself to those active in cultural life, while conversely it is interested in getting to know their ways of working more closely. Towards this end, employees from the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs will be given the opportunity to work briefly at the city's cultural institutions. Communication at the Senate Department of Cultural Affairs will no longer take place as "closed shop", as an invitation for the very few to private locations. In the framework of publicity work, "town hall meetings" will be held that offer everyone the opportunity to pose questions and offer their own ideas.

### FREEDOM AND DIVERSITY

At the latest since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the city has come to symbolize freedom and diversity around the world. We need to expand on this unique aspect of our city. Towards that end, we need to use the opportunities offered by the digitalized and globalized world. The cultural offerings funded by the city should be made freely accessible digitally. This is not only true of our cultural heritage in libraries, archives, museums, and memorial sites, but also for streaming broadcasts of the city's performing arts and music. The situation of rights is complicated, but first steps can be taken with the institutions. The Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs will support institutions in developing digital strategies and networking.

Diversity begins with the people of the city. In decisions about staffing - from jury members to institutional management, diversity needs to be placed at the foreground. In the interest of promoting an international and diverse city, all information on the funding policy of the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs should be published in English, if not in other languages as well, and the multilingual presentation of cultural offerings is supported. A mid-range goal is to provide subtitles or supertitles for all cultural offerings.

EMPHASES OF  
BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY

---

# LOCATIONS



## OVERVIEW / ACTIVITIES

"I can only be free in my studio", as the artist Birgit Brenner put it in an interview marking the 20th anniversary of the Berlin Studio Programme. Since 1993, Berlin has been supporting this freedom by establishing studio buildings and rent grants and by providing consulting for many Berlin artists. At the end of 2013, the Berlin government's studio programme funded 388 studios, around 18 percent of which are located in city-owned property and 82 percent located in privately owned locations. At the end of 2012, 396 studios were rented to artists, while at the end of 2011 365 publically supported studios were available. These studios are offered to artists for a rent of 4 Euros/square meter, including utilities.

Currently, the lack of space has drastically worsened due to skyrocketing real estate prices, especially for central locations. Over the past three years especially, the crowding out of those artistic pioneers who made the city so attractive with their creative and artistic projects has become increasingly clear. There is only a ten percent chance of receiving a funded and affordable workspace, and thus lower than ever. We thus need to give top priority to securing work spaces, co-working spaces, workshops, and labs for future use, and not just for the fine arts.

In 2011, the Berlin Senate and city parliament established policy guidelines towards strengthening of art production in the current legislative period (2011-16) and the two-year budget allocated funding for 100 addi-

tional work spaces. 106 new studios were taken into the studio rental programme by 2014.

Following a decision made by the city parliament, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs will be focusing on refurbishing publicly owned properties, and thus has become intensely involved in altering the city's approach to publicly owned property. We need increasingly to make publicly-owned properties usable for artists and other creatives, making them more independent of fluctuations on the real estate market. While securing and developing these properties is a long-term process, the city's unused former schools, police stations, and administrative buildings could increase the holdings of work spaces over the long term. A successful example of such a reuse is the Kreativhaus on Krenzberg's Baruther Straße, a former school that today offers studio space for fine artists and rehearsal studios for musicians.

By awarding funds from the Stiftung Deutsche Klassenlotterie Berlin, additional spaces were created or secured for the arts in Berlin. For example, Zentrum für Kunst und Urbanistik (ZK/u), located in Berlin Moabit and operated by Kunstrepublik e.V., this new location offers residencies for foreign guests, Eden \*\*\*\*\*, established by Dock 11 with Lotto funding, a dance and rehearsal space in Pankow, or Sophiensäle in Mitte, one of the city's most important alternative locations.

But securing and expanding the infrastructure for artistic production is not just a public task. At Wedding's



Uferstudios, private investors could be convinced to invest in the future of the city. In the former workshops of the Berlin Verkehrsbetriebe, Uferstudios GmbH rents to dancers, performers, students from the Hochschulübergreifenden Zentrum Tanz and scholars who here produce and research jointly.

The new art complex Uferhallen across from Uferstudios is also in private hands. Here, a vibrant venue has emerged with a large exhibition space, studios, and a café which, together with Uferstudios, contributes significantly to the attractiveness of the neighbourhood. In 2013, city funds were used to renovate the former workshop of the Deutsche Oper from the 1930s to create a new event location. Die Tischlerei is a work and experimental space where Berlin's largest opera house can try out new ideas, new approaches, and surprising

confrontations, a lab for 21st century opera. In addition, the intention is to build up a repertoire for children and young people and to the next generation of performers.

Last but not least, with the programme Bibliotheken im Stadtteil (Libraries in the Neighbourhood) the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs has been investing directly in the renovation, modernization, and expansion of available spaces. Public libraries with their broad and current offerings of information provide high quality space for artists to work and research. Institutions like the Bezirkszentralbibliothek in Friedrichshain or the renovated Bibliothek am Wasserturm in Prenzlauer Berg can be used especially by creatives who work digitally.





## OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVE

### (SUB)CULTURE REQUIRES SPACE

Berlin is now internationally recognized for its great density and diversity of event locations, projects, and events, both for its high culture and its subcultures (Grésillon 2014). Regardless of the formats of the locations – whether galleries, clubs, or theatres – most activities had time to develop without any commercial pressure to finance property and could focus resources on cultural and artistic concepts, rather than a project's economic feasibility. But in the wake of the current Berlin real estate boom and an increasing orientation towards profit, these spaces of possibility are dwindling at a dramatic speed. High investments at the start, competing demands for use, and limited choices are endangering the city's cultural development.

#### CREATIVITY NEEDS NO BUSINESS PLAN

The development of club culture in the 1990s is an example of the creative power of an absence of profit interests and state planning. Looking back towards the subcultural boom after the fall of the Berlin Wall, almost all narratives begin with vacant apartment buildings, factories, industrial plants, and empty lots (Rapp 2009, Gutmair 2013). The improvised first uses reded-

icated socially redundant structures and held up neither to the strict criteria of commercial use nor to notions of economic rationality. And yet, this unfinished character became a prerequisite for the development of unique forms of expression and previously unknown synergy effects. In studies on club culture and creative economy, the spatial aspects of the city centre and functionally mixed structures are regularly mentioned (Lange 2007, Jacob 2009), but it is always about the specifically urban quality of the room to create something new. When it comes to cultural and artistic activities, not only specific construction requirements (light, sound proofing, surface, accessibility) but also low costs are of utmost importance. Musicians performing artists, and fine artists achieve an average monthly net average income of only 1,400 Euros (SenWTF 2014: 83), so that it soon becomes clear there is little room for the high rents for studios, rehearsal rooms, and work spaces. Innovative and creative uses without the compulsion to achieve quick economic success were for a long time possible in Berlin without the intervention of public policymakers. Under the changed conditions, the property requirements for improvised and informal uses are no

longer a given, and cultural development has to be taken into consideration when shaping Berlin's policy on publicly owned properties.

#### ART, CULTURE, AND GENTRIFICATION

In debates in the media and politics, the link between artistic activities and gentrification is regularly referred to. The Berlin situation also seems to confirm the nexus of a cultural-symbolic improvement and the social process of urban displacement. Both the spatial structure of the creative economy (and cultural and artistic venues) and the residential situation of those artists in the city insured by the Künstler-sozialkasse correspond to the Berlin geography of rising real estate values in recent years (SenWTF 2014: 90 ff.). Mitte, Prenzlauer Berg, Kreuzberg, Friedrichshain and Nord-Neukölln are characterized by both the highest density of artists and the highest rent increases. But the problem at the heart of this correlation is not constituted by the cultural locations, but the increasing prices. International gentrification research now points to many examples of displacement dynamics without an equivalent symbolic improvement, so we can exclude a direct

causal effect between artistic and aesthetically effective activities and gentrification. Rather, both processes have neglected urban areas of economic disinvestment as their prerequisite. Ultimately, it is the dynamics of real estate profit interests that results in processes of social displacement and limitations on (sub) cultural possibilities of development. For conflicts in urban policy planning, a suspension of the opposition between "symbolically effective pioneers" and renters threatened with displacement could result in new possible coalitions, that until now have seldom come to pass. The activities of the Club Commission or the initiative Haben und brauchen explore the negative impacts of property value increases for the city as a whole, but have not yet formed alliances with the increasing mobilization of renters in the city.

#### NEW ALLIANCES AND CLEAR DEMANDS

The spatial overlap of club closings and processes of social displacement is the result of a similar process. For many artists and cultural producers, the availability of residential space, working space, and locations for events was a matter that could be solved individually for a long time. With knowledge of the city, personal contacts, and intense searching, it was usually relatively easy to find the right conditions. For many of those in search of a place to live, locally limited upscale developments on the real estate mar-

ket, for example in Mitte and Prenzlauer Berg, could be compensated for by moving to neighbouring areas. But now gentrification in Berlin has become a phenomenon all across the city, and the real estate yield expectations have exploded across large parts of the city centre and beyond (Holm 2014). Unused lots, empty commercial spaces, and owners pleased about temporary usages will be available less and less in future. The development of cultural locations in the city cannot be left to develop on its own as has been done until now, but requires a targeted strategy of enablement. Even if creativity and cultural improvisation are difficult to plan (Kirchberg 2010: 40), without publicly organized responsibility for the maintenance of existing spaces for future cultural space, Berlin's character as a cultural centre is threatened. The redistribution of income from the booming tourism business by way of a city tax will not suffice. Culture needs space. And under the conditions of the real estate boom, space can only be secured with a strategic adjustment of the city's policy on public property.

ANDREJ HOLM teaches and researches urban sociology at the Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boris Grésillon (2004): Kulturmetropole Berlin, Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag.
- Gutmair, Ulrich (2013): Die ersten Tage von Berlin: Der Sound der Wende, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Holm, Andrej (2014), "Gentrifizierung – mittlerweile ein Mainstreamphänomen?", in: Informationen zur Raumbewertung 4.2014, 471-483.
- Jakob, Doreen (2009): Beyond Creative Production Networks: The Development of Intra-Metropolitan Creative Industries Clusters in Berlin and New York City, Berlin.
- Kirchberg, Volker (2010): "Kreativität und Stadtkultur – Soziologische Deutungen", in: Christine Hannemann, et al. (eds.), Jahrbuch Stadtregion 2009/2010, 19-44.
- Lange, Bastian (2007): Die Räume der Kreativszenen. Culturepreneurs und ihre Orte in Berlin, Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Rapp, Tobias (2009): Lost and Sound: Berlin, Techno und der Easyjetset, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Forschung, Der Regierende Bürgermeister von Berlin, Senatskanzlei – Kulturelle Angelegenheiten, Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung (2014): Kreativwirtschaftsbericht, Berlin.

EMPHASES OF  
BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY

---

# EXCELLENCE & UNDERGROUND



## OVERVIEW / ACTIVITIES



Berlin has around 150 project spaces. They are located in storefronts, garages, former train stations, lofts or pavilions. They work on a self-organized basis, are usually interdisciplinary and linked to the subculture. They are art laboratories and discursive sites that stand for the diversity of Berlin's cultural life. The Berlin climate of available affordable spaces and the idealism, creativity and motivation of those behind these spaces contribute to this. They are often motivated by the goal of creating a public sphere for artistic processes and presentation without proceeding in a market-oriented fashion. And with their competence, their perseverance, and their visions, they have created the grounds for the emergence and implementation of innovative projects.

Since 2012, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs has been awarding prizes to honour these initiatives. This support mechanism, developed in collaboration with Berliner Netzwerk freier Projekträume und Initiativen, invests in the foundations of a vital art city. The awards are given to independent art locations and initiatives that are usually operated by individuals or associations and enrich the spectrum of fine art with their experimental and original programmes in an outstanding way. Annually, from around 80 to 100 applications seven project spaces are chosen by a jury and awarded a prize of 30,000 Euros, excellence in the underground. The prize offers the operators of these

spaces financial freedom for a certain time period and places trust in their ideas, no matter how and what they use the prize money for.

The realm of the performing arts in the capital is similarly varied and diverse. Not only do the three opera houses and five large state theatres play a role in the German-speaking world and beyond, the alternative theatres of the city in recent years have been gaining in quality and diversity and thus have been increasing in importance beyond Berlin's borders. To promote the professionalization of alternative theatres and the marketing of its productions, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs and the Landesverband Freie Darstellende Künste established the Performing Arts Programme. Since 2012, using funds from the EFRE and the ESF, a networking, advice, and consulting institution has been established for performing artists working freelance. A digital rehearsal space platform addresses the increasing need for production sites. The export of productions is supported with the help of the city's Department of Economics. The target is to strengthen the structure and improve the perception of the alternative performing arts community.

For music groups, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs has been able to add to the number of rehearsal spaces in recent years, enabling many musicians to work freely without disturbance.



## OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVE

### CULTURAL BEACONS AND THE ALTERNATIVE SCENE: CULTURAL FUNDING FOR A DIVERSE POPULATION

In absolute numbers, Germany is the country with the highest level of public cultural funding around the world, with 9.5 billion Euros going to the arts and culture each year. 25 percent of all classical orchestras and 14 percent of all opera houses around the world are located in Germany, and the country's 150 three-discipline theatres were even proposed to be listed as part of the UNESCO World Cultural Heritage. Berlin, although it is one of the poorest Federal States, ranks at the top in terms of cultural funding. This has to do with its status as capital, its rich cultural tradition, and its history as a divided city. And yet, among many public cultural establishments there is a quite justified concern that the status quo cannot be maintained. With altered social conditions, a strongly changing population due to migration, and shifts due to digitalization that have developed a new, more participative culture, public cultural institutions need to innovate in order to represent the interests of heterogeneous population groups. Here, a look at cultural user research can help.

- Only 10% of the population, largely people with university degrees, belong to the regular users of publically funded cultural institutions like theatres, concert houses, and museums (Zentrum für Kulturforschung 2005, 2011, 2012)

- Educational level has gained in importance as a central influence on cultural participation and the educational gap has increased: young people with a minimal education scarcely have interest in or access to publicly funded cultural offerings.

- The interest of young people in traditional cultural offerings is declining in general (Zentrum für Kulturforschung Jugendkulturbarometer 2012)

- Young people with a migrant background are more interested in art and culture than the average population, but primarily take advantage of commercial cultural offerings.

- As a whole, an interest in popular culture dominates in the population. Film/cinema and rock/pop music are the favourites, opera and theatre take last place. "Good entertainment" is named as the most important expectation of for cultural event.

These results challenge cultural policymaking to develop concepts that make the publically funded cultural system more permeable, flexible, and open and can represent various population groups with their cultural interests. In so doing, we should not aim at "missionizing" to bring people to high culture, but rather, on the basis of a non-normative concept of culture, accept various artistic and cultural modes of expression as different, but equal in status. Cultural excellence and high artistic or cultural quality is not an evaluation that is limited to certain cultural forms, but can be expressed in traditional classical art just as it can in alternative venues in popular cultural forms.

A central challenge for public cultural funding is shifting from a funding policy of the conservative maintenance of the existing cultural landscape to a concept-based, transparent cultural policy that funds institutions and projects among various groups of actors and populations to achieve negotiated cultural goals. This is easier said than done. For past experience shows

that due to existing legal regulations, but also due to leading opinion makers among cultural journalists, it is scarcely possible to change existing institutional structures, for example, to close an established cultural institution in order to free funds for newer cultural offerings.

All the same, the existing institutional wealth of the German and Berlin cultural landscape can only be maintained if the institutions and the cultural landscape in general change in such a way that they become relevant and attractive for a larger spectrum of the population. The "justification consensus" that Gerhard Schulze describes for public cultural life, which places traditionally funded cultural institutions per se under protection, regardless of their achievements or their significance for the society, is becoming increasingly unstable. If cultural offerings are financed using tax money, they have to accept being scrutinized under transparent criteria, one of which can be reaching a broad public. The argument that high demand is an automatic indicator of poor quality mass entertainment rather than for high quality is not empirically tenable. Just as an orientation towards and engaging with new potential users be-

yond milieus traditionally open to culture is by no means necessarily accompanied by a decrease in artistic quality (see the Arts Council England, *New Audiences Programme 2004*, Mandel 2013). The objection repeatedly raised that the quality of art and cultural institutions is not measurable is more or less a pretext, just as an insistence on artistic freedom serves as the foundation for an argument that cultural institutions per se should not be subject to public scrutiny.

The criteria that can be considered evidence of quality depend on the respective goals of an institution, and these can be very different: maintaining the cultural heritage, funding new art forms, enabling cultural processes of education, or reaching a widely varied audience, bringing together various groups of a city population in an intercultural way.

The most important prerequisite for public cultural funding is that the goals of the funded institutions are clearly formulated and made transparent in joint processes between cultural policymakers and the institutions themselves. "Almost none of the institutions developed clear criteria by which they can measure the success of their activities - this is closely tied to the lack

of goals"; according to the result of an evaluation report on the cultural outreach programmes of cultural institutions funded by the Senate (Birnkraut, 2011, p. 6).

With its cultural offerings, Berlin has to do justice to its mission as a representative capital city and as a destination for cultural tourism by funding the cultural beacons that stand as brands for excellence and outstanding achievement in their respective genre. But at the same time, Berlin lives, in terms of cultural tourism as well, from its broad and vital independent art scene and the many cultural-economic actors "underground", many of them small businesspeople: Berlin has the highest proportion of cultural workers among those employed in Germany. To maintain this valuable cultural potential, public cultural funding has to be used to protect room for cultural projects and to promote affordable infrastructure, proceeding with the same decisiveness as it does in institutional funding. Here, the relationship between institutional funding and the alternative cultural life of the city needs to be rethought. 95 percent of funding goes to cultural institutions without them having to show quality, while little is left over for alternative

projects, which require extensive evaluation in order to receive funding.

Although many cultural offerings in Berlin live from the strong demand of cultural tourism and the city's large cultural life, the cultural policy of the Berlin government should also take account of the many population groups that are less open to the arts and frequently possess a below average income and low educational level. This can best succeed on low-level cultural work on the local level.

Networking and collaboration between funded cultural institutions and the alternative scene, so that they can profit more from the institutional cultural infrastructure, has proven useful. At the same time, the cooperation of the large cultural institutions with local municipal cultural work and cultural education is an important step to make their offerings accessible to more people, just as the institutions provide valuable inspirations for processes of change by engaging with new actors and a new audience with whom they usually scarcely have any contact.

The great cultural wealth and high estimation of art and culture in our society can only be maintained if it is not museumified, but if culture-policy adjustments are made so that new popu-

lation groups and coming generations can discover an interest in cultural life.

BIRGIT MANDEL

is a professor for cultural education and cultural management at the Institut für Kulturpolitik, Universität Hildesheim

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Arts Council England/Johnson, Gill (2004): *New Audiences for the Arts: The New Audiences Programme 1998-2003*, London.

Birnkraut, Gesa (2011): *Bericht zur Evaluation Kultureller Bildung*. Im Auftrag senatskanzlei Kulturelle Angelegenheiten, Berlin.

Mandel, Birgit (2013): *Interkulturelles Audience Development. Zukunftsstrategien für öffentlich geförderte Kulturinstitutionen*, Bielefeld.

Zentrum für Kulturforschung/Keuchel, Susanne, eds., 8. Kulturbarometer, 2. Jugendkulturbarometer, 1. Inter Kultur Barometer.

EMPHASES OF  
BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY

---

# TRANSPARENCY



## OVERVIEW / ACTIVITIES

For several years now, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs has been regularly exchanging ideas with initiatives, associations, and networks of Berlin cultural life, discussing current and future cultural funding or the impacts of the policy on public property for locations for culture and work. In dialogue, measures and instruments of public cultural funding are reflected upon and developed further. This exchange at eye level complements established governance structures of the Senate's cultural funding, for example awards on the basis of jury votes (p2p processes), reliable compliance with funding principles, and the transparent publication of funding results.

In the fine arts, this dialogue between administrators in November 2012 was begun with the event "K2" at the initiative of the State Secretary of Culture. The occasion for the event were debates on the Berlin Kunsthalle and the exhibition Based in Berlin. The event itself polarized, but everyone agreed that a structured exchange between the figures from the alternative art world, established fine art institutions, administration, and policymakers was necessary for the future of Berlin as a city of the arts.

The result is a italics for the fine arts held at the offices of the Senate Department of Cultural Affairs, which has been taking place since 2013, dealing both with issues that require timely action as well as concepts for a long-term, sustainable discursive process.

These stakeholder dialogues primarily involve active initiatives and institutions such as the Rat für die Künste, the Koalition der freien Szene, Landesverband freie Darstellende Kunst, LG Jazz, Initiative Neue Musik, Netzwerk der Projekträume, bbk, and Haben&brauchen. The series "Be Berlin, Be Diverse" sought to include a broader public in core questions of cultural policy. It was carried out from 2009 to 2015 together with the Gemeinnützige Hertie-Stiftung and engaged with questions of cultural participation.





## OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVE

### A VISION OF TRANSPARENT ADMINISTRATION

Transparency is the natural enemy of bureaucracy. Files, procedures, and memos still fill the everyday life of government officials. But something is changing. Due to the increased longing of citizens for information about what public authorities actually do, a market for open data and more transparency is developing. State institutions have to learn to deal with this new situation, for these developments are just beginning. There are great chances for a new age of cooperation. An overview:

Digitalization is changing life reality for people of all ages and does not ask for context, vision or framing conditions. It is simply happening. The core of this transformation is the visibility and accessibility of data, information, and structures. We do not need to understand digitalization while it changes and shapes our lives, the world of work, and culture. It is better to use the advantages of the new openness and the omnipresence of the digital or at least to have our ears on the rails listening for the next disruption. Existing structures are usually not prepared for such game changers.

Administrations are static structures, democracy poured into a cast. They

control and define processes and apparently required procedures for the general public. Through their very constitution and structure, they are the exact opposite of agile or change-based action. This means that the citizens and actors that are actually supposed to be the focus are quickly left behind. The balance between security (administration) and flexibility (creatives) has to be secured for each actor, reliability is only possible with plannability. And yet what are concrete steps towards more transparency of resources and offerings of the Department of Cultural Affairs in Berlin? An important and pioneering step is the publication of meta-data and its licensing via open licensing. On the one hand, the numbers and facts should be provided in a machine-legible form to the interested public. In this way, new visualizations and representation and thus better access for citizens can be created. On the other hand, it is important that this data is open and sustainably licensed, for only then will people be motivated to do something with the data. Important here is not only accessibility, but also, but also the clear statement that the data can and should be used to work. In this way, a new space

of resonance can be established between civil society and public authorities that promotes trust and understanding on both sides. Towards this end, the internal steps of the administration management need to be communicated in a clear and understandable way. The employees of the Department of Cultural Affairs and the actors in the field all need to be taken along. The employees are in the position to serve as a platform for the citizens interested in their tasks and actions. This can lead quickly to excessive demands that can be prevented by way of good communication.

Parallel to establishing a more transparent administration, we also need to develop new approaches for awarding cultural funding. Here, applications for methods from crowdfunding could be found. Why not include citizens in decisions about how to distribute funds? The online platforms necessary for this are already available. The necessary change in perspective can be accompanied by pilot projects and tests. Here too, sustainability is more important than quick implementation.

Transparency is not just digital! A strategy of openness also creates locations. Why can we not create a structure of

“public working” (analogous to co-working)? That is, physical space for the projects funded? Here, the administration could work together with creatives and continuously monitor the progress made on projects. A great new perspective for the public and a great support for the projects!

The public evaluation of jury or other creative award processes always need to be the standard of cultural policy. In the process, a new dynamic can result that can animate cultural life, a competition of possibilities between the institutions and venues that think they hold a monopoly on interpretation and venues, technologies, and groups beyond this inner circle. Collaboration and team play is the opposite of envy and resentment. Transparency involves respect and understanding for the various actors involved. Transparency also means security: both for one's own planning of projects and locations and for the over-all framework. Today, complex and paralyzing accounting and application processes are one of the main reasons to simply avoid taking part in publically funded cultural life. An unconditional culture of openness and the transparency of the digital world need to be reflected in how cultural policymakers come to formulate their strategies and opinions. It must allow fluid processes and actor-structures the space they need and should not play the various sectors of the arts against one another. Towards this end, investments and agile concepts are needed. The guiding principle here cannot be “that's the way it always was”,

but “how will things be like in future?” Can we maintain financing for locations and institutions over the long term if they are constantly presented to the public as “elitist” and “over funded”? No! This is why the aggressive funding of a transparent cultural policy and administration needs to demand doubling the cultural budget and to invest this money in digital culture.

The developments between so-called high culture and the underground are like stalactites and stalagmites. It takes a long time until they come close to one another or even touch. The speed has no connection to the needs of the individual actors involved.

Here, the Berlin mix of both, a unique cultural life and international institutions, can provide a cornerstone for long-term projects and agreements. Living transparency is here a fundamental building block. Integrating structures that are clear to all, but also possibilities of influencing policy.

This new form of “cultural governance” has to focus more on structures and requirements and thus create a sustainable approach. In so doing, errors can, indeed must be made, to give innovations and changes the freedom they need to develop. On concrete methods and approaches, the actors need to agree in an open and participative process.

If all actors are involved. If the politics of administration delivers clear instructions and places resources at disposal. If sites, online and offline, emerge, where participation and transparency can be lived and worked, then

a new cultural policy can emerge in the best sense, a structure capable of a future. And if the way there requires so much time and money. There is no alternative.

ANDREAS GEBHARD  
is a businessman in the creative economy  
and managing director of re:publica.

EMPHASES OF  
BERLIN'S CULTURAL POLICY

---

FREEDOM  
&  
DIVERSITY





## OVERVIEW / ACTIVITIES

Since 2012, the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs has been funding the digitalization of objects from the city's institutions of cultural heritage - archives, libraries, museums, and memorial sites. The goal of the funding is to digitalize outstanding works of culture or cultural goods strongly in demand that are representative of Berlin or the various cultural institution in question. Towards this end, Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik Berlin (ZIB) was commissioned with establishing the multi-discipline Servicestelle Digitalisierung (Digis), combining consulting and presentation of digitalization services for cultural institutions in Berlin with their own IT services, especially in the area of long term archiving.

Since 2012 as well, the city's Department of Cultural Affairs and Economic Administration have been funding 10 innovative model projects from the realms of digitalization, automation, and IT service provision in the competition "Digitalisierung und IT-Anwendungen von Einrichtungen der Informationsversorgung" (Digitalization and IT-Applications in Institutions for Information Provision).

The programmes in libraries, archives, and museums take their orientation from the initiative Digital Agenda for Europe from the EU's Europe 2020 Initiative. Findings are to be collected by the Servicestelle Digitalisierung and will contribute to the acquisition of further expertise in the region.

A digital reference format known around the world was established by the Berliner Philharmonic with the Digital Concert Hall, which delivers live streamings, archive access, and background information.

Alongside digitalization, cultural education, and accessibility, cultural diversity is one of the four main emphases in the realm of cultural participation. Continuous funding monitoring in the realm of project funding at the Department of Cultural Affairs provides information about an openness to the demographic shift. The results show that the diversity of the migration society is largely reflected by the juries, the applicants, and the projects funded in terms of quantity. In the realm of institutional funding, with the event series Be Berlin - Be Diverse the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs is focusing on sensitizing decision makers to the issue. Together with the Hertie Stiftung, the State Secretary of Culture hosted eight events from 2011 to 2013. Since the summer of 2013, Shermin Langhoff has been serving as the first artistic director of a German state theatre with a Turkish background. The former director of Kreuzberg's Ballhaus Naunynstraße already caused a furore there with her concept of a post-migrant theatre. At Maxim Gorki Theater, she continues her success with a diverse ensemble and new forms and subjects. It is already clear how changes on the level of casting and programme have already attracted a much more diverse audience to the institution. All major Berlin stages and orchestras place a focus on cultural diversity in their various pedagogical offerings. Diversity and internationality shape the image and attractiveness of Berlin cultural life. This is true for the many young artists that are attracted to Berlin to live and work and also applies to one of the beacons of the city's musical life, the Berlin Philharmonic, whose musicians come from 21 countries.



Remembering Reichskristallnacht in 1938 and the delegation of power to the Nazis in 1933 served as an occasion for the theme year "Zerstörte Vielfalt: 1933-1938-1945" (Destroyed Diversity 1933-1938-1945). This programme was initiated by the Berlin Department of Cultural Affairs together with Humboldt-Universität and organized by Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH, and thanks to the commitment of many institutions, initiatives, and individuals grew into a citywide event. In numerous events throughout the year, the diversity of life in the world city of Berlin was remembered and its destruction in Nazism was commemorated. Several Berlin institutions, museums, memorials, archives, universities, churches, the Jewish Community, the Sinti and Roma Association, historical initiatives, various cultur-

al institutions, companies and unions contributed their own specific aspect. In the process, newer forms of addressing a new and younger audience were explored and used. Through events and presentations at authentic sites in the city, those people could also be reached who would otherwise not visit a history museum or a memorial.



## OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVE

### OPEN BERLIN: 2039 A UTOPIAN MAGNET FOR FREEDOM AND DIVERSITY

It's 2039: "Open source everything!" That was the demand made in 2015 by the artists and innovators who began to use the many new possibilities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution in Berlin's melting pot. Their programme: open source everything!

In 1998, as part of the new political party founded by the Volksbühne Chance 2000, Christoph Schlingensiefel tried to organize an event where one million unemployed people would jump into Wolfgangsee to generate a flood wave that would drown Helmut Kohl and bring about a change in the employment market. In 2015, several subversive artists picked up on this action. Their goal: a friendly takeover of Facebook, to return citizens their data. As so often in revolutionary times, the theatre played a decisive role here. This time, a public theatre was postheroically transformed into a communications concern using all the tools of the trade. The fourth Industrial Revolution had begun in Germany, and the so-called Internet of Things became concretely palpable. Productions and museum content were made accessible to all online. The workshops of the theatre were expanded as open and freely accessible maker spaces and fablabs:

the seamstresses, carpentry workshops, and metalworking shops of the theatre were given interesting technologies for 2015, like 3Dscanners and printers, CaD milling equipment, laser cutters, and intuitive design software. Under the direction of artists, Berlin residents, tourists, artists, engineers, and scholars could develop effective prototypes: robot art, installations, individual furniture pieces, and tableware were built as props for productions that attracted attention all over the city. The city became increasingly a stage and the theatres open rehearsal centres: in the foyers of the theatres, coworking spaces emerged where regular hackathons were held. Using the new and expanded possibilities of theatre in Berlin, the economic shift of the information society to an age of meaning of a creative society was anticipated and made sensually graspable: Open Berlin.

The claims of Open Berlin were and still are being developed jointly. Here a small selection:

Open-Berlin 2015:  
**FROM CREATIVITY  
TO CONCREATIVITY**

Open-Berlin 2022:  
**FROM THE INFORMATION  
SOCIETY TO THE SOCIETY  
OF MEANING**

Open-Berlin 2029:  
**FROM THE MULTICULTURAL  
TO THE MULTIOPTION SOCIETY**

Open-Berlin 2031:  
**FROM "POOR BUT SEXY" TO  
"RICH BUT SEXY"**

Open-Berlin 2001:  
**THOSE OPEN FOR EVERYTHING  
MUST HAVE A SCREW LOOSE**

Open-Berlin 2039:  
**KILL YOUR DARLINGS...**

Sociologist Dirk Baecker already anticipated this movement in 2013 in the reader "What's Next: Die Kunst nach der Krise" (Art after the Crisis): "I con-

ceive of the next society primarily as society's engagement with the computer, showing the computer its limits. Here we will badly need the help of art, an art that using the medium of the computer shows the computer its own limits. Art will need to find new locations, new times, and a new audience. It will experiment with formats where the standard institutions become variables. Think of Walid Raad and his Atlas Group, which makes the theatre into a university or perhaps an installation for thinking about not-so-fictional events. Or think of Matthias Lilienthal's theatre project X Wohnungen (X Apartments), that transforms private apartments into stages. Or the famous audio-walks by Janet Cardiff and others who create a kind of accessible book landscape in which we walk around in a dream like state similar to reading. Open Berlin became a public agora and the action field for the digital agenda where the necessity of the analog in the digital became visible and concrete. Initially, many thought it was a joke or a game: and that is precisely why it succeeded in the end...

Bitcoins, DIY biolabs, 3D printed shoes and toys, occupy everything, share economy, kickstarters, smart cities, cloud, the energy revolution and informal economies. The variety of the new economies needed art and vice versa. And it is of no importance whether someone believed that art could transform the world or not: the world transforms art and vice versa. The new possibilities meant that not only could anyone become an artist, but that an-

nyone could also become a distributor of their art, without difficulty, could refer to everything and no longer fit in any category. State funded art was now at eye level with the art beyond the art institutions. Regardless whether as a business, state, world-improving, "free"; applied, superfluous, useless, valuable, wild, quiet and still, effective and un-known - in all conceivable forms no problem was too small and no challenge too great for the people who came to Berlin and wanted to become part of the idea. Open Berlin. Open source everything. The prototypes that emerged were given a stage with all the tools of the theatre, and could be made available to experience communicatively around the world. The theatre, as the last dinosaur of organization, renewed itself playfully. Art and culture now provided the sensory programme for a society in the process of transforming meaning: what makes the human human, individually and as a society. The human being can invent himself or herself "creatively", for which both creative forces and concrete possibilities exist together with our fellow human beings and nature.


The challenge of the Fourth Industrial Revolution was the free and responsible design of humanity in the openness of endless room for play in technological and practical self-enablement in both the aesthetic and the ethical, in the social and political habitat. The creative principles that art and culture had access to over the centuries provided the basic law of these various

sociogeneses. Whereby the "individual is only allowed whatever helps all, and all are only allowed what helps the individual and nature".

This mindset, using new and old products and ideas, became rich so easily that in an overnight action in 2017 Facebook was taken over to return to the residents of Berlin and the world their data. This went down in history as the second Fall of the Wall, a cultural enrichment and enthusiasm that made people more inventive and more courageous. The end of the movement is well-known today: artists from around the world work together on improving it:

Open Berlin is everywhere!

CHRISTOPH BACKES  
is managing director and co-founder  
of the U-Institut at Hochschule Bremen  
and since 1 Jan. 2015 has been director  
of the Kompetenzzentrum Kultur- und  
Kreativwirtschaft des Bundes.

A photograph of six men of various ages and styles standing on a stage. The men are arranged in a line from left to right. The first man is bald and wearing a plaid shirt and khaki pants. The second man has a beard and is wearing a grey shirt and dark pants. The third man has a mustache and is wearing a light blue shirt and jeans. The fourth man is older with white hair, wearing a dark polo shirt and dark pants. The fifth man is bald and wearing a black t-shirt and grey pants. The sixth man is wearing a dark long-sleeved shirt and khaki pants. The background is dark with hanging lights, and the floor is made of wood. A white rectangular box with black text is overlaid on the image.

**PEOPLE  
INFORMATION  
FIGURES**

# STAFFING DECISIONS

## APPOINTMENTS<sup>1</sup>

INSTITUTION	FUNCTION	YEAR	NAME
<b>OPERA</b>			
Deutsche Oper	Artistic director	2012-2017	Dietmar Schwarz
	Managing director	2011-2017	Thomas Fehrlé
Komische Oper	Artistic director	2013-2018	Barrie Kosky
	GMD	2013-2017	Henrik Nánási
Deutsche Staatsoper	Managing director	2014-2019	Susanne Moser
	Artistic director	2011-2018	Jürgen Flimm
	GMD	2012-2022	Daniel Barenboim
Bühnenservice GmbH	Managing director	2011-2016	Ronny Unganz
	Managing director	2012-2016	Rolf D. Suhl
Stiftungsdach	General director	2013-2018	Georg Vierthaler
<b>THEATRE</b>			
Maxim Gorki Theater	Artistic director	2013-2018	Shermin Langhoff / Jens Hilje
	Managing director	2013-2018	Jürgen Meyer
Theater an der Parkaue	Artistic director	2015-2020	Kay Wuschek
Deutsches Theater	Artistic director	2014-2019	Ulrich Khuon
Volksbühne	Artistic director	2013-2017	Frank Castorf
HAU	Artistic director	2012-2017	Annemie Vanackere
<b>DANCE</b>			
Staatsballett Berlin	Artistic director	2014-2019	Nacho Duato
	Managing director	2013-2018	Georg Vierthaler
<b>MUSIC</b>			
Konzerthaus	Artistic director	2014-2019	Sebastian Nordmann
	Chief conductor	2012-2015	Ivan Fischer
	Managing director	2013-2018	Raphael Graf von Hoensbroech
Berliner Philharmoniker	Artistic director	2010-2017	Martin Hoffmann
	Chief conductor	2002-2018	Sir Simon Rattle
<b>REVUE THEATRE</b>			
Friedrichstadtpalast GmbH	Managing director	2014-2019	Bernd Schmidt
<b>MUSEUMS AND FINE ART</b>			
Stiftung Berlinische Galerie	Director	2014-2019	Thomas Köhler
Stiftung Bröhan Museum	Director	2013-2018	Tobias Hofmann
<b>MEMORIALS AND THE CULTURE OF MEMORY</b>			
Stiftung Berliner Mauer	Director	2014-2018	Axel Klausmeier
<b>LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES</b>			
Stiftung Zentral-und Landesbibliothek	Director	2012-2017	Volker Heller
<b>INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTIONS</b>			
Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH	Managing director	2012-2016	Moritz van Dülmen

<sup>1</sup> In the following, only those appointments are listed where the Department of Cultural Affairs as funder or member of the committee exerts a decisive influence. This is not the case for the private organizations with state funding, Georg-Kolbe-Stiftung or Schaubühne GmbH, or institutions funded by the Federal Government (Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum or Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz).

# FUNDING STATISTICS

	2011	2012	2013
<b>FUNDING STATISTICS</b>			
Project funding divided by area, in Euros <sup>2</sup>			
Theatre	4,656,700	6,165,700	6,186,296
Dance	3,034,000	2,660,900	2,310,912
Music	2,617,050	3,203,250	3,262,738
Literature	988,367	1,229,400	1,144,883
Fine Art	4,979,893	4,951,200	5,517,220
Interdisciplinary	1,096,456	1,143,900	2,032,954
Other	4,097,500	2,868,000	2,629,488
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>21,469,966</b>	<b>22,222,350</b>	<b>23,084,491</b>

## THEATRES

Development of average funding for Berlin theatres, in Euros

Opera houses	198	200	187
Large theatres	86	97	97
Children / Youth theatre	46	47	48
Concept-funded project theatres	31	34	37

## FUNDING, THEATRE IN EUROS

Project funding, Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds	4,656,700	6,165,700	6,186,296
Institutional funding, Berlin	214,625,536	227,160,515	226,130,977
Stiftung Oper in Berlin	121,723,391	124,714,063	121,622,033
Large theatres	74,406,738	81,524,056	83,113,824
Children / Youth theatre	7,880,041	8,431,100	8,558,300
Concept-funded private theatres	4,158,366	4,466,796	4,517,320
Friedrichstadtpalast	6,457,000	8,024,500	8,319,500
<b>Funding</b>	<b>214,625,536</b>	<b>227,160,515</b>	<b>226,130,977</b>
Project funding, percentage	2.2%	2.7%	2.7%
Institutional funding, percentage	97.8%	97.3%	97.3%

## AUDIENCE NUMBERS, THEATRES

Stiftung Oper in Berlin	700,819	696,514	726,513
Large theatres	862,645	815,860	843,295
Children / Youth theatre	168,903	179,648	176,624
Concept-funded private theatres	147,607	141,290	139,720
Friedrichstadtpalast	451,767	445,388	522,209
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,331,741</b>	<b>2,278,700</b>	<b>2,408,361</b>

<sup>2</sup> Incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds

	2011	2012	2013
<b>INDIVIDUAL PROJECT FUNDING, PERFORMING ARTS</b>			
Number of applications	170	296	163
Volume of total grants awarded, in Euros	5,724,948	9,251,429	5,285,785
Grants awarded, percentage	31 / 18%	48 / 16%	28 / 17%
<b>Total funding in Euros</b>	<b>734,400</b>	<b>1,179,000</b>	<b>758,500</b>
Average grant in Euros	23,690	24,563	27,089

## DANCE

### Dance funding, in Euros

Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds	3,034,000	2,660,900	2,310,912
Institutional funding, Berlin <sup>3</sup>	8,488,373	8,572,287	8,572,287
<b>Total funding, Berlin</b>	<b>11,522,373</b>	<b>11,233,187</b>	<b>10,883,199</b>
Project funding, percentage	35.7%	31.0%	27.0%
Institutional funding, percentage	64.3%	69.0%	73.0%

### DANCE GRANTS

Number of applications	38	47	47
Grants awarded, percentage	7 / 18%	8 / 17%	8 / 17%
<b>Total funding in Euros</b>	<b>17,500</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>20,000</b>
Average grant in Euros	972	1,111	1,111

## MUSIC

### Music funding in Euros

Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds	2,617,050	3,203,250	3,262,738
Institutional funding, Berlin	36,182,784	37,216,000	37,679,000
<b>Total funding, Berlin</b>	<b>37,785,534</b>	<b>39,044,962</b>	<b>39,734,873</b>
Project funding, percentage	4.4%	4.9%	5.5%
Institutional funding, percentage	95.6%	95.1%	94.5%
<b>Number of visitors, concert houses and orchestras</b>	<b>737,036</b>	<b>763,574</b>	<b>641,792</b>

### INDIVIDUAL PROJECT FUNDING IN POP, JAZZ, WORLD MUSIC<sup>4</sup>

Number of applications	124	140	124
Application volume in Euros	855,724	915,508	932,998
Grants awarded, percentage	35 / 28%	46 / 33%	40 / 32%
<b>Total funding in Euros</b>	<b>254,100</b>	<b>276,000</b>	<b>337,218</b>
Average grant in Euros	7,260	6,000	8,430

<sup>3</sup> Staatsballett Berlin,  
Sasha Waltz & Guests, Cie.  
Toula Limnaos, Tanzbüro Berlin

<sup>4</sup> Not including grant award,  
construction, studio technology,  
and grants

<sup>5</sup> Initiative Neue Musik Berlin e.V.  
(INM), funded by the Cultural  
Affairs Department, awards  
government money annually  
for new music projects.  
The information presented here  
refers to government funding  
that goes to project support  
(without individual grants).

<sup>6</sup> Incl. structural funding  
(Kulturwerk GmbH des BBK)

<sup>7</sup> Stiftung Berlinische Galerie,  
Kunst-Werke e.V., Künstlerhaus  
Bethanien GmbH, Haus am  
Waldsee, Bauhaus-Archiv e.V.,  
Brücke Museum, Stiftung  
Bröhan, Verbundarchiv e.V.,  
Georg-Kolbe-Stiftung

<sup>8</sup> Stiftung Stadtmuseum Berlin,  
Stiftung Preußische Schlösser  
und Gärten (co-financing, Berlin)

<sup>9</sup> Co-financing, Berlin

<sup>10</sup> Stiftung Deutsches Technik-  
museum Berlin, Schwules  
Museum, Jugend im Museum e.V.

	2011	2012	2013
<b>INDIVIDUAL PROJECT FUNDING, NEW MUSIC<sup>5</sup></b>			
Number of applications	37	45	29
Application volume in Euros	887,515	1,009,773	994,842
Grants awarded, percentage	15 / 41%	18 / 40%	18 / 62%
<b>Total funding in Euros</b>	<b>515,650</b>	<b>583,962</b>	<b>567,375</b>
Average grant in Euros	34,377	32,442	31,521

## LITERATURE

### Literature funding, in Euros

Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds	988,367	1,229,400	1,144,883
Institutional funding, Berlin	2,262,111	2,424,336	2,422,925
<b>Total funding, Berlin</b>	<b>3,250,478</b>	<b>3,653,736</b>	<b>3,567,808</b>
Project funding, percentage	43.7%	50.7%	47.3%
Institutional funding, percentage	56.3%	49.3%	52.7%

### LITERATUR WORKING GRANTS

Number of applications	318	320	343
Grants awarded, percentage	13 / 4%	13 / 4%	13 / 4%
<b>Total funding in Euros</b>	<b>156,000</b>	<b>156,000</b>	<b>156,000</b>
Average grant in Euros	12,000	12,000	12,000

## MUSEUMS AND FINE ART

### Museums and fine art funding, in Euros

Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds <sup>6</sup>	4,979,893	4,951,200	5,517,220
Institutional funding, Berlin	56,992,890	58,569,010	59,691,521
Art museums and exhibition spaces <sup>7</sup>	8,366,016	8,951,821	9,026,195
History museums <sup>8</sup>	15,743,967	16,791,489	17,507,606
Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz <sup>9</sup>	15,846,000	14,809,000	14,809,000
Special museums <sup>10</sup>	17,036,907	18,016,700	18,348,720
<b>Total funding, Berlin</b>	<b>62,222,783</b>	<b>63,770,210</b>	<b>65,458,741</b>
Project funding, percentage	9.2%	8.9%	9.7%
Institutional funding, percentage	90.8%	91.1%	90.3%

	2011	2012	2013
<b>VISITOR NUMBERS, MUSEUMS AND FINE ART</b>			
Art museums and exhibition institutions	402,064	556,297	515,018
History museums	2,023,630	1,991,652	1,991,485
Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz	5,741,280	5,394,207	5,221,561
Special museums	722,403	670,229	748,673
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,889,377</b>	<b>8,612,385</b>	<b>8,476,737</b>

## MEMORIALS AND THE CULTURE OF MEMORY

### Memorial funding, in Euros<sup>11</sup>

Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of Nazism <sup>12</sup>	3,376,785	3,800,490	4,144,732
Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of the GDR <sup>13</sup>	1,352,000	2,675,137	2,874,972
<b>Total (Berlin)</b>	<b>4,728,785</b>	<b>6,475,627</b>	<b>7,019,704</b>

### VISITOR NUMBERS, MEMORIALS

Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of Nazism	1,135,179	1,293,555	1,540,333
Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of the GDR	981,580	1,053,828	1,219,828
<b>Total (Berlin)</b>	<b>2,116,759</b>	<b>2,347,383</b>	<b>2,760,161</b>

## LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES

### Use Profile VÖBB<sup>14</sup>

Local branches	77	77	77
Mobile libraries	10	10	10
Media holdings	6,876,003	6,771,513	6,776,313

### USE PROFILE, VÖBB

Registered users	547,990	402,952	402,567
New users	72,564	68,043	70,991
Loans	22,988,398	23,375,737	24,136,009
Loans per user	41	58	60
Use of the Internet presence (number of clicks)	301,141,835	308,645,635	326,193,903

► Every day over 7,562 people visit one of the city's eight official memorial sites.

<sup>11</sup> Co-financing, Berlin

<sup>12</sup> Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, Trägerverein Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, Dokumentationszentrum NS-Zwangsarbeit Berlin-Schöneweide, Aktives Museum, Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand

<sup>13</sup> Gedenkstätte Berlin-Hohenschönhausen, Stiftung Berliner Mauer

<sup>14</sup> VÖBB – Verbund der öffentlicher Bibliotheken Berlins (<https://www.voebb.de>)

	2011	2012	2013
<b>FUNDING, LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES</b>			
Stiftung Zentral- und Landesbibliothek	21,429,266	19,769,051	19,755,077
Landesarchiv	5,334,901	5,832,565	6,128,811
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,764,167</b>	<b>25,601,616</b>	<b>25,883,888</b>

## INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTIONS, PROGRAMMES

### Funding Interdisciplinary, in Euro

Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds	1,096,456	1,143,900	2,032,964
Institutional funding <sup>15</sup>	8,021,741	7,348,016	6,962,029
<b>Total funding, Berlin</b>	<b>9,118,197</b>	<b>8,491,916</b>	<b>8,994,993</b>
Project funding, percentage	13.7%	15.6%	29.2%
Institutional funding, percentage	86.3%	84.4%	70.8%

## PROJEKTFONDS KULTURELLE BILDUNG

### Statistics 2011-2013

	2011	2012	2013	TOTAL
Number of applications	692	666	557	1,915
Number of grants awarded	252	246	224	722
<b>Participating children and young people</b>	<b>15,113</b>	<b>13,287</b>	<b>14,643</b>	<b>ca. 14,300 annually</b>
Number of schools funded	284	203	190	677
Funding programme 1	100	74	84	258
Funding programme 3	95	104	90	289
Funding programme 2	89	25	16	130
Number of funded school programmes where more than 40 % of the children have non-German backgrounds (only FP 1)	66%	68%	57%	ø 64%

programmes where more than 40 % of the children have non-German backgrounds (only FP 1)

From 2011 to 2013, around 2,000 applications were submitted to Berlin's Projektfonds Kulturelle Bildung in all three funding areas. More than 700 projects were funded and implemented. Each year, over 15,000 children and young adults participated. 677 projects took place in schools (as well as childcare centres, youth centres, and art/cultural institutions). In Funding Programme 1, 258 in schools were funded (71 % only once).

An average of 57 % of the schools funded have more than 40 percent students from non-German speaking backgrounds.

<sup>15</sup> Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH, ConSense – Ges. zur Förderung von Kultur mbH (Kulturbrauerei), RambaZamba e.V., ufa-fabrik e.V. (includes project funding for these institutions)

---

# APPENDIX

Institutions funded by the Senate Department of Cultural Affairs (2014):

## THEATRE

**BALLHAUS NAUNYNSTRASSE  
(KULTURSPRÜNGE E.V.)**  
[www.ballhausnaunynstrasse.de](http://www.ballhausnaunynstrasse.de)

**BERLINER ENSEMBLE GMBH**  
[www.berliner-ensemble.de](http://www.berliner-ensemble.de)

**DEUTSCHES THEATER**  
[www.deutschestheater.de](http://www.deutschestheater.de)

**FÖRDERBAND E.V. - KULTURINITIATIVE  
BERLIN (THEATERHAUS MITTE)**  
[www.thbm.foerderband.org](http://www.thbm.foerderband.org)

**FRIEDRICHSTADTPALAST  
BETRIEBSGESELLSCHAFT MBH**  
[www.show-palace.eu](http://www.show-palace.eu)

**GOB SQUAD**  
[www.gobsquad.com](http://www.gobsquad.com)

**GRIPS-THEATER GMBH**  
[www.grips-theater.de](http://www.grips-theater.de)

**HEBBEL-THEATER BERLIN GMBH**  
[www.hebbel-am-ufer.de](http://www.hebbel-am-ufer.de)

**KLEINES THEATER AM  
SÜDWESTKORSO GMBH**  
<http://kleines-theater.de>

**MAXIM GORKI THEATER**  
[www.gorki.de](http://www.gorki.de)

**NEUKÖLLNER OPER E.V.**  
[www.neukoellneroper.de](http://www.neukoellneroper.de)

**NICO AND THE NAVIGATORS GBR**  
[www.navigators.de](http://www.navigators.de)

**NEUE THEATER-BETRIEBS GMBH  
(RENAISSANCE THEATER)**  
[www.renaissance-theater.de](http://www.renaissance-theater.de)

**PRIME TIME THEATER GGMBH**  
<http://primetimetheater.de>

**RIMINI PROTOKOLL**  
[www.rimini-protokoll.de](http://www.rimini-protokoll.de)

**THEATER UND KOMÖDIE AM  
KURFÜRSTENDAMM GMBH**  
[www.komoedie-berlin.de](http://www.komoedie-berlin.de)

**SCHAUBÜHNE AM LEHNINER PLATZ  
THEATERBETRIEBS GMBH**  
[www.schaubuehne.de](http://www.schaubuehne.de)

**SCHLOSSPARK THEATER BERLIN  
(HALLIWOOD GMBH)**  
<http://schlosspark-theater.de>

**SHE SHE POP**  
[www.sheshipop.de](http://www.sheshipop.de)

**SOPHIENSAELE GMBH**  
[www.sophiensaele.com](http://www.sophiensaele.com)

**STIFTUNG OPER IN BERLIN**  
[www.oper-in-berlin.de](http://www.oper-in-berlin.de)

**DEUTSCHE OPER BERLIN**  
[www.deutscheoperberlin.de](http://www.deutscheoperberlin.de)

**DEUTSCHE STAATSOPER BERLIN**  
[www.staatsoper-berlin.de](http://www.staatsoper-berlin.de)

**KOMISCHE OPER BERLIN**  
[www.komische-oper-berlin.de](http://www.komische-oper-berlin.de)

**STAATSBALLET BERLIN**  
[www.staatsballett-berlin.de](http://www.staatsballett-berlin.de)

**THEATER AN DER PARKAUE**  
[www.parkaue.de](http://www.parkaue.de)

**THEATERDISCOUNTER**  
<http://theaterdiscounter.de>

**THEATER IM PALAIS GMBH**  
[www.theater-im-palais.de](http://www.theater-im-palais.de)

**THEATER STRAHL E.V.**  
[www.theater-strahl.de](http://www.theater-strahl.de)

**THEATERHAUS MITTE (FÖRDERBAND E.V.)**  
[www.thbm.foerderband.org](http://www.thbm.foerderband.org)

**VAGANTEN BÜHNE GEMEINNÜTZIGES  
THEATER GMBH**  
[www.vaganten.de](http://www.vaganten.de)

**VOLKSBÜHNE**  
[www.volksbuehne-berlin.de](http://www.volksbuehne-berlin.de)

## DANCE

**CONSTANZA MACRAS/DORKY PARK GMBH**  
[www.dorkypark.org](http://www.dorkypark.org)

**SASHA WALTZ AND GUESTS GMBH**  
[www.sashawaltz.de](http://www.sashawaltz.de)

**STAATSBALLET BERLIN**  
[www.staatsballett-berlin.de](http://www.staatsballett-berlin.de)

**ZEITGENÖSSICHER TANZ BERLIN E.V.  
(TANZBÜRO BERLIN)**  
[www.ztberlin.de](http://www.ztberlin.de)

## MUSIC

**AKADEMIE FÜR ALTE MUSIK GBR**  
[www.akamus.de](http://www.akamus.de)

**BERLINER PHILHARMONIKER**  
[www.berliner-philharmoniker.de](http://www.berliner-philharmoniker.de)

**BEROLINA-ORCHESTER E.V.  
(BERLINER SYMPONIKER)**  
[www.berliner-symphoniker.de](http://www.berliner-symphoniker.de)

**CHORVERBAND BERLIN E.V.**  
[www.chorverband-berlin.de](http://www.chorverband-berlin.de)

**ENSEMBLE ORIOL E.V.**  
[www.ensemble-oriol.de](http://www.ensemble-oriol.de) (bis 2013)

**KONZERTHAUS BERLIN  
(MIT KONZERTHAUSORCHESTER)**  
[www.konzerthaus.de](http://www.konzerthaus.de)

**LANDESMUSIKRAT BERLIN E.V.**  
[www.landesmusikrat-berlin.de](http://www.landesmusikrat-berlin.de)

**ORCHESTER-AKADEMIE E.V.**  
[www.berliner-philharmoniker.de](http://www.berliner-philharmoniker.de)  
(bis 2013)

**RUNDFUNK-ORCHESTER  
UND -CHÖRE GMBH**  
[www.roc-berlin.de](http://www.roc-berlin.de)

## LITERATURE

**GESELLSCHAFT FÜR SINN UND FORM E.V.  
(LITERATURFORUM IM BRECHT-HAUS)**  
[www.lfbrecht.de](http://www.lfbrecht.de)



GEMEINSCHAFT ZUR  
FÖRDERUNG VON KINDER- UND  
JUGENDLITERATUR E.V. (LESART)  
www.lesart.org

LITERARISCHES COLLOQUIUM BERLIN E.V.  
www.lcb.de

LITERATURBRÜCKE BERLIN E.V.  
(LITERATURWERKSTATT)  
www.literaturwerkstatt.org

LITERATURHAUS BERLIN E.V.  
www.literaturhaus-berlin.de

## MUSEUMS AND FINE ART

AKTIVES MUSEUM  
FASCHISMUS UND WIDERSTAND E.V.  
www.aktives-museum.de

BAUHAUS-ARCHIV E.V.  
www.bauhaus.de

BRÜCKE MUSEUM  
www.bruecke-museum.de

DEUTSCHER KÜNSTLERBUND E.V.  
www.kuenstlerbund.de

DEUTSCHER WERKBUND E.V.  
www.werkbund-berlin.de

FÖRDERVEREIN GUTSHAUS MAHLSDORF E.V.  
www.gruenderzeitmuseum.de

GEORG-KOLBE-STIFTUNG  
www.georg-kolbe-museum.de

HAUS AM WALDSEE E.V.  
www.hausamwaldsee.de

JUGEND IM MUSEUM E.V.  
www.jugend-im-museum.de

KÄTHE KOLLWITZ MUSEUM E.V.  
www.kaethe-kollwitz.de

KULTURWERK DES BERUFSVERBANDES  
Bildender Künstler Berlins GmbH  
www.bbk-kulturwerk.de

KUNSTARCHIV BEESKOW  
www.kunstarchiv-beeskow.de

KUNST-WERKE BERLIN E.V.  
www.kw-berlin.de

KUNSTHAUS DAHLEM GGMBH  
http://kunsthaus-dahlem.de

KÜNSTLERHAUS BETHANIE GMBH  
www.bethanien.de

STIFTUNG BERLINISCHE GALERIE  
www.berlinischegalerie.de

STIFTUNG BRÖHAN-MUSEUM  
www.broehan-museum.de

STIFTUNG DEUTSCHES TECHNIK-MUSEUM  
www.sdtb.de

STIFTUNG DOMÄNE DAHLEM  
www.domaene-dahlem.de

STIFTUNG PREUSSISCHE SCHLÖSSER UND  
GÄRTEN BERLIN-BRANDENBURG  
www.spsg.de

STIFTUNG PREUSSISCHER KULTURBESITZ  
http://hv.spk-berlin.de

STIFTUNG STADTMUSEUM BERLIN  
www.stadtmuseum.de

VEREIN DER FREUNDE EINES  
SCHWULEN MUSEUMS IN BERLIN E.V.  
www.schwulesmuseum.de

WERKBUND ARCHIV E.V.  
www.museumderdinge.de

## MEMORIALS AND CULTURE OF MEMORY

FRIEDHOF DER MÄRZGEFALLENEN  
www.friedhof-der-maerzgefallenen.de

GEDENKORT PAPESTRASSE  
www.gedenkort-papestrasse.de

GEDENKSTÄTTE DEUTSCHER WIDERSTAND  
www.gdw-berlin.de

GEDENKSTÄTTE PLÖTZENSEE  
www.gedenkstaette-ploetzensee.de

GEDENKSTÄTTE STILLE HELDEN  
www.gedenkstaette-stille-helden.de

GEDENK- UND BILDUNGSSTÄTTE  
HAUS DER WANNSEE-KONFERENZ  
(„ERINNERN FÜR DIE ZUKUNFT“ E.V.)  
www.ghwk.de

MUSEUM BLINDENWERKSTATT OTTO WEIDT  
www.museum-blindenwerkstatt.de

STIFTUNG BERLINER MAUER  
www.stiftung-berliner-mauer.de  
(GEDENKSTÄTTE BERLINER MAUER  
www.berliner-mauer-gedenkstaette.de  
und ERINNERUNGSSTÄTTE  
NOTAUFNAHMELAGER MARIENFELDE  
www.notaufnahmelager-berlin.de)

STIFTUNG GEDENKSTÄTTE  
BERLIN-HOHENSCHÖNHAUSEN  
www.stiftung-hsh.de

STIFTUNG TOPOGRAPHIE DES TERRORS  
www.topographie.de und  
DOKUMENTATIONSZENTRUM  
NS-ZWANGSARBEIT BERLIN-SCHÖNEWEIDE  
www.topographie.de/dz-ns-zwangsarbeit

## LIBRARIES AND ARCHIVES

BERLINER BLINDENHÖRBÜCHEREI GGMBH  
www.berliner-hoerbuecherei.de

LANDESARCHIV BERLIN  
www.landesarchiv-berlin.de

STIFTUNG ZENTRAL- UND  
LANDESBIBLIOTHEK BERLIN  
www.zlb.de

## INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMMES

CONSENSE - GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FÖRDERUNG  
VON KULTUR MBH (KULTURBRAUEREI)  
www.kesselhaus-berlin.de

DEUTSCHER AKADEMISCHER  
AUSTAUSCHDIENST (DAAD) E.V.  
www.berliner-kuenstlerprogramm.de

KULTURPROJEKTE BERLIN GMBH  
www.kulturprojekte-berlin.de

NEUE BABYLON BERLIN GMBH  
www.babylonberlin.de

RAMBA ZAMBA E.V.  
www.theater-rambazamba.org

UFABRIK BERLIN E.V.  
www.ufafabrik.de

## ILLUSTRATION CREDITS

p. 6 / 7

Oedipus Rex, im Hebbel am Ufer  
(© Thomas Aurin)

p. 11 from the top

1 and 2: Sculpture workshop,  
Kulturwerk, bbk-berlin GmbH,  
3: Practice space, Baruther Straße  
(Daniele Ansidei)

p. 13

Sculpture workshop,  
Kulturwerk, bbk-berlin GmbH  
(Daniele Ansidei)

p. 17 from the top

Deutsches Theater,  
Poetry Slam Berlin Neukölln,  
(Daniele Ansidei);  
Set design "Luna" by Herbert  
Fritsch (© Thomas Aurin)

p. 19

Rundfunkchor Berlin  
(© Matthias Heyde)

p. 23 from the top

Mittelpunktbibliothek  
Adalbertstraße,  
Poetry Slam Berlin Neukölln,  
Mittelpunktbibliothek  
Adalbertstraße (Daniele Ansidei)

p. 25

Berlinische Galerie  
(Daniele Ansidei)

p. 29 from the top

Kulturbezirk Kreuzberg,  
Neuköllner Oper  
Annual event:  
Berliner Dialog der Religionen  
(Berlin Dialogue of Religions)  
at Rotes Rathaus  
(Daniele Ansidei)

p. 31

"Female Gaze",  
Ballhaus Naunynstraße  
(© Jule Sievert)

pp. 34 / 35

"Süpermänner",  
Ballhaus Naunynstraße  
(Daniele Ansidei)

Der Regierende Bürgermeister von Berlin  
Senatskanzlei  
Kulturelle Angelegenheiten



## ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

The Governing Mayor of Berlin  
Senate Chancellery – Department  
of Cultural Affairs

**Authors:**

Günter Kolodziej  
Amelie Müller  
Helge Rehders

**Contact:**

Senatskanzlei –  
Kulturelle Angelegenheiten  
Brunnenstraße 188-190  
D-10119 Berlin  
Tel: 030/90228-701  
Fax: 030/90228-456  
Mail: [office@kultur.berlin.de](mailto:office@kultur.berlin.de)  
<http://www.berlin.de/sen/kultur/>

**Design:**

Ines Ebel, Claudia Wagner  
Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH

**Translation:**

Brian Currid ([Zweisprachkunst.de](http://Zweisprachkunst.de))

February 2015

