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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 increasing number of Berliners with a livelihood.

But our success poses new challenges. Not only do we need to ensure 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.
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, for example, in the development of city neighbourhoods, spaces 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 forefront. 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
"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 additional 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 Kreuzberg’s Baruther Straße, a former school that today offers studio space for fine artists and rehearsal spaces 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 studio space for fine artists and rehearsal spaces for musicians.

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 Tischlererei 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.

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.
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 2004). 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, Gutmaier 2003). The improvised first uses redefined 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 Künstlerbauten and braucht in the city centre is threatened. The redistribution of income from the booming tourism sector to creative use and the availability of residential 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.

**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 market, 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 (Hörm 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 is 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.
EMPHASES OF BERLIN’S CULTURAL POLICY

EXCELLENCE & UNDERGROUND
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 interdisciplinarily oriented and linked to the subculture. They are art laboratories and discursive sites that stand for the diversity of Berlin’s cultural life. The Berlin di-
mirate 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-ori-
ented fashion. And with their competence, their per-
severance, and their visions, they have created the

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 sim-
ilarly 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
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 Darstel-
lende Künste established the Performing Arts Pro-
gramme. Since 2012, using funds from the EFFE and
the ESF, a networking, advice, and consulting institution
has been established for performing artists working
freelance. A digital rehearsal space platform address-
es 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 strength-
en 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 rehear-
sal spaces in recent years, enabling many musicians to
work freely without disturbance.

In absolute numbers, Germany is the
country with the highest level of pub-
lic 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 54 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 Feder-
al States, ranks at the top in terms of
cultural funding. This has to do with its
status as capital, its rich cultural tradi-
tion, and its history as a divided city.

And yet, among many public cultural
establishments there is a quite justi-
fied concern that the status quo can-
not be maintained. With altered social
conditions, a strongly changing popu-
lation due to migration, and shifts due
to digitalization that have developed
a new, more participative culture, pub-
lic cultural institutions need to inno-
vate 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, be-
long to the regular users of publically
funded cultural institutions like thea-
tres, concert houses, and museums

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

- The interest of young people in
traditional cultural offerings is declin-
ing in general (Zentrum für Kulturför-
schung Jugendkulturbarmeter 2012)

- Young people with a migrant back-
ground are more interested in art and
culture than the average population,
while interest in or access to publicly fund-
ed cultural institutions like thea-
tres, concert houses, and museums
tend to decrease (Zentrum für Kulturforschung 2005, 2011, 2012)

- A central challenge for public cultural
funding is shifting from a funding pol-
icy of the conservative maintenance
of the existing cultural landscape to a
concept-based, transparent cultural
policy that funds institutions and pro-
jects among various groups of actors
and populations to achieve negotiat-
ed 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, regard less 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 is not empirically tenable. High quality is not empirically tenable. Mass entertainment rather than for high quality is not empirically tenable. Automatic indicators of poor quality are finance with tax money, which is 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 population groups and coming generations can discover an interest in cultural life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
Zeitgeschichte des Kulturlebens, Susanne, ed., 2. Jugendkulturbarometer, 1. Inter Kultur Barometer.

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 cultural institutions 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 businessespeople: 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 population groups and coming generations can discover an interest in cultural life.
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TRANSPIRENCY
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 Projektträume, ibbk, 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 long ing 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 overall framework. Today, complex and paralyzing accounting and application processes are one of the main reasons to simply avoid taking part in publicly 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 GERHARD

is a businessman in the creative economy

and managing director of re:publica.
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FREEDOM & DIVERSITY
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 institutions 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 cultural 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 Schlingensief 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 the social network market continued to grow, creativity and the capacity for change 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 the internet, 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 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 3D scanners 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 the internet, 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 MULTIPONTION 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 Baeker already anticipated this movement in 2013 in the reader “What’s Next: Die Kunst nach der Krise” (Art after the Crisis). “I conceive 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 loca-

tions, new times, and a new audience. It will experiment with formats where the standard institutions become variables. Think of Velid 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 was 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 diaspora 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 concreative 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 “individu-al 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!
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### Staffing Decisions

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Oper</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2012–2017</td>
<td>Dietmar Schwarz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2011–2017</td>
<td>Thomas Fahle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komische Oper</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
<td>Berrie Kosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2013–2017</td>
<td>Henrik Nünki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2013–2016</td>
<td>Daniel Barenboim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2011–2016</td>
<td>Ronny Ungans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komische Oper</td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2012–2016</td>
<td>Rolf D. Zehl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftungsdach</td>
<td>General director</td>
<td>2015–2018</td>
<td>Georg Vierthaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theatre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim Gorki Theater</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
<td>Sherrem Langhoff / Jens Hille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
<td>Jürgen Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater am der Parkaue</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2015–2020</td>
<td>Kay Woschek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsches Theater</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2014–2019</td>
<td>Ulrich Kühn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkstheater</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2013–2017</td>
<td>Frank Castorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAU</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2012–2017</td>
<td>Anamie Vanaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsballett Berlin</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2014–2019</td>
<td>Nacho Duato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
<td>Georg Vierthaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konzerthaus</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2014–2019</td>
<td>Sebastian Nordmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief conductor</td>
<td>2012–2015</td>
<td>Iven Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2013–2016</td>
<td>Raphael Graf von Hohenbichl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner Philharmoniker</td>
<td>Artistic director</td>
<td>2010–2017</td>
<td>Martin Hoffmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief conductor</td>
<td>2002–2016</td>
<td>Sir Simon Rattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Theatre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrichstadtpalast GmbH</td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2014–2019</td>
<td>Bernd Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Museums and Fine Art</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Berolina Galerie</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2014–2019</td>
<td>Thomas Köhler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Bode Museum</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2013–2018</td>
<td>Tobias Hoffmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorials and the Culture of Memory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Berliner Mauer</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2014–2018</td>
<td>Axel Klausmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries and Archives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Zentral- und Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2012–2017</td>
<td>Volker Heller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH</td>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td>2012–2016</td>
<td>Moritz van Bümren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding Statistics

#### Project Funding divided by area, in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>4,656,700</td>
<td>6,165,700</td>
<td>6,186,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>5,074,000</td>
<td>2,662,930</td>
<td>2,310,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3,672,950</td>
<td>3,205,290</td>
<td>3,362,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>988,167</td>
<td>1,229,400</td>
<td>1,344,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>4,973,893</td>
<td>4,951,200</td>
<td>5,117,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>1,096,456</td>
<td>1,143,900</td>
<td>2,032,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,977,500</td>
<td>2,868,000</td>
<td>2,629,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,469,966</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,222,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,084,491</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Theatres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatres</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opera houses</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large theatres</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children / youth theatre</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-funded project theatres</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding, Theatre in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project funding, Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</td>
<td>4,656,700</td>
<td>6,165,700</td>
<td>6,186,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funding, Berlin</td>
<td>256,625,536</td>
<td>227,160,515</td>
<td>226,150,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Oper in Berlin</td>
<td>122,753,193</td>
<td>124,714,063</td>
<td>121,622,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large theatres</td>
<td>76,406,738</td>
<td>83,529,036</td>
<td>83,133,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children / youth theatre</td>
<td>7,880,041</td>
<td>8,431,100</td>
<td>8,556,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-funded private theatres</td>
<td>4,358,366</td>
<td>4,460,796</td>
<td>4,577,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrichstadtpalast</td>
<td>6,457,000</td>
<td>8,024,500</td>
<td>8,315,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>236,625,536</td>
<td>227,160,515</td>
<td>226,150,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding, percentage</td>
<td>2.2 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funding, percentage</td>
<td>97.8 %</td>
<td>97.3 %</td>
<td>97.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Audience Numbers, Theatres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theatres</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Oper in Berlin</td>
<td>701,183</td>
<td>698,516</td>
<td>726,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large theatres</td>
<td>862,645</td>
<td>815,860</td>
<td>843,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children / youth theatre</td>
<td>168,913</td>
<td>179,648</td>
<td>176,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept-funded private theatres</td>
<td>145,207</td>
<td>142,290</td>
<td>139,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrichstadtpalast</td>
<td>461,767</td>
<td>465,388</td>
<td>522,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,331,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,278,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,408,161</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds
## Funding Statistics

### Individual Project Funding, Performing Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
<th>Grants Awarded, Percentage</th>
<th>Total Funding in Euros</th>
<th>Average Grant in Euros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31 / 18%</td>
<td>5,724,948</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>46 / 28%</td>
<td>9,251,429</td>
<td>31,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>28 / 17%</td>
<td>5,285,785</td>
<td>32,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dance

#### Dance Funding, in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</th>
<th>Total Funding, Berlin</th>
<th>Project Funding, percentage</th>
<th>Institutional Funding, percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,054,000</td>
<td>11,233,187</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>11,341,287</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,510,912</td>
<td>10,883,199</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Music

#### Music Funding, in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</th>
<th>Total Funding, Berlin</th>
<th>Project Funding, percentage</th>
<th>Institutional Funding, percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,625,250</td>
<td>37,069,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,345,250</td>
<td>39,453,736</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,262,738</td>
<td>39,734,873</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Literature

#### Literature Funding, in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</th>
<th>Total Funding, Berlin</th>
<th>Project Funding, percentage</th>
<th>Institutional Funding, percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>988,367</td>
<td>3,250,478</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,229,400</td>
<td>3,653,736</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,144,883</td>
<td>3,567,808</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Museums and Fine Art

#### Museums and Fine Art Funding, in Euros

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</th>
<th>Total Funding, Berlin</th>
<th>Project Funding, percentage</th>
<th>Institutional Funding, percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,797,993</td>
<td>62,223,782</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,951,200</td>
<td>62,779,219</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5,517,220</td>
<td>65,455,964</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Statistics

 Visitor Numbers, Museums and Fine Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art museums and exhibition institutions</td>
<td>402,064</td>
<td>556,297</td>
<td>525,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History museums</td>
<td>2,025,630</td>
<td>1,995,602</td>
<td>1,991,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz</td>
<td>5,791,280</td>
<td>5,394,207</td>
<td>5,221,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special museums</td>
<td>722,403</td>
<td>670,229</td>
<td>718,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,889,377</td>
<td>8,612,385</td>
<td>8,476,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Visitor Numbers, Memorials, and the Culture of Memory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memoria</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memorial funding, in Euros</td>
<td>3,370,705</td>
<td>3,800,490</td>
<td>4,344,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of Nazism</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>2,675,337</td>
<td>2,874,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Berlin)</td>
<td>4,728,785</td>
<td>6,475,627</td>
<td>7,019,704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Visitor Numbers, Memorials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorials, remembrance sites, and documentation centres on the history of Nazi</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,191,205</td>
<td>2,293,005</td>
<td>1,346,226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Berlin)</td>
<td>2,166,710</td>
<td>2,346,210</td>
<td>2,780,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Libraries and Archives

 Use Profile VÖBB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local branches</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile libraries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media holdings</td>
<td>6,876,003</td>
<td>6,771,513</td>
<td>6,776,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,546,312</td>
<td>4,667,287</td>
<td>4,715,712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Fundering, Libraries and Archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statungen Zentral- und Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>21,492,346</td>
<td>19,769,351</td>
<td>19,769,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landesarchiv</td>
<td>5,334,902</td>
<td>5,832,565</td>
<td>6,128,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,827,248</td>
<td>25,601,916</td>
<td>25,898,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Interdisciplinary Institutions, Programmes

 Funding Interdisciplinary, in Euro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project funding in Berlin incl. Hauptstadtkulturfonds</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,096,456</td>
<td>1,143,900</td>
<td>2,032,964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funding, Berlin</td>
<td>9,118,197</td>
<td>8,491,916</td>
<td>8,994,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding, percentage</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funding, percentage</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Project Fonds Kulturelle Bildung

 Statistics 2011-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of applications</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of grants awarded</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools funded</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of funded school programmes</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of funded school programmes where more than 40 % of the children have non-German backgrounds (only FP 1)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 From 2011 to 2013, around 2,000 applications were submitted to Berlin’s Projekt fond 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 child care centres, youth centres, and art/cultural institutions). In Funding Programme 1, 258 in schools were funded (74 % only once). An average of 57 % of the schools funded have more than 40 percent students from non-German speaking backgrounds.
APPENDIX

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

THEATRE

BAUHAUS MAHUYMINSTRASSE
(HEUTE:SPREEGEGEN E.V.)
www.ballhausmauyminstrasse.de

BERLINER ENSEMBLE GMBB
www.berliner-ensemble.de

DEUTSCHES THEATER
www.deutsches-theater.de

FÖRDERBAND E.V. – KULTURINITIATIVE BERLIN (THEATERHAUS MITTE)
www.thbm.foerderband.org

FRIEDRICHSSTADTPALAST
BETRIEBSGESELLSCHAFT MBH
www.show-palais.de

GOLD SQUARE
www.goldsquare.com

GRIPS-THEATER GMBB
www.grips-theater.de

HERBELLTHEATER BERLIN GMBH
www.hebbel-am-ufer.de

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

MAXIM GORKI THEATER
www.maxim.de

NEUHEIMLER OPER E.V.
www.neuheimlerperde.de

MICO AND THE NAVIGATORS GMBH
www.navigators.de

NEUE THEATER-BETRIEBEN GMBH
(RENAISSANCE THEATER)
www.renaissance-theater.de

PRIME TIME THEATER GMBH
http://primetimetheater.de

RIMINI PROTOCOL
www.rimini-protocol.de

THEATER UND KÖMÖDE AM KÖRÜFSTEDERHAIN GMBH
www.komedia-berlin.de

SCHAUBÜHNE AM LEHNHOFNER PLATZ
THEATERBETRIEBEN GMBH
www.schaubuehne.de

SCHLOSSPARK THEATER BERLIN
(HALEWOOD GMBH)
http://schlosspark-theater.de

SHE SIE POP
www.shepop.de

SOPHIESALE GMBH
www.sophiesale.de

STIFTUNG OPER IN BERLIN
www.oper-in-berlin.de

DEUTSCHE OPER BERLIN
www.deutscheoperberlin.de

DEUTSCHE STAATSBALLETT BERLIN
www.staatsballett-berlin.de

KÖNIGLICHE OPER BERLIN
www.komische-opern-berlin.de

STAATSBALLETT BERLIN
www.staatsballett-berlin.de

THEATER AN DER PARKAUE
www.parkaue.de

THEATERDISCOUNTER
http://theaterdiscounter.de

THEATER IM PALAIS GMBH
www.theater-im-palais.de

THEATER STRAH E.V.
www.theater-strahl.de

THEATERHAUS MITTE (FÖRDERBAND E.V.)
www.thbm.foerderband.org

VAGANTEN BÜHNE GEMEINNÜTZIGES THEATER GMBH
www.vaganten.de

VOLKSBUHNE
www.volkssbuehne-berlin.de

DANCE

CONSTANZE MAGNAS/DORKY PARK GMBH
www.dorkypark.org

SASCHA WALTZ AND GUESTS GMBH
www.saschawaltz.de

STAATSBALLETT BERLIN
www.staatsballett-berlin.de

ZEITGENÖSSISCHER TANZ BERLIN E.V.
(TANZBÜRO BERLIN)
www.tanzburo.de

MUSIC

AKADEMIE FÜR ALTE MUSIK GMBH
www.werkstatt.de

BERLINER PHILHARMONIKER
www.berliner-symphoniker.de

BEROLINA-ORCHESTER E.V.
(BERLINER SYMPHONIKER)
www.berliner-symphoniker.de

CHORVERBAND BERLIN E.V.
www.chorverband-berlin.de

ENSEMBLE ORODI E.V.
www.ensemble-oro.de (bis 2013)

KONZERTHAUS BERLIN
(NACH KONZERTHAUSORCHESTER)
www.konzerthaus.de

LANDESMUSIKRAT BERLIN E.V.
www.landemusikrat-berlin.de

ORCHESTERAKADEMIE E.V.
www.berliner-symphoniker.de

(2013)

KUNSTFUNK-ORCHESTER UND -CHÖRE GMBH
www.kfo-berlin.de

LITERATURE

GESELLSCHAFT FÜR SICH UND FORM E.V.
(LITERATURFORUM IM BRECHT-HAUS)
www.lfbrecht.de
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