

**THE PUBLISHING OF TRANSLATED FICTION AND  
THE CULTURAL FUNDING SYSTEM IN BRITAIN AND DENMARK.  
A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY AND ASSESSMENT.**

**TINA PIHL**



**A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements of the University of North London  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**This research was carried out in collaboration with  
the Royal School of Librarianship, Denmark**

**APRIL 1996**

## **ABSTRACT**

Denmark and Britain are examples of closely related West-European national cultures and of cultures of major and minor importance. The thesis explores how different industry structures and values within publishing facilitate or hinder the publishing of translated fiction. It also explores how different traditions, values and history have influenced the structuring of state institutions such as the cultural funding systems. The thesis also explores how the differences in the cultural funding systems have created different conditions for artistic production and availability.

The contemporary changing world and the problems it creates between national cultures, ethnic and racial groups are discussed. In this context cross-cultural understanding and openness and the role of cultural products are discussed.

The influence of Britain on Denmark is explored through specific and universal historical developments and popular culture products which have led to an openness and knowledge of British culture.

The two publishing worlds are profiled because translated fiction has to survive on the same marketforces as all other publishing.

The factors which influence the selection of fiction for translation are discussed. These factors are selection criteria, sources of information and considerations of the market.

The importance of publicity in Britain is explored through a case study on two Danish titles published in Britain in 1993.

Traditions, values and history are drawn upon to explain differences in the cultural funding systems of Denmark and Britain, as reasons for exclusion or inclusion of different concepts of culture are also looked at.

The funding systems for literature as they are expressed through the Arts Council, the Danish State Arts Foundation and Public Lending Right are analysed.

The ways in which public libraries are incorporated in the cultural funding system are explored.

The support to translated fiction and the promotion done for export of fiction are discussed. Influences from the contemporary changing world in support and promotion of translated fiction are identified.

# CONTENTS

1) Introduction .....	2
2) Setting the Scene .....	10
3) Danish Openness towards Britain .....	41
4) Profile of the British and Danish Publishing Industries .....	64
5) The Publishing of Translated Fiction .....	81
6) Publicity and Promotion .....	101
7) Traditions for Cultural Policies .....	115
8) State Funding of Literature .....	155
9) Public Libraries as Public Service Disseminators .....	188
10) Support for Translated Fiction .....	209
11) Conclusion .....	235
Summary in English .....	247
Resumé på Dansk (summary in Danish) .....	259
Notes and References .....	271
Bibliography .....	298
List of People Interviewed .....	310

## 1) INTRODUCTION

Research more often than not starts with a spark of interest, with a "how curious", a "how strange", an "I wonder why". These sparks of interest are of course inspired by the field the researcher works within, but especially within the humanities and the social sciences, not to mention cultural studies; the inspiration has also come from personal experiences, from being as much part of the world in which we live, as a professional analyser of it.

This study too is inspired by living in the world of today, and it is inspired by meeting two national cultures. It is inspired by having met British culture first through its pop music, its films and novels and language all through my childhood and youth. Had I been British this would have been normal, but being Danish and growing up in Denmark this was also normal.

When I later came to live in Britain everything was very familiar and very strange. What made it strange was in many ways to be seen both as a foreigner, and as someone who was not dissimilar to the British, at the same time as the perceptions of Denmark were very stereotypical. People would tell me that "In this country it always rains in winter" as if this was something very strange for a Dane, and perhaps it ought to be because the next sentence would usually be something like "I suppose in Denmark you go skiing all winter". "Well", I would answer, "Denmark is on the same latitude as Newcastle so we don't get that much snow". The stereotypical picture of Denmark was usually less stereotypical when I met people who knew other Danes, and I have met a lot of British people who had met other Danes on previous occasions. A friend of mine once remarked that there are so few Danes and so many of them are travelling around the world. This led her to conclude that there must be a sign on the door to Denmark saying "Out to Lunch". And, yes, I did get the double meaning of "Out to Lunch" and she knew me well enough to know that I would.

But what no-one would - or rather did not think of explaining - was why everyone perceived themselves as belonging to a class. I knew about the British class system, but surely in the 1980s and 90s class could not determine restrictions and



opportunities. Surely in the 1980s and 90s in the welfare state, the classes were not so different that they became a barrier to cross or choose to stay within. And if this was the case, then of what class was I? I had to sit down and think that one out, because before I came to Britain I had never perceived myself as coming from or belonging to a particular class.

Between these meetings with a stereotypical picture of Denmark, the knowledge of Britain I brought with me from Denmark and those hard to pin-point and unanswered questions, I also met my own culture. I found that the questions which were most difficult to verbalise and most difficult to answer were the most important. Those are the questions which go to the core of a culture's self-understanding (*selvforståelse*). A meeting with another culture and through this the meeting with one's own culture lead to the realisation that this self-understanding is subjective. In a sense a culture is a subjective reality, but because it is shared by a whole community it becomes objectified.<sup>1</sup>

But what these meetings also show, as in the question of class, is that these cultures structure their lives within this objectified subjective reality. In this study the focus is on national cultures. And though I have here used my personal experiences to point to the fact that British popular culture and the English language imported and taught in Denmark have led to familiarity with British culture, whereas British familiarity with Denmark is primarily based on individual meetings with Danes and an assumption of similarity, the two cultures are in this study to be seen as examples of a culture of major importance in the World Society and one of minor importance.

The World Society of today is changing through globalisation and political organisations such as the European Union. This means an increased contact with foreign cultures, and through this an increased awareness of own culture. But where a seeking out of foreign cultures and a knowledge of foreign cultures often lead to a certain cosmopolitanism, a meeting arranged by higher powers such as economic and political elites seem to lead to reactionary nationalism and racism.

However, if cultures, also national cultures, are objectified subjective realities which influence not only how the world is perceived by that culture, but also how the society of the culture is structured, then national identity and nation-states -

whether a major national culture such as the British or a minor such as the Danish - are not only obstacles to a United States of Europe but part of the structure of the World Society of today. Even Globalisation, primarily a financial and technological venture must mediate cultural differences in its world-wide media venture.

The media do this by catering for maximum groups through a minimum of commonalities. For instance channels such as MTV and CNN cater for audiences which across national boundaries are interested in pop-music and news.

Cultural studies have dismantled the faith in a common high culture by focusing on class, race and gender. On the basis of these determinants it has shown how the formation of sub-cultures is a mediation and opposition to the hegemony of a dominant (national) culture. Though cultural studies have studied ideology, hegemony and the mediation and opposition to these, it has also pointed to the fact that sub-cultures which are different, but functioning within national cultures, exist. The global media through channels such as MTV and CNN are aimed at world-wide sub-cultures which are big enough to carry financially successful business ventures.

Cultural studies do not define class, gender and race as sub-cultures, but its study of the uses of popular culture are often based on either sub-cultures such as youth cultures or on gender-defined groups as in women's uses of soaps and romances. By the study of the uses of popular culture, cultural studies have pointed to the fact that the value of a cultural product whether a television programme or a novel are not determined by a fine arts definition of quality. Rather the uses are determined by the individual in relation to class, gender and race within a hegemonious culture.

By pointing out that the uses of popular culture give a different value from that defined by a high culture quality criterion, cultural studies have pointed to the fact that cultural products serve more functions than being expressions of artistic excellence and that these functions are also valuable.

The globalised media manage to reach across the boundaries of nation-states and reach world-wide sub-cultures and the sub-cultures accept these foreign produced channels without a thought to the impact on national identity which they fear from a political union such as the EU. What is characteristic of this use is that it is sought out, out of interest.

Much art - or cultural products so as not to exclude popular culture - is sought out out of interest as well, whether this is in a preference of films to novels, or a preference for subject. If the point made by cultural studies, that uses determine another value than artistic quality, then this point taken further also means that foreign produced cultural products sought out out of interest does not only function as the carrier of a potentially interesting subject for which it was sought out, but also as an unwitting and unacknowledged source of information on another culture.

My point is, that because these foreign produced cultural products are both foreign and non-threatening to national identity, they are also great conveyers of cross-cultural openness and understanding.

But if this is so, then the availability of foreign produced cultural products is important. It is both important in the sense that diversity in available products increase the chances of a diverse understanding and openness; and in the sense that diversity in availability increases the chances of reaching a diverse group through their particular interests. One such product is the translated literary novel which is distributed through a commercial publishing world.

In the homogenous society of Denmark with no class-consciousness there is no cultural studies tradition. The uses of popular culture are not much studied and though popular culture is not completely discarded, the focus tends to be on art or on the differences between art and popular culture.

For literature, the question of availability is discussed within the branch of literature of sociology called "Litteratur och Samhälle" (Literature and Society) or "Litteraturen i samfundet" (Literature in Society).

In 1972 in Denmark Robert Escarpit's *Bogen og Læseren* was published. In this book Robert Escarpit explores the literary process consisting of production (author), distribution (publisher, sales and libraries) and consumption (readership and the reading experience). This book proved very influential, not least because of the substantial supplement by Hans Hertel on the literary system or process in Denmark.

This tradition is to a certain extent inspired by Marxist thinking and classical sociology. "It is a clear interchange between 'the social situation as producer of the literary work' and 'the through the literary work produced social situation'".<sup>2</sup> About

Robert Escarpit, Hans Hertel says that "like his English colleagues Richard Hoggart and Raymond Williams he sees research and critique, theory formation and cultural politics/policies reform work as sides of the same issue."<sup>3</sup>

The Danish tradition, nonetheless has taken the political issue of discussing the social situation and uses of culture in another direction than that which the work of Richard Hoggart and Robert Williams has been taken. The reason is perhaps to be found in the ambiguity of the word "politik" which I have left in the above quotation as politics/policies. The cultural studies tradition founded on the work of Richard Hoggart and Robert Williams went on to study the politics of culture, whereas the ambiguity of politics and policies is kept in Hans Hertel's comments to Robert Escarpit's work and has become primarily a concern with policies.

For instance when Escarpit discusses the role of the patron he states that in the modern form it has made it possible to integrate the author in an economic circulation (kredsløb) so he could exist and produce, but that patronage has also been beneficial for the literature.<sup>4</sup> Hans Hertel on the other hand sees early author support by king and state as a way of exempting artistic endeavour from the influence of the market-forces in consideration of their importance in society.<sup>5</sup> Hertel also sees his supplement to Escarpit's book as having the cultural policy/politics aim of removing the secrecy around book production because this is part of the reinforcement of the mechanics of book production which control the literary system or process.<sup>6</sup> Finally he sees literature policy/politics as part of cultural policy/politics in creating new conditions for the spread of existing literature to all, for equal access and access to create new and different literature which is neither avant garde nor mass-culture.<sup>7</sup>

In a Danish tradition the question of availability is therefore a question of diversity and access. Although the tradition first focused on an opposition to mass-culture, it has now the added concern of making alternatives available. The tyranny of the majority which is expressed in the commercial global media of producing for a majority on the basis of a minimum of communalities is to be counteracted or supplemented by other forms which are perhaps not economically viable. And this is the concern of cultural policies.

The two different traditions of Britain and Denmark are at the same time - to

pick up on an extension of a cultural studies point again - an example of how, not class, gender and race, but history, traditions and values of two different nations have led to the development of two different traditions. It is an example of how however much a national culture is based in an objectified subjective reality, this reality is also based in actual conditions and has led to actual actions based in perceptions formed through an alloy of history, tradition and values, where they in a constant interaction, have influenced the others in the on-going narrative of that particular national culture.

Though both Denmark and Britain are part of a West-European culture with roots in Christianity, the Enlightenment and Industrialisation, they have also had different circumstances. Britain is a heterogeneous society which has roots in Empire and an early industrialisation. It is today a liberal welfare state with an emphasis on individuality and with a strong class-consciousness. Denmark is a homogenous society and has been a small nation for as long as Britain has been an Empire on the rise and in decline. It has been primarily agricultural with a very slow industrialisation. Today it is a Social Democratic welfare state with a perception of union between country, state and people. Put like this it would be ludicrous to think that there in spite of similarities in Danish and British society would not also be differences.

Through this study Britain and Denmark are examples of two nations of West European culture with individual differences. They are also examples of cultures of major and minor importance.

The literary translated novel is part of the diversity of availability. It is also a product in the sense that it is made available through a commercial publishing world. This study aims to explore how industry structures and values hinder or further availability.

Since the literary novel is also an art form, the natural agent for support in opposition to the tyranny of the majority is according to Danish traditions, cultural policy. Therefore this study takes state cultural policy as an example for exploring the second aim of this thesis, of how different nation-states in the structuring of institutions are influenced by the particular history, traditions and values of that

country. This is the overall aim of the exploration of cultural policy, but it also aims to show how these different traditions have led to systems which create different climates for artistic production and availability.

Chapter 2 and 3 form the framework. Chapter 2 focuses on the contemporary changing world and the problems it creates. It also discusses cross-cultural understanding and openness and the role of cultural products in this. Chapter 3 explores the minor and major dichotomy and cultural openness and understanding through the examples of British influence in Denmark.

Chapters 4 to 6 deal with the publishing industries in Denmark and Britain and with the publishing of translated fiction in particular. But they also show the major/minor dichotomy through the influence of a major culture on a producer of cultural products in a smaller culture, as it shows how being a major culture influences industry structures and criteria for selection.

Chapters 7 to 10 explore the cultural funding systems of Britain and Denmark. In particular chapter 7 explores differences based in values, traditions and history, whereas chapters 8 and 9 exemplify this through the support for literature. Chapter 10 on the support and promotion of translated fiction closes the circle by being linked to the cultural funding system and by taking up issues of the contemporary changing world discussed in chapter 2, which are evident in the work for translated literary fiction.

Chapter 2 does not deal specifically with Denmark and Britain, otherwise the methodology is comparative, because this constant meeting of one culture through the eyes of another is the way to get to the underlying values, traditions and history. But there is no rule without an exception or two.

In chapter 3, on Danish openness towards Britain, the aim has been to explore the influence of a major culture on a minor one and how openness and understanding are created. It does therefore not lend itself to a comparative angle.

Chapter 6 deals with publicity and promotion in Britain. In the two previous chapters this is identified as a problem for Britain but not for Denmark. Though a comparative methodology would have been possible in this chapter it would not have led to a deeper understanding of the issue.

In addition to printed sources the work is based on interviews with key people within the publishing industry and the cultural funding system. The criteria for selection of interviewees are discussed in the appropriate chapters in particular chapter 5 but also in chapters 6 and 10. A list of interviewees is to be found at the end of the thesis. Chapter 9 also includes a discussion of the translatable of cultural specific concept terms.

## 2) SETTING THE SCENE

*This chapter establishes the framework for the thesis. It draws on the latest research in establishing how globalisation and political initiatives such as the EU are drawing the world together at the same time as forces such as national identity and racism are drawing the world apart. Within this context the chapter points to cross-cultural understanding as familiarity with and openness towards foreign cultures and establishes how narrative cultural products can further this. The chapter deals in particular with how the qualities of printed fiction can further cross-cultural understanding.*

The man made world is an ever-changing place. Though ever-changing in the light of history, it often seems to change from the stable old to the unknown new for people living in the present. Not only is the world ever-changing, a constant meeting with the new, it is also a constant meeting with others living in the world. No man is an island unto himself. No culture can stay closed to the meeting with and influences from others. This chapter explores contemporary changes, the fears they bring and how cultural narrative products such as translated fiction can be part of bringing openness and understanding towards the Other and thereby reduce the fears brought on by instability.

In a sense the world is becoming smaller. In another sense it is becoming more defined through cultural groups. The world is becoming smaller through the Global Village where information technology allows for a global flow of information and entertainment. In Europe, The European Union (EU) is building a political union among the states of West Europe. The old territorial borders and political power structures of the nation-states are becoming blurred. The world is drawing together.

At the same time cultural groups are re-affirming their identities as distinct ethnic or national. The old world-order in Europe has fallen apart. The enemy is no longer in East Europe, but no-one is quite sure where he is or who he is. The Other



is now West-European in the form of the EU at the blurred borders of the nation-states and the Other is within the blurred borders in the form of immigrants from old colonial countries, guestworkers, refugees and asylum seekers. To many they become the new enemies, and in the meeting with the Other who is not only of different nationality, but frequently also of a another colour, different religion and culture, ethnic and national groups affirm their own distinctiveness. There has been an upsurge in nationalism, racism and xenophobia during the late eighties and early nineties. The world is fragmenting in the animosity of cultural distinctiveness.

Though the world to a West-European eye is both becoming smaller and fragmenting, the causes of this, pull and draw at different levels. The Global Village is an information and technology led enterprise. The European Union is a supralateral organisation of political nation-states. Nationalism and racism are based in people, not organisations. Though they share certain characteristics in protecting a collective identity, they are also different. Nationalism can be aggressive towards the Other, but it is primarily an affirmation of the collective identity. Racism, though affirming the collective identity by focusing on the differences between Them and Us is primarily aggressive towards the Other.

The Global Village is a phrase coined to explain the contraction of the world into one "community" where multinational conglomerates become powerful because they control the information flow. This is possible because of technologies such as fibreoptics and microchips which can be utilised in computers and satellites. This again means that the flow of information to the whole world can become simultaneous and instantaneous. An example of this is the Gulf War which through the American owned CNN was broadcast to the whole western world as it happened, second for second, minute for minute, 24 hours a day.

The news coverage of the Gulf War shows how much the technology of the Global Village has developed, and how we take it for granted. In 1962 the first programme was broadcast in the United States via satellite. As Arthur C. Clarke puts it in his book *How the World was One* "Today, the TV-newscasters no longer bother to superimpose 'Live by satellite', as everyone takes this for granted. But thirty years ago, it was still a miracle." Two years later satellites had been further developed

and it was possible to transmit the Olympics from Tokyo. But few networks in the States broadcast it live, because they did not expect people to stay up for it. "They had yet to learn that satellites would teach whole nations how to do without sleep".<sup>9</sup>

The Gulf War shows how far the technology for audio-visual media has advanced. But the war was also perfect for transmission through this medium. It was short, there was no doubt who were the heroes and who the villains, and it was fairly clean without too much blood and gore or fallen heroes. This sounds crass and there are lots of objections to this statement. But for the media event that it was, it is true.

The prolonged war in the former Yugoslavia for instance has not in the same way been under constant media scrutiny. This highlights some of the fears connected with the Global Village. For one thing, this war was far longer and it was never clear cut who were the heroes and who were villains. The fears are that the uses of the products of information technology will change our mental abilities, shorten our attention-span and dull our senses.

This is the land between modernity and postmodernity. The global flow of information based on multinational conglomerates, leads to a "small number of centres for production of knowledge and storage of information, nerve centres in the cybernetic grids, command and central headquarters of the world's financial and industrial system".<sup>10</sup> But it is not only the world's power structures which will change back to some sort of pre-nation-state structure. It is also, as implied, the modes of thinking. Not only will news be available instantaneously and simultaneously, but because computers have the ability to be interactive, it will be possible to work and shop from home and communicate via for instance the Internet. Every human contact become instantaneous, simultaneous and impersonal. Marshall McLuhan one of the first to explore the Global Village opined that this would result in the electronic man:

Electronic man wears his brain outside his skull and his nervous system on top of his skin. (...) But he is not flesh and blood; he is an item in a data bank, ephemeral, easily forgotten and resentful of the fact.<sup>11</sup>

Humanity disappears, not as a species but as soul, identity and humanistic values. What is left is electronic man connected to a computer. As far out as this may seem popular culture is exploring it. In Philip K. Dick's *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep* (a.k.a. *Bladerunner*) the androids - robots - are indistinguishable from humans and more human than humans. In William Gibson's *Johnny Mnemonic*, the courier - Johnny Mnemonic - has given up his childhood memories for an information implant. He surfs through cyberspace to avoid the enemy.

It is not the first time popular culture has explored changing paradigms and the fears this has brought. But it has yet to be an accurate predictor of the future. In *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley and in *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson the progress of rationality and emperi of modernity are explored. But we are yet to see such monsters as described in those books. - Unless they will be a result of genetic engineering... Nonetheless, history also tells us that the consciousness and world structure of agricultural, oral societies changed when they became literate and industrial. What history cannot tell us is what happens when literate and industrial become audio-visual and electronic.

Returning to the Gulf War for another aspect of the Global Village which causes concern. In the Gulf War the USA was directly involved, which it never was in East European Yugoslavia. CNN is an American owned station with a large homemarket. In the Global Village the fear is that powerful owners of the technology decide what information is available to us.

The European Union has set up various schemes to strengthen European audio-visual media. Through its projects, the EU is trying to construct a pan-European media industry which can take up the competition with the big, mainly American and Japanese owned conglomerates such as Sony, Matsushita, Time Warner and the Walt Disney Company. This is the EU supporting and promoting European enterprise.

The other fear of the EU, and of nation-states as well, is based in the nature of the programmes broadcast by channels such as CNN, MTV and SKY. The trend within TV-channels broadcasting via satellite is to concentrate on a particular subject, whether it will be news, music, or sport. Another trend is that most of what is shown is in English and primarily American.

By having a European based media power the EU hopes to create diversity in programmes as such and with an emphasis on European diversity, but European diversity as a characteristic of European unity.

One aspect of the Global Village which is hardly ever emphasised is that elites - whether they are political or intellectual elites - fear the consequences of the Global Village, whereas the users of the media have embraced it. The conglomerates behind the media are commercial enterprises, which focus on the bottom-line rather than on the variety or quality of content. If their products were not profitable they would not be on the air. Therefore, to stay within the language of enterprise, the consumers by their choices decide by the vote of majority what stays on air. Admittedly they do not decide what goes on air. This is decided by an estimate of how big the global audience for a particular subject is. Therefore channels specialising in sports, news and music can draw together sub-cultures across the borders of nation-states and continents. But the bottom-line is that the consumers through their interests and choices have embraced the Global Village whether it is satellite television, interactive banking or a surf on the Internet with no fear for health, sanity or loss of nationality.

Jeremy Seabrook's version of the Global Village is the leisure society where leisure comes to take on the strenuous forms of work because the industrialised mode of thinking is still prevalent. In this society, where "real" work becomes secondary to leisure, people's "ordinary passions" become subject to professionalisation and a strong sense of escape and nostalgia. Nonetheless Seabrook mirrors the above statement of the acceptance by the population and in his conclusion on this, the fears of intellectuals:

Whatever the political implications (...) may be, they are far from most people's thoughts. Most leisure-time activities demonstrate an absence of political or ideological consciousness. People want to be left alone. What they want to do, the obsessions and preoccupations, are not the concern of politicians, have nothing to do with them. People want to get on with leading their own lives. This may be a powerful conservative force, one that leads to political inertia and detachment.<sup>12</sup>

But the Global Village is more than consumer goods. It is also an economy in which the financial input and output are of a size that can only be handled by multinational conglomerates, and where the division of labour becomes more

specialised. In their books Jeremy Seabrooks and David Morley and Kevin Robins point out that the information society leads to specialisation in core and peripheric jobs. There will be high-powered jobs within information technology, but there will also be a need for low-paid manual workers.<sup>13</sup> Most of these jobs are presently held by women and young people and by guestworkers and immigrants in Europe.

Literature on Racism in Europe expresses the same opinion:

That is the most fundamental sense in which the growth of racism in Europe needs to be understood. The new imperative of silicon age economics is to have a highly stratified system of employment. Such a structure differentiates between 'core' workers - whose jobs carry with them status, security and civic rights - and 'peripheral' workers whose employment is uncertain and ill-paid, and whose rights are minimal, conditional and often inaccessible.<sup>14</sup>

Where the Global Village pulls the world together, the fear of the Other, in the form of racism, pulls it apart. There has been an upsurge of racism in the late eighties and early nineties in Europe. Alec Hargreaves and Jeremy Leaman explain how powerlessness is "an acknowledged contributor to discriminatory and exclusionary behaviour".<sup>15</sup> With recession and rising unemployment white majorities in the North feel powerless. In a structure where economies seem to fail and unemployment seems to rise for no apparent reason it is easier to turn against the very visible Other than to find a way through the corporate or political maze which no longer consists of local factory owners and domestic policies but of multinational conglomerates and supranational organisations such as the EU.

Racism is many things. It is racial stabbings in London and the burning of asylum centres in Germany. It is the British National Party in England, Le Pen in France, the Klu Klux Klan in the States and neo-nazi parties in Germany, Denmark and most of the rest of the Western World. But it is also when a Dane thinks that Muhammed, Mustafa and Ali "ought to go home", but Kevin can go on DJ'ing in cockney English on the local radio station. The last statement came from a Dane who did not consider herself a racist.

This is the difference between pre- and post Holocaust racism. Racism is no longer based solely on ideas of a superior caucasian race. Rather it is not explicitly based on this notion, but often on cultural notions whether this is religion or

nationality. But as several researchers point out, the notion of "racism without race" is dangerous because it masquerades the fact that some racism is genuine racism<sup>16</sup>. A Danish woman with a Danish mother and an Afro-American father, brought up in Denmark by her Danish mother and a Danish citizen, was refused entrance to an East-European country. In spite of her Danish passport the passport-inspectors refused to believe that a dark-skinned woman with afro hair could be Danish. This is an expression of racism, not cultural discrimination.

Michel Wieviorka divides racism into infrapolitical and political racism<sup>17</sup>. In the case of infrapolitical racism there are groups and individuals to whom racism is either central or not, but to whom racism is often inarticulate and weak. Political racism on the other hand is either part of politics or the state, such as for instance the Third Reich, is racist.

Inracultural racism is very common in Europe. It is often almost silent, it is hidden behind correct attitudes and even hidden for the bearer who would condemn expressions of overt racism such as the Klu Klux Klan and neo-nazism. As Robert Miles point out, the term racism "is heavily negatively loaded":

Thus, to claim that someone has expressed a racist opinion is to denounce them as immoral and unworthy. In brief, racism is, in the late twentieth century, a term of political abuse.<sup>18</sup>

This means that rather than verbalising and airing racist opinions they are internalised and hidden, but just as explosive and dangerous. This is not to advocate open verbal racist attacks but to point out that the discourse on race and racism is highly sensitive. As Morley and Robins say: "The most fundamental challenge is to confront the relation of superior to subaltern identity that is embodied in the construction of Otherness"<sup>19</sup> This is almost impossible on the level of individuals meeting when the slightest hint of what could be perceived as racism cannot be aired in so much as a question.

The notion of superior and subaltern in Otherness is deeply embedded in Western civilisation. It is imperialism, colonialism and the belief that the white man can civilise primitive cultures. Though the civilising mission of White Man is no longer expressed, it is embedded in the superior and subaltern of Otherness which is

very much alive. It may no longer be a question of civilising the Other, rather it may be to exclude him.

Several researchers have discussed Fortress Europe. Among those are Mel Read and Alan Simpson who in *Against the Rising Tide* list the rejection of Turkey's application to the EU, the conflict of the Gulf, the upsurge of anti-Islamic feelings in Europe and the tightening of immigration rules as indicators of how Fortress Europe is strengthening its borders. "It all", they say, "adds to the momentum which seeks to describe Europe's future in terms which are increasingly white, continental and Christian."<sup>20</sup> If this is how Europe is perceived at the political level it only adds to the primarily silent racism of the individuals of the white majority. Though political elites may condemn racism openly, the action of keeping the Other out is an affirmation of the beliefs that "they" are taking our jobs, are not as good as "us" and "should go home".

In the world society the Global Village is turning the world in to one "community", drawing the world together, erasing borders. But it also means bigger power distances between individuals and decision-makers. In a global economy this means that it is easier for the individual to turn his or her sense of powerlessness against very visible minorities. The animosity towards the Other draws the world apart. A debate which could lead to a better understanding is difficult when the Other is kept in a subaltern position by the jobs offered and by the implicit attitudes of political elites.

An organisation in Europe which is drawing the world together is the European Union. It is also pulling it apart by trying to set up a distinct European media power which will be able to convey European identity, and by furthering the idea of Fortress Europe.

The EU, when it was still the European Coal and Steel Community was founded on lessons learned in two world wars. The two world wars, the rise of a Hitler and Mussolini, had shown that some sort of union was necessary in Europe in order to secure peace and prosperity. This resulted not only in the European Coal and Steel Community, but also in other supralateral organisations such as OECD, UN and NATO. Therefore, after the Second World War the world started drawing

together through political - as opposed to the Global Village's commercial - initiatives.

The European Coal and Steel Community has been the organisation that has had the greatest impact on the citizens of the involved nation-states. In 1957 it became the European Economic Community (EEC, later EC). In the Rome Treaty the goals were stated as to "progressively approximating the economic policies of member states to promote throughout the Community a harmonious development of economic activities".<sup>21</sup> In the post-war era Europe had to compete with strong economies such as the USA and later Japan. Because of the Iron Curtain, this new Europe became West Europe.

The EEC worked towards streamlining and removing trade restrictions among its member states. In 1987 the Single European Act was signed which was to lead to the Internal Market in 1992. This has meant a continuous change in the regulations of the member-states and an opening up for a free flow of labour between the states. Within the cultural area, not part of the EC economic sphere as such, this has led to the aforementioned attempt to strengthen EC media technology. But because culture in an economic context become goods, and because the EC did not allow discrimination of nationalities, it has meant that national support schemes such as Public Lending Right came under scrutiny.

In 1993 the EC took one step further. The Maastricht Treaty was ratified and it became the European Union. This meant the inclusion of both social and cultural dimensions in the Union. As Ali Kazancigil points out "it ventures into the highly symbolic sphere of national sovereignty and makes provisions for a unique European currency and a European Central Bank to manage it."<sup>22</sup>

Once out of the EMU, Great Britain decided to stay out. It has also opted out of the social dimension. Denmark was only able to ratify the treaty after a second referendum on the treaty. In both Denmark and Britain there is strong opposition to the European Union. In fact they are seen as special test cases for public opinion.<sup>23</sup> Nonetheless, the opting out of the social dimension was done by John Major, not the British public who have not like the Danes had a say via a referendum. But as Karlheinz Reif concludes:



The lower levels of explicit support and the higher levels of explicit opposition in Denmark and the UK illustrate, without question, the extent to which the level of consensus and support depends on the existence - and success in mobilizing mass support - of elites who are hostile to integration or to more of it.<sup>24</sup>

In Great Britain the Conservative Party has always been divided over the question of the EU. In Denmark there has been a strong political and non-political opposition on the left. Strangely enough it seems that the British right and the Danish left agree. All the same they agree for different reasons. In Denmark the question has been on the power-distance and bureaucracy between Brussels and Denmark. But it has just as much been about cultural integrity and ecological standards. To Danes the EU is threatening to national identity and culture.<sup>25</sup> To the Danes, Denmark is a small pawn in the political play of the superpowers of Germany, France and Great Britain. The reality of this major/minor culture notion is exemplified and discussed in the next chapter in the bilateral context of Denmark and Great Britain.

Where Denmark perceives itself as a minor culture in danger between the major cultures of Europe, Great Britain does not want to be dragged in to too much regulation such as for instance the social dimension. Not only do Great Britain's strong liberal traditions, strengthened in the Thatcherite era, oppose regulation and interference, but on a cultural level so does British antagonism to the other major cultures of Germany and France and its perception of itself as distinct from Europe but closely connected to the USA and the Commonwealth.

Nonetheless, it is not only the specific historic-cultural reasons of Denmark and Great Britain which have eroded the permissive consensus for the EU. It is a general trend among all the member states.<sup>26</sup> What is happening is that as the political union becomes more and more of a reality it interferes more and more with the everyday lives of its citizens. It is very much a question of national sovereignty, yes, but it is also the fear of having the ECU rather than kroner, pound, deutschmark or guilder. Other strong national symbols such as passports have been changed. The passports are now red and are no longer a visible sign of belonging. Other streamlining regulations have been affected. The telephone number that everyone knows is that of the emergency services. In Great Britain it is 999, in Denmark it was until recently

000 but is now 112 as it will be in Great Britain because of EU regulations. Denmark narrowly avoided having to add nitrate to its liver paté because it was accepted as a national dish as was Greek feta cheese. England has had to adopt the metric system so that no-one knows how tall they are, how much they weigh or how much lager they drink.

The EU is seen as moving towards a federal Europe of States in line with the USA. Both Britain and Denmark have always been intergovernmentalists in an EU context. That is, they have always wanted a union of nation-states with common institutions for co-operation and co-ordination. Because of strong British resistance to the federalist idea this has never been a clearly stated objective in EU politics. But as Thomas Wilson points out the objective of the Rome Treaty to "establish the foundation of an ever-closer union among the people of Europe" means that the EEC "was primarily an economic community but which nonetheless retained implicitly the undefined - goal of political union."<sup>27</sup>

The resistance to this United States of Europe - both as reality and perceived threat - is a resistance to the (perceived) abolishment of the nation-states. This fear may be clearly expressed or sensed through the encroachment on national symbols such as currency and passports. Nationalism seems to show its ugly head with its implied discrimination towards the Other:

Generally speaking, there is a discourse which is extremely sensitive to the effects that a Centralized European Community could have on matters of identity (national and otherwise). As with the presence of aliens, the process of European Union generates a real fear of losing territory, personality and the power to control one's own affairs; in a word there arises a crisis of identity which expresses itself in a reactive nationalism, often accompanied by chauvinistic and jingoistic manifestations.<sup>28</sup>

No doubt nationalism shares some characteristics with racism and discrimination. When researchers of racism debate the modern form of cultural racism they concede that it seems to intermingle with nationalism but is not the same thing. When researchers of nationalism debate this they admit that nationalism can include discriminatory factors, but that it, fundamentally, is not racism.

Peter Alter in his book *Nationalism* differentiates three forms of nationalism. There is what he calls Integral Nationalism, inspired by Darwinistic evolutionary

ideas it believes in the survival of the fittest<sup>29</sup>. This is how most people see nationalism, as fascism or imperialism. Reform Nationalism wants to protect a threatened state against outside economic control and cultural influence. Or it may want to change old structures but keep the values behind it<sup>30</sup>. Japan and Singapore for instance are thoroughly modernised nations, but the value systems are not Western. The last form of nationalism that Peter Alter defines is Risorgimento Nationalism. According to this nationalism all nations have a "divine" purpose. They are different but equal<sup>31</sup>. This is the oldest form of nationalism. It is humanistic and liberalistic. It is also the one which comes closest to pre-national notions of for instance a Fellowship of Christians. That is, notions of identification by, say religion, but no notion of division by territory or national culture. This is probably also in some way the way the Danes perceive the British or the Dutch perceive the French. Not as either subaltern nor superior, but as different in their own right. After all, they, like Risorgimento Nationalism, have values based in Christianity, enlightenment and rationality. They are all Western countries.

Most recent researchers of nationalism have rejected the idea of nationalism as an "ism" as in liberalism or fascism. Nationalism they say, is not an ideology. Benedict Anderson in his influential study *Imagined Communities* points out that nationalism belongs with kinship and religion rather than liberalism and fascism.<sup>32</sup> He says:

My point of departure is that nationality, or, as one might prefer to put it in view of that word's multiple significations, nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artifacts of a particular kind.<sup>33</sup>

Anderson's book is a fascinating study in the changes of consciousness it took to facilitate nationalism. He explores this through, among other issues, the changing concepts of time, how print, capitalism and protestantism led to the rise of vernacular languages of state, which again emphasised difference rather than unity through Latin and Christianity.

This change of consciousness is the key to understanding how deeply rooted nationalism is. For instance, today, a monarch who did not speak a national language of the nation-state would be out of the question. Also, when we look at the geogra-

phy of Europe, we see Italy, France, Great Britain and Denmark, not centres of importance such as Florence, Paris, Berlin and Edinburgh.

The whole breakdown of the Eastern block was a shock to citizens of Western European countries, not only because it broke up the Iron Curtain, but because it was an example of how fragile the geographical map is, even in the so very old and consolidated Europe. In this sense memory is short, because World War I shaped many of the states now in crisis, and the Iron Curtain did not come down until after World War II. But because nationalism sees old territories, whether they are nation-states such as Denmark or nations such as England and Scotland, the perception of old Europe is of solid and defined nations or nation-states. But without a perception of linear time or of territory this was not possible.

The re-invention of the past as old as implied above, is the topic of David Lowenthal's essay *Identity, Heritage and History*.<sup>34</sup> Heritage is used to establish a national identity.

Each group's heritage is by definition incomparable. The past we prize is domestic; those of foreign lands are alien and incomparable with ours. National identity requires both having a heritage and thinking it unique. It is heritage that differentiates us; we treasure most what sets us apart.<sup>35</sup>

This seems common sense. For tourists coming to London, Buckingham Palace and Bobbies on the streets are typical symbols of English-ness. They are not perceived as property of the Crown and the legacy of man whose first name was Robert. On visits to Egypt the pyramids will show this country's great past and not the supremacy of the Pharaohs. This is exactly what David Lowenthal points out. Heritage was something for the wealthy and powerful, not for the common man. It was "not only what rulers were entitled to; it defined them and assured their rule".<sup>36</sup> Lowenthal goes on to say that heritage remains metaphorically ancestral. But today it is our heritage. It confirms identity and boosts the solidarity of nations.

The past, not as heritage, but as myths and symbols, is also the main component of Anthony D. Smith's idea of national identity. His book *National Identity* is a thorough exploration of the ties that bind nation, state and nationality. His thesis is that nation-states have conceptually blended two dimensions which are components of the civic state. This is partly an ethnic and genealogical dimension consisting of

shared memories, myths and traditions and partly a civic and territorial one. "By definition", Smith says, "the nation is a community of common myths and memories, as is ethnies. (...) [N]ations always require ethnic 'elements'. They may, of course, be reworked. But nations are inconceivable without some common myths and memories of territorial home."<sup>37</sup>

Where Anthony D. Smith explores the construction of national identity Michael Billig in his book *Banal Nationalism* shows how integrated and how common sense nationalism is. We are constantly reminded of nationality through flags in front of public buildings, through coinage and through discourse. But it is never perceived as a reminder because it is so common sense. Every "we" in a newspaper story implies our national "we". Every "this nation" implies our nation. But no-one needs to have these implications explained. They are common sense.

Nation-ness, nationality or national identity then, is cultural, imagined, but strong. Not only is it almost impossible for contemporary western consciousness to perceive a lack of nationality, it is also a strong component of both individual and collective identity to belong to this imagined community.

All the same, even though these communities are imagined, they are also real. They are real partly because whether imagined or not they are an integral part of the cultural make-up of the nation. And they are real because the nations and nation-states have formed their policies in accordance with the limitations and options which their territorial placement have given them in the world society. Though West-European countries share a legacy of Christianity, modernity and industrialisation, they also show individual differences. Denmark has not been an empire as Britain has. Britain, on the other hand has never had the same union between nation and state that Denmark has. None of the countries has had a Hitler or Mussolini. Re-invented myths and real events converge in national identity to form something which both shares roots with other nations and is specific to that nation. Real or imagined individual circumstances have shaped societies distinct from each other with distinct traditions and structures. The chapters on cultural policies in this thesis show that though there are communalities, the differing British and Danish conceptions have shaped two different systems of cultural support.

The EU in its search for legitimacy acknowledges the cultural differences in Europe, but prefers to ignore the strength of the consciousness of nationality. It does try to create European symbols of unity in line with national symbols of unity such as a flag, a hymn, a cultural city of the year, book awards and European media, but it does not realise how strong national identity is. In the name of unity it changes the colour of passports and emergency phone numbers which in no way can obstruct the Internal Market or closer political union, though of course it would be an inconsistency in a United States of Europe.

The European Union pulls the West-European continent together, the Global Village pulls the world together. National identity and racism draw it apart. It happens at different levels; politically and commercially the world is pulled together. Identity and discrimination draws it apart. But what seems to be happening as well is that the pulling forces are ignoring actual human behavior and the drawing apart forces are ignoring the vision of the future that political and commercial elites are offering. Individuals live small histories in the present and the big history as what was or what will be, where the big history by and large are thought out today and lived tomorrow. The individuals of today are experiencing the by-product of this through a polarisation of "them" and "us" and a suspiciousness towards the Other.

Instead of ignoring the actual differences between "them" and "us" in the general discourse, a debate on difference and sameness would be much more fruitful, in neutralising the subaltern and superior in the Other, in keeping the actual distance to what it is and in bridging the difference rather than having expectations of removing it. This is the land of cross-cultural understanding.

This however, expands the field in question, for if nationality is culture, then religion is another dividing aspect such as Muslim vs Christian. If national identity is based on myths and symbols, traditions and an actual and re-invented past then it is culture, in the anthropological sense of culture, as a way of life. And if the question is of a way of life then sub-cultures too are part of the field. All in all, cross-cultural understanding is not only between nations but between cultures at all levels. One does not exclude the other. In fact an interest in for instance pop music can be the bridge to youth cultures abroad, who are also part of other national cultures.

Knowledge and understanding of the national culture may not be the objective, but will, so to speak, be a by-product.

Cross-cultural understanding is understanding across cultures. It attempts to show that cultural differences exist, but also that the cultural differences are not arbitrary or incomprehensible. Cross-Cultural understanding is a meeting with the culture of the Other, but in the understanding of the foreign it is also - ideally - a meeting with the unacknowledged cultural elements of the familiar self.

Hans Gullestrup identifies these unacknowledged elements of the familiar self as the self-understanding (egenforståelse) of a culture<sup>38</sup>. Most of us are encultured into a culture, that is, the culture is learned by the example of others, rather than having been taught as a skill or a fact. Therefore these cultural traits are unacknowledged as acquired. They are part of a subjective reality. But because this reality is shared with all members of the culture, it seems as if this is the natural order of things. The subjective reality becomes objectified. Because the subjective reality goes unacknowledged as subjective, it becomes what Daniel Norman has called a cultural barrier. He defines the cultural barrier as follows:

...everything that the individual derives from the community in which he is brought up, and which he does not share with individuals brought up in other communities with different ways.<sup>39</sup>

The objectified subjective reality does not only become a barrier, it is also the basis for the "us" and "them" dichotomy because it dictates the premises on which the Other is judged. The judging of people of other cultures by our own standards is ethnocentrism, and this is the major obstacle in crossing the cultural barrier. Therefore, in order to understand the barrier, cross-cultural understanding is trying to transgress Daniel Norman's definition will have to be refined.

Ethnocentrism is to judge people from foreign cultures by one's own standards, but the concept includes the notions of trust and distrust. Ronald Inglehart has on the basis of the Eurobarometer measured trust and distrust among EEC countries.<sup>40</sup> He defines trust and distrust in the following way:

Trust is the expectation that another's behavior will be predictably friendly; distrust is the expectation that another's behavior will be harmful or unpredictable. Thus trust or distrust predispose one to interpret another's actions as friendly or threatening when ambiguity exists.<sup>41</sup>

Cross-cultural understanding is therefore not only to bring understanding of another's culture, but to open up for the idea that other cultures are only unpredictable because they cannot be understood purely on the basis of one's own culture. The unpredictable becomes predictable through knowledge of the foreign culture. Furthermore being aware of this, leads to less fear of what is unpredictable because the unpredictability lies in lack of knowledge.

The whole idea of openness towards others, the idea of gaining knowledge of a foreign culture and seeking to understand this culture on its own premises is called cultural relativism, and it is through cultural relativism that we can transgress the cultural barrier.

Cultural relativism has more often than not been criticised for being "valueless", a blind acceptance of everything within the other culture. Are we to condone the holocaust of Nazi Germany because we understand that it is based on the idea of the aryan race as superior to other races? In my view this is not the case. To understand is not necessarily to accept, as accepting is not always the same thing as understanding.

Gillis Herlitz discusses cultural relativism from this perspective.<sup>42</sup> According to him we have peripheric and central values. These values are culture bound. For instance in Western cultures there is a strong emphasis on individual freedom and the rights of the individual. It is difficult for individuals of these cultures to accept cultures or aspects of cultures which do not respect the freedom of the individual. This is because this value is central to Western culture. With more peripheric values other cultures' differences are judged as either positive, neutral or negative. With peripheric values, perceptions of a foreign tradition can be changed through acceptable explanations. Gillis Herlitz gives two examples.

In India cows are holy.<sup>43</sup> Members of a Western culture may find it ridiculous that these cows can walk around freely and die of old age while part of the popula-



tion is starving. But the cows do actually have economic importance as well, and when this is explained it makes sense that they are not slaughtered.

Gillis Herlitz' other example is that of circumcision of girls in Africa<sup>44</sup>. This can be explained by the high mortality among children under the age of one. By making sex purely reproductive women can breastfeed their children longer and thereby increase their chances of survival.

Both explanations are logical from a Western point of view, whereas the cultures involved would probably stress tradition and religion. Nevertheless most people brought up in the Western tradition would intuitively reject circumcision of girls even though they understand the rational explanation. This is too close to the core values, whereas the holy cows of India will be accepted because the set of values involved here are not part of the core values.

To follow Herlitz' theory through, there will always be a part of us which will stay ethnocentric. In practical cases of, for instance, support to the developing countries this can - as cultural relativism can - lead to severe ethical questions of our right to give or withhold support on the basis of our values. But when the question is of cross-cultural understanding between cultures without a specific goal, a core of ethnocentrism is healthy.

A measure of ethnocentrism is necessary in an attempt to gain a general cross-cultural understanding. As discussed above, nationalism is an identity. It is an identity which tells the individual where he or she belongs, but it is also part of who he or she is. If this part of the individual is made purely relative, incorporating all sorts of contradictory values all held as being of the same importance, the person will end up being completely uprooted and alienated from his or her own culture. This is not the idea of cross-cultural understanding.

At the same time, ethnocentrism is the biggest danger to cross-cultural understanding because it distances "them" and "us" and fears the Other. Fear of what one does not know or understand makes it impossible to cross the cultural barrier. It is therefore paramount to reach some sort of balance between cultural relativism and ethnocentrism, because cultural relativism is an openness towards what is different. This openness leads to more than an understanding of the Other. The meeting with

what is different is also a meeting with familiar values and ideas in the light of the Other's otherness. It leads to an awareness of our own objectified subjective reality and a chance to re-evaluate it - or keep it as it is. But whether the meeting with the other in the light of cultural relativism changes our perception of ourselves and our culture or not, it will always lead to an openness towards those who are different.

Though cross-cultural understanding tends to focus on where we differ, part of the meeting with the other will often show a sameness as well as an otherness. Again, the knowledge of sameness will erode the cultural barrier. As with the understanding of the other, it will remove the fear of what is not known.

It is not easy to reach a balance between cultural relativism and ethnocentrism when the Other is seen as threatening as he is in the world which is pulling together, whether he is within the borders of states as guestworker or from old colonies; or whether he is standing just outside the border threatening national sovereignty. But there are ways. One is actual tuition in schools. The next chapter will show how English language learning and the changing concepts of the tuition of foreign languages in Denmark was part of creating familiarity with and thereby openness towards British culture. Yet another way is tourism. To go abroad is to seek out the unfamiliar. Tourism is one of the activities in the leisuressphere. But it is also possible to meet the Other through cultural products such as translated fiction and foreign produced television programmes. Popular culture as a conveyer of openness and familiarity is also exemplified in the next chapter on Danish openness towards Britain.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, users of the media-products in the Global Village have embraced these with no fears of loss of identity or antagonism towards the Other. Products of the Global Village share characteristics with the above mentioned ways of keeping a balance between ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. All are non-threatening. They keep the distance between "us" and "them" without accentuating it.

Foreign produced cultural products on the whole - not just popular culture - are ways of expressing objectified subjective realities and ways of expressing that "them" is also an "us".

These cultural products could also be termed cultural artifacts or representations. But these terms covering plays, novels, films, television programmes, paintings and more, are in this particular context too closely connected with representing a particular culture. The idea of representing a specific culture is more often than not secondary to exploring more universal themes in arts and popular culture. Of course, the term cultural products implies the exchange of goods and in connection with art and popular culture has connotations of Adorno's false consciousness and mass-culture. All terms - art, popular culture, representations, cultural artifacts and cultural products have each their debateable connotations. Nonetheless, I have chosen the term cultural products in order not to force a link between arts and popular culture and a specific culture. It is of course my contention that there is such a link, but not that it is the primary concern of the cultural product.

Through most of this study it is art rather than popular culture which is the focus. Whether discussing the publishing industry or the funding system, the implied starting point is the conditions of economically non-viable art - through most of this study the translated novel - in the marketplace. This is why novels are not published and why it is supported. On the other hand, in this and the next chapter I do not wish to exclude popular culture. Therefore cultural products connotes representations of culture, whether universal or specific, which are also products in the marketplace.

The cultural products I have in mind in the context of this chapter are what could be termed narrative cultural products such as film and television shows, but also plays, opera and translated fiction and to a certain extent music videos and pop music. It does not have to stop there, game shows, human interest documentaries and sports events can share some of the characteristics of the narrative cultural products in being based in the "us" of the Other. Nonetheless, I shall concentrate on the narrative cultural products and later on, on literary fiction in particular. These forms of expression are not produced to teach a culture as the "Other". Rather they start from the premisses of an "us" expressing ideas, criticisms and visions of various aspects of human life, whether they are stories of love, hate, violence, injustice or alienation in contemporary or historic society.

The Otherness is pointed out not by subject but by language, settings and different traditions. In particular television can, if not dubbed, point to Otherness through language. But settings and traditions particularly point to the Otherness. Cities, towns and villages are no longer London, Birmingham or Aspley Guise, they are - in a Danish context - Århus, Greve and Ejby. The characters are not called Debbie, Martha, Kevin or Anthony but Dorte, Mette, Keld or Arne. Christmas is not celebrated on the December 25, but in the evening of the 24th. No-one pops out for a sandwich at lunch time, they open their packed lunch. All these external characteristics become signs of Otherness.

What the reader/viewer is doing, is exploring cross-cultural differences or similarities as a secondary aspect. It is most often a secondary aspect because cross-cultural differences are not necessarily the subject explored, mainly because for instance, readers of fiction, choose their reading according to interest, whether that is by genre such as crime, romance or science fiction or by subjects such as addiction to heroin, a young man in the eighties or a middle aged woman's way out of a marriage. For the reader it may be expressed in even more vague expressions such as "sounds interesting", "what I feel like reading now" or "sounds similar to a book I enjoyed reading". It is therefore subject whether it is expressed in the terms of plot or in subject matter such as violence, identity, alienation, love or hate which is what attracts the reader, not its culture of origin and culture-bound perceptions of problems and solutions. But it is in the culturally different perceptions of problems and solutions that the deepest cross-cultural understanding is embedded.

Experience of the Other as part of an "Us" is an important part of openness towards other cultures because it highlights the objectification of the subjective reality. Though the culture bound perceptions of solutions and problems lead to the most genuine cross-cultural understanding, the externalities or the settings for the plot also lead to cross-cultural understanding. The characters' acceptance of the externalities of settings and traditions as ordinary points to this. A knowledge of specific external differences may come in handy in an actual meeting with an Other of that particular culture. But most importantly, by having met an Other so to speak at home where the Other treated it as normal, it opens up for a general awareness of

Otherness as a possible Us where the obvious differences fit into a different everyday life. Because seldom is the specific celebration of Christmas, the Ramadan or a birthday the focus of the tension or solution of the subject explored. Rather they are part of the externalities through which it is explored. Therefore universal problems discussed in specific settings turn obvious differences into ordinariness. By turning them into ordinariness they lose some of their power as a focal point for fear of the Other.

Foreign narrative cultural products can therefore just by being consumed, open up for a general awareness of foreignness as relative and ordinary when it is at home.

There are other signs of Otherness embedded in narrative cultural products in the way characters solve their problems within their objectified subjective realities which will be different to perceptions and solutions in the objectified subjective reality in which the reader exists. These are the true expressions of cross-cultural differences because they are based not on the external expressions of traditions but on the internalised understandings of myths, traditions and heritage which make up the ethnics of the culture. But in the consumption of a narrative cultural product this may be perceived either as expressions of another culture, of Otherness, or they may be perceived as the specific individual responses of the characters to their specific circumstances. In the interpretation of narrative cultural products from other cultures there are no teachers to point to the correct cultural interpretations.

This does not necessarily defeat the idea of cultural narrative products as conveyers of cross-cultural understanding. This is partly because it does not conflict with the idea of relativity of foreignness conveyed through narrative cultural products. But also because whether perceived as a culturally different perception or solution of a problem, it is at the individual level perceived as a different perception from that of the reader's. This could lead to a rejection of the perception expressed in the cultural product in question. But if the cultural product is able to suspend disbelief of its fictional universe, then the perceptions expressed within this universe will be part of its intrinsic logic.

A closer look at some of the qualities of fiction and the process of reading will exemplify how foreign narrative products can come to form a cross-cultural frame of reference.

It is a cross-cultural frame of reference which is established through the non-threatening narrative cultural products of foreign cultures. They are non-threatening because they are chosen by the user and because they teach cross-cultural understanding indirectly. It is an indirect teaching because foreign cultural products are chosen not for the foreignness of their cultural origin, but for the subject they deal with. Foreign cultural products are foreign because of externalities such as origin and language, but they do not perceive themselves as foreign but familiar and therefore they point to the "us" in the "Other". Linked with this is the content of the products. The cultural products point to foreignness through externalities to the subject matter such as a foreign setting, names and traditions. Because of the secondariness of these to the subject matter and because of the way they are treated as ordinary, they point to the relativity of foreignness. This dismantles the fear of Otherness. But the cultural products can also convey a genuine understanding of cultural differences through the qualities of fiction. Because in the text the perceived problems and solutions are dealt with in the context of an objectified subjective reality different from the one the reader/viewer exists in. This is partly through its ability to suspend disbelief in a fictional universe. And it is partly in the case of literary fiction or - in order not to exclude popular culture - print based fictions through the qualities of the text and the reading process such as empathy, the aesthetic experience and accommodation and assimilation. This cross-cultural frame of reference is both specific because it conveys actual knowledge of a foreign culture, and it is general because it allows for acquiring a stance of cultural relativism and openness towards foreign cultures.

Now on to literary fiction and the qualities of reading. Fictions, when they work, are able to suspend disbelief. But printed fiction allows for a way to get to know the characters which people the fictional universe. This can be done in various ways, through an unreliable narrator to multiple reliable narrators, through actions which discredit an unreliable narrator. Basically what fiction allows is for the reader

to step in to the shoes of the characters. It is easier to understand a fictional character through the qualities of fiction, the structuring of an intrinsic logic universe, through bringing a problem to its solution or non-solution in accordance with this universe, than it is to understand an actual individual in his or her changing persona to whose inner thoughts other individuals have no access and whose life is an on-going, changing often illogical narrative.

What fiction does is to allow the reader to identify with the characters, in the sense that the reader comes to understand the characters and their reasons for action. But this is not identification because the reader does not become the character. It is empathy. The notion of empathy rather than identification is one of the qualities which leads to a cross-cultural frame of reference and not a direct incorporation of the identity. Empathy allows the reader to stay the reader as someone different from the character at the same time as it allows for understanding of the character. Encyclopedia Britannica defines empathy in the following way:

An ability to imagine oneself in another's place and understand the other's feelings, desires, ideas and actions. It is a term coined in the early 20th century, equivalent to the German *Einfühlung* and modelled on "sympathy". The term is used with special (but not exclusive) reference to aesthetic experience.

Encyclopedia Britannica links empathy with the aesthetic experience. Aesthetics is most often thought of as the appreciation of the beautiful in art. It is through and by the aesthetics that we decide the body of literary works which is to form the canon. In its original sense the word aesthetics emphasized apprehension through the senses. Through science we gain knowledge and through the arts we gain pleasure by recognizing the beautiful. Raymond Williams concludes his outline of the development of the word by saying:

It is clear from this history that aesthetic, with its specialized references to art, to visual appearance, and to a category of 'fine' or 'beautiful', is a key formation in a group of meanings which at once emphasized and isolated subjective sense activity as the basis of art and beauty as distinct for example, from social or cultural interpretations. It is an element in the divided modern consciousness of art and society: a reference beyond social use and social valuation which, like one special meaning of the word culture, is intended to express a human dimension which the dominant version of society appears to exclude. The emphasis is understandable but the isolation can be damaging (...).<sup>45</sup>

Though the idea of fine, beautiful and subjective sense may be the generally acknowledged meanings of aesthetics, it does not combine aesthetic with empathy in a way which is productive for cross-cultural understanding. As Raymond Williams points out, it is dangerous to isolate the aesthetic from other experiences. And empathy is more than an appreciation of the beautiful through the senses. It is an ability to understand how others feel and why they act as they do. The purpose of the aesthetics combined with empathy (if one can talk about purpose with such a non-utilitarian term as aesthetics) is to hold on to the idea of the pleasure of reading and experiencing what the Other feels without losing the distinction between self and other. But in order to combine understanding with feeling in the aesthetic it is necessary to approach the concept from another angle.

The American philosopher Nelson Goodman discusses in his book *Languages of Art* the idea of art and understanding through the aesthetic experience. While stressing that the aesthetic experience is basically non-utilitarian he does not see this as a distinguishing feature. Also, he substitutes the notion of pleasure with that of emotion. It is possible to be angry, confused, distressed, saddened while reading a novel or watching a play. Still, it is the novel or the play apprehended through the emotions. Nevertheless, the idea of literature as a promoter of cross-cultural understanding is to learn while being entertained. That is, to understand the foreign culture, not only to feel for and with the characters of the plot. This can be achieved by combining the sensory notion of aesthetics with the cognitive process of learning. Nelson Goodman says:



Sensory and emotive experiences are related in complex ways to the properties of objects. Also, emotions function cognitively not as separate items but in combination with one another and with other means of knowing. Perception, conception, and feeling intermingle and interact; and an alloy often resists analysis into emotive and non emotive components. The same pain (or is it the same ?) tells of ice and fire.<sup>46</sup>

To sum it up, though literature is first and foremost to be enjoyed, part of the enjoyment is to experience and learn through a combination of cognitive faculties and emotions. One does not exclude the other. At the same time comprehension through the emotions is different from pure cognitive comprehension because it opens up for the possibility of empathy.

Nonetheless, because the qualities of fiction and the aesthetic experience allows for cognitive and pleasurable experience it does not necessarily follow that cultural differences, whether perceived as this or as individual differences become part of understanding, of expanding a cross-cultural frame of reference. Lothar Bredella discusses this in his essay *Understanding a Foreign Culture through Assimilation and Accommodation*.<sup>47</sup> He follows the cognitive line introduced earlier with Nelson Goodman's conceptualisation of the aesthetic experience. Through reading it is possible to either assimilate or accommodate foreign concepts. The two terms both imply the learning or incorporation of something new. But where assimilation reduces the new to something which is part of already familiar concepts, accommodation is to accommodate new concepts among the old ones.

Bredella combines this with the concept of the irreal borrowed from Rickert. The irreal bridges what is foreign with what is familiar, "because as irreal sense it is neither one's own nor foreign".<sup>48</sup> That is, the irreal is that which is in common. It can be feelings such as love, hate, disillusion and so forth. But the expressions and reasons for these feelings can vary considerably. The reader has chosen the novel out of interest for the subject, and hereby already found his irreal sense to bridge the differences.

To take this one step further, if this understanding of learning is accepted, it follows that the reading of translated fiction will allow both for personal development, by understanding through old concepts, and for the expansion with new concepts. That is, the reader who reads a translated novel out of interest can read the

novel at both levels of personal interest, but also accommodate foreign concepts which may not apply directly to something familiar in his or her own universe.

The cross-cultural frame of reference is based on the idea that the consumption of foreign produced narrative cultural products can help put the "Us" in the "Other" and enhance openness and cultural relativism by removing the fear of the Other. In addition to this, these products can provide actual knowledge of foreign behaviour and values.

Most foreign produced cultural products are consumed during leisure time. It is not a taught knowledge, neither informal nor formal learning. Rather it is a broadening of the mind, enlightenment. Not necessarily in the old sense of the cultured man as in high culture, but through sheer exposure and consumption. Firstly, this means that it is an unacknowledged knowledge. A frame of reference to be drawn upon when needed or wanted without awareness of it as such. Secondly if placed within leisure time, the conditions and uses of this time influence the formation of this frame of reference.

There are enumerable forms of leisure pursuits: recreation through arts, sports and countryside, hobbies, crafts, education, tourism, holidays, entertainment, eating out and so forth. All of these take place during time free of work, time free to do what one wants to.

Several studies have shown that it is not quite adequate to define leisure as time to do what one wants in time free of paid work. For instance studies such as *Women's Leisure, What Leisure* by Eileen Green et al show that women do not have this experience of the division of work and leisure, and rather than seeing leisure as a time to pursue specific leisure pursuits, leisure is "a state of mind or quality of experience",<sup>49</sup> and that for instance reading means solitude, time and space to oneself<sup>50</sup>. John R. Kelly finds that within families leisure is understood primarily in terms of the stability and richness it can bring to family life even though this may mean restrictions in the leisure pursuits chosen. The Rappaports find that the leisure pursuits found interesting depend on where in the life cycle the individual is: young and single, married with children, elderly; and that specific activities as for instance walking in the park takes on different meanings according to this. Stanley Parker ex-

plores leisure related to the work experience and finds that if work is rewarding, leisure is seen as an extension of this, if work is not rewarding the leisure pursuits sought are as deliberately different from work, whereas if there is indifference to work, leisure pursuits are neither like work, nor deliberately different, but attitudes towards leisure pursuits are as indifferent as those to work<sup>51</sup>. Danish research focuses on lifestyles. Thomas Højrup has distinguished three lifestyles, the self-employed who do not divide his or her time between work and leisure, because the "free" is in being responsible for his own work. The employer lifestyle follows the old perception of work and leisure, and in which the focal point is spare time. The third lifestyle is the career lifestyle where work - or rather career - is more important than spare time, and where activities in the spare time are aimed at enhancing the career<sup>52</sup>.

All these studies with their individual visions and limitations show that leisure is many things, and that the strict division between work and time free to do what one wants is mediated by factors such as family and position within the family. It is mediated by perceptions of what uses leisure time is for whether it is to enhance family life or secure time for solitude, and it is mediated by attitudes to work. This means that leisure pursuits are chosen in accordance with these mediations, and although people are free to choose what they want to do, this freedom is used to choose what is suitable according to their specific circumstances. For the narrative cultural products this means that it is not only in competition with the multitude of other activities and products but also with the changing needs and wants of individuals.

This is a fairly straightforward conclusion to draw from the complexity of leisure studies. But what they also tell us is that leisure in its diversity is ever changing. This is not so much a conclusion drawn from the fact that leisure interests are dependent on factors such as family composition and attitudes to work, but on what the Rappaport study indicates, that life is changing. This is as they point out, in connection with the lifecycle from child to elderly, but can also be based on other changes such as change of work or changes in the family for instance by divorce. Therefore solitude and contemplation may be sought at one period; and activity and

socialising in another while the pursuit of a specific hobby is a constant. All this leads up to the point that people choose according to wants and needs, but that it is a choice and the circumstances this choice depends on can change. This means that the narrative cultural products are in competition with other leisure activities, but also that just because they are not pursued at one point of an individual's life, this does not necessarily mean that they won't be at another.

More and more leisure time is spent at home, and television is becoming the most used leisure pursuit.<sup>53</sup> This means that a lot of narrative cultural products are being consumed. Unfortunately most of what is being consumed is American. This is for two reasons. It is because this is what people want to watch and it is because this is what is available. These are two other mediating factors; that of availability and that of what Joffre Dumazedier has called the hedonistic character of leisure.<sup>54</sup>

The hedonistic character of leisure, is the pleasure of leisure. The "I want to", the "I find it interesting". As Dumazedier points out this is not necessarily instant, empty gratification, but may mean the postponement of gratification in order to reach a goal. "But such efforts, such commitments are freely chosen in the expectation of disinterested pleasure, not for utilitarian ends".<sup>55</sup> This is not a problem for narrative cultural products, but of course the fact that people do not choose them is. Therefore it is important that there is a constant supply of foreign produced narrative cultural products for if and when people choose to use them.

This ties in with the limitation of availability. If the foreign cultural products are not available they cannot be chosen. If only American products are available it is not possible to form a broad cross-cultural frame of reference. But also, if the hedonistic character of leisure is to be taken into consideration, if all that is available is American cops and robbers stories, they will not catch the attention of people interested in fine arts. It will of course also mean that the cross-cultural frame of reference will tend to form a picture of the USA as a nation with nothing but villains and their law-abiding pursuers. There must therefore be a variety of offers both to ensure interest and diversity in expressions of foreign cultures.

Cultural narrative products are primarily produced by commercial interests. The media conglomerates of the Global Village have shown that it is possible to produce

programmes and channels which are so specialised in catching mass interest that they can broadcast to huge numbers of audiences. But this specialisation is also a generalisation or universalisation which focuses on the minimum of requirements of content of a product in order to catch a maximum of audiences with diverse interests.

The media conglomerates are an extreme example of a commercial enterprise. But all commercial producers of cultural products have to keep an eye on the bottom-line in order to stay in business and therefore produce what can be sold. This goes for foreign produced television, film, opera and fiction as well.

The bottom-line is dependent on what can sell, but also on the competition within the business and with other products and on distribution channels such as cinemas, theatres, TV-stations and bookshops. For translated fiction this means a dependence on the importing publishing industries. The conditions of publishing in Britain and Denmark are explored in chapter 4

But foreign cultural products go through one more selection process than home-produced products. They have to catch the interest of the distributor/producers abroad, and the channels through which they are made available such as film festivals, book fairs and international talk up through the inner circles of distributor/producers influence this. The case of translated fiction is explored in the Danish/British context in chapter 5.

The diversity and availability is therefore dependent on the structures and attitudes of the commercial environments which produce them and by the profit they can bring.

The profit they can bring in is "the tyranny of the majority". It is audience attendance figures, viewer ratings and print-runs sold. It is the minimum requirements for reaching the maximum audiences. If availability is judged by figures rather than diversity in products sold, this means that people with minority interests, because of the hedonistic character of leisure, will not be able to form a cross-cultural frame of reference through foreign narrative cultural products.

All the same, the industries which produce these products cannot be expected to make loss-making products available in order to cater to minority interests. This does not mean that they do not do so. After all translated fiction is available and foreign



### 3) DANISH OPENNESS TOWARDS BRITAIN

*This chapter links to the previous chapter and the following chapters on publishing by focusing on familiarity with and openness towards other cultures. The next chapters will show the importance of familiarity with the foreign culture in what is chosen for translation. This chapter explores familiarity and openness through the example of British influence in Denmark. The chapter shows how bilateral connections through trade facilitated interest in Britain and how language teaching and the English language rise to become a lingua franca with increased openness towards Britain. Furthermore, after supralateral rather than bilateral relations took on increased importance, popular culture has taken on the role of creating openness towards British culture in Denmark. The chapter shows how these products accumulate interest and expand the range of British cultural products which can be incorporated in a Danish context.*

This thesis explores the publishing of translated fiction in Denmark and Britain and the cultural funding system related to this. The two countries have a long inter-related history. Or rather they have a history of Britain being dependent on Denmark for import of agricultural products and Denmark being dependent on this export.

Whereas this dependency for a major culture like the British has not meant any substantial considerations of Denmark, for Denmark the wishes of the importing country has had substantial implications.

This chapter explores the impact of the major culture of Britain on the minor culture of Denmark. Major and minor is not to be understood as one culture being superior to the other, rather it is to be understood as one being more powerful than the other. This is further exemplified through more universal trends such as English language tuition and the rise of English as lingua franca in the specific setting of Denmark.

Apart from exploring the major/minor culture dichotomy, the chapter also explains how the cross-cultural frame of reference is established. The openness towards and familiarity with a foreign culture is in the case of Denmark and Britain based on specific historic reasons, universal historic reasons and on cultural products.

Literary novels, which this thesis concentrates on, are one of these cultural products but so are popular culture products. In this chapter the cultural frame of reference is exemplified through Britain's huge export of popular culture.

Nonetheless, British fiction in translation in Denmark is part of this cultural export and a lot of British fiction is published in Denmark every year and it sells. The bookshops have shelves full of fiction in English/American paperbacks. There is no doubt that Danes are open towards British and American fiction. There is no doubt they want to read it. In fact, this fiction is much better represented on the Danish market than fiction from Denmark's traditional "brother" countries Norway and Sweden.

British and Danish culture are similar and it is therefore easy to find points of identification in the people and environments portrayed in British fiction. But German, French, Dutch, Belgium, Swedish and Norwegian cultures are also similar to Danish culture and can provide points of identification. This puts the question in perspective. Why should one particular European national culture be more accessible, popular or attractive than another of relative closeness to the Danish?

The answer is still relatively simple. Representatives of British culture and Britain are everywhere. No Dane, no matter what interest or age can avoid coming into contact with some representative of British culture: Shakespeare, Byron, Yeats, Arsenal, Manchester United, Hooligans, John Major, Margaret Thatcher, Inspector Morse, Taggart, Miss Marple, Lord Peter Wimsey, Sherlock Holmes, poll tax demonstrations, Union Jack, Big Ben, Lady Di, Camilla Parker-Bowles, Prince Charles, Charles Dickens, Oliver Twist, Wimbledon, Henry VIII and his six wives, Hamlet, "Something is rotten in the State of Denmark", Monty Python, the Young Ones, kilts, bagpipes, Andrew Lloyd Webber, Vera Lynn, Beatles, Rolling Stones, David Bowie, Sex Pistols, Warehouse raves, Mary Quant, Naomi Campbell and the



list goes on and on. But whether a Dane has interests within politics, sports, high or low culture, British national culture shows its many-sided face.

No wonder Danes find British culture familiar when we can discuss the crisis in the British royal family, when we in fact discuss that more than our own royal family since that family is not as rich on scandals as the British. We all know that the Beatles came from Liverpool - not England, but Liverpool - and our Danish football fans have been named "roligans" (calm-gans) as an answer to the British Hooligans. In this way British culture is part of a Danish cultural frame of reference and a cross-cultural frame of reference.

Nevertheless, it is not a God-given situation, or a law of nature that Danes should feel a familiarity and openness towards British culture. When the British navy bombed Copenhagen in 1801 and six years later in 1807 returned to Denmark and kidnapped the Danish fleet, Danish sentiments towards Britain were not positive.

Likewise, Danish openness towards British literature and the Danes' ability to read it in the original language is not to be taken for granted either. Jørgen Erik Nielsen describes in his book *Den Engelske Litteraturs Dyrkere i Holsten Omkring 1820* how a small group of anglophiles in Holstein read, discussed, translated and wrote about and to, in particular, Lord Byron, but also showed an interest in Walter Scott and Thomas Moore.

Especially the solicitor F.J. Jacobsen and the poetress Elise Von Hohenhausen seem to have shown interest in the British authors. They were both born and brought up in the German speaking duchy Holstein which was part of the Danish monarchy, and it was through the German language and these people that a knowledge of the new British authors reached Copenhagen.

Though the German anglophiles admired British authors and though for instance Hans Christian Andersen published his first book under the pseudonym Villiam Christian Walter for William Shakespeare, Hans Christian Andersen, Walter Scott, the general interest and influence of English literature and culture was small. On the whole English was not a well-known language. Few spoke it and the most influential literature was German. Hamlet, for instance, was not translated until 1777.<sup>56</sup>

But things change over time. In 1864 the Danish government discussed the construction of a new harbour on the west coast of Jutland:

It was stressed, that the advantage of a harbour was not alone of material kind, but also, and not the least, that we thereby would get in a more intimate touch with a country [Britain] "whose people is friendly towards our people and at least does not hate us, as one would have to say that the German people hates us".<sup>37</sup>

As can be seen from this quote, the close connection to Germany has disappeared as has the anti-British sentiment. In 1864 Denmark lost Schleswig-Holstein to Germany, and trade with Britain had started. Until 1864 this trade went through the harbours in Holstein, mainly Hamburg but also Altona, but after the war in 1864 Denmark had to establish a new harbour from which goods could be shipped to Britain. Eventually Esbjerg harbour was constructed and it is from this harbour that the only direct connection by sea between Denmark and England still exists. This line is still run by the company founded in 1870 as a result of Danish-British trade, namely "De forenede Dampskibsselskaber" - DFDS.

Danish-British trade started after the Napoleonic wars. Britain had come out of the Napoleonic wars with victory, whereas Denmark had lost. Not only did Denmark lose Norway in 1814, but the country was also declared bankrupt. Since Britain had seized the Danish fleet in 1807, Denmark had not had a merchant fleet. After the Napoleonic wars the trade conventions under which Denmark had operated successfully were no longer applicable and Denmark never became a sea-merchant nation again. What was left of Denmark was a small agricultural country.

Britain on the other hand, was the head of a growing empire and in the grips of the Industrial Revolution. In 1861 only 19% of the British population was employed in agricultural business<sup>38</sup> and the country was therefore not able to produce sufficient food supply for its population and it started importing. From Denmark it imported grain.

From the 1840's Britain was the main importer of Danish grain. When Germany started its industrialisation it too began importing from Denmark, but Britain was the main buyer of agricultural products. It was through this trade that Denmark

reached financial success and became a country as rich as the industrialised countries.<sup>59</sup> The dependency on Britain can be seen in the way the infra-structure of Denmark changed to accommodate this trade. As mentioned before, after the loss of access to Hamburg Harbour, Esbjerg Harbour was constructed, as were railway connections to this harbour. But Danish farming also changed to accommodate British needs. When it became possible and more profitable, Denmark began to export live cattle. Later the main export products were eggs, bacon and butter. Danish farmers improved methods of butter-churning, bred cows better for milk production and bred long lean pigs to accommodate the British taste in bacon. By 1914 Danish economy was flourishing because of its agricultural export.

British-Danish trade relations also played a part in the few considerations Britain had around Denmark in connection with the First World War, where Denmark stayed neutral.

Denmark with its close proximity to Germany and dependence on this country could be important because it could provide access to the Baltic. Britain decided to accept a slightly pro-German Danish neutrality not only because Denmark had no real strategic importance, but also because a German occupied Denmark would cut off access to food provisions.<sup>60</sup>

After World War I Danish agricultural export continued to Britain. But in the 1930s British import fell because of policies encouraging import from the Commonwealth.

Nevertheless at the outbreak of World War II Denmark once again found itself caught between Britain and Germany. The country wanted to show its anti-German sentiment and also keep trading with Britain. At the same time Denmark had to take into consideration that it shared a border with Germany, in particular since this border was drawn through Schleswig, one of the duchies lost in 1864. In 1920 North Schleswig voted itself back to Denmark, but Germany had never signed the treaty.

Denmark wanted to keep neutrality as in the 1914-1918 war, but this time Britain would not accept it, since this time political relations took precedence over commercial relations. On the whole "British relationship with Denmark was seen

increasingly in the light bearing on Anglo-German rivalry, both in economic and strategic terms, and the traditional friendship between the two countries suffered as a result".<sup>61</sup> The strained relationship did not improve until later in the War when Danish resistance became visible and Britain began to consider the post-war period. Because British policy of buying from the Empire in the 1930s had not been successful, Denmark as a provider of dairy products and bacon became a desirable possibility.<sup>62</sup>

British troops liberated Denmark, Danish export resumed, and the Ministry of Information, the British Council and the BBC did their best to turn Denmark westward.<sup>63</sup> Jørgen Sevaldsen concludes in his paper *Culture and Diplomacy* that:

In bilateral Anglo-British relations, the years 1945-49 had an intense quality that marked them out from the 50s and 60s, when economic problems were increasingly taken care of in international organizations such as the OECD or GATT or EFTA, when political and military questions were discussed in NATO where the USA was the dominating influence (...).<sup>64</sup>

After the Second World War the international society we know today was created. Anglo-Danish trade relations were also strong, but their bilateral characteristic lost some of its significance, especially when both countries entered the EEC in 1972. In addition other socialising powers within culture took over.

Relations between Britain and Denmark have a strong historical background in the export/import of agricultural products from Denmark. History shows how the relationship helped to shape Denmark. It shaped Danish farming and part of the infra-structure of the country and it made Denmark capable of shaping a modern society in spite of the fact that the country stayed mainly agricultural until the late 1950s. Put another way, the affluence of Danish society today has its roots in providing an industrialised country with agricultural products. Also British attitudes towards Denmark during the two world wars were influenced by the perceived importance of food import from Denmark.

Danish openness towards British culture has roots in the trading relations between the two countries and Danish dependency on this trade. But trade alone does

not lead to an awareness of a foreign culture. Another important factor is the culture communicated through the learning and knowledge of a foreign language.

For instance, earlier in this chapter it was shown how the awareness and influence of British authors like Lord Byron and Sir Walther Scott was communicated through German. German was an important language in Denmark because of its close connections to Germany and because of its German-speaking Duchies. French was also spoken because it was the international language of diplomacy. But very few people spoke English.

Today most Danes speak some English. Recent years have seen a major debate about when to start the teaching of English in primary schools, whether pupils should start learning English from the time that they start school in the first grade as six or seven year olds or whether they should wait until the fifth grade as they have been previously. A compromise was reached in consideration to the mother tongue. In order for the pupils to speak their mother tongue properly before starting to learn a foreign language, tuition of English is now started in the fourth grade. English, then, has reached major importance since the mid-nineteenth century.

Until the end of eighteenth century modern languages were not taught in the learned schools "Latin-skolerne". Latin and Greek were studied both as means of learning grammar and as sources of knowledge and as access to knowledge in further education. Latin and Greek kept this position until late in the nineteenth century.

In 1795 a decree introduced modern languages to the learned schools for a trial period. The languages introduced were French and German. The form of tuition was taken from the classical languages. That is, they were taught as dead languages with an emphasis on grammar and with no pronunciation taught. English was not introduced because it was thought of as having no particular grammar and so its study could not lead to the ability of reasoning, abstraction and critical sense.

The learned schools continued this line. Whenever the modern languages were given more space in the curriculum French and German were the priority. When English was introduced it was not a compulsory subject.

English was taught in another school namely "real-skolen" which was a school directed at the practical working life rather than preparing the pupils for higher

education. Here trade relations played a greater part and as Danish-British trade relations grew so did the importance of English as a language for communication.

The learned schools adapted to this demand in the mid-nineteenth century by introducing the "real" stream, but not by introducing it in the general curriculum. English was not accepted as a language carrying culture.

Nevertheless a slow change was taking place towards the turn of the century. By now Britain was a nation to be taken into consideration not only because of Danish trade with Britain, but also because Britain as a nation was important. Likewise the Victorian age with its bourgeoisie began to be seen as culturally important. Denmark too had its bourgeoisie.

This gradual change was seen in the Act of 1903 (almueskoleloven) which reformed the Danish school system and brought the learned schools into contact with the primary schools. After four or five years of primary school the students could now continue with four years of middle school or three years of "gymnasium" (the learned school). English and German were compulsory in the middle school and on the modern language stream in "gymnasium" and optional on the classical language and mathematical streams. French was compulsory on all three streams.

Modern languages were no longer taught as the classical languages. That is the languages in themselves were no longer means to an end. What they could convey grew in importance. English and German were now subjects which were intended to elevate the student to a cultured person. The main subjects for this were Danish and History, and the language subjects followed this line of tuition.<sup>66</sup>

Here, for the first time the beginning of what could lead to an openness and familiarity with British society is seen. What is taught is no longer pure language, but understanding through language. Likewise the importance of England is shown. Though this importance was reflected in the teaching of English in "real" skolerne - and there is no doubt this would have opened the eyes of these pupils - this teaching was aimed at trade rather than culture.

Language teaching was changing. Not quite to the extent where it became the teaching of cross-cultural understanding, but compared to earlier methods it was a

step in that direction. Karen Risager in her essay *Sprogfagene mellem Nationalisme og Internationalisme* describes this change in the following way:

During the second half of the nineteenth century the content of modern languages changed, so that gradually the focus became the history of national literature. Literature had been studied in the teaching of the classical languages; but while this teaching of literature was cosmopolitan - one referred to a common original culture which no longer existed - then the focus of the teaching of literature in the modern languages became slightly nationalistic: Now one took one's models from the existing culture and the evaluation of literature and culture could be brought in to the rivalry between the European countries."

This focus on nationalism and national culture led to the teaching of English being concentrated on Great Britain rather than on the English speaking world. It was not until the 1960s that the teaching of American culture was mentioned in the guidelines for "Gymnasiet". For instance, I remember from my own English lessons in the 1970s in "Folkeskolen" and the early 1980s in "Gymnasiet" how we were taught about the English school system. I remember this in particular because it was extremely confusing with terms like grammar schools, comprehensive schools, creaming, streaming, public and private schools. We were not taught about the American school system, and what I know about this I have picked up mainly from popular culture and literature. Who doesn't know about the cheerleaders and jocks in American high schools? Most of the rest of the English speaking world is still missing from the curriculum. This does not mean it isn't taught, but the main focus is on Britain and to a lesser extent the United States.

Karen Risager notices that English is the subject with the greatest tradition for teaching an understanding of society, and she says:

England has at least since the inter-war period been the big ideal, the English have mainly been portrayed as a freedom-loving, fair people who lived in a well-functioning democracy. The teaching about society has been concentrated on the depiction of the English national character, the judicial system and academia. Even in the 1970s the concept of national character played a major part in descriptive accounts of society in the teaching of English. Also the English imperialism - whose ideological aspects are an extension of nationalism - took up a lot of time and was until half a score years ago mainly depicted in a positive light: English supremacy was seen as tolerant and universally respected <sup>67</sup>

Until the 1970s what was taught was literature. As in the subjects History and Danish, the aim was to promote the cultured person and this was done through a canon of literature. In the 1970s this tradition was abandoned for one of reading texts. In English for example one could study war, race, death, love, conflicts between the generations, environment, problems in connection with education, social contradictions.<sup>68</sup> Through this a more nuanced picture and thereby understanding of British society could be gained.

Through the 1980s and early 90s the Danish educational system has been through many minor and major reforms which have led principally to a more goal-orientated education system focusing on job possibilities rather than the cultured person. This is largely a result of Conservative government during these years, although it also arises from a deliberate attempt to standardize the Danish educational system according to international standards. Most subjects taught at university are now divided into a bachelor and a masters degree instead of as before a 5-6 year course. Also the Danish "licentiat" degree is slowly being substituted by the Ph.D.

The international outlook which can be traced in the structure of the Danish educational system can also be found in the objectives for the teaching of English. For "Gymnasiet" these objectives were:

...for the pupils to be able to understand similarities and differences between their own frame of experiences and the world they meet in texts in English<sup>69</sup>

Here is cross cultural understanding in the focus. How do we differ and why? It is expressed even more clearly in the objectives for "folkeskolen" (compulsory school). Where it, perhaps somewhat ambitiously - taking into consideration that the



pupils are still learning their English ABC - is stated that the English language teaching will

make the students able to orientate themselves about people in other countries - and thereby give a foundation for international understanding<sup>70</sup>

English language teaching in Denmark has developed from being a language taught sporadically to being the first second language. A Gallop poll in 1945 concluded that 29% of the population thought they were able to communicate in a foreign language, and of these 47% mentioned abilities in German while 30% mentioned abilities in English<sup>71</sup>. A survey done in 1992 concluded that "slightly above half of the Danish population can lead an ordinary everyday conversation in English. About every third is able to lead an ordinary everyday conversation in German".<sup>72</sup> This means that the English language as access point to British culture has increased.

English was the last of the modern languages to be introduced into the Danish school system, and when it was introduced it was because of Anglo-Danish trade where English was needed as a practical source of communication. Therefore, not only do more people speak English today, but the content of the teaching has changed from a practical subject with no connection to a (common) culture and without any prestige whatsoever, to a subject which conveys both understanding of another culture in all its aspects and functions as a frame of reference for understanding of own culture.

English language teaching has roots in the trade between Denmark and Britain, but its development to its place as the first second language in Denmark is not only rooted in specific relations between Denmark and Britain. Rather it is part of an international trend.

Today English is a lingua franca. It is the language used for communicating research and it is the language in which scientists communicate with each other. Likewise a whole industry is based in the language. Computer language is, when it is not mathematical, English: software, hardware, computer, know-how, disk etc.

French was once the lingua franca. It was spoken at court, it was the language of diplomacy and it was the language of some of the Enlightenment's most influen-

tial writers. Nevertheless, today French is a minor lingua franca. But its status as lingua franca can be seen in the Danish history of modern language teaching. It was the first modern language to be taught at the learned schools because it was a carrier of culture.

Thomas Cable states in his *A History of the English language*, that "A language is important because the people who speak it are important - politically, economically, commercially, socially, culturally"<sup>73</sup> For French to lose its leading role as lingua franca and for English to take over is a long and complicated process where France's loss of colonies and internal problems are of just as much importance as Britain's rise as a world power. On the whole the rise of English to lingua franca can, in short, be explained as Magnus Ljung does it in his book *Skinheads, Hackers och Lama Ankor*:

The explanation for why precisely English has reached this world-wide spread is purely non-language. It was the development of the British Empire and - in this century - the transfer of the political, economical and technological-scientific dominance from Great Britain to the USA which vouched for dominance of English today.<sup>74</sup>

Magnus Ljung is not the only one to point out the role USA has played in promoting English as a lingua franca. Randolp Quirk and Gabrielle Stein in their *English in Use* point to the importance of communication and mass transport in the Global Village of the mid- to late twentieth century and how that has made English lingua franca. Most of the companies within communication and mass transport - the authors mention IBM, Plessey, Boing, Cable and Wireless - are American.<sup>75</sup>

Therefore the status English has today is based in British history, but is just as much due to the development of the communication industry, including the film and television industry, in the USA.

Since the USA has gained more and more importance after the Second World War, the question is therefore whether the openness and familiarity Danes gain through the English language as a lingua franca is not directed towards the states, and whether the historical relationship between Denmark and Britain is more than historical?

There is no doubt that Denmark like the rest of the western world is Americanized, but the degree to which Denmark is Americanized depends on who is "wearing the glasses". For example, the immediate post war period has been researched thoroughly.

In *Amerikaniseringen af det Danske Kulturliv i Perioden 1945-58* the authors describe American supremacy in the immediate post-war period and how the export of its popular culture products was received and influenced Danish cultural life. The authors explain the influence of American culture in the following way:

When the relations in strength among the imperialist powers change radically through the Second World War and Denmark explicitly is incorporated in the American sphere of influence, the picture changes qualitatively: In the ideological and cultural area this relationship means, that the USA first and foremost functions as a fascination factor.<sup>76</sup>

In his interesting and well-written essay *The Charisma of the Liberators*, Søren Schou tells some of the same story of the way that Denmark, a country starved of cultural products because of the war, embraced American popular culture. His interesting thesis is that the United States at the time was at its most Europeanised and that the cultural products first imported were at their highest standards partly because of the input from artists such as Fritz Lang who had fled from the Nazis to the USA.<sup>77</sup>

When the eyes are looking through British glasses the major influence on Denmark in the immediate postwar years was Britain.

Susan Seymour's book *Anglo-Danish Relations and Germany* deals chiefly with the relations between Britain and Denmark before and during the Second World War, but it also deals with how the allies perceived Denmark's position in the immediate postwar period. Susan Seymour describes the tug-of-war concerning the headquarters of the Danish resistance movement abroad, whether this should be within British or American domain. She suggests that the recognition of Denmark as an ally was for Britain a question of asserting dominancy over Denmark mainly to ensure that after the war Denmark would remain a British domain. She concludes by saying:

In looking at both Danish and British deliberations it is apparent that the dominant belief on both sides, although not universally held, was that the experience of war and, in Denmark, of German occupation had brought what can only be described as a spiritual element into Anglo-Danish relations. The extra-ordinary circumstances heightened a sense of kinship between the two nations.<sup>78</sup>

Jørgen Sevaldsen's *Culture and Diplomacy* is a detailed account of Anglo-Danish relations immediately after the war, covering language proficiency, British representation within literature and theatre, cultural promotion by the British Council and the interest of the Danish worker's movement in the British worker's movement. He concludes that Anglo-Danish relations have never been as intense as during these post-war years.<sup>79</sup>

Opinions are divided as to whether Denmark was influenced by the British or the Americans in the immediate postwar years and this is mainly due to the perspective from which the researcher is looking. The truth is probably somewhere in between. Denmark has been Americanized, but even the post-war generations know about the RAF coloured hats young boys wore in Copenhagen and they have all heard the broadcast by the BBC on the evening of May 4th 1945 of the message of German retreat from Denmark. But when a young Danish writer in 1988 can write the following the inspiration is clearly American:

It strikes me, that we often played our games in English. All the good expressions are so easily found in English. We quickly learned the expressions for sorrow and happiness, clichés which easily pass the lips, but which are difficult to translate without sounding clumsy. We were quick learners, pupils of the cheap films which reached our local cinema.<sup>80</sup>

Hollywood and American popular culture have played an important part in the Americanization of Europe, but this Americanization does not necessarily mean that Danes are not open towards Britain, or that British popular culture products do not create familiarity with Britain. For instance, Danish television does not dub its foreign programmes, and a knowledge of the English language is an access point whether the programme is British or American. Likewise, whether a pop song is British or American the language is English. In fact the shared language of Britain and the USA probably influence the interest in both directions. The shared language

in itself creates an impression of familiarity whether one is Americanized or Anglophile.

Since World War II popular culture has played an increasingly important role in forming a cross-cultural frame of reference in a country like Denmark. One of the most important developments in this area is the spread of television, the great communicator of news and popular culture. Danish state television is a Public Service Broadcast corporation formed in the image of the BBC. There are two national television stations. One is partly financed by advertising. About 50% of the Danish population can watch TV-channels by satellite. Here the Danish version of the Scandinavian station, TV3, is probably the most watched.

In a world of multi-media the book has been dethroned by television, rental videos and cinema. The topic of polite dinner-conversation may as well be last night's documentary or TV-film as the latest book by Fay Weldon."

Britain is of course often mentioned in the news for the role it plays in the EU, but the IRA bombings in London, the kidnapping of James Bulger, the burning of Windsor castle make news, and the light anecdotal news-story at the end of the bulletin may be about the lighting of the Christmas lights on Oxford Street. It is a curious mixture of important foreign news reflecting Britain's role as an important decision-maker in Europe and the general familiarity with Britain which makes British home news worthy as foreign news in Denmark.

News bulletins are home-produced, but Danish television imports around 50 % of the programmes broadcast. In the early 1990s the one country supplying the most programmes to Danish television was the USA. Programmes from this country take up 15% of broadcast time. Britain takes up the second largest share with 9%. As comparison it is worth noticing that the Nordic countries - with whom Denmark historically has close relations and whose languages are closely related to Danish - only provide programmes for 5% of broadcast time.<sup>22</sup>

The 15% and 9% imported from the United States and Britain may not seem much, but broadcast and viewing time do not always correspond. Jeremy Tunstall in *The Media are American* says:

The real social and political impact of imported programs may be greater than might be inferred from the volume of imported material, because of audience viewing patterns and the placing of foreign programming. Available studies about prime-time programming in various countries tend to show that the proportion of foreign material during these hours is considerably greater than at other times.<sup>43</sup>

Preben Sepstrup's conclusion on his analysis of Danish TV-viewing is that in 1993 47% of the consumption consisted of foreign produced programmes. 50% of the Danish population can watch foreign channels via satellite and here the consumption of foreign produced programmes was 53%.<sup>44</sup> Especially imported fiction programmes, mainly from the States, is the reason why the figures for foreign produced viewing is so high.<sup>45</sup>

Again it seems that Americanization is bigger than the Anglophile elements in Danish culture, and it is true that as quickly as I can mention the British detectives Morse, Dalgliesh, Taggart and Frost, known from the TV adaptations; I can mention the American crime series Miami Vice, Hill Street Blues, Moonlighting and NYPD Blue, not to mention the 1970s American detectives Columbo, McCloud and Kojak. Again I think it is important to keep in mind, that Americanization does not exclude the importance of British presence in a Danish cross-cultural frame of reference. Excluding the USA, Britain is the single largest supplier of foreign imports in Danish television. Some may even see British popular culture as an anti-dote to American popular culture as in this review on John Harvey's *Off Minor*:

They are middle-aged, disillusioned, usually overweight and usually either divorced or widowed - preferably with some sort of fairly sensitive hobby such as poetry, opera or jazz music. And there are a lot of them in these years, the English police people with names such as Morse, Resnick, Frost, Taggart, Dalgliesh or Wexford which in a higher unity of book- and TV-business push themselves forward as the run-down Empire's last nostalgic answer to the hard-boiled Americans and their cynicism, as some sort of 90s-depressed knights of the sad empathy.<sup>46</sup>

In some areas British popular culture has had a greater influence than American. Within humour, the British comedy has always been more widespread than American. Most Danes enjoy British humour, and if they do not understand it, they do at least have an opinion about it. Programmes such as Monty Python, the Young

Ones, Fawlty Towers, Yes Prime Minister and Blackadder have had several reruns on Danish television and they are part of the general frame of reference Danes use. Phrases such as "wink, wink, nudge, nudge", "booooring" and "Don't mention the war" make as much (or as little!) sense to a Dane as to someone British.

British humour at its best is often extremely British, not only as humour - which is where, I think, the Danes relate or connect to British comedy series - but also as an expression of and critique of British society. Danes, then, will assimilate or accommodate<sup>7</sup> the content through humour.

Another example of British humour on the Danish market is Sue Townsend's *The Queen and I* which has been translated into Danish. In my view the novel is extremely British, both in its humour, subject choice and as an expression of the British debate on the Royal Family.

In *The Queen and I* the English monarchy is abolished and the Royal Family is allocated accommodation on a run-down council estate. The depiction of the Royal Family's life at the estate is based on general perceptions of how the Queen, the Queen Mother, Prince Charles and the rest of the Royal family "are". It is through these easy recognizable traits and the Royal Family's inability to deal with practical problems the humour arises. The Royal Family's interaction with their neighbours is based in the traditional perception of working-class values where everyone in the street knows each other and help each other.

The critique and the thought-experiment in Sue Townsend's novel is based in the interaction between the Royal Family and the friendly neighbours. Because of this interaction we get to hear of the neighbours' problems related to poverty and unemployment. Also the welfare system represented by social workers and unemployment benefits are part of the story both for the neighbours and for the nouveau-pauvre Royal Family. Through the life they have come to live on the estate, the Royal Family slowly get to look like and behave like their friendly neighbours.

Though the novel is very British in its subject choice, it has been chosen for translation in Denmark. It may be because of purely publishing policy considerations: In order to keep an author, you have to publish the latest title by the author.

But it is more likely that the novel, in spite of subject, is economically viable on the Danish market.

Sue Townsend is the author of *The Diaries of Adrian Mole* which have been translated into Danish, and the TV-adaption of these novels have been shown on Danish television. Sue Townsend and her humourous writings are therefore already known in Denmark and this can in itself tempt the reader.

Though the subject choice and especially the critique implied in the plot are extremely British, the leading characters are well-known in Denmark. The Queen's "Annis Horibilis" speech was covered by the Danish press, but more importantly, so is the Diana-Charles soap opera, whether it is the latest of what Prince Charles said to Camilla Parker-Bowles, the latest unauthorized biography or the latest pictures taken of an unsuspecting Diana or Sarah Ferguson published in Germany.

Familiarity created around Britain is in this way self-promoting with one aspect influencing the other in an interaction of politics, gossip and high and low culture. For instance, Heathcliff and Cathy and Wuthering Heights form part of a cross-cultural frame of reference. Some have read the novel by Charlotte Brontë, others have seen the film on television, and failing that, they have probably heard Kate Bush in falsetto singing Heeaathcliiif and Caaathyyyyy in her pop hit Wuthering Heights.

Another important area in British cultural export is pop music. American and British pop music tend to take turns in being the most influential style of the time. Britain has produced idols such as Cliff Richard and Tommy Steele, but more importantly bands such as the Rolling Stones and The Beatles. Later glam-rock was represented by Marc Bolan and an early David Bowie, which again led to more mainstream but hugely successful bands like Sweet and Slade. In 1976 in England punk was discovered by the world. The leading name within punk is undoubtedly Sex Pistols, but also bands such as Sham 69 and Generation X played their part in the punk scene. Punk quickly became New Wave with new bands like U2 and the Cure or the more image conscious New Romantics such as Spandau Ballet and Duran Duran. Today it is a bit more difficult to tell whether there is any influential trend within British music, but the most likely candidate is the Manchester scene with



names like Happy Mondays and Stone Roses, or the so called Brit Pop with names such as Blur and Oasis.

Nevertheless, British youth culture is influencing Danish youth culture today. The author and journalist Henrik List describes in his essay *Dansegulvet som Medie* how British youth after punk turned to dance music. This dance music is mainly American or inspired by American trends in styles called rap, house and hip hop. But the dance scene around these music styles is purely British<sup>88</sup>. On the Manchester scene the clubs around this music formed bands such as Happy Mondays and Stone Roses with their mixture of guitar rock and dance rhythms. This dance scene developed into warehouse raves with a youth high on the rhythm, Ribena and Ecstasy.

Also Denmark heard the music and heard of the British club scene, not to mention the Warehouse raves which with their mixture of youth and drugs were food for the tabloids and led to analytical articles in the serious press.

In 1990 Denmark had its first rave at the Roskilde Festival and later the scene has in true rave style set up clubs such as Baby, Amnesia, Subway and Club X at different locations. Like British youth, Danish youth today wear baggy jeans, unlaced trainers and a cap worn with the shade at the nape of the neck.

In the anthology *Medieeksplosionen* Danish writers explore popular culture in a Danish and international perspective. A general theme running through the essays is that punk was the last youth culture movement with a message, whether in Denmark or Britain.

Denmark also had its punk-expired "no-future" generation clad in black with safety pins and mohican hair cuts. In Denmark the movement was mainly a middle-class phenomenon and centred around the "gymnasie"-environment ( usually compared to "grammar schools").

Though punk today is dead, it inspired a generation which today is in their late twenties to middle-thirties. It is also from this generation the young opinion-formers of today have grown. In Britain Julie Burchill is an example of this generation. Rooted in the punk generation she wrote for the music magazines. Today she writes for the Sunday Times "Culture" supplement. A Danish example is the poet Claus

Lynggaard who has an encyclopaedic knowledge of rock music and who today reviews for the broadsheet "Information".

In Denmark the inspiration from the punk movement created its own Danish heroes. The Danish music scene took its inspiration from punk and influential Danish bands such as Sods, Klichée and Malurt were formed. The punk band Sods later renamed themselves Sort Sol (Black Sun) and recently they have been commissioned by The Royal Ballet to write the music for a ballet version of *Hamlet*.

This generation formed by the ideas and music of punk still turns toward Britain and British culture. Henrik List (born 1965) whom I quoted above is an example of this. In 1988-89 he lived in London, and based on this he wrote an impressionistic book *London Non Stop* describing a colourful multi-cultural London marked by the Thatcher-years.

His first inspiration was his childhood readings of Sherlock Holmes and his childhood dream of living in a flat in Baker Street with a library and a butler. But later it changed:

My boyhood predilection for Anglo-Saxon crime fiction and my grandmother's anglophile influence had of course long ago been mixed up with an interest for the 70s and 80s British export products: Punk, football hooliganism, street fashion, electro pop, style magazines, club culture etc. Restless as a lot of other young people of the interrail- and charter generation was I. Even though a couple of trips to New York had fuelled the inner cosmopolitan tremendously, I instinctively felt that London was the place where things happened. There the good stories were to be found at every street corner. Yet another freelance writer had been born... He would travel incognito. He would be the eyes and ears and registrator for the new pioneers! He would fearlessly throw himself into the maelstrom of the city.<sup>99</sup>

Another example of how the inspiration from the punk movement stayed with the people who listened to the music, identified themselves with the "no future" generation is the novel *Til Verdens Ende* (Till the End of the World) by Benn Q. Holm (born 1962). The main character in the book is David Nord who is in his late twenties. He is studying architecture, but this is mostly a cover for the lifestyle he leads which is one long tour de force through Copenhagen night life.

David is stuck in an eternal youth which becomes more and more of a problem as his friends find an identity as young adults. His closest friend, the intellectual, introverted and eternally David Bowie quoting Thomas gets a Ph.D. scholarship in Frankfurt. David's "partner in crime" the flighty socialite Alex, finally settles down with his girlfriend.

David remembers the time he spent in the periphery of the punk movement. He is caught between this era which he remembers with both fondness and the sense of doom of the time, and his somewhat ambivalent wish to find something that matters. At one point he reflects on the days of punk - and what came after for this generation:

And slowly also the music became more golden while the last gloomy stars dropped out. Sid Vicious died of an over-dose, Ian Curtis committed suicide. Michael Strunge had jumped out of the window with Bowie's *Starman* blasting out from the ghettoblaster. It was something long forgotten which surfaced. (...) Perhaps it was the gloomy electric guitars from back then which boomed in our ears as an unreal echo. The clothes, the make-up, the black coats. Hash and beer. Rats and spiders. Tattooed smiles and suburbia-wrecks from the forecourt of Hell who sniffed glue and lighter gas. The rest of us had gone to the cafés in the city centre, had conquered the University and the Academy of Arts. Had sniffed us into an increasing sleep of adulthood and unpaid rent. Somewhere there were unpaid arrears, I could feel it.<sup>90</sup>

David tries to find meaning by writing a book called *Finis Terrae* which is both wish fulfillment and a comment to his life. In *Finis Terrae* the main character travels south, never stopping long enough at one place to settle down. He becomes friends with an Englishman who finally writes the book *Hiding Places*. Finally the young Dane finds true love in a small village in Spain where he marries a local girl.

In David's own life he meets and falls in love with a girl with whom and because of whom he thinks he can get some sort of meaning into his life. As opposed to the *Finis Terrae*, David's relationship with the girl Signe does not work out, but through the failure of this wish fulfillment he comes to some sort of understanding of himself and the times he lives in.

*Til Verdens Ende* is packed with references to British culture. There is the importance David's youth plays and thereby the punk movement, and all the way

through the Danish nightlife music by bands from the punk and new wave era plays: Joy Division, The Jesus and Mary Chain, Echo and the Bunnymen, The Smiths. The main character's friend in *Finis Terrae* is English, and last but not least the girl Signe moves to London to work for an advertising company. David follows and most of the book dealing with their attempt to form a relationship takes place in Signe's London flat and in London cafés and restaurants. As yet another symbol stands the high rise buildings near Bayswater called "End of the World". The London described is a lived in and understood London.

This book is at one level an example of how a youth culture based in a British movement influences the youth of Denmark. At another level, this influence has now become part of Danish fiction and at another level a British cross-cultural frame of reference in Denmark has been formed. Also, the in-depth knowledge the author shows of London is as detailed and non-tourist as that of Henrik List in his book *London Non Stop*, based on his one year stay in London. How the author of *Til Verdens Ende*, Benn Q. Holm has researched his book, I don't know. But an interest in a particular music and particular youth culture often leads to visits to the "real thing", as it did for Henrik List.

British cultural export has formed a cross-cultural frame of reference in Denmark which creates a familiarity and openness toward Britain. As can be seen from the example of Susan Townsend's *The Queen and I*, within cultural export, products in an interaction across different spheres such as high and low culture, youth culture and sports and news coverage expand the cross-cultural frame of reference for what can be assimilated or accommodated by Danes. Likewise, as exemplified by punk, the cross-cultural frame of reference in itself creates new Anglophiles.

Though a foreign culture in this way through its cultural export can create a familiarity and openness towards its culture, it is not a matter of course that Denmark should embrace British culture to the extent it has. From a cultural point of view Norway, Sweden and Germany are probably more likely candidates because of their close proximity to Denmark and because of their historical links.



#### 4) PROFILE OF THE BRITISH AND DANISH PUBLISHING INDUSTRIES

*This chapter analyses the publishing worlds in Britain and Denmark in general. It does this because the publishing of translated fiction is part of the general publishing of fiction and must survive on the same conditions as fiction from the importing country. The chapter shows how British publishing is governed by conglomerates and major bookchains. It shows further how this has meant a change from a product-led industry to a market-led industry. It concludes that the increased emphasis on profit is not conducive to the publishing of translated fiction. The Danish publishing world debates the same issues as the British, but this chapter shows how it is still product-led because the market is small and compared to the British market no major capital has been invested in the market. The chapter concludes that the more old-fashioned product-led publishing of Denmark is more conducive to the publishing of translated fiction.*

Translated literary fiction is part of general trade publishing, it is part of the ordinary literary circulation as is any novel written by a citizen of the country or in the national language of the country. From the acceptance by the publisher and all the way via bookshop or library to the reader, the translated novel is in competition with all the other titles on the market, and has to survive on the same terms as them. This of course is valid for the translated Danish novel on the British market and the translated British novel on the Danish market. An analysis of the two markets - their structure, traditions and customs - will therefore show whether the markets in themselves are accommodating to the translated literary novel. Likewise, it is within this market the publisher of translated fiction judges his or her possibilities of publishing the translated novel, and a knowledge of this market is therefore information on which the publishing of translated fiction can be judged and understood. As with other aspects dealt with in this thesis, the inherent structures and values are most clearly shown in the comparison.

The first thing that comes to mind when studying the publishing industries of Britain and Denmark are the differences in size. In 1991 the British publishing industry published 7,852<sup>91</sup> fiction titles, while Denmark published 1,166<sup>92</sup>. The population of the countries are of different sizes. Britain has a population of around 56 million people while Denmark has one of around 5 million.

When assessing the title output the spread of the two languages must also be taken into consideration. Danish is a minority language spoken by the 5 million Danes and a few foreign language students scattered around the globe. English is spoken by the British, Americans, Australians and others - and by many Europeans as a second language. Though there are complicated rules within publishing regulating the export of a British book to for example the USA, British publishing definitely has the advantage of language. In 1991 Britain exported for £ 524 million, of which 37.12%<sup>93</sup> went to the European Union. On the whole, the British publishing industry had a turnover of £ 1,358.8 Million in 1991, while Denmark had one of 2,175 million kr (the equivalent of £ 198 million)<sup>94</sup>.

It is therefore obvious that the British publishing industry is much bigger than the Danish. This on the other hand does not necessarily mean that it is more of an industry than the Danish. Both industries have their roots in the tradition of the gentleman publisher and the rise of the bourgeoisie.

Per Gedin explains in his book *Literature in the Marketplace* how the rise of the bourgeoisie created, not only a homogenous culture within, but also across nations among this class. This "transformation from an aristocratic, court-dominated society to a middle-class capitalist society meant the creation of a market for culture."<sup>95</sup>

Publishing as we know it, or perhaps, as we knew it, arose within this market for culture. Publishers were gentlemen of the middle classes who had a passion for literature and a flair for business. The business consisted in selling, of course, but also in exploiting authors who had no copyright protection. The passion for literature meant that the gentleman publisher would take on manuscripts he believed in as art rather than as profit, and nurture these authorships until they, hopefully, eventually were profitable.

Gedin notes that "readers in West-European countries are no longer part of a clearly defined class, but rather a large mass of people who are influenced by the mass media"<sup>96</sup>. Publishing continues to exist and change within and according to these changing times, without a clearly defined readership and as a small part of the media industry. As part of this, Giles Clark sees publishing as having gone from being product-led to being market-led.<sup>97</sup> Or put in another way novels have gone from being art to being a commodity.

The question is how much has the publishing industry changed from the old paternalistic gentleman publisher with respect and reverence for art? Has business become so important that there is no longer room for non-profitable products even though they are art? The publishing business debates the changes in publishing fiercely and "There is", as Tim Waterstone says, "nothing the book trade likes more than to predict, in delicious, shivering terror, its own demise"<sup>98</sup> The debates in Britain and Denmark are remarkably alike. In both countries the debate usually centres around the following:

Any discussion of the book market has to make the point that there are "too many" new titles published each year - "too many" by any rational standards, leading to duplication, print runs that are too short, unit prices that are too high, stockholding problems for the bookseller and confusion for the customer.<sup>99</sup>

It is the Gordian knot where too many titles are produced. The bookshops cannot stock all the titles, and books are remaindered. As a result the shelf life of the books become shorter, and the chances of steady selling diminish. Therefore more titles are put on the market in the hope that one of them may become a bestseller and make up for the losses on the unsold books.

Another result is that the publishing houses spread their publishing over more areas and for instance publish both fiction and educational books, where the market can be targeted and the chances of success therefore are bigger. Also, in an industry - especially concerning fiction - where the success of the individual title cannot be predicted, the risk of loss making cannot only be diminished by spreading the production over different areas of publishing. The industry must rationalise in other ways such as marketing, electronic equipment and rights. A company can increase its



profit by using the rights of the few profit-making titles by producing paperbacks, utilising foreign rights, film rights and other spin-offs. But in order to diversify itself to such a degree, the industry needs major capital. Therefore it contracts into conglomerates which have the capital and are able to develop the subsidiary areas in which money can be made to make up for the profit losing titles.

The British publishing industry has bigger markets for subsidiary rights than the Danish. Through its traditional links to the Commonwealth, British publishers have far greater possibilities for exporting their fiction titles than Danish publishers have. Denmark has traditionally had close relations with Norway and Sweden. This is also true within the publishing business where some of Norway's finest authors such as Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson and Henrik Ibsen were published in Denmark during the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>100</sup> This union has withered. The Nordic countries no longer read the fiction of their neighbour countries in the original language. In fact more than 50% of the Danish population is able to read English, while only 30-40% claim to be able to read Norwegian or Swedish.<sup>101</sup> At the turn of the century Danes would read Swedish and Norwegian books in the original language. Today these books are no longer to be found in the bookstores while every store will have a section with English paperbacks.

Nevertheless, both in Denmark and Britain the industry's contraction into conglomerates and their effect on the industry have been debated for years. The fear is that these conglomerates will turn the publishing industry into a true industry without consideration for its tradition of the gentleman publisher and books as art.

In Britain 1/3 of the total turnover on booksale is taken home by three conglomerates: Pearson, News International and Reed International. News International is Rupert Murdoch's media empire. Reed International merged in 1992 with the Dutch Elsevier and it is now the biggest media conglomerate next to the German Bertelsman. Pearson is going from having interests in fine china and oil to being a media conglomerate. Each of these three conglomerates own publishing conglomerates headed respectively by HarperCollins, Penguin and Reed with subsidiaries such as Hamish Hamilton, Viking, Collins, Heineman and Methuen. It is an ever-changing world with buy-outs and takeovers. But these three, HarperCollins, Penguin and

Reed are together with Hodder Headline, MacMillan, Random House and Transworld the Seven Sisters of British publishing.<sup>102</sup>

These mergers and take-overs have taken place during the 1980s and early 1990s but seem to a certain extent to have stabilised now. In a study on the values of publishers done by Michael Lane, the publishing industry has, according to one of the respondents, gone through the following development:

One man to whom I talked characterized the last thirty years of publishing by saying that the great publishers before the war were editors; from 1947 to the 1960's was the era of the sales staff. Since then because of the mergers and larger groupings, accountants have taken control.<sup>103</sup>

These conglomerates are shaping the face of British publishing. There are plenty of small publishing houses specialising in niche publishing, and there are some very successful general trade publishers such as Peter Owen and Bloomsbury. But they all have to exist within the conditions created by the Seven Sisters.

In September 1995 the much contested Net Book Agreement fell. On September 26, Random House and HarperCollins announced that they would de-net before Christmas. Penguin followed soon after whereas Reed and Hodder Headline had already de-netted.

HarperCollins and Random House set the ball rolling. Though they had thought of de-netting before, the final decision was not taken until they were approached by W.H. Smith. The two publishers and the bookseller shared the costs of a huge promotion campaign with reduced prices on books from HarperCollins and Random House.<sup>104</sup>

W.H. Smith is a representative of yet another power concentration. The Seven Sisters estimate that 25-35% of their adult trade books are sold through W.H. Smith and its subsidiary Waterstones, while Dillons are accredited with about 10%.<sup>105</sup> These three chains together with the publishing conglomerates can change the structure and conditions of British publishing, and it is within these conditions that the small publishing houses which traditionally publish most of the new and different literature have to exist.

The Net Book Agreement had been thought to be a safe-guard for smaller bookshops from devastating price wars. It is doubtful, though, whether it still gave

this safeguard. Since the emergence of such chains as Dillons, Waterstones and Books Etc., bookselling had changed. They are big and well-stocked and with immense power within the industry, and most importantly cover almost every city.

The other way the Net Book Agreement was seen as being protective was in diversity of production. Through price reduction some books will sell more than others. This would create a greater interest for bestselling authors and diminish the possibilities for young and lesser-known authors to be published. It seems this trend has started already.

The publishing of fiction is not only a question of title output, turnover and ownership. These are aspects of the business side of publishing. But literary fiction is also art, culture or national heritage. The success of a publishing house as a business can be measured through quantifiable data on for instance turnover. But the product and its cultural or artistic value cannot be measured in the same way. From this point of view the success of the publishing house is not quantifiable. Rather it is its efforts to make the best, or the most relevant or the most interesting available which are in question here.

The contradictions between industry and art are embodied in the terms publishing industry and -house, and because publishing is a business where the product is "art", the industry will always to a certain extent influence the cultural or artistic value of the output.

In Britain the mergers have changed the face of literary publishing as well. Traditionally the centre of publishing has been the work of art and its literary value, and the most important person in the publishing house was the publisher/editor, the person who selected the manuscripts for publication. The author as the creator has ideally been nurtured and guided according to need by his or her editor/publisher, and the editor has been at the disposal of his or her author. Also, the editor/publisher was often responsible for the whole process from editorial work on the manuscript to ideas and suggestions on dust cover and publicity. Today the editor is frustrated because the publishing house has become so big that different functions are taken care of by specialised departments, and he is therefore no longer solely responsible

for "his" book within the publishing house. The author is frustrated because he - because of takeovers and mergers - no longer knows who his editor is.

The conglomerates are run by the accountant whose responsibility is to maintain and increase share price; this creates an inevitably short-term focus and instability of management.

The effects of that instability create a new impersonality in a business which thrived on the reliability and closeness of its relationships, particularly between author and editor, who believed in content and style rather than merely fashion, and in development rather than growth.<sup>106</sup>

The editor/author relationship can become the hallmark of the smaller publishing houses in so far as they are smaller, run by the owners and therefore able to run a traditional publishing house. In fact some houses have been started by former editors. What can happen as well - and is happening - is that authors who start up with small publishing houses can, when they have gained some recognition and popularity, get higher advances from the bigger houses than the small and move on to them. It is a clear example of how the capital strong conglomerates can influence the publishing scene. It is not only a question of author advances, but also a question of having capital for larger promotion campaigns, of having paperback imprints which can publish paperback editions of the title.

The change in editor/author relationship has two implications which is furthered or influenced by the increasing competition on the market.

One is that the literary agent becomes more important. When the author's ties with the editor and thereby the publishing house weakens, he turns to the agent. It is the agent's job to place the work of his author with a publishing house. In this way the trend of bestsellerism and growth is furthered, because the old tradition of nurturing an authorship rather than publishing a series of individual books disappears from the publishing house.

Secondly; not only are the ties between author/editor weakened because of the instability in the house, but also the emphasis on growth rather than development in itself removes the publishing house from the traditional way of publishing authors and building up a backlist. The backlist ends up being a mixture of more or less successful individual books.

Since the publishing house can no longer trust its backlist, it is important to use the successful titles to their utmost. Hardbacks do not sell as well as they used to, and the publishing houses have gone from a horizontal to a vertical structure. The conglomerates and major independents have bought paperback houses and the income from both hardback and paperback rights stay within the corporation.

On the whole paperbacks have become more and more important. In 1991 more than half of the fiction titles published were in paperback.<sup>107</sup> Paperbacks are traditionally reprints of original hardbacks and a major part of the paperback titles published are the paperback editions of hardbacks, but some are paperback originals. In order to find new ways of selling, some houses have started printing the titles straight into paperback.

The debate about the death of the hardback has been going on for the last three or four years. Whether one believes the hardback is important or not, it is a fact that the traditional buyers of literary hardback fiction - the libraries - no longer can support this part of the publishing industry. Also, the younger book-buying public, brought up on Penguins and other paperbacks prefer the small and handy paperback editions. What is most interesting about the paperback original venture is that many lists consist of first novels.

One last thing to mention in the British publishing industry is the issue of marketing and publicity. About this Peter Owen says that until recently there was little professionalism in this area. He himself did not employ full time publicity staff until the 1960s. He goes on to say that: "At that time few publishers were aware of the importance of author and book promotion."<sup>108</sup>

Today, within the conglomerates special departments are responsible for the marketing of books. It is no longer enough to send a review copy to the literary editors on the major papers and other key figures. For a book to be noticed by the book-buying public, not to mention booksellers, the title must stand out among the rest. It is possible to advertise the book on the literary pages of a paper, but most of all the marketing department and the publicist must get the literary inner circles talking, and through them convey information about the book to the book-buying public. This is especially important with potential bestsellers, for which the imprint

may have paid out a substantial advance. With respect to literary fiction, the danger is not so much whether it will be reviewed or not. And all though John Walsh of The Sunday Times says : "If the book is worth reviewing it gets reviewed"<sup>109</sup>, it is still to a certain extent arbitrary which novels get reviewed:

Editors and reviewers are, it would seem, free to make the selections of what they review. No-one instructs them. Yet with up to two thousand new novels produced annually, the selection has perforce to be arbitrary and severe. According to the literary editor of The Times, from fifteen to twenty novels a week are received in peak season; ten are sent to the reviewer; four of five are finally reviewed. The most important decisions as to the value of any novel occur invisibly, behind the scenes.<sup>110</sup>

What is problematic for the literary novel is that the publishing houses do not spend huge amounts of money on promoting a book they do not expect to have the potential for sale. That is, it may get through the keyhole of arbitrary choice and on to the literary pages of the papers, but it will not get the talking up and publicity gimmicks which a potential bestseller will receive. Because some books get massive publicity and some do not, a bigger gap between their selling powers is created.

The situation in Denmark is different from that in Britain. A major part of the debate in Denmark discusses publishing house contractions in terms of concentration of power on few hands rather than the erosion of the author/editor relationship.

When looking at who owns who, when it comes to publishers of fiction in Denmark, it turns out that the most prestigious house, Gyldendal, is the head of one publishing group. Gyldendal is owned by Museumsfonden af 7 December 1966. This foundation owns, apart from the Gyldendal publishing group, the art gallery/museum Louisiana. It has no foreign interests and the Gyldendal publishing group consists of Gyldendal, four other general trade publishing houses - Samlerens Forlag, Tiderne Skifter, Forum and Spektrum - The new Danish National Encyclopedia and 1/3 of the library supplier Dansk BiblioteksCenter. The Swedish Bonnier group, which also concentrates on publishing, owns the Danish Ringhardt og Lindhof. The British Blackwell group owns the Danish Munksgaards Forlag group which in turn owns another five general trade publishing houses of which Rosinante is a very successful publisher of literary fiction. One last group should be mentioned here, namely that of Egmont-gruppen, owned by another self-governing foundation. This group compared

to the Gyldendal group is much more commercial. It publishes most of the magazines published in Denmark. But in 1992 the group merged five of its general trade publishing houses into one house called Aschehoug. The intentions of this house is to enter the market for literary fiction in competition with Ringhardt og Lindhof, Rosinante, Vindrose, Gyldendal and its publishing houses. This is probably the closest the Danish publishing world comes to a merger for the sake of the accountants, but the house enters the market of literary fiction, which means the editor, not the accountant will be in charge if it wants to stay in that section of the market.

The publishing houses are either small, mainly specialising in some sort of niche production or bigger, better known and more prestigious. On the whole the Danish publishing world consists of small groups without connections to media conglomerates. That is, publishing houses own publishing houses. Though this does not mean that Danish publishers do not need to be shrewd business men, it does mean that the owners understand the workings of the business. Claus Brøndsted, the then managing director of Forum has said the following about his board of directors:

They are all people who know a lot about the publishing industry. And it is a great, great advantage, because there are things which succeed and there are things which fail. They know that. So because of that they understand the whole mechanism of a publishing house. It is a very great advantage. It has been very favourable for me, that Gyldendal became the owner.<sup>111</sup>

In Britain the Seven Sisters are thought of as either minimalists or maximalists<sup>112</sup> The minimalists, such as Penguin, want their imprints to stay distinct and autonomous within the group whereas the maximalists are "great admirers of the collective strengths provided by single branding"<sup>113</sup> HarperCollins is one of the maximalists, with all imprints under one roof in a modern office block in Hammer-smith, London. MacMillan is a fairly new convert to the maximalist view, and Ian Burns from this group says about HarperCollins:

I believe this branding has helped their profile. They have established a very strong image for HarperCollins books and I'm sure it helps their presentation to the retail trade.<sup>114</sup>

This connects in two ways to Denmark. First and foremost the publishing groups in Denmark are umbrella organisations under which the subsidiary publishing houses function as autonomous houses. Most of these publishing houses are either run by the founder or by people who are allowed to take them in the direction they want. Only Gyldendal is so big and old that it has historical roots to its founder, but since it is also the best known publishing house, traditions and expectations to its fiction list from the public cannot be disregarded.

John Feather gives an historical background for the mergers and acquisitions which have governed the British publishing world during the 1960s - 1980s. He draws attention to the fact that most successful publishing houses have been family owned, run by a charismatic publisher. Most of these publishing houses have either folded or been taken over unless a capable heir had been produced by the time the publisher either died or retired.<sup>115</sup> As can be seen, this is the trend the Danish publishing world is still following 30 years later, John Feather understands the last (or latest) generation of great publishers to have died out in Britain.

Secondly, the quote from Ian Burns is yet another indication of the strength of the bookchains in Britain.

In Denmark there are two chains Arnold Busck and G.E.C. Gad, but far bigger is Bog & Idé which is a chain of independent booksellers. These stores, and most other bookstores in Denmark are a sorry sight compared to a Waterstones or a Dillons. They tend to look like a mixture of a W.H. Smith and a Rymans. The Danish market is so small that only in cities such as Copenhagen and Århus can a bookstore survive as purely booksellers.

Danish Booksellers are regulated by an arrangement between the Danish Publisher Association and the Danish Bookseller Association. It is an exclusivity principle which regulates who can trade with books, partly through approval of bookshops eligible to trade with the books of the publishing houses involved. In practice, this is of minor consequence, but the other aspect, the Danish Net Book Agreement is important. Not only does it decide prices but also that books above a certain price - and this is most books - cannot be sold through other channels than the approved bookshops.



The exclusivity principle is debated in Denmark, but in a country so small and with a strong cultural policy tradition, no one is really interested in furthering competition on the bookmarket. The industry is as yet not that commercial and no players are so big that the system can be undermined as it has been in Britain. Increased competition would most likely mean fewer and less well-stocked bookshops, and in my opinion it is already bad enough as it is. But it would most certainly mean less diversity in what is on offer, which again would reflect back on the diversity of published books.

Bog & Idé buys wholesale for the bookshops in the chain, but it is more than a wholesaler. All shops within the chain carry the logo and they are all obliged to carry stock from the chain, though in varying degrees according to size.

Bog & Idé also produce catalogues as promotion for the chain. These are the most visual sign of marketing of books in Denmark, and their content is therefore of importance to the publishers. These catalogues tend to focus on coffee table books and the most popular titles in fiction. Susanne W. Madsen from the chain states their selection criteria in the following way:

At Bog & Idé we have no narrow cultural or literary obligations. We go for the books with a broad and general appeal, not books for a limited target-group. (...) On the other hand, we do not take into consideration which publishing house has published the book. We go for what is sellable.<sup>116</sup>

Part of the current debate in Denmark is on the power of the booksellers. Nonetheless publishers interviewed for this study do not find it a problem to get their books placed with the booksellers. This is probably because they are all well-esteemed houses. On the other hand they are also representative of the publishing scene in Denmark. Most literary fiction is published by well-esteemed houses.

The publishing houses generally think that booksellers should promote books to the readers more than they do at present. And this is certainly a valid criticism where literary fiction is concerned. But the pressure which is put on British publishers to think up and finance huge campaigns in order to get their books into the stores, does not exist in Denmark. So far publicity still consists of sending out preview copies. The occasional display bin or poster is produced, but most of the houses publishing

literary novels are so established, that their name alone makes sure that their publications will get a second look whether by the newspaper reviewer or bookseller. This does not mean that everything gets reviewed, rather that the market is so small that it is easier to keep an overview, than it is on the British market.

On the whole what springs to mind when comparing the Danish market to the British, is the obvious difference in size. To return to the paperback original. Until recently there were no literary paperback originals in Denmark, but now Gyldendal publishes one a month, where the book-of-the-month is discounted during that month.

The paperback original is dependent on being able to sell enough copies to make up for the difference in price to the hardback. In Denmark a hardback costs an average of £ 28 and a paperback an average £ 8. In Britain a paperback original costs 2-3 pounds more than an ordinary paperback. If a Danish paperback original were to be a couple of pounds more expensive than the paperback edition, it would still be less than half the hardback price. The market simply isn't big enough.

Danish publishers do publish paperbacks - or rather cheaper editions of other titles. Danish first editions are hardly ever in hardback but in paperback, printed on a heavy quality paper.

The competition on the paperback market is strong. This does not show in publicity gimmicks for the author or a particular title, but in a row of series where the title for one month is sold a couple of pounds cheaper whereafter they return to their normal price. Ringhardt og Lindhof started this book-of-the-month idea, and has for many years had great success with their middle brow list. Since then various publishers have hooked on to the idea with varying success, and the latest is Gyldendal's paperback original.

Where the British publishing industry has slowly developed a vertical structure, the Danish publishing industry has always been vertical. There is a historical explanation for this.

When Allan Lane started Penguin in 1935, he bought paperback rights from the hardback publishing houses. He was the first to start a successful list of cheap editions of quality books.

(..) Penguins came to enjoy a privileged status; their large sections were in effect, sponsored bookshops. What gave them unprecedented success and cultural influence was less that they were revolutionary, in the common sense of the term, than that they became extremely orthodox. They were no longer Woolworth's 3s and 6d book: indeed they very quickly discarded that degrading image. They were paperbacks which sold just like hardbacks.<sup>117</sup>

In Denmark cheap editions did not become successful until the late 1950s where the general affluence, improved libraries and education increased the reading public to such an extent that it could support the cheap editions.<sup>118</sup> By then the success of Penguin was well known in Danish publishing circles, and a long list of lists appeared, all with an animal as its logo. The most successful list was *Tranebøgerne*, published by Gyldendal, using the House' logo of the crane on their cheap edition list and named the list after the crane. In this way the paperbacks or cheap editions were always published by the house which owned the rights (primarily, they may have bought a title or two). In the tradition of Penguin, they used an animal name, but what they did was to use their own titles to their fullest.

This paperback market is vital to Danish publishers. With a small market which cannot be expanded over the borders, every possibility of utilising a title must be used. Most publishing houses in Denmark have lists consisting of middle brow to high brow fiction. This ensures profit making titles to make up for loss making titles.

The houses also put an emphasis on authorships rather than titles. By nurturing their own authors from unknown first novel authors to popular authors who can sell on their name, they ensure that backlist titles can bring in a profit in the future if the author becomes successful. Therefore the editor/publisher - author relationship in Denmark is still strong.

The editor - author relationship has been under debate in Denmark, because authors left one publishing house for another, so the system is not completely feudal. Around 1991-92, several well known authors left the prestigious house of Gyldendal. This had, for some of the authors, to do with the then literary director, and for others it had to do with an editor they followed to Lindhardt og Ringhof. But a

closer look at the Danish publishing world and the changes happening there, show that other reasons could have influenced these authors.

Gyldendal was founded in 1770, and has until recently been the publishing house in Denmark, but during the last twenty years other houses, especially Lindhardt og Ringhof, have gained reputations for being good, solid publishing houses of literary fiction. Adding to that is the fact that Lindhardt og Ringhof, the Munksgaard group, Borgen/Vindrose have started the book club 12 Bøger and hereby opened up for the possibility of publishing their authors in book club editions. Until this book club was started, Gyldendal was the only one to publish literary fiction in book club editions. This means that whereas previously Gyldendal could offer authors the most favourable conditions, they are now in competition with the smaller and younger publishing houses.

I have here touched upon another aspect of the Danish publishing world which is different from the British. Book clubs in Britain are mainly owned by Book Club Associates, whereas book clubs in Denmark are owned by the publishing houses. Furthermore in Denmark the book clubs Gyldendals Bogklub, Samleren (both owned by Gyldendal) and 12 Bøger are middle to high brow book clubs with the occasional foreign bestseller - as are the publishing houses. These book clubs are important in the Danish publishing world because the paperback market alone cannot bring in sufficient earnings.

In Britain literary fiction and book clubs have never been associated with each other:

Most literary folk, I suspect, would no sooner admit to being members of a book club than to taking their annual holiday at Butlins.<sup>119</sup>

This may be changing due to the two book clubs Quality Paperbacks Direct and the Softback Preview which, like the Danish book clubs, offer quality fiction. The difference is that in Denmark these book clubs are institutions and an accepted and recognised way of buying books, whereas in Britain this is something new. The other difference is that the Danish clubs are owned by publishing houses, whereas the British are owned by respectively the Book Club Association and the American Time

Warner. Once again Danish publishing is vertical, whereas British publishing has a tradition of being horizontal in structure.

One other conclusion can be made on the vertical structure in Denmark. The market is simply too small to be horizontal. No paperback house, not to mention more than one, can survive on the basis of so few readers. Therefore the structure will have to be vertical and the book club 12 Bøger, shows how the Danish publishing world also expands within the tradition of keeping subsidiary rights in-house, that is in a vertical structure.

One last thing to touch upon in connection with the Danish publishing world, is the question of agents. The question has a simple answer. There aren't any in connection with Danish fiction, though of course there often are when buying foreign rights. The reason for the lack of agents is most likely that the market is too small. But apart from that, the gentleman's agreement among publishers is still very much alive in Denmark. According to Kurt Fromberg, administrative director of Gyldendal, no other Danish publisher bid on *Scarlett*, the sequel to *Gone With the Wind*, simply because Gyldendal had published *Gone With the Wind*.<sup>120</sup> But as the publishing houses are few, there are no major auctions for bestseller titles, and there would have been very few subsidiary rights to sell had the structure been horizontal rather than vertical.

The overall picture of the British and Danish publishing worlds in comparison, is that of the big, commercial market and the small, traditional market still securely rooted in the old structures. In fact in comparison the British publishing world would be a commercial industry whereas the Danish would be a cottage industry.

The drawbacks with the Danish industry is that it is small with few possibilities for expansion. It is conservative in the sense that it is kept in line by old rules - spoken and unspoken. And it is conservative because it is small and well-defined which again means that the inner-circle is closed.

On the other hand, a small publishing industry in crisis (and both the British and Danish industry perceive themselves as being in crisis) may commercialise its industry further for instance by promoting the most sellable titles, or on the whole,

by giving up the gentleman's agreement. This can lead to a greater disadvantage for literary fiction.

For British literary fiction the Danish market could stop it by its conservatism, but this conservatism is not towards language - more than half the title output is translations - neither is it towards "quality", rather it is the system not the content which is conservative.

If the Danish market commercialised itself, it would influence the possibility of publishing British literary fiction, but this commercialisation would also influence the possibility of publishing Danish literary fiction. On the whole the Danish market is as open for British literary fiction as it is for its own literary fiction.

The drawbacks of the British publishing world is that it is so competitive and commercial that the literary novel must lose out. Though the smaller houses may publish the literary novel and do well, they still have to compete with the market forces and the money put behind popular novels by the conglomerates.

In Britain translated fiction does not sell. A typical remark is: "Certain types of fiction (by unknown writers, for instance, or translations) have already become almost impossible to sell to a publisher."<sup>121</sup> On the market, translated fiction survives on the market's ability to export to other English-speaking markets. But it barely survives, because it does not have a perceived potential for selling, and therefore will either not get the backing it needs, or it simply won't be published because of its lacking potential for profit. A peripheric language and culture like the Danish (as opposed to for instance French) will have even more odds against it.

Translated fiction is a very small part of the Danish market. The Danish market is not particularly open to translations of fiction. The market is very much dominated by the large houses, which have a very strong knowledge of the market and the ability to publish in a very short time a large number of titles. This is a very strong position, which is not easily challenged.

The market is not open to translations of fiction. The market is very much dominated by the large houses, which have a very strong knowledge of the market and the ability to publish in a very short time a large number of titles. This is a very strong position, which is not easily challenged.

## 5) THE PUBLISHING OF TRANSLATED FICTION

*This chapter deals with the factors which influence the publishing of translated fiction. It shows that British publishers primarily translate from languages they speak. They choose titles for translation which, apart from being of literary quality, are able to travel culturally. Since the publishers do not speak Danish they are not able to utilise printed sources such as trade publications and are therefore dependent on contacts within the international publishing world for information on Danish titles. Danish titles are disadvantaged because publishers do not read Danish. British fiction in Denmark is also chosen for literary quality but does not have the added criterion of being able to travel culturally since British culture is perceived as familiar. Danish publishers read English which means that they can access the British market through printed sources such as newspapers and trade papers. Danish publishers are therefore not as dependent on international contacts. Because Danish publishers read English they are also able to read the titles in the original language. British fiction is therefore not disadvantaged on the Danish market as Danish fiction is on the British.*

This chapter deals with the publishing of translated fiction in Denmark and Britain. It is based on interviews with British and Danish publishers. The chapter begins with the methodology which led to the choice of publishers for interviews. The how's and why's of this methodology are based on knowledge of the publishers and the fiction they have published. In this way it forms a characterization of the publishing world of translations in Denmark and Britain.

The main part of the chapter is based on the interviews and here the main issues are the factors which influence the selection of titles for translation. Such factors as the selection basis, the influence of language and culture are discussed as well as other more general publishing issues such as literary quality and salability.

## Methodology and Introduction to Publishers of Translated Fiction

There are no official statistics on fiction in translation in Britain, but The Danish Literature Information Center has published a bibliography on Literature from Denmark<sup>122</sup>. This short bibliography registers books from 1980-1991 published in Britain and the United States. The bibliography does not only include novels, but literature in the old meaning of the word, including poems, anthologies, essays and memoirs.

There are two separate bibliographies. One for Hans Christian Andersen who has had almost a 150 titles published during the 12 years the bibliography covers. The other is for Søren Kierkegaard who had 22 titles published. The general bibliography contains 106 titles - less than the published titles by Hans Christian Andersen.

Of these 106 titles, 13 are by Karen Blixen or Isak Dinesen. She is, next to Hans Christian Andersen and Søren Kierkegaard probably the best known literary Dane. Professor Sven H. Rossel says somewhat optimistically in his introduction to the bibliography: "The works of Karen Blixen (writing under the pseudonym Isak Dinesen) are no longer the only books that can be bought - and enjoyed - by readers of English".<sup>123</sup> Karen Blixen was available to her own contemporaries in English - and even translated and wrote in English, but the contemporary interest in her has been furthered partly by the film *Out of Africa*, which was based on her life, and partly by the film *Babettes Feast* based on one of her novels. The translations of her work, unfortunately, do not feature in this survey, simply because she - like Hans Christian Andersen - was not a novelist, but a storyteller.

Of the titles in the general bibliography, 65 were published in the States, 33 in Britain and 6 in Denmark. One is without information on publishing house.

Of the British titles 11 are in some way biographical, either memoirs, autobiographical, letters or biography. 13 are novels. From 1980 - 1991 then, 13 Danish novels were published in translation in Britain. To this I can add one title the bibliography left out, namely *Simurghen* by Elsa Gress from 1989. I will also add 2 titles published in 1992-1993, namely *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup and *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* by Peter Høeg. All in all 16 Danish novels were pub-



lished by British publishers between 1980 -1993. These titles include authors such as Herman Bang and Martin A. Hansen, who are influential, classical authors in Denmark. The list includes Dea Trier Mørch, a Danish woman's writer and representative of the social realism of the 1970s Denmark. It includes the high brow historical novels of Henrik Stangerup, and the Danish tradition for critical crime fiction is represented by Leif Davidson and Peter Høeg. All in all the list represents some of the best of Danish fiction and a variety of it.

The titles have been published by 10 different publishing houses. I have been in contact with 5 of them. All ten publishing houses are middle size to small publishers. All are independent, though Harvill at the time of the interview was part of the conglomerate HarperCollins. I have by my sample tried to ensure that all kinds of publishers are represented, but I have also deliberately chosen to speak to publishers who in general publish translated fiction. This is mainly because the Danish titles published in Britain are part of all the foreign fiction being published in Britain, and this again is part of the publishing industry as such. It is characteristic for the publishers in this sample that they cannot remember the Danish titles specifically, but often in my interviews with them use current titles from their lists to illustrate their various points on the publishing of translated fiction.

Seven publishers have published one book each. Among these are the big independent publishers MacMillan and the mainly academic publisher Athlone Press. The publishing house Harvill had also published one book at the time, namely *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*, but has since then published both *Borderliners* and *A History of Danish Dreams*. I have chosen to speak to this publishing house because it specialises in translated fiction, and because *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was published while work on this thesis was in progress.

Quartet Books and Serpent's Tail have published two Danish titles each. I have spoken to both publishing houses. They are both general publishers, and both started out as publishers of translated fiction, and at a later date on included English language titles. Apart from this similarity Quartet Books is a middle size publishing house and Serpent's Tail is a small progressive paperback-only publishing house. I have also been in contact with Dedalus, which has also published two Danish titles.

Dedalus specialises in European literature, and unlike most publishing houses, it is not London based.

One house, Marion Boyars, has published four Danish titles, all by Henrik Stangerup. Marion Boyars is a small independent publishing house, publishing a general list with both English language and foreign language titles. The publisher, Marion Boyars, has worked in the business for many years and was at one point co-publisher in Calder and Boyars, which for most of its life has been known as Calder. This was one of the first publishing houses to specialise in foreign fiction. I have also spoken to Marion Boyars.

I have also spoken to the small publishing house Norvik which specialises in Scandinavian literature. Norvik is situated at the University of East Anglia and is run by members of the academic staff from the Scandinavian department. It distributes mainly through a mailing list. This house falls outside the scope of this thesis since it is not part of the main commercial line of publishing. Nevertheless, it does specialise in Scandinavian fiction and it is indicative of the status of Danish fiction in Britain that it has been deemed appropriate to set up a publishing house in connection with academia to publish Scandinavian fiction in Britain.

The Danish publishing houses have been chosen differently, mainly because the title output of British fiction is so big that it is difficult to form a picture through this output. I have therefore started by finding out the title output of the established trade publishers.

This may seem questionable, but the Danish market for British fiction is different from the market for translated fiction in Britain. Most publishers of literary fiction are general trade publishers where translated fiction is an integral part of the list.

The Danish national bibliography is available on-line, and I have through this been able to find out how big a percentage of the publisher's lists were made up of titles translated from English. I have further weeded out all non-British titles from this. The sample is based on titles published in 1992-1994.

Since the purpose of this was not to compile statistics, but to identify the main publishers of British fiction the figures the sample showed are not reliable, but the

British title output from eight of the 13 publishing lists I analysed, indicates that British titles, on an average, constitutes 11,5 % of the title output, whereas titles from English speaking countries constitute 36,5 %.

This varies within the publishing houses, where the British title output may be 20% or 6%. Percentages can be dangerous. Sometimes 20% are 5 titles, sometimes 30 titles, but since a publishing house' efforts and interests for British literature is shown in how prominent a place it has on the list, rather than in the number of titles, I have chosen to speak to the publishers who publish close to the average or more.

I have spoken to Gyldendal since this is the biggest and most prominent publishing house of quality fiction in Denmark. It was established in 1770 and has since then been the blue print publishing house in Denmark.

I have also spoken to Ringhardt og Lindhof. This publishing house is one of the most esteemed and successful houses in Denmark. It is also known for its list of English speaking women's writers. The house is of middle size.

Rosinante is a small publishing house started by the publisher Merete Riis, but now part of the Munksgaard group. Besides being a well-respected publisher Merete Riis is also the Danish publisher of Peter Høeg, the most successful Danish author abroad since Karen Blixen.

In addition I spoke to Samlerens Forlag, a subsidiary of Gyldendal. It is a small publishing house but with a big list of translated literature. Besides British literature, Samleren's Forlag specialises in Latin American and Swedish literature.

One publishing house I didn't speak to, but which would have qualified is Tiderne Skifter. It is of the same size as Samleren, and like Samlerens Forlag it is a subsidiary of Gyldendal. Its list of British authors is almost identical to that published by Samlerens Forlag.

The publisher from Tiderne Skifter was willing to talk to me at a "later date" since he was very busy when I contacted him. Tiderne Skifter is in many ways similar to Samlerens Forlag (though in some not), the answers from the four other publishers were quite homogenous and lastly, I had spoken to Tiderne Skifter's publisher on an earlier occasion<sup>124</sup> and had therefore touched upon his views on translated fiction before, so I decided not to contact Tiderne Skifter again.

The British titles published in Denmark span a wide spectrum, from middle brow to high brow, from crime fiction to experimental literature. In my sample are few classical authors. They have been translated into Danish, but not within the timespan I used for my sample. Otherwise this sample include names such as: John Banville, David Lodge, Tolkien, Margaret Forster, Robert Harris, Fay Weldon, Sue Townsend, Pat Barker, Virginia Woolf, Julian Barnes, Ben Okri, Bruce Chatwin, Martin Amis, Ian McEwan and Jeanette Winterson.

### The publishing of Translated Fiction

Both Danish and British publishers work within a publishing world which is both international and national. These various publishing worlds are to a large extent structured in the same way. They all have to get hold of manuscripts or foreign titles for translations. They all have to print their chosen titles and they all have to sell them on to bookshops, libraries and readers. - And whether the publisher is British, Danish or French, he or she has to make a profit in order to survive. The publisher of translated fiction is part of the same market, and though there are differences, there are also similarities. Therefore some of the methods British and Danish publishers use are alike, while some of their work is influenced by the differences in the two markets.

Both Danish and British publishers use the same sources for finding foreign titles for publication. These sources are reviews, contacts and the Frankfurt Fair. Since the rights to Danish titles are handled by the Danish publishers, a British publisher is not likely to hear of a title through an agent, whereas Danish publishers get a lot of titles sent by foreign rights agents. The main source, though, within the publishing of translations is contacts, which function as an old boy's network. This network takes on an importance which it cannot do within the publishing of home country fiction. A publisher cannot tell another publisher anything about a manuscript from an unknown author sent to the publisher since the manuscript is not publicly known until it is a printed book. Also, within the national market, publishers are in competition with each other for market shares. This competition does not exist between two markets.

There is no doubt that the network is the main source for the selection of foreign titles. Though an agent may talk up a book for a publisher, a publisher will not rely on this information solely. If a book is not talked about within the Old Boy's Network a publisher is not likely to pay much attention to a title. Likewise if an agent can show who else is interested in a title, the publisher in question will pay more attention to why these other publishers would publish the title than to the praises of the agent.

One reason for this is of course that the agent is trying to sell the title, the other reason is that this network is based on mutual trust. A Danish publisher will tell a British publisher whether he or she thinks the Danish book the British publisher is considering is good, rather than trying to promote Danish literature at all costs. The latter method would backfire, not only for the Danish publisher who may be deemed untrustworthy, but also for Danish literature as such, since a publisher who has once taken a chance on a not quite "worthy" title is not likely to take a second chance with Danish literature.

The network is built up over the years based on mutual interests in the titles, shared values and personal likes and dislikes. One of the main forums for meeting one's foreign colleagues is the Frankfurt Fair.

The Frankfurt Fair is a big rights fair held once a year in Frankfurt. Since most of the publishers know who they are going to talk to at the fair, and what books they are going to look at, the fair is mainly for the meeting in person of the publishers and agents. This is where the last negotiations are done, and where a possible auction may be held, but the main reason for the publishers to attend, is to hear whether something new is happening and to meet old colleagues and form new ties. One Danish publisher describes the Frankfurt Fair and the socialising which leads to these mutual trust bonds in the following way:

During the Frankfurt Fair, publishers from all over the world meet and talk to each other. It is a very important time for the publishers to meet and talk to each other. It is a very important time for the publishers to meet and talk to each other. It is a very important time for the publishers to meet and talk to each other.

The British publisher describes the Frankfurt Fair and the socialising which leads to these mutual trust bonds in the following way:

We go around and confirm our interest. We make deals about books we have read, talk to people and cultivate the social network, which is so infinitely important, try to get in touch with people other than the usual [contacts]. (...) Those who deal with foreign rights for the publishers and agents and then get in touch with the editors to hear what is happening further in to the future. - Sit and talk, drink a bit of wine, eat a few dinners, drink a couple of pints further into the evening, go to a few cocktail parties. Send out the right signals and receive [signals], and try and get in touch with some new people. This is where the unexpected happens, because if you only do the expected, then that is all you are going to get. (...) Because if you don't take part in all this small talk and a small champagne here and a small glass of wine there instead of going to a meeting where you know what you are going to be told [nothing new is going to develop]. That is also why this is such an incredibly personal business.<sup>125</sup>

Though the personal contact is the main source of information for the translated titles, Danish publishers have a greater chance of hearing of the titles than the British. Most publishers receive the British Sunday papers such as *The Times* and *The Observer*, they read magazines and the trade publication *The Bookseller*. Because of this they are able to get a general picture of the British market. Though most titles are sold for translation before they are published on the homemarket, a general awareness of the market can lead to translations in the future.

Within information theory it is a well-known fact, that you cannot seek out information unless you are aware of an information lack. So if for instance a Danish publisher become aware of a new trend, or a new author he may not choose to follow this trend or publish the new author now - either because the Danish market is not ready for it yet or because his programme is full for now - but he will be aware of this for later use.

British publishers cannot read Danish and they are therefore not able to keep up with what is happening on the Danish market.

Some Danish publishers employ scouts who work within the English-speaking market. Their job is to be aware of titles relevant for the Danish market and the particular Danish publisher long before the publication on the home market. British publishers do not employ scouts on the Scandinavian market<sup>126</sup>.

That British publishers do not employ scouts on the Scandinavian market whereas Danish publishers do on the British market, is not only because of a general

lack of interest for Scandinavian literature but also a sign of the salability of Scandinavian literature on the British market. There is no reason to actively seek out titles which as a rule are not even able to pay for their own costs. The scouts employed by Danish publishers show that British literature does sell on the Danish market, but it is also a clear indication of the interest for this literature in a market where more than half of all translations are from the English language.

The scouts are also an indication of what sort of publishers publish British literature in Denmark and vice versa. Of the four Danish publishers I spoke to, only one publishing house did not employ a scout. This publishing house, Samleren, is the smallest of the four and it is the house with the smallest programme. Before a publishing house can take full advantage of a scout, not to mention afford one, it has to have a programme big enough for this.

Though the British publishing houses I spoke to are not necessarily smaller than the Danish, or on the whole have a smaller programme of translated fiction, they are much more niche publishers than the Danish publishers I spoke to. This is not as much a bias of my selection of publishers, but a reflection of who are the main publishers of British literary novels in Denmark, and of Danish literary novels in Britain. Of the British publishers I spoke to, only Harvill seems to have the status the Danish publishers have. That is, only Harvill has a programme which seems big enough to validate the use of scouts.

All in all the Danish publishers have a larger basis for selecting British titles than vice versa. This is because Danes can read English but also because the Danish market is open to British literature. This market and the size of the translated fiction lists are of a size in Denmark which warrants the use of scouts. Opposed to this, is Britain, where the translated fiction market is small, and the market for Danish fiction even smaller. There is a lack of interest for Danish literature.

Though the basis for choosing Danish fiction is smaller in Britain than for British literature in Denmark, both share the most important source, namely the Old Boy's Network. Since this is the most important source both British and Danish publishers have a fair chance of finding titles. The lack of Danish titles on the British

market is therefore more an indication of the salability of Danish fiction than result of the smaller basis for selection.

The above description of the Old Boy's Network indicates that this network is not only a source for selection but that it also plays a part in the decision making process. The main criteria for selection are literary quality, salability and the profile of the publishing house.

The selection is based, of course, on the information the publishers have gathered. All publishers, whether Danish, British or Finnish sort through the pile of manuscripts and translated titles by reading the first couple of pages, a bit in the middle and the end. If the title catches their interest they will read the whole manuscript and/or get a reader to do this.

Since British publishers do not read Danish they are dependent on a reader to do this. This again costs money and a publisher would have to have more than a passing interest in a Danish title for him or her to find a reader.

In the selection process, language is quite clearly a handicap for the Danish book. Lindsey Evans from *Serpent's Tail* described it in the following way when asked what languages they mostly translated from:

German, French, Latin America. Pete [Peter Ayrton, the publisher at *Serpent's Tail*] is half French, so it is helpful as well, because when people send the books over, they often send the proofs in their own language. And we can't read Danish. So it is like: Well, does anybody have an idea what this is about? And obviously there'll be an English letter, and a description of the book, but it is really not the same as Pete curling up at night with a volume of a French book. And that is a problem.<sup>127</sup>

There seems to be a correlation between what languages can be read in-house and what books are published. The main language is French which could be read in all the publishing houses, in two houses German could be read and in one Italian. All the publishers used Latin American literature as an example of translated literature which was successful, but so did Danish publishers when they were to give examples of other than Anglo-American fiction which was successful on the Danish market. Latin American fiction, represented by authors like Gabriel Garcia Marquez



and Isabella Allende are therefore to be seen more as an European trend or fashion than as a general example of translated fiction on the British and Danish markets.

The Danish publishers I spoke to all read English. Merete Riis from Rosinante said the following when asked whether that perhaps meant that the publishers had a greater interest in literature from the English speaking world:

We are like all other Danes. We can read the language, we can relate to it, we can judge quality much better in that language than most of us can in any other language, because I doubt that there are very many Danish publishers who are completely fluent in French or completely fluent in German.<sup>128</sup>

When language becomes a barrier the Old Boy's Network becomes all the more important. If a publisher has heard of a title from colleagues he is more likely to pay attention to it. Though the receiving publisher has heard of the book from the publisher who wants the book translated, the sources for information are the other publishers in the network. What happens here is often that a publisher in a third country has decided to publish the book. Since publishers know each other and each other's lists, a publication in a third country can indicate that this title will also be of interest to the particular publisher.

In 1994, Samlerens Forlag published Michael Larsen's *Uden sikker Viden* (Without Certain Knowledge). It was first sold to the German Carl Hanser Verlag and has after that been sold to Italy, Holland, Greece and was at the time of the interview on option to a British publishing house<sup>129</sup>. Peter Holst, Michael Larsen's Danish publisher, is in no doubt that the reason why so many publishers have been interested in publishing the book, is that Carl Hanser Verlag bought it first. He says that other publishers would have noticed this and perhaps borrowed the reader opinion from the German publishing house, and have on the whole discussed the book with colleagues.

Another example is the hugely successful *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg. This was published in the United States by the prestigious Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, which gave the publishing world an indication of the quality and salability of this book. It was published in at least 13 countries. What is interesting

here, is that the editor at Farrar, Strauss and Giroux is Danish. This not only removed the language barrier, but added a cultural and personal interest.

It is not a coincidence either, that Michael Larsen's book was first sold to Germany. Germany has a tradition for publishing Danish books. Peter Høeg's first book was published in Germany, and this as well was part of the reason why the international publishing world paid so much attention to *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*.

It is also interesting to note that the Danish publishers I have spoken to think that the success of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* has opened up the international market for Danish literature. Not to the extent where every Danish book can be sold. It would still have to be the best of the best. But it has opened up because Peter Høeg's book has, so to speak, put Danish fiction on the map. It has shown that Denmark and Danish literature is other than Hans Christian Andersen and Karen Blixen aka Isak Dinesen. In the short term this seems likely since two Danish books were sold on the Frankfurt Fair in 1994, the first fair since Peter Høeg's success. One is Michal Larsen's *Uden Sikker Viden*, the other is Solvej Balle with *Ifølge Loven* (According to the Law) which was sold to Peter Høeg's British publisher Harvill. Harvill has also published *Borderliners* and *A History of Danish Dreams* by Peter Høeg, which means a stronger Danish profile.

The question is of course whether this opening up of the publishing world towards Danish literature will last. Tradition and reputation are not created overnight. I would say that a lot depends on the success of the authors being translated now, whether this is the beginning of a trend or a short interlude.

A general criterion for publishing of both translated fiction and fiction in the original language is quality. Both Danish and British publishers agree on this. But when it comes to translated fiction it has to be of the highest quality, because books of medium quality can be found in plenty on the home market. But the British publishers I spoke to also used the quality criterion as a way of excluding translated fiction:

But it is also the fact that there is an enormous amount of literature written in English which isn't necessarily British: American, South African, Canadian, Australian (...). So that before or as well, as the homegrown [literature] we are competing against literature from all over the world and we do wince, publishers about how difficult it is to sell translations, but I think that is entirely natural. And I don't think we are particularly bad at it. When you look at foreign markets, there are some foreign markets where people buy enormous amounts of translated books, Italy being one. The quality of literature available in Italy is nothing like what there is available in English, so I mean it is not a fair comparison.<sup>130</sup>

It is true that the literature available in English is major. Nonetheless, the huge import of fiction in English in other countries, rather than for instance import of German or French books, is more likely an expression of the familiarity with these cultures, and Anglo-American hegemony. In one way the large output of books translated from English on the Danish market is an expression of the market, but taking that aside Danish publishers probably publish more translated fiction than British publishers. It is not possible to ascertain since there are no statistics on translated fiction in Britain. This in itself though, is an indication of how little emphasis is put on translated fiction in Britain.

The above quote also indicates British relations to the rest of the English-speaking world. Though written in English, fiction from the USA and Australia is fiction from other cultures. But because of Britain's (perceived) close relations, they are seen as familiar. Even more familiar than British culture is perceived to be in Denmark. Fiction from other English speaking countries also have the advantage of being written in English.

The other reason the British publishers gave for the poor sale of translated fiction was that the British were xenophobic. There certainly seems to be some truth in this. The strong ties to the Commonwealth and the USA probably plays into this.

That both British and Danish publishers emphasised the quality criterion is also an expression of their publishing profiles. Since this study deals with the literary novel, I have interviewed publishers who publish this rather than publishers of mass fiction, but as mentioned above the emphasis was on the best of the best. Two of the Danish publishers also said that they may translate some of the bestsellers which had

a wider readership in order to make a profit, but they would not publish the novel in the middle, because there are plenty of those novels as it is.

Another criterion for selection is that the author is already on the list. All publishers, whether in Denmark or Britain believed in publishing authorships, that is publishing all titles by an author. The rationale behind this is that the success of one title from an author can lead to sales of titles on the backlist. That is one of the reasons why Harvill is now publishing earlier books by Peter Høeg. A more altruistic reason is that not all books of an author will be of the same quality, but sometimes they have to be written before the author can go on to the next book. That is, an author should have room to develop.

Much more than the British publishers, the Danish publishers emphasize that having commenced on publishing an authorship, the author is "yours", meaning that whatever reputation the author gains will always be of benefit to the publishing house. The explanation for this difference can be found in the gentleman's agreement, which to a large extent is still valid in Denmark. This is another reason why the Danish publishers publish the so-called middle books. If they don't they may lose the author to a publisher who will.

Among the British authors, both Marion Boyars and Serpent's Tail had lost authors because they could not pay the advance other publishers offered the author. Though Marion Boyars publishes Henrik Stangerup in the hope that he will one day gain so much recognition that his titles can pay for themselves and perhaps more, the British publishers do not feel so secure in having "their authors" as the Danish publishers do.

Besides the criterion of quality, translated fiction in Britain often has to pass the "culturally relevant" criterion. Quartet, for instance, chose to publish *Simurghen* by Elsa Gress because it dealt with both Danish and American culture. On the whole the publishers agreed that a book should be able to "travel". That is, it can be foreign but not so foreign that the British reader cannot understand it. To this Guido Waldman adds what he calls "privileged insight". To explain this he uses the example of two Italian books he had on option at the time of the interview. One was about the rain forest, the other about the mafia:

I would say to myself I am looking from Italy for what I would call privileged insight, that only that country can provide. When it comes to the Amazon rain forest, an awful lot of people all over the world are working in that field, and there probably is some perfectly good English writer to write a book on the subject. But when it comes to the particular question involved with the mafia, then an Italian insight is of particular value and that is what one should be going for.<sup>131</sup>

The Danish publishers do not talk about whether British fiction can travel the cultural distance to Denmark. British culture is well known, and as Liv Bendtsen from Ringhardt og Lindhof points out: even the "whacky" things are easy to understand. She is also the one to point out that Danes too can get privileged insight and learn from the British. She mentions that Britain for years has been a multi-cultural society. From literature about, for instance, the problems second generation immigrants experience in Britain, Danes can come to understand the problems which face the group of second generation immigrants now living in Denmark.

Another criterion for selection is how well a translated title can expect to do on the market. This point has already been dealt with in connection with authorships which publishers in both countries see as a way of building a backlist and thereby create steadysellers or to use rights to titles already bought if an author should get a break-through with a later title.

Besides that, there is the question of financial viability, it is a question of how big a readership the book has and on how much the publishers can sell to bookshops and libraries.

In the question of sales to bookshops and libraries, publishers in both countries agreed that the bookshops were the main customers. British publishers mentioned Waterstones and Dillons as their biggest customers. They also found that the bookshops did not always want to stock their titles and that it could be difficult to get their books properly displayed. The main issue here seems to be one of promotion. This is dealt with in the next chapter.

Danish publishers felt that the bookshops gave an adequate service. What they did mention was the increasing number of English original paperbacks sold in the bookstores. All publishers mentioned that it was impossible to say exactly in which way it influenced their sales, though it was not to the extent where they chose not to

translate. A report from Instituttet for Fremtidsforskning (The Institute for Research into Future Developments) Concludes:

A certain market for English language literature does exist, and the size of it is enough to rouse debate. The problem is that the American/British export editions of new novels reach Denmark, partly a long time before the translated version of the book and partly at prices, which are competitive with the Danish version. Sales of the export editions can hardly be regarded as being of a size, which constitutes a real threat to a later Danish version, though there is of course a marginal sale which disappears. The bottom-line is though, that the English version can only be expected to sell in a greater number of copies in Denmark when it comes to sales successes, which will also manifest itself in considerable sales of the Danish version.<sup>132</sup>

To the publishers I spoke to, the bottom-line was not that the English editions could only expect to sell well if it was a bestseller. The bottom-line was that the English editions did sell, and that the titles which sold, whether a few copies or many copies were of titles the publishers had published in translation. The Danish market consists of and exists on a population of 5 million people. In a market where it is not unusual to sell only 400 copies of a title, the margins count.

Likewise Danish publishers have during the last 5-8 years complained about falling sales to libraries. They are no longer supporters of quality fiction to the extent they were before. Again, when the market is as small as it is, the margins count.

Also British libraries have had diminishing funds, but the British publishers seem to show greater understanding for this than the Danish. The issues behind the different attitudes are explored in chapter 9, but had British libraries been vital to the survival of quality fiction the British publishers would have had more to say on the subject.

Nevertheless it is an accepted statement that translated fiction does not sell in Britain. Translated fiction in Britain has a readership far smaller than the population, and far smaller than that which literature from the English speaking world has. Since it, like literature on the Danish market has a small readership, margins must also be important concerning translated fiction.

Instead of relying solely on library and bookshop sales, British publishers rely on rights to the Commonwealth and Australia and to a lesser extent Canada. In this

way the market is increased, and the increase has been obtained because of the common language. Danish publishers do not have this possibility.

On the whole it is expensive to have a book translated, but it is also a fact that the first copy of a book is what costs and the price is lowered or kept down in accordance with how many copies can be expected to sell. If a novel has been translated into English, the cost of this translation can be carried by all the English editions printed, whether it is to Australia or Britain.

The publishers I spoke to survive on their English language rights. Serpent's Tail and Marian Boyars have daughter publishing houses in the States. Guido Waldman from Harvill mentioned that the question of other English-speaking rights could decide whether they took on a book or not.

The publishing houses also took the chances of receiving support for translations into consideration. Since they cannot rely on this support beforehand it is a general knowledge of what tends to receive support which is the decisive factor. The Arts Councils supports translated fiction, and for European fiction the EU have grants. As for Danish literature specifically, The Danish Literature Information Center give out translation grants. These grants and institutions will be discussed in chapter 10. Suffice here to say that British publishers find it difficult to publish translated fiction without these grants.

Danish publishers also receive grants for translations, but according to themselves, not for British literature. The reasons given for this are that there are plenty who will publish it and there are probably languages/countries which are more needy. The figures from the Danish Literature Information Center tell a different story, as it is shown in chapter 9. Nonetheless, compared to how much English language fiction is being published, it does not receive much support. Danish publishers take the possible paperback and book club sales into consideration. If the market cannot be expanded through language it has to be expanded in other directions.

British publishers do not think in paperback editions since smaller houses seldom publish both hardbacks and paperbacks. But both Quartet and Serpent's Tail

publish directly in paperback. Marion Boyars tries to sell paperback rights and will, failing that, publish her own titles in paperback just to keep them in print.

Where for Britain it is true that translated fiction does not sell, it is true for Denmark that Anglo-American literature does sell. I asked the Danish publishers whether British literature sold as well as American literature. They found this to be true. It was not so much a difference in origin as a difference in the specific authors. A title with a narrow readership would sell the same whether it was British or American.

I also asked the Danish publishers whether British literature sold as well as Danish literature. Here opinions differed. Two publishers said it did, and two said it didn't. The answer to this difference in opinion can be found in the British titles the publishing houses publish.

Liv Bendtsen from Ringhardt og Lindhof said that British titles sold as well as Danish titles. On Ringhardt og Lindhof's list most of the best known woman writers can be found. The house publishes authors such as Fay Weldon, Mary Wesley and Joanna Trollope. These authors are steady selling authors in Britain as well.

Peter Holst from Samlerens Forlag did not think British authors sold as well as Danish authors. On this list authors like Jeanette Winterson, Martin Amis, Ian McEwan and Kazuo Ishiguro are represented. These authors are not household names in Denmark. Their books are more experimental, and these authors do not write big narrative novels to the extent the above mentioned women authors do.

It is therefore fair to assume that well known authors who write big narrative novels can compete with Danish novels of the same kind, whereas the more experimental novel, whether in content or style cannot compete in the same way with the Danish equivalent. If a library has to choose between a British and Danish book with a narrow readership, the librarians will choose the Danish. Likewise Danish readers are more apt to take a chance on a novel by an unknown Danish author than on an unknown book by a British author. With regards to the better known British authors with a more popular style of writing, what seems to happen is that the difference between British and Danish disappears and the author and the author's culture is regarded as, not exactly Danish, but familiar.



Both Danish and British publishers are part of an international network which is based on trust and mutual interests. This network is a source of information on titles worthy of translations. In this way it is also a trendsetter because the publishers through their likes and dislikes play a part in deciding what is the canon.

Language plays an important part. Because Danish publishers understand English they can familiarise themselves with the British market through British written sources such as newspapers and trade magazines, and because they read English they have immediate access to titles under consideration for translation.

When British publishers consider Danish titles for translation, the language becomes a barrier because they cannot read Danish, and the publisher will therefore have to rely on the opinion of a reader. It is therefore easier to consider titles in languages the publishers can read, such as French, German or Italian.

The English language becomes a hindrance for Danish literature on the British market in one other aspect, namely because of the huge amount of literature available in English from the States, but also from Australia, Canada and South Africa. The English language is also beginning to play a part in Denmark where imports and sales of English language originals are increasing.

Also in the question of salability, language becomes an issue. British publishers can expand their market into other English-speaking areas, whereas Danish publishers cannot. Danish publishers are therefore more dependent on library sales, book club editions and paperback sales than the British publishers are.

British publishers rely on grants for translations. Danish publishers do not do this because fiction in English is regarded as commercially viable.

In close connection with the issue of language, is the issue of culture.

Not only can Danish publishers read English, but they consider British literature a market so interesting (and economically viable) that it warrants the use of scouts.

One Danish publisher points out that publishers are like other Danes, they understand the English language - and culture. Because British publishers too, are like other British people, they are more open to English language titles than to those from other cultures.



## 6) PUBLICITY AND PROMOTION

*This chapter analyses the importance of publicity and promotion in Britain. This was identified as an important factor in the British market in chapter 4. The chapter is based on a case study of the launch of Brother Jacob by Henrik Stangerup published by the small publishing house Marion Boyars and the launch of Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow by Peter Høeg published by the HarperCollins owned Harvill. Both titles are translated from Danish and both titles were published in Britain in 1993. The case study shows that the huge campaign put behind Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow resulted in extensive coverage by the press and well-stocked bookshops at the time of the launch. This again led to huge sales and later on to the publication of the title in paperback. Brother Jacob was promoted the way most titles from small houses, and titles which are not thought to have a big readership are promoted. Press release and proof copies were sent to the press. Because it was not talked up and because it was not deemed likely to sell it was not widely stocked by bookshops and did not sell enough to cover its own production costs. This is the way most translated fiction is perceived, promoted and sold. The role of publicity on the British market is therefore an added disadvantage for translated fiction on the British market.*

Within publishing circles in Britain the statement "Translated fiction doesn't sell" is generally accepted. Of course, every publisher can mention the exception: Marquez, Kundera, Høeg, but generally, translated fiction does not sell.

There are various reasons for this. First and foremost the novel must have a readership; secondly the potential reader must be aware of the existence of the translated novel and the book must be available either through bookstore or library.

This chapter deals with how knowledge of the book is brought to the potential reader and how the book is made available through the bookstore. It deals with this

through a case study on *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup and *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg. Both were published in 1993 in Britain by respectively Marion Boyars and Harvill. It is therefore not a comparative study between Britain and Denmark. This is primarily because publicity and promotion do not have the same importance in Denmark. The two novels chosen here are by two authors who are both successful in Denmark. But had two unknown British authors written two similar books, the results of two similar publicity campaigns would most likely have been the same. Such is the importance of publicity in Britain.

Most of this case study is based on conversations with Christopher MacLehose, publisher, Jane Thurlow from HarperCollins' marketing department and publicist Steve Williams during the launch of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* and on a later interview with Marion Boyars. Harvill also made press releases, the publicity schedule for Peter Høeg and other material available. In addition two buyers from respectively Waterstones and Dillons were interviewed. The two bookstores are both based close to the corner of Oxford Street and Charing Cross Road in London, that is, in the West End. Though these stores may not be typical, their close proximity means that they share the same readership, which again means that the differences which show up are based in different store-policies rather than the community they serve.

But first, the importance of the bookstore. Reader and bookstore are inter-linked, partly because the bookstore makes the book available for the potential reader, but also because the bookstore through its display of the books can enhance the reader's chances of becoming aware of the book. The bookstore therefore functions as a gatekeeper between publisher and reader.

If a potential reader is not aware of the existence of the novel, he or she is not likely to look for it in the bookstore. But if the bookstore stocks the novel in question, the buyer can become aware of it through browsing in the shop. Nevertheless a potential reader browsing in a bookstore does not have a specific wish to buy, for instance a Danish novel dealing with, as *Brother Jacob* does, a Franciscan monk working among Indians in Mexico. The bookbuyer may be in the bookstore with a specific wish for another title or has entered the store simply to browse for "a book".

Therefore the possibility of the novel reaching its potential reader is dependent on whether the bookstore stocks the novel, and on how the store displays it. The browser is more likely to pay attention to books prominently displayed in front of the shop, in dump bins or in the "New Titles" section than books on the A-Z shelves.

But all books do not end on the shelves in the bookstores. In fact if the publishers do not make bookshops and readers aware of their titles, they will end up being remaindered. Therefore to create as wide a readership as possible, they have to promote their titles. This is not only to get a readership, but also to get the bookshops to stock their books. Jacqueline Graham says:

An important criterion in any bookshop's backing of a title is the publicity potential of the book: the likelihood of widespread review coverage, plus author interviews coverage, plus author interviews on television, radio and in the press. Publicity is crucial to the selling of a book (...). A bookshop will take more copies of a title and display them prominently if a formidable publicity schedule is in prospect. If the coverage materializes and the author is a compelling performer in the right media slots for him or her, the result should be immediately apparent in sales.<sup>133</sup>

In the question of availability and awareness of titles reader and bookstore are linked through the twin concepts of promotion and publicity. It is mainly the publishers who are responsible for promotion and publicity. Promotion is aimed at the bookstores, and the function of this is to make the bookstores aware of the books and to promote them to the extent where the bookstores wish to stock them. Publicity is aimed at the media - newspapers, magazines, radio and television. Though publicity is aimed at the media, it is indirectly aimed at the reader since media coverage brings public attention to the book, and this, of course, is why publishers want the media coverage.

The dividing line between promotion and publicity is not strict, but generally promotion is the responsibility of the marketing department which will be responsible for producing display bins, posters etc. It is also the marketing department which informs the bookshops and the head offices in the book chains about new releases, and it is the marketing department who talks up the titles for the publishing house's reps, who are the people who sell the books to the bookstores. The publicity is the responsibility of the publicist, but the two departments work closely together. In fact

in the small publishing houses both publicity and promotion are the responsibility of the sales manager or the publisher.

The promotion campaign (both publicity and promotion) is of tremendous importance for the sales to bookshops. If the bookstore knows there is going to be a big publicity campaign, they will buy the book, if not - and the book may seem slightly obscure, which most Danish novels will - they may not buy the book. Gary Spence from Dillons says:

There are so many books published each week that we can't find space for all of them. Some of them we put on maybe some of the smaller display tables at the back. Some of the smaller amounts of new titles, where we maybe only take half a dozen copies, they end up just on the fiction shelves (...). It is sort of a catch 22 situation, because we don't think we can sell enough of them to justify taking more than ten. But if we only take about ten they end up just going on the fiction section, so they don't get the publicity which would help us sell more. It is a bit tricky but we have to promote the books we know we can sell.<sup>134</sup>

The publishers know the importance of promotion. They know the buyers in the bookstores are going to ask the reps about the promotion budget, and they know the answer to the question is going to decide whether the store chooses to stock none, two or twenty copies of a title, and it is going to decide how the book will be displayed.

All publishers wish to see their titles prominently displayed. All publishers wish to sell as many copies of their titles as possible, but when deciding how to promote a title various aspects are taken into consideration. The publisher - especially small publishers - cannot afford a big promotion budget. Therefore they may choose only to send out review copies with a press release. This is how most books are promoted whether it is a big or small publishing house. Another consideration is the potential readership the publishers presume a book may have. A thriller will have a bigger readership than a high brow novel based on Kierkegaardian philosophy. A novel by a well-known British author will have a bigger readership than a novel by an unknown Danish author.

Likewise the literary editors in the media will choose to review titles which they presume most of their readers will be interested in - or they will choose to review titles they themselves are interested in.

In 1992 the small publishing house Dedalus published *The Black Cauldron* by William Heinesen as part of their *Dedalus Europe 1992 Series*. The author had died the year before and two obituaries from respectively *The Times* and *The Independent* were sent out with proofs and press release. The novel failed to get any reviews. In the same campaign Dedalus published a Greek, a German and a French novel. The French novel was *Book of Nighus* by Sylvie Germain, who came to England to promote the novel. This novel received 12 reviews and two interviews with Sylvie Germain. The Greek and German novels received respectively 2 and 3 reviews.<sup>135</sup> French culture is better known than Faroese or Danish culture, and it is easier for a living French author to promote her novel than it is for a deceased Faroese author.

Lindsey Evans from *Serpent's Tails* points out that "You need enthusiasts in the trade to get it out". As an example she mentions a book about Pedro Paramo. At the time of publication the book received a few reviews, but not much happened. About half a year later the *Guardian* did a major piece on the book, and Penguin became interested in doing a mass market edition of it. In spite of *Serpent's Tail's* promotion and information about the book on publication, Penguin had not noticed it because it was a translation. But because Richard Goth the literary editor at the *Guardian* is interested in Latin America and therefore chose to do a piece on Pedro Paramo, the book received the attention needed.<sup>136</sup>

Publishers of translated fiction do therefore face the paradox of wanting to promote their titles and of having to decide whether the book can be promoted. If the publishing house can afford it they tend to promote the books they deem likely to succeed. All literary fiction is difficult to promote, but a French book is more likely to find sympathetic buyers, literary editors and a bigger readership than a Danish book.

None of the publishers I spoke to would or could say which books they promoted more than others. Their general answer to the question "Do you promote some books more than others?" was "No". Mostly they would send out review

copies to key-people in the trade, and that was the promotion they did. But when discussing the success of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* and the promotion campaign for this, they would admit that for some of their titles they may do a bigger campaign. If they were to do a bigger campaign it might be:

a book by an author we had already published on a subject that was either particularly exotic or had some sort of relevance in this market, that the previous book hadn't, even though it is a writer we think is very good. The book where you think you are going to break through into a big market.<sup>137</sup>

Very few Danish authors have had novels published in Britain, and of those who have, only Henrik Stangerup and Dea Trier Mørch have had more than one novel published. Since they are from a small country and from a culture which does not receive much interest, they are not likely candidates for a big promotion campaign.

In 1993 two Danish novels were published in Britain. One was *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup, and the other was *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* by Peter Høeg. *Brother Jacob* had very small sales (800 copies) while *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* four months after publication had sold more than 21,000 copies.

The two books are both fairly high brow. *Brother Jacob* is a book in a trilogy based on Kierkegaardian philosophy. It follows Brother Jacob from Denmark through Europe to Mexico. Brother Jacob is a Franciscan monk who opposes the Reformation and therefore leaves Denmark, but whether he is in France or Spain he cannot find truth within the Church. He ends up in Mexico, trying to form a Utopia among the Indians there. At his death he is sainted by the Indians.

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is a thriller set in contemporary Denmark and Greenland. Miss Smilla, a Greenlandic/Danish woman wants to find the truth about how her upstairs neighbour, a young boy, fell to his death from the roof of the building they live in. Her investigation takes her through the world of Greenlandic immigrants in Denmark, the Danish stockbroker belt and she ends her search in Greenland.

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* deals with the cultural split which people born in one culture experience when living in another culture. It is a critical description of



the influence of Danish culture on the Inuit culture in Greenland. *Brother Jacob* takes its starting point in Denmark, but focuses on the common European experience of the reformation. It deals with influential theories of the time, such as Thomas More's *Utopia*, and could therefore be expected to have a wider readership than *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*. Both novels are packed with factual information and both books are of high literary quality, but where the plot of *Brother Jacob* is almost non-moving, *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is, if not fast moving, then at least it does start with a promise of a solution, and the search for this solution moves the plot along.

*Brother Jacob* and *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* were published at almost the same time. Both are Danish. Both could be called genre novels - *Brother Jacob* is a historical novel and *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* is a thriller, but *Brother Jacob* is too intellectual to conform to the genre. On the other hand *Brother Jacob* is much more European than *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*. All in all both novels would have their advantages and disadvantages on the international market. So why did *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* do extremely well, while *Brother Jacob* did not even sell enough to make up for production costs?<sup>138</sup>

To begin at the end, when I showed the two novels to Gary Spence from Dillons, he told me that *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* had done very well for them, while he had never seen *Brother Jacob* before. Jack Noe from Waterstones had seen both books. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* had been Waterstones' Book of the Month in December. They had carried a few of *Brother Jacob*, placed in the A-Z section for foreign fiction. So, *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was prominently displayed at the two stores, and thereby easy for the reader and browser to see. *Brother Jacob* was only available in Waterstones and here displayed so that the reader would have to have a specific interest in foreign literature. In Dillons the reader would have had to have a specific interest in *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup since the reader would have had to ask for the title in the store, and the book would have had to be ordered for this reader.

As for the reviews, both books received more reviews than Danish books usually receive.<sup>139</sup> *Brother Jacob* received 5, But *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*

received 9 and three interviews with Peter Høeg. Peter Høeg also had four radio interviews. A closer reading of the reviews will show which impression a potential reader will get of the book, and thereby what sort of a potential reader would want to buy the book.

*Brother Jacob's* five reviews were in three broadsheets: The Times, The Daily Telegraph and The Independent, and in two magazines: The Spectator and The Times Literary Supplement. All but Robert Nye in The Times are positive. Robert Nye is very negative: "Seldom can a book so much concerned with movement and discovery - physical, mental, and spiritual - have been so static. Rarely can so static a book have proved itself so misty at the edges."<sup>140</sup> Christopher Stace in The Daily Telegraph informs that the book is part of a trilogy and in the light of this, a novel about Kierkegaard could have been expected<sup>141</sup>. This introduction seems slightly off-putting for the reader who has no knowledge of Henrik Stangerup, but the rest of the review is up-beat and inviting with the main focus on religion and the Indian people. The main focus of Euan Cameron in the Independent is Jacob's life among the Indians in Mexico and his conflict with the church in that connection<sup>142</sup>. The reviews in the two magazines both focus on the relevance of the story for modern day Europe, but without forgetting the religious implications in the novel<sup>143</sup>. Eric Christiansen's review in The Spectator is the most thorough of the reviews. He and Christopher Stace in the Daily Telegraph are the only ones to mention Kierkegaard and the two seem to be the only ones who have a knowledge of Henrik Stangerup and his works.

On the whole *Brother Jacob* comes across as being a historical novel dealing with the religion and thoughts of 17th century Europe. Though the Reformation is viewed critically, the best of religion and secular theory is brought to the Indians of Mexico. None of the reviews try to categorize the novel, except for Euan Cameron in the Independent, who points out that you cannot categorize it: "Brother Jacob is occasionally dense, and the careful philosophical reflection means that this is not a historical novel in the accepted term"<sup>144</sup>

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was reviewed in all the broadsheets. Two of the tabloids - The Mail on Sunday and Today also carried reviews. New Statesman and The Times Literary Supplement reviewed the novel as did Time Out, the weekly magazine for London. All in all there were 9 reviews and all in all they were positive<sup>145</sup>.

All reviews except for Times Literary Supplement see the novel as a thriller, but it ranges from a "whodunnit" to a metaphysical thriller. The Times Literary Supplement does not categorise the novel, but says: "The Book declines to limit itself"<sup>146</sup>. Two of the reviews were sandwich reviews where in each three thrillers were reviewed. In these the thriller genre is discussed and both state that the thriller can also be a novel. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is defined as a thriller which is also a novel.

Where the reviews move away from the thriller genre and see the novel as rising above the genre it is in the character of Miss Smilla. She either develops or stands as a focal point for the European/Danish - Greenlandic tension. But this tension or split is never discussed in the same way as for instance the motif of snow within the context of the thriller is discussed.

All in all the reviews see *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* as an exceptional thriller rather than a critical novel about Danish/Greenlandic relations. Where *Brother Jacob* fails to conform to its genre, and the emphasis is put on subject, *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* has so many of the traits acquired that the genre takes precedence over content.

The crime novel has won more and more recognition as a genre which is also critical of society, and it is a genre with a wide readership. The historical novel too has a wide readership, but it is not a genre which is thought of as serious, therefore *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is easier to categorize than *Brother Jacob*. This is reflected in the reviews. The reviews of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* target the book's readership - the crime reader, while the reviews of *Brother Jacob* will reach a diffuse group of people who may be interested in the Reformation or the 17th century or South America.

Though this may mean *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* will reach a wider audience, this is not only because of the angle of the reviews, it is also because the two novels are different. Both could have been reviewed as novels dealing with European culture and ideas, and the influence of this on other cultures. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* stays much more within the genre than *Brother Jacob*, and it is this difference which the reviews mirror, rather than a purposeful targetting of a readership by the literary editor. What is more interesting is why *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* had twice as many reviews as *Brother Jacob*.

Behind the reviews and sales to bookshops is the promotion campaign. *Brother Jacob* is published by Marion Boyars, a small publishing house run by the founder Marion Boyars. When I asked her how she promoted her titles, she said:

Everything we do, we do without spending money, except our time and our effort and our ideas. But it is not enough.<sup>147</sup>

*Brother Jacob* was promoted by sending out proofs and letters to reviewers and editors. Marion Boyars chose to play down the Kierkegaardian theme in *Brother Jacob*. Instead she focused on the story of a good man - something which the arts hardly ever deals with. She also pointed out that the novel was interesting from a religious point of view and she mentioned it contained violence, anger, betrayal.

Henrik Stangerup came to Britain to promote the book. The literary editor of the Guardian, Richard Goth, who is interested in South America was especially interested in the novel; and he and Henrik Stangerup met over lunch at the Danish Embassy. Though Richard Goth intended to do an article about Henrik Stangerup and *Brother Jacob*, the book failed to get even a review.

*Brother Jacob* was promoted the way most books are promoted. Considering the reception of other Danish novels it did quite well in getting five reviews. One reason for this could be that certain people within the trade are aware of Henrik Stangerup and his works. The reviews in The Daily Telegraph and The Spectator indicate this. In spite of this *Brother Jacob* only just made it in to the bookstores. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*, on the other hand, ended up prominently displayed in the stores.

When Harvill's publisher, Christopher MacClehose, bought the rights to *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*, he decided to make it the top name of the Autumn 1993 programme. That is, he chose to promote it intensely, more than Harvill's other new releases.

Long before the book was published this promotion started because Harvill chose to talk up the book within the trade rather than to place advertisements in the press. 2000 proof copies were printed well in advance and sent to booksellers, the press and other publishers in order to get the talk started. 2000 copies is a lot, more than many translated titles sell, but even this was not enough to secure the talk which Harvill wanted to snow-ball within the trade.

Jane Thurlow from the marketing department was responsible for the promotion to distributors. In order to get the book noticed among all the books published, she decided on a promotion "gimmick"<sup>14</sup>. The department came up with an idea based on *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* and the thriller genre. A four piece jigsaw puzzle was made, and each week for four weeks a jigsaw was sent to the booksellers with a new clue taken from the book. On the last jigsaw the title and author were mentioned. In this way the marketing department hoped to catch the attention of the bookstores, and to start the talk of the book within the bookshop chains. It was followed up by information on the reception of the book in Denmark, other countries which were publishing the book, and later on, on the reception in England. The marketing department also designed posters and display bins. This of course the bookstores were informed of as well. Also, the distributors were sent a gift box containing a proof copy of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* and a watch in the same blue colour as the rest of the promotion material for the book and with a Harvill Black Panther at its centre.

The representatives were enlisted in the work of promoting *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* as well. From Harvill they were told to keep the novel first on their list, to have an extensive knowledge of the book and to make sure the information was conveyed to bookshops they were dealing with.

Steven Williams was responsible for publicity. When *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* received as much attention from the press as it did, it was due partly to the

promotional material, partly to the snowballing effect of talking the book up. But literary editors receive a lot of books to be reviewed and only a few are. It is possible to follow up on promotional material with telephone calls etc., but only to a certain extent. Therefore the launch was helped by Harvill's reputation for publishing quality fiction and by Steven William's personal talking up of the press.

For *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* the interest shown by the press was furthered by two interviews with Peter Høeg published before the launch. These interviews were in *The Independent* and *The Sunday Times*<sup>149</sup>, but it was especially the one in the *Independent* which drew the attention to Peter Høeg and *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow*.

Two members of the press had been invited to Denmark. Paul Binding from *The Independent* is interested in Scandinavia and Scandinavian literature. The literary editor of *The Times Magazine* found Peter Høeg interesting looking and sent a journalist and a photographer. Unfortunately the pictures did not come out well, which can account for the small space allotted - considering a journalist was sent all the way to Denmark - to the interview in *The Magazine*. Both journalists found Peter Høeg a subject for an article, not so much because he was about to be published in England, in about 12-13 other countries and about to sign a film contract for the book, but because he had an interesting past as dancer, actor, fencer.

It is interesting to notice how the interviews both in *The Independent* and the later one in *The European* focus on culture rather than the thriller aspect. In fact the interview in the *European* starts by denouncing this categorization: "There is no word for thriller in Danish, says Peter Høeg (...) It's not part of my vocabulary"<sup>150</sup> When the interviews focus on culture and the split between cultures a person can experience, the words are Peter Høeg's. The plot of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is described in both articles, but the main focus is on Peter Høeg, his past professions as dancer, fencer and actor, and on his character and appearance. "He's a man of great charm, not only of manner and expression but of movement. It made sense to remember he'd spent years as a professional classical dancer."<sup>151</sup>

Peter Høeg came to London for the launch of his novel. Here he gave several interviews and met the booksellers and the press. This was possible because he spoke

English, but he was also an asset to his book. Because of his interesting past he himself could be turned into a news item. To the public *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was not promoted through Peter Høeg, but as part of the talking up campaign to the trade he was a valuable asset.

The talking up campaign succeeded. It snow-balled and the trade was ready to receive *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* on publication. The bookstores had ordered their first copies. The press was aware of the talk and thereby of the book. When the favourable reviews appeared, sales escalated and the first print run of 10,000 copies sold out quickly and three months later 21,000 copies had been sold. The book is now available in paperback and 2½ years after the first publication it is still not only widely available but also prominently displayed. Two more books by Peter Høeg have been published.

Marion Boyars will find it difficult to sell the paperback rights to *Brother Jacob*. When the hardback eventually sells out, she may choose to publish it in paperback herself, just to keep it in print.

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is an exceptional example of how well a translated novel can sell. In fact it has done very well for a literary novel. *Brother Jacob* did more or less as expected.

What is remarkable about these two novels is the difference the promotional campaign did for availability. It brought one to the attention of thousands and thousands of people and the other to the attention of hundreds and hundreds of people. Though *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* would have sold better than *Brother Jacob*, because more people would have browsed through the A-Z crime section than the A-Z foreign fiction section, it would never have sold to the extent it did without the promotion campaign behind it.

Marion Boyars as a small publisher could never have afforded the campaign Harvill gave *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*. No small publisher could, and small publishers are usually the ones publishing translated fiction. But had *Brother Jacob* been published by a big publisher it would not have received the same campaign as *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*. *Christine* by Helle Stangerup was published by MacMillan, and I have only been able to find one review on this novel. Like *Brother*

*Jacob* it is a historical novel with Europe as its background. It is a more accessible novel than *Brother Jacob*, but still, it failed to do well.

By promoting some books more than others the publishing world furthers the bestseller effect, even among literary fiction. If the novel is not written by a well-known author, talked up in the international publishing world (as *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was), if it has no clear-cut promotional angle whether it is genre or subject, chances are it is going to end up on the publisher's mid-list and more or less left to fight for itself. Perhaps a literary editor with special interest in the subject of the book will discover it among the rest of the new releases. But otherwise it is most likely to be remaindered without having sold more than perhaps a 1000 copies.

Most Danish novels are and will be by unknown authors. They will either be mid-list publications or published by small publishing houses not only without a publicity and marketing department, but without a promotion budget. This will hinder their availability since the bookshops either will not stock them or will only stock a few copies for a short while. Without reviews and hidden away on the shelves, they are not likely to come to the attention of their potential readership and they are not likely to sell.



## 7) TRADITIONS OF CULTURAL POLICIES

*This chapter explores the influences which have shaped cultural policy in Denmark and Britain. It is within this context the support for fiction is to be found and therefore the structure of the system and the concept of culture used in the cultural funding system as such also influence the support for literature. The chapter finds that the British cultural funding system is split in 3 traditions which are not linked conceptually. These are the educating/leisure tradition, legislation for industry and councils for artistic production. The chapter shows how the industrial revolution and the strong class system in Britain facilitated a tradition such as the educating/leisure tradition and also with the British emphasis on liberalism, legislation for industry. It is also shown how liberalism and John Maynard Keynes' preference for the performing arts and institutions meant that the Arts Council, though a result of the welfare state, could lead an arts policy with no conceptual link to the educating/leisure tradition. The chapter shows that Danish cultural policy is also a result of the welfare state but that this system is all-rounded with legislative support for artistic production and artists, and a public service dissemination tradition.*

*Influences can be traced to the perception of state, nation and people as a unified whole with the people as the backbone of the nation. Danish cultural policies have a philosophy based in Grundtvigianism, Social Democratic ideology and Cultural Radicalism which has led to an emphasis on artist rights, self-organisation, artistic freedom of expression and the right to a meaningful leisure time. The same influences can be traced in the concepts of culture used where Danish cultural policies have included democratisation of culture, cultural democracy and folklore whereas British cultural policy has primarily used democratisation of culture and left in particular folklore to an academic tradition such as Cultural Studies.*

This chapter deals with the general state support system created for culture, in particular the arts, in Britain and Denmark. It deals with the traditions which have shaped the two systems of support, because the climate for literature is shaped not only by market-forces and idealistic publishers, but also by state support. The next chapter looks at state support for fiction, but in this chapter the whole system of support is the focus. It is within this context that support to fiction is given.

When the state decides to intervene with the market forces in order to protect products such as translated fiction, it has taken on the role of the patron, and the responsibility for supporting arts and culture. It is often done for a mix of reasons, but mostly in order to support the artistic community and art; and to promote the uses of arts and culture in the population.

Other purposes have shaped cultural policies. Some Governments such as Hitler's Third Reich or Mussolini's fascist Italy have promoted arts and culture as conforming forces in society. Cultural policies in countries such as Denmark and Britain have from the outset seen the uses of arts and culture as creating national identity and as promoting self-reflection, enlightenment and critical abilities.

Cultural economics have identified three justifications for supporting arts and culture<sup>152</sup>. They are the market-failure argument, the merit-good argument and the public-good argument.

To support arts and culture from the point of view of the market-failure justification is to support art forms, such as the translated literary novel or opera, because they are not economically viable. This argument simply states that cultural products which cannot survive in the market-economy must be supported. It does not discuss the value of the product or the reasons for supporting it.

The merit-good justification on the other hand focuses on the value of art. It is not the monetary value which is the centre of the argument but the intrinsic value of art. It is an art for art's sake justification which focuses on the aesthetic and on the autonomy of art. This argument sees art as an expression of the best of mankind and therefore worth preserving.

The public-good justification sees art as part of society. Art reflects and interprets society. Art has abilities which enables the user of art to understand, to

reflect upon and to be critical of society and to understand the individual and the self in and of society.

In most cultural policies the three justifications for support intermingle with most emphasis on the merit-good and public-good reasons, and often work through the market-failure reason.

The three justifications, especially the public-good justification, also separate the tradition within which Danish and British cultural policies are formed from that of the totalitarian state where arts and culture are used to pacify and conform the citizens; and the old form of patronage where art was used to confirm and elevate the status of patrons such as the Royal families.

Both Denmark and Britain decided to take on the responsibility for culture as part of the developing welfare state after the Second World War. In this, public-good arguments for support took precedence as to why culture should be supported, though not necessarily in what and in how culture was supported. The *raison d'être* for including culture in the welfare state can (in a British version) be characterized in the following way:

The idea was that the benefits that the upper-class had customarily arranged for itself would now be generally available - healthcare, education, housing, financial security. And 'good' culture, too, would be generally available. So what had hitherto been, in the main, the culture of the leisure class was proclaimed (...) as a universal culture. Literature and the arts were made to embody the spiritual and human values that consumer capitalism and "mass" culture seemed to slight and, at the same time were deployed as indicators for educational success and social mobility.<sup>159</sup>

Though the support of culture formed part of the building of the welfare state for both Britain and Denmark, and for most other Western European countries, the ways this support has been set up has varied. This is based in different traditions and varying ideas of what state support entails. It has resulted in different institutions and support systems, and thereby in different climates for arts and culture.

In Denmark the responsibility for support of culture lies with the Ministry of Culture. In England it is now with the Department of National Heritage, but this is a recent invention. On the whole, English support to culture has been fairly decentra-

lised through various councils, while Danish cultural policy, with the Ministry of Culture, is a comparatively centralised system of support.

The Department of Heritage is a new ministry which did not come in to existence until 1992. Its area of responsibility is arts, broadcasting, sport, tourism, national heritage and film. This ministry is very new and the funding system is therefore still very much as it was before it came into existence.

Before the Department of National Heritage, culture belonged under different departments. The arts have mainly been under the Department of Education and Science, though at one point they were the responsibility of the Treasury. Of other areas now included in the Department of National Heritage's field of responsibility, press, publishing and cinema came under the Department of Trade and Industry, and Broadcasting was at the Home Office, whereas historic buildings came under the Department of Environment. In fact, cultural producers and products specifically working on market forces were under trade, while "arts" were under education, thereby splitting distribution and consumption from production.

The content, the promotion and well-being of the cultural products are split on various councils, the British Film Institute from 1931, the Arts Council from 1946 and the Craft Council, set up in 1981, are the Council's which decide what is available and what is not. The same system is set up at local government level where 10 Regional Arts Boards work for the local area and in association with the Arts Council.

At its roots the system is fragmented in three traditions: leisure/education, legislation for industry and artistic content.

Support for a cultural product such as film would be split out on different ministries and councils with the artistic or content aspect of film being the responsibility of the British Film Institute under the Exchequer whereas legislation for film and cinema was conducted by the Department of Trade.

When the British Film Institute was set up in 1931, it was to promote the knowledge of the artistic and educational value of film. Nevertheless, film was still seen as the escapist pleasure of the masses, and therefore legislation in the area of film and cinema was purely on the industry aspect of the field.<sup>154</sup>

The British Film Institute is a pre-war organisation. Though it was to work for artistic and educational values, it worked within a heavy industry in whose interest Government legislated.

Another public service institution, the BBC, was set up "so that the wireless trade could profit by selling receivers".<sup>155</sup> But where the British Film Institute was left to work with small government funds, the BBC had the licence fee and through this came Government awareness of the immense power of the institution, and it was able to develop the strong Public Service Broadcast tradition.

The Public Service Broadcast tradition is special and distinct within British cultural policies. It comes closest, but is not the same as the third founding split in British cultural policies, namely that of the leisure/educating tradition.

The educating/leisure tradition is in many ways interesting. It is a split between the idea that arts or other leisure pursuits are educating or elevating and leisure as pure fun, an end in itself. But the tradition does not combine the idea of free choice and fun with enlightenment. This is not to say that consumption of art is thought of as tedious, but that the idea that the consumption of art at the same time as being enjoyable can also be instructive or enlightening is not present. Art's both aesthetic and enlightening functions are accepted ideas among providers such as the Arts Council - one of the two other strands in the conceptually split cultural funding system - but in the strand focusing on the users and uses it does not exist.

The roots of this educating/leisure tradition are to be found in the problems of industrialisation, where Victorian philanthropists wanted to elevate the morals of the working classes. The first law to secure the moral elevation of the people was the Museum Act of 1845. It was a result of James Silk Buckingham's Select Committee's investigations of the "extent, causes and consequences of the prevailing vice of intoxication among the labouring classes of the United Kingdom."

The idea was to curb the influence of public houses, partly through restrictive legislation, and partly through providing alternatives such as museums and libraries through which the worker could be educated and elevated to a level where he would choose to lead a productive life for the good of society rather than go to the pub.<sup>156</sup>

Since the beginning the tradition has been based in leisure time - the time where the labouring classes ought to be elevated through rational recreation pursuits rather than going to the pub. The tradition is conceptualised around this time rather than centred around ideas, say, of democracy or the functions of art. This is not to say that the functions of art, for instance, have not had importance in the tradition. It was after all put to use as a morally elevating force. But the conceptual leitmotif in the development of the tradition has been the uses of leisure.

The functions of arts and other leisure pursuits have on the other hand played a part in internal splits in the tradition. This is not so much because of the inherent values of art or other leisure pursuits, but because of the external uses they have been put to, as in the nineteenth century top-down provision of elevating institutions such as libraries and museums or in modern versions for combating urban and youth problems. This has to a certain extent led to an opposition to Government control through the provision and uses of leisure pursuits, so that these external uses of elevation or control have deepened the split between education and leisure - the split between education and fun. And this split is to be found back to the beginning of the tradition.

In connection with the People's Palace in the East End of London, Samuel Barnett who believed in the morally elevating forces of art and Walter Besant who believed that the joy of art could improve social conditions and install middle-class values had quite different attitudes to the place:

Besant regretted that within a few years of its opening a 'polytechnic was tacked on to it: the original idea of a place of recreation was mixed up with a place of education', whereas Barnett wrote of the early days that 'inwardly one is haunted by the fear that it all means play and not work and leaves one to ask the question "what is the end?"'<sup>157</sup>

Barnett and Besant, the two nineteenth century philanthropists both thought within the top-down tradition of middle-class philanthropic provision for the working classes and installing moral, but essentially middle-class, values. The provision of leisure pursuits have up until the 1960s followed this line, though in somewhat less paternalistic versions, of providing a common, national, but again essentially middle-class, culture.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s the welfare state - though not having forgotten leisure in the earlier stages - began emphasising leisure as a right of citizenship and the focus shifted away from content of provision to equal opportunity of access. That is, to a question of limitations by availability and access for the users of leisure. This together with new ways of perceiving leisure as advocated by for instance feminist research led to an even more profound split in the cultural funding system where the providers such as the Arts Council still thought within the high arts conception of culture rather than the different uses of leisure. This tradition, again, did not focus so much on the inherent values of art but on the perception of leisure and how the leisure pursuits were used in the context of everyday life. For instance, Janice Radway in her study *Reading the Romance* found that reading romances was both a way of marking time to oneself and in the reading a way of dealing with the hegemony of patriarchy.<sup>158</sup>

I think that most professional leisure providers still take the new insights of the 1970s into consideration, but at the same time the 1980s brought new Thatcherite inspired trends in which good commercial management and the user as consumer came more and more to the fore. An example of this is the Victoria and Albert Museum which was transformed into the V&A - a café with quite a nice museum attached. This consumer orientated trend, the tyranny of the majority, has deepened the split in the cultural funding system further. Where most arts policies work through the market-failure argument, this new trend ignores the idea of supporting something which cannot survive in the marketplace.<sup>159</sup>

Fred Coalter in *Recreational Welfare*, talking from within the leisure/education tradition of the conceptually split cultural funding system, explains that:

The establishment of the Arts Council and the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949 were essentially preservationist measures, rooted in elitist views of fine arts or landscape and rural idyll and their contribution to the democratisation of opportunities was limited.<sup>160</sup>

Though this is true of the first leisure provisions of the welfare state, the Arts Council was nonetheless different from such institutions as the British Film Institute and the BBC. Where these pre-war institutions were Government answers to growing

industries, the Arts Council as the first post-war Council was to promote the arts as part of the welfare state.

The Arts Council came into existence after the Second World War as a substitute for the Council to Encouragement of Music and the Arts, i.e. CEMA. Its roots and traditions are therefore the policies of CEMA.

CEMA promoted the arts during the Second World War, while ENSA (Entertainments National Service Association), established during the First World War, provided Entertainment through dance bands, singing and variety. This split is part of the fragmentation within British cultural policy. The Arts Council with its roots in CEMA were to support the high arts as opposed to entertainment, which ENSA took care of.

The Arts Council, dealing with the products which are traditionally thought of as high culture and the first council set up without industry ties, is the most influential policy-maker:

The greatest source of the Arts Council's power lies in its official capacity to conceptualise and to identify the arts and the artistic. The arts as disciplined forms of enquiry and expression through which feelings and ideas about experience can be organised and communicated. (...) More generally, it has served to legitimise and encourage some kinds of creativity and to ignore others. Its silences have been as significant as its decisions and proclamations.<sup>161</sup>

The Arts Council was the last crystallisation of the fragmentation of the British system, emphasising the artistic content strand of the fragmentation, disregarding the leisure/educational tradition and free of the ties to industry.

In the conceptually fragmented support system Governmental attempts have been made before the Ministry of Heritage to show interest in the field. But it has not been possible to overcome the split.

In 1965 a position as Minister for Arts and Libraries was created, and the first one to hold this position was the dynamic Jennie Lee. The Minister for Arts and Libraries was a junior post under the Department for Education and Science. Jennie Lee did much for the arts, and she formed a policy in the white paper "A Policy for the Arts". One of the things she addresses here, is the need "for more systematic planning and a better co-ordination of resources."<sup>162</sup>



The Office for Arts and Libraries ran nothing itself, it hardly had any executive power, and since the Arts Council functions at the arm's length principle - that is the Government funds, but is not policy-maker - and museums under the responsibility of the office had their own trustees, even its supervisory functions were limited.

The Minister for Arts and Libraries chances of actually implementing an arts policy were minimal. This was furthered by the fact, that the post was not a minister for culture, and therefore cultural policies stayed fragmented. Hugh Jenkins, Minister for Arts and Libraries in the 1964 Labour Government, noted with some frustration how he - though given the responsibility lacked the authority to do anything:

To do him justice, Harold Wilson was conscious of this muddle and his first attempt to do something about it was to give me what he described as a 'general co-ordination role in relation to artistic and cultural matters' and an 'effective interest both in the work of the film industry and in ancient monuments and historic buildings'. Unfortunately, neither at this nor at any other time did he consult me on the matter and I was given neither the means nor the authority to make my co-ordination and interest effective in any real sense of the word.<sup>163</sup>

Whether a country chooses to set up a Ministry of Culture or chooses a fragmented system such as the British one tends to be a reflection of how the country in general has organised its political infrastructure. M.C. Cummings in his essay *Government and the Arts in the Modern World* explains that the organisational structure of arts funding tends to mirror the way other areas of governmental concern is structured.<sup>164</sup> That is, if the values of a government, like the British, is primarily liberal, it will seek to interfere as little as possible. To set up a centralised Ministry of Culture, would signal interference in what would be thought of as a private concern.

In Britain there has been a strong tradition for leaving much of the social work to private citizens and charity organisations. That is for the citizens of the country to voluntarily do right by others, rather than for "the others" to have rights. The Arts Council's annual report from 1952-53 mirrors this conviction:

A Ministry of Fine Arts would impose a chain of command from top to bottom; the method in this country, on the other hand, is to recognise a chain of responsibility all along the line, from Parliament to the Little Nessing Music Club.<sup>165</sup>

The British system of Councils as policy-makers are fashioned on the charity boards. Hugh Willat uses in his essay *How the Arts are Promoted*<sup>166</sup>, as an example the repertory theatres of the 1920s and 30s. Though perhaps not of the best quality, these companies were struggling, and "the proclaimed social purpose and absence of show business quality"<sup>167</sup> would serve a social purpose of educating and elevating. This brought out the "do-gooders" and the arts and culture slowly became worthy of philanthropic efforts. The way these charities were set up is reflected in the state funding system.

Nicholas Pearson takes this one step further. He uses Raymond Williams' description of the mood of bewildered benevolence and the consensus of goodwill which characterised the atmosphere of the Arts Council during Williams' time there. This, Pearson says, also characterised the nineteenth century philanthropist traditions. As Pearson points out councils - quangos - such as the Arts Council "is part of a tradition of *private* individual 'public' generosity."<sup>168</sup>

In the liberal tradition of Britain a second point made by M.C. Cummings ties in. He states that a general fear of state involvement in arts and communications has led to the setting up of the Arts Council model so as to "insulate their programs as much as possible from normal political and administrative process."<sup>169</sup>

The split between policy-maker and the funding power, i.e. the government, is a basic principle within British cultural policies. The Arts Council of Great Britain works on the arm's length principle. That is, the government allocates funds to the arts but does not issue guidelines or interfere with how these funds are used. During the Second World War, the allies had seen in Hitler's Germany, how arts and culture could be used for propaganda<sup>170</sup>. Therefore the arm's length principle which distances policy and decision-making from the Government and its possible misuse of power, was important. But it does also mean that Government has chosen not to develop a coherent policy for the field of culture.

British tradition for cultural policies, then, is decentralised to the extreme as a result of the liberal traditions government is based on. Since the liberal welfare tradition will regulate for industry, there has been legislation in this area related to culture. The actual arts policies are made and implemented by councils. The system

is based on the voluntary and philanthropic ideas of the charity organisations - another strong British tradition. It is done to distance political power in the country from policy-making in a hyper sensitive area, but it does also mean that no coherent policy can be formed. In addition to the areas of legislation for industry and decentralised policy-making for the artistic content, a third tradition fragments the system. This is the educating/leisure tradition which is squarely focused on the uses and users of leisure, but which conceptually does not connect with the supporters or providers of culture.

In Denmark there has never been the same fear of involvement from the government. Therefore in 1961, it was a ministry of culture which saw the light of day and not an arts council. Its area of responsibility is the arts, architecture, craft and design, sport, broadcast and film. The Danish Ministry of Culture and the Department of National Heritage share more or less the same field of responsibility. The Ministry of Culture in Denmark is the main legislative body for culture, but it too invests some of its powers in councils such as the Danish State Arts Foundation (Statens Kunstfond) which is to encourage what is called the creative arts, that is visual arts, literature and music. It is therefore the foundation in Denmark which is closest to the Arts Council. Another foundation is the Cultural Foundation (Kultur Fonden) which is to encourage what is called folk culture through the collaboration of amateur and professional artists. Also local authorities carry a responsibility for the promotion of culture.

As the decision to fund the arts in Britain was part of a move towards the welfare state, so was the founding of the Ministry of Culture in Denmark. But the idea of direct support of culture or the arts by the state was not a new idea. "Kultusministeriet" - The Ministry of Cultus, which was responsible for church, culture and education had since the abolishment of the absolute monarchy in 1848, been responsible for several cultural institutions such as the Academy for Fine Arts and the Royal Theatre.

The first Minister of Cultus, D.G. Monrad had ambitions of making this ministry into what could be termed a pre-dated notion of a modern ministry of culture. He wanted to gather "all which is connected with the formation of the

national and on the whole connected with the spiritual interest of the state"<sup>171</sup> under the Ministry of Cultus. Kultus or Cultus is an older version of the word culture, denoting something which "can give us advantages, but which is not subjugated to our power and which rewards our efforts at its own pleasure"<sup>172</sup>. In this conceptualisation of Culture, the arts, faith and enlightenment could be incorporated, and Minister Monrad was therefore justified in wanting to gather everything of spiritual interest under his ministry. Though this ministry was substituted by the Ministry of Church and the Ministry of Education in 1916, it had linked the patronage of the arts of the absolute monarchy with that of patronage of the state. There was therefore a tradition of supporting national institutions of high culture as part of the national heritage even before the idea of supporting culture gained prominence.

But far more important than these admittedly vague roots of centralised state support, were other strong Danish traditions such as Grundtvigianism, the strength of the Social Democrats at the time of the formation of the Ministry of Culture and the Cultural Radicalist movement of the inter-war period.

These will explain the cultural policy the Ministry of Culture came to lead, and partly, but not entirely why Denmark had no fear of state involvement in a potential ministry of propaganda. This can be explained by looking at why the Danish ministry of culture was established and how this ties in with the Danish perception of country, state and the people.

In Danish national identity there is a strong idea of the common man as the foundation of the nation. The common man and woman are not common, they are the sensible, sober-minded backbone of the country. This common man started out as a peasant in Grundtvig's ideas of shedding light, of enlightening the people, so that the people understood its Danish-ness, its identity, and so that the people could make the best decisions for this nation in a democracy. This was not a job for philanthropic do-gooders, but a way to make the farmer/peasant reliable to himself and his community.

Grundtvig's thoughts led to the establishment of the so called "Højskoler" - High Schools, which were to enlighten the farmers through the spoken word and

discussions. There were - and are - no exams and no curriculum. Rather, in modern day language the keywords are the broadening of the mind and self-realisation.

Another movement inspired by Grundtvig's thoughts was "Andelsbevægelsen" which translates into something like the part-owning-movement. It was - and is - a co-op movement where the farmers bought and owned primarily dairies. Today the idea is much used in housing associations, where the inhabitants are the association. They do not own their own flats but part of the whole block of flats. The committee of these housing associations is elected from and by the inhabitants.

This digression was to show the practical results of Grundtvig's thoughts and that the impact of these on the Denmark of today have excluded the British tradition of hierarchical philanthropy as embodied in the leisure/education tradition in Britain and its strong class system.

Therefore the idea of giving to the common man the privileges of a higher class could not enter a conceptual context in Denmark. To enable people to enjoy the best, yes, to enable the people to make the best decisions, yes. But to give the people the privileges of another class, no. The people is the class, as the people is the country, and the individual takes on the responsibility for the welfare of not only him- or herself, but its fellow individuals - the people and the country.

The Danish union of nation, state and people is rooted in the loss of Schleswig-Holstein and nationalism. It is rooted in an agricultural society in which the political and ideological power was also based, but when the Ministry of Culture was founded, it was in a Social Democratic Government and with a Social Democratic minister, Julius Bomholdt, as the driving force.

The main industrialisation of Denmark took place in the inter-war period, but until the late 1950s, early 1960s the country was geared towards the production of agricultural products. Nevertheless, the union between nation, state and people was never split. In an interesting chapter on Political Culture in Denmark, Henning Silberbrandt explains the development of the Danish Social Democratic Party. The party has been extremely influential in Denmark since the 1920s, but in particular from 1933 and until the late 1970s. According to Henning Silberbrandt the Danish Social Democratic Party, almost subconsciously, integrated the prevalent peasant

ideology. It became a party for the good of the nation, rather than a party for the good of the workers. Of Danish Social Democratic voters Henning Silberbrandt says:

What joins them (...) is an ideological community which somehow tells them that they are some sort of workers or their parents were, *at the same time as they, compared to the traditional working classes in England, France and Germany think and act like farmers*. The ideological integration of the working class in a farming culture is something specifically Danish (...).<sup>173</sup>

The Social Democrats, and especially Julius Bomholdt, had during the 1930s spoken up for "arbejderkultur", the worker's culture. Through the 40s and 50s this became the people's culture. Therefore, when the Ministry of Culture was formed, the Social Democrats had already put culture on the agenda. From its ideology it brought its emphasis on the right to a meaningful leisure time and thereby put an emphasis on equal access to all cultural goods. It also brought the idea that all groups, including artists, had the right to organise and influence their circumstances.

The Grundtvigian tradition and Danish Social Democratic ideology do to a certain extent complement and fuse with each other. In connection with this it is interesting to note that Julius Bomholdt was not only a Social Democrat politician, he also came from the Danish Folk High School movement.

From Grundtvigianism the Ministry of Culture took the idea of cultural freedom both for the individual and for the organisations and foundations working within the field. It also took the idea of self-administration which had worked so well in "andelsbevægelsen" (The Co-op movement) and it incorporated the Danish enlightenment tradition.

The enlightenment tradition in Denmark is based on the idea that the people are capable of making the right decisions if they are given the facts. Rather than informing from the top down, the tradition demands that the people and experts or politicians enter into a dialogue about the facts.

The last strand in what Peter Duelund has called "The Historical Compromise"<sup>174</sup> which led to the formation of the Ministry of Culture in Denmark is Cultural Radicalism.

Cultural Radicalism was in the inter-war years a movement on the left. It was strongly opposed to fascism and believed in a democratic cultural programme as opposition to fascism. Though a "programme" was the opposite of what it stood for, rather it stood for a democratic cultural consciousness. It was a humanistic movement on the left incorporating both socialistic ideas of industry and solidarity, and psychoanalytic ideas of the individual irrationality and the subconscious. According to Jens Fjord Jensen it had two basic themes:

First a view of man as a social being, as part of a social whole of interlinked hierarchies: the family, the class and society. Secondly a view of man as an individual with the rights of the individual to, without consideration to the social whole, unfold according to his own conditions and needs.<sup>175</sup>

To the Cultural Radicalists "art should first and foremost be art, and that it because of its artistic effects in particular had an awakening and stimulating function which reaches further than the aesthetic field".<sup>176</sup> But because the movement was socially engaged, what it produced was always social both in content and form. It was never introverted or cut off from its surroundings.

Cultural Radicalism, therefore believed in the autonomy of art, and that art at its best was a critical force within society. It did not believe in subscribing particular forms of expression, rather it believed in artistic freedom of expression, in art seeking to be the best it could be, because it in this way would fulfill its inherent value of being a critical and reflective force in society.

It was this that the new Ministry of Culture took from Cultural Radicalism, the belief in quality, in the freedom of artistic expression and the critical and reflective forces of art.

At the same time Cultural Radicalism was, as Ernst Bjarke Jensen explains<sup>177</sup>, dualistic. Literature, which Bjarke Jensen uses as his example, should be for instance socially or culturally involved. This he likens to the Cultural Radicalist attitude with regards to solidarity within the community/society. Cultural involvement/solidarity engages in a dialectic with the other demand of artistic freedom which Bjarke Jensen likens to the cultural radicalist attitude with regards to freedom of the individual and protests against every form of dictatorship.

The people within the movement were fiercely individualistic, but socially engaged. One of its best known figures was the architect and artist Poul Henningsen. P.H. produced, among other things, the remarkable *DanmarksFilmen* (The Denmark Film) in the 1930s. The film was commissioned to show Denmark abroad. But instead of producing a sugar sweet picture of a Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale land, it showed industry and country; it showed people at work and at leisure, and it was set to a soundtrack of syncopated jazz. It caused an uproar, but the only way this film has dated is in the way Danish society has moved on from the Denmark of the 1930s.

The movement was individualistic and Danish cultural policy has incorporated the individualism, quality and artistic freedom of the movement. But the Cultural Radicalists shared certain keywords with the Social Democrats and Grundtvigianism. There is social solidarity as in Social Democratic ideology. There is dialectic and protest against dictatorship as in the Grundtvigian inspired enlightenment tradition. But where Danish Social Democratic tradition and Grundtvigianism are rooted in the rights of the people, Cultural Radicalism took its starting point in the powers of arts and culture.

When the Danish Ministry of Culture was formed in 1961, it had a philosophy on which to base its policies. This philosophy incorporated equal access to cultural goods, a right to a meaningful leisure time, a tradition of dialectic enlightenment, acknowledgement of the artists' rights, cultural organisations' rights to self-administration, artistic freedom of expression and artistic quality. It was also part of the Danish Social Democratic, solidarity welfare state, and the emphasis was therefore on the concept of the people rather than individual expression.

The Ministry had a field of responsibility which meant that it could form a policy for the whole area of culture rather than for instance only the fine arts. It had as a ministry legislative power and could therefore secure the status of culture within the Government. It had a philosophy which allowed it to work for products, the user and the creator.



One way of exploring how the liberal British tradition and the Grundtvigian/- Social Democratic Danish tradition created different structural circumstances for cultural work, is to look at the arm's length principle which both countries employ. In England the councils work through the arm's length principle. So does the BBC so far as it works under a charter with a board of trustees, though its revenue is provided by a licence fee. In Denmark the national channel Danmarks Radio has its own policies as well, and the various foundations such as The Arts Foundation and Statens Teaterråd ( Theatre Council of the State) and Statens Musikråd (Music Council of the State) work through the arm's length principle but within the legislative framework provided by the Ministry of Culture.

In England the Arts Council works on the arm's length principle. It is structured into different departments of which music, visual arts and drama were established at its foundation. In the 1950s the Poetry Panel was added. It was renamed the Literature Department in the 1960s and together with the original departments of music, visual arts and drama these four departments have provided the continuity in the policies of the Arts Council. Other departments and committees such as The Young People's Theatre Group, the Community Artist Committee and the present Broadcast and Media Committee have been established and abolished.

The Council has at its top an executive committee with a chairman under which a secretary general and the departments work. The departments are advised by advisory panels of individuals with knowledge of the specific area.

The executive committee sits for five years, but the members are not replaced at the same time. The chairman and the committee were appointed by the Minister of Arts and Libraries, and now by The Department of National Heritage.

The Arts Council works on the basis of the arm's length principle, because of the belief that the "piper should not call the tune" when it comes to art. This is very admirable and a sound principle when dealing with the arts which ideally work as both reflection and opposition to society. - Not to mention the art which does not make sense to the present and often offends it. An example of this is the Impressionists who today are a part of popular culture.

The question is whether this principle works in practice. The people appointed to positions in the Arts Council are appointed by Government. But Richard Hoggart, who was the Arts Council's vice-chairman, would customarily have had his term extended when the end of his term came in 1981, but this did not happen because "Number 10 doesn't like him".<sup>178</sup> The idea of creating diversity through a continuous change of members is somewhat lost when members have their terms extended. Also, the arm's length principle is compromised by the fact that government appoints according to personal likes and dislikes.

Lord Goodman, chairman of the Arts Council during what has been called its golden age, was appointed by the first minister for Arts and Libraries, Jennie Lee. That this was the Arts Council's golden age was to a large degree because of the shared aims of these two. When Lord Eccles became Minister of Arts and Libraries, Lord Goodman found that "his approach to matters was totally different to mine"<sup>179</sup>, and later in his autobiography Lord Goodman remarks on the relationship between minister and Arts Council:

We [Lord Goodman and Jennie Lee] therefore deceived ourselves that an arrangement empirically excellent was theoretically so. It required a situation where two principal figures did not operate in sympathy, had divergent notions and divergent objectives, to demonstrate the difficulties of an Arts Council of present-day character operating under the canopy of a ministry.<sup>180</sup>

The arm's length principle, then, does not work as well in practice as in theory. What is more, the shortening of the arm is not done in public view, rather it is done through politics of the individual. F.F. Ridley says:

The secrecy which surrounds such informal contacts is typically British. Private discussions take the place of defined powers, formal procedures, and recorded decisions. This has something to do with the limited role of law in the structure of British administration. There is little belief that the relations between government and other bodies are improved by formalizing their interaction or that organizations work better if their internal procedures are regulated. This makes it hard to trace the influence of Ministers, civil servants, council members, staff and other notables in the arts world.<sup>181</sup>

In Denmark, the Arts Foundation works on the arm's length principle as well. But the principle is a slightly different version to the British.

The Arts Foundation is to encourage Danish creative art within the visual arts, music, literature, design, craft, film and theatre. There are seven committees consisting of three members sitting for three years. The chairmen of each committee sit on the executive committee.

The executive committee is to develop the overall policy within the legislative framework and guidelines set down by the Ministry of Culture, but does not interfere with the work of the committees as long as it is within the overall policy.

The committees cannot be re-elected after the three years and this ensures diversity in the work of the foundation. But it also disrupts continuity since they are all appointed at the same time.

What is exceptional about the Danish model is the Representative Committee which appoints two out of three members of the council.

The Representative Committee is an example of the tradition of self-administration and respect for the rights of the artists incorporated in the founding philosophy of the Ministry of Culture. Its members are representatives from artist's organisations such as the Author Association and other organisations such as the Library Association. Also local authorities, the University of Copenhagen and the Minister for Culture sit on the committee. It secures the work of the Foundation from the influence of political decisions and individual preferences. It also gives members of the cultural community the possibility of influencing their circumstances through their organisations.

The work of the Arts Foundation has recently been evaluated<sup>12</sup>. It was found that the work done during the thirty years in which the foundation has existed as measured against legislation, policies and impact has been unequivocally positive.

Nevertheless, the survey points out that the structure does pose a few minor administrative problems. One is the aforementioned problem of discontinuity caused by replacement of all members every third year. The other is a problem with the Representative Committee whose main function is to shield the work of the foundation from the politics and personal likes and dislikes that shortens the British arm's

length distance. The Committee is so large that it is not possible to keep a focused debate on the aims, goals and interests which the Committee represents for its organisations.

The two different versions of the arm's length principle have exemplified how the informal contacts favoured by the British system have led to a shortening of the arm, whereas the Danish system with "defined powers, formal procedures and recorded decisions"<sup>18</sup> as embodied in the Ministry of Culture's legislative and policy-making powers have led to a clearly defined arm's length. This is encouraged in the founding philosophy where the rights of organisations and artists working within the field are recognised and expressed in the appropriate legislation.

Before moving on, a note of caution. Though the Danish system is a more steady, all-rounded system than the British, the dangers expressed by the British system are valid in the Danish system as well.

The British system is telling us that culture is a powerful tool that should not fall into the hands of politics. This is a valid critique of the Danish system, with its Minister of Culture of a certain political conviction who can influence legislation implemented within the area.

Danish councils work within a legislative framework which safeguards them and creates continuity in policies. But this is a double edged sword which can also lead to propaganda for politics rather than cultural policies no matter what the perceived relationship between state and people is.

What saves the Danish system is the founding philosophy based in such strong traditions as Grundtvigianism, that a move too far away from these traditions would cause an uproar and split the reigning consensus about cultural policies.

Likewise, the British traditions defeat the system's caution about mixing politics and culture by insisting on the informal system of appointments used. - And on the other side of the double edged sword, by not legislatively securing the framework for cultural workers to work within.

The British system is as mentioned fragmented into the traditions of legislation for industry, councils for artistic production and leisure/education whereas the Danish system is all-rounded and consensual. Fragmentation or all-roundedness;

splits or consensus have influenced the uses of definitions of culture within the policies, and the various definitions have influenced the actual policies within the two systems just as much as its formal and informal structures.

For Denmark, Peter Duelund particularly has charted and analysed the Danish Cultural funding system under the Ministry of Culture<sup>14</sup>. Apart from his work and other monographs on the system, several easily accessible government reports testify to the development of Danish cultural policies. In Britain on the other hand no encompassing account of the whole funding system has ever been undertaken.<sup>15</sup> In discussing how the concept of culture and the two funding systems have influenced the actual implementation of policies I shall therefore concentrate on the Arts Council for Britain.

Though the Council had roots in CEMA, it came to emphasise the support of high culture. This was due to its founding father, the economist John Maynard Keynes who formed the post-war Council according to his ideas of artists and artistic endeavour.

Keynes' personal philosophy was that the artist was of great importance in society, and that artistic standards were what mattered. The Council's first charter was passed in 1946 and with a few amendments re-established in 1967, in which the objectives are:

- 1) To develop and improve the knowledge, understanding and practice of the arts.
- 2) To increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout Great Britain.
- 3) To advise and co-operate with Departments of Government, local authorities and other bodies on any matters concerned, whether directly or indirectly, with the foregoing objects.

Keynes, who belonged to the Bloomsbury Circle, put a strong emphasis on the professional arts, and on excellence in artistic endeavour. This is part of the Arts Council's charter, but so is dissemination - access to the arts - and knowledge and understanding.

The way the Arts Council chose to prioritise within its charter was by supporting the established arts and the fine arts, in particular the performing and visual arts and in particular institutions rather than individual artists. Most of the Arts Council's

budget has gone to The Royal Opera, Saddlers Wells and the four London Orchestras. The support given to arts have mainly been centred around London, while the support of regional art has been left to local authorities. The Arts Council then, has concentrated its support on the established and on London.

One reason often given for this by the Arts Council is the "few but roses" argument. Since funding was not adequate enough to support everything, then rather cultivate a few roses. In the same vein the expression "raise or spread" was discussed. In spite of debates on the priority of quality or dissemination during the 50's and 60's the Arts Council stayed true to its founding father's policy of raising artistic quality rather than dissemination of the arts.

In Denmark the newly established Ministry of Culture implemented various forms of legislation during the 60s. In 1969 *En Kulturpolitisk Redegørelse* (A Cultural Policy Account) was published<sup>16</sup>. It deals with the work of the Ministry so far, as well as looking ahead to the future. It is divided into 5 sections: The Ministry, Education (encompassing both librarianship, architecture and acting), Artistic Production (such a artist's rights, literature and music) and "Kulturformidling" which I for the time being will translate as dissemination (including Libraries, Museums, Cinemas and Radio and Television) and A View to the Future.

The Report deals with education, artistic production and dissemination and so did the legislation the Ministry had implemented during the first eight years of its existence. In the report the legislation implemented during this period is listed. There are eight acts on this list and a further four acts have been revised. The list includes support to creative arts (The Arts Foundation, 1964), Art Museums in the Provinces (1964), Film and Cinema (1964), Zealand's Symphony Orchestras and the Royal School of Librarianship (1966). Therefore the legislation supports the creative artist and the performing arts - the Arts Foundation and the symphony orchestras. There is support for dissemination institutions in Art Museums in the Provinces legislation and in the Film and Cinema legislation. Through the legislation on The Royal School of Librarianship, the cultural "disseminator" - the cultural worker - is prioritised.

The first report mirrors the way Danish cultural policies have been designed. It has weighed "raise" against "spread", but never forgotten one completely. Never-

theless, the cultural concept on which the Ministry implicitly had based its policies had created problems.

In 1964 the Arts Foundation had been expanded. What was new was partly that the Foundation now worked independently of Government and that it could support young artists partly through work-stipends (arbejdsstipendiat) and through production awards (produktionspræmier) "in connection with the publication of works of art, where the financial returns are not in reasonable proportion to the artistic effort".<sup>187</sup>

When the stipends and awards were announced it caused an uproar among the population. These grants-in-aid were mainly given to young modernist authors whose writings often seemed incomprehensible to the average reader.

The public protest has been called "Rindalisme" after Warehouse Keeper P. Rindal from Kolding. He had collected 305 signatures in protest among his colleagues and sent them to the Danish Parliament. These were followed by several other letters of protest from workers in various industries all over Denmark.

It led to a major and long debate in the press which has been analysed by Anne Marie Kastrup and Ivar Lærkesen in *Rindalismen*. They conclude:

The material tells us about confrontations between under-educated and well-educated, between people with laborious, monotonous work and people with self-elected, status-giving and somewhat flexible work, between province and capital, between country and city, between folk culture and incomprehensible - irrelevant - high culture.<sup>188</sup>

In this context high culture is the keyword. In the debate that followed the concept of culture the Ministry of Culture implicitly had based its policies on came under debate. The ministry had implicitly assumed that the fine arts were what should be supported and disseminated to the people. The cultural gap could be bridged through dissemination. The changing values and the Rindal debate is mirrored in *En Kulturpolitisk Redegørelse*:

The popular protest movement which arose when the Arts Foundation Act was to be implemented, showed on the one hand the positive, that groups of the population, which in earlier times had not had the energy to interest itself in how state funds were being used in support of arts and culture, now regarded this as a matter which concerned them. On the other hand the protest revealed the negative phenomenon which has been called the cultural gap, but which if anything was - and is - a flaw in the communication. It revealed that far too little had been done in the field of "kulturformidling" (dissemination), that there was a huge need for information and for a far closer contact between artists and their audience.<sup>189</sup>

During the 1970s Danish cultural policies changed to emphasise "Formidling" (dissemination) and to work on the basis of cultural democracy rather than democratising culture. It is tempting to see this as a result of the Rindal debate, but the move from democratisation of culture to cultural democracy is an international move.

This chapter will end with a discussion of the changing concepts of culture and how this has influenced policies, but also how the incorporation of differing concepts has been influenced by different traditions. Therefore, before entering in to that discussion, I will discuss the Danish "kulturformidling" tradition, the importance of it, its implications and the implications of not having one.

The tradition of dissemination is evident in *En Kulturpolisk Redegørelse* in which the chapters are divided according to artistic production and "formidling" (dissemination) rather than according to art form. - A structure which every account of Danish cultural policies has followed up until the latest by Peter Duelund from 1995.

"Formidling" is a very Danish tradition. What makes it interesting in this connection is how it has formed Danish cultural policies, and how British traditions are different because it does not have this tradition.

"Formidling" means dissemination, diffusion, accessibility, conveying, communicating and promoting; and it means all of those at once. In order to explain how the concept means more than making available and more than promoting, I shall borrow some terms from information theory.

Information theory operates with the concepts of a sender, a medium and a receiver. What the sender sends is data, which if it is what the receiver is looking for, and it is not interrupted by noise, the receiver will receive as information. That



is, the data is relevant and conveyed in a way which is useful for the receiver, and it can therefore become information.

The book *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg can never be enriching to an English reader if it is not translated into English. The medium - the book - can only contain senseless data which might as well have been written in binary codes for computers since the English reader will not be able to decipher either. The same book, in Danish, given to a Danish reader can become information on Danish/Greenlandic relations or alienation. The novel contains the same data whether given to a Danish reader or an English reader, but only the Danish reader will be able to make use of it, turn it into information. But also, if the Danish reader was looking for a book depicting, say, Canadian eskimos in the seventeenth century, *Miss Smilla's Feeling For Snow* will stay data because the reader would not be able to relate the experiences of the twentieth century Greenlandic woman living in Denmark to his or her interest in the lives and culture of seventeenth century Canadian eskimos.

"Formidling" therefore contains pedagogic elements, but it is not education. Within the Social Democrat/Grundtvigian tradition it encompasses the Social Democratic belief that everyone has a right to a fulfilling leisure time and the Grundtvigian belief in taking the starting point in the every day lives of people, in enlightenment through knowledge and self-reflection. "Formidling" straddles the spheres of education and leisure and puts the emphasis on enlightenment.

At the same time the tradition respects the Cultural Radicalists insistence on art at its best is the best reflection and critique of society. The tradition - ideally - becomes a search for the best way of making the best available for the right person. It is not a tradition which believes in giving to people what people want. Rather, it wants to give what is right for the person, but in a Grundtvigian tradition it is done with respect for the individual, not in a top-down fashion.

In Cultural policies in Denmark theatres, libraries, museums, cultural houses and concert halls are viewed within this tradition. But so is to a certain extent support to amateur arts and local culture, because it too emphasises enlightenment and reflection, though through the process rather than through the medium. These

institutions and their purposes continuously engage in a discourse of what, how and to whom; mixed with considerations of artistic excellence and the artistic climate they create.

In England this tradition does not exist within arts policies. Theatres, galleries, museums and concert halls are "buildings" or "housing for the arts". In 1995 Lord Gowrie, chairman of the Arts Council of England can write about the lottery money made available to the Arts Council for buildings:

In an age of increasingly sophisticated, electronically packaged home entertainment, the living arts need attractive and affordable venues, with good facilities for all, if attendances and revenues and ancillary spending are to make their contribution to current costs.<sup>190</sup>

At one level the arts become entertainment and at the other level the theatre-goers become supporters of the arts, but the arts do not become an enlightening force. In its various guises this has been the stance the Arts Council has taken through its debates on "few but roses" during the 1950s, "raise and spread" in the 1960s, community arts in the 1970s and devolution during the 1980s and 1990s. The Council has led an arts policy where it has focused on supporting the arts, primarily through institutions and the performing arts, but nevertheless the arts rather than the receiver. It has always seen the receiver as secondary, at the most a supporter of the arts. In the annual report of 1961/62, Lord Kottlesloe, chairman of the Council wrote:

In the long debate between Raise and Spread the decision has been adopted to put standards first. Widespread diffusion is liable to produce the dry-rot mediocrity. High values in the arts can only be maintained on a restricted scale. (...) The decisive factor in the situation, however, is that both sound radio and television are the 'natural' agents of diffusion and that both of them, whatever their deficiencies, are in fact bringing music and drama of high quality to communities and individuals who seldom enjoyed them before. For all these reasons, then, the Arts Council puts less emphasis on diffusion than CEMA did.<sup>191</sup>

It is interesting to see how the Arts Council allows itself to rely on the BBC for dissemination, and one can't help wondering what happened to the experience of seeing a play in the theatre; of viewing a painting, taking the time needed, paying

attention to the aspects found interesting rather than being dictated by the time allotted by television and by the gaze of the camera.

Nevertheless it is interesting because the British Broadcast Corporation is a public broadcast service. Arts Council policies are based in Keynesian philosophies where arts and artists have been elevated in an almost Platonian way. The artist becomes the elite. Where Plato in the *Republic* elevates the philosopher to the highest place from which he can rule society unencumbered by menial work and everyday tasks of sustaining life, so that he through his wisdom can rule the same people who is sustaining his life; so has the Arts Council conceptually taken arts and artists out of the context of every day life and put them on a pedestal precisely because art has the ability to analyse and reflect on the very same society.

The BBC as a Public Service Broadcast institution has not been able to do this. It is financed directly by the viewers and listeners through the licence fee. It has therefore as a starting point that of bringing a service to the people who have chosen to licence its equipment, that is, it is from the outset defined at the horizontal level rather than at the hierarchical top-down level of the roots of the leisure/educating tradition.

Nevertheless the BBC has as its purpose to educate, inform and entertain the public. This policy was formed by its first general-secretary John Reith and has been incorporated in its charter.

Reith developed the Public Service Broadcast concept which many other countries - among them Denmark - have adopted for their national broadcast services. He began with a conception of the public or publics without which he could not visualise a broadcast service. "The publics are treated with respect not as nameless aggregates with statistically measurable preferences, "targets" for a programme sponsor but as living audiences capable of growth and development."<sup>192</sup> In this Reith, though respecting the audience, did not allow them to choose the programmes by majority. Rather, the BBC was to provide the best of and for education and information, but with respect for the public.

Through the years this balancing between the audience vote by majority through viewer figures and fulfilling the purpose of public broadcast service has been debated

and experimented with. From Reith's high culture concept through Hayes' division into the home, light and third programmes and later the conception of the public as many distinguished but overlapping publics to today's discussions on satellite and narrowcasting the public broadcast service concept has discoursed on content and receiver<sup>99</sup>. - Just as the Danish "formidler" tradition has.

The public broadcast service concept is close to the Danish "formidler" tradition. But in the fragmented cultural policy of Britain this is the only place it is to be found. I therefore suggest that the Danish "formidler" tradition as a concept in English is best translated as Public Service Dissemination, denoting respect for the users of culture in a flat structure (rather than a top-down structure) as conceptualised in Reith's publics; also denoting respect for artistic excellence and diversity; and with these two poles entering a discourse in order to provide the right artistic excellence for the right cultural user, but not by giving the user what the majority demands.

I also suggest that for a cultural policy to be successful it is necessary to incorporate Public Service Dissemination. It should be impossible to dismiss the spread in "raise and spread". Cultural policies, following the public-good argument, are often instigated to render the public capable of self-reflection, of understanding society and the place of the individual in society. Cultural policies are therefore rendered obsolete if Public Service Dissemination is not incorporated in the policies.

Nevertheless, this raises another issue, namely that of artistic excellence versus Public Service Dissemination which I will preface with the development of Danish cultural policies during the seventies until the mid-eighties.

Most work done through that time was to decentralise with the focus on the user. The so-called "carrot-principle" was introduced through which the state topped the money invested by local authorities in culture by the same amount. Amateur arts and/or folk culture received attention. This led among other things to the foundation of the Culture Foundation which supports the cooperation between professional artists and amateur artists.

The focus became the uses of culture and the local environment as the breeding ground for folk culture. Folk culture is not an idealised past brought up. According

to Dorte Scot-Hansen in her 1984 study of folk culture and cultural policies, it is local, communal, non-professional, creative in the sense of both relating to past traditions and the present and in this way also related to the every day lives of people.<sup>194</sup>

The closest in Britain at the time to the local or folk culture of the Danish cultural policies is the community arts movement. It too emphasised the local community and arts in the local community. Like the Danish Cultural Foundation it put professional artists out into the local community.

The Arts Council reluctantly put community arts on the agenda in 1974 and continued this support until the Regional Arts Associations took it over in 1981. But it did not do so because community arts provided a valuable stimulating force for local communities. Rather it did it because:

It must be a basic principle of community arts work (as of adult education) that in approaching people you must start where people are. (...) The second basic principle, however, is that growth and development are the essential signs of truly creative life, and at the end of the process many, though doubtless not all, of the people involved in participating in community arts should be capable of proceeding to enjoy a greater share of the common cultural heritage.<sup>195</sup>

Community arts was seen by the Arts Council as a helper in educating and elevating people to a level where they were able to appreciate the fine arts. For community arts to be accepted as a force in itself it is necessary to turn to the local authorities and to the most controversial council of the Greater London Council (GLC) whose Community Arts Committee valued the process of community arts. On the whole, though, according to Ken Worpole, the cultural work done by GLC was exceptional and controversial because it prioritised social groups in need of funding rather than following in the traditions of arts policies by starting from the financial needs of the art forms.<sup>196</sup>

This leads me back to the issues of artistic excellence and Public Service Dissemination. In her survey of cultural policies in Denmark from 1945-1985, Marit Bakke concludes that:

The (...) conclusion is that the largest part of state support has been given to the Public Service Dissemination institutions at the expense of creative activity.<sup>197</sup>

It seems there is a contradiction between nurturing artistic excellence and Public Service Dissemination. That is, a contradiction between nurturing an artistic climate consisting of artists and time, space and finances to sustain artists and artistic production for its own sake rather than for the good of the population as incorporated in Public Service Dissemination. Again, on one side there is artistic excellence, on the other the uses of arts and culture by the population. It is a question of an arts policy or a cultural policy.

The Arts Council has solved this by leading an arts policy in which the audience for the arts constantly has been allotted second place to the arts. It has nurtured and housed the arts, and been able to do this because it is an arts council, not a cultural council. There is a difference between arts policies and cultural policies.

In *Arts and Cultures*, Andrew Sinclair sees the Arts Council involvement with devolution to local authorities, with (half hearted) interest in community arts and minority group arts as social welfare rather than arts policy.<sup>198</sup>

Peter Duelund states in *Kunstens Vilkår* that cultural initiatives increasingly are instigated because of social policies<sup>199</sup> and in his report on cultural policies based on 17 special reports he concludes that cultural competence, that is the ability to use and partake in culture, is to be encouraged outside of cultural policies such as in social- and work policies.<sup>200</sup>

It seems then that where an arts policy can focus on the artists and arts, a cultural policy is nearing a social welfare policy.

Both arts and social welfare throw up aspects that are important to keep in mind. There cannot be art to disseminate unless there is an artistic community to produce it. Also an artistic community is in constant dialogue not only with society, but also with past and present artistic traditions, as they themselves will be part of the future artistic dialogue.

The arts have traditionally sought patronage because they could not survive within the market economy. This holds true today. It is therefore important to support the artistic community and climate.

As for cultural policies as social welfare, this becomes dangerous if it is used as substitute for social innovation. If culture and arts become pacifiers for social unease and displacement caused by unemployment and alienation in modern society, then the purposes of cultural policies have been defeated.

Once again if the public-good argument is accepted, then the arts work as a reflective and critical force within society, and enables the user to view and reflect on society and the person's own position within society. The same argument is used for folk culture and community arts where the emphasis is on the process which is thought to have the same abilities as the arts. This is the purpose of most cultural policies. It contains elements of social welfare in so far as it focuses on the welfare of the people.

From an arts policy point of view it can seem almost immoral to attribute to the arts a purpose other than the artistic. This is in line with the art for art's sake argument. But even this argument somehow defines art outside of itself in relation to a receiver. Instead of being a force within society, art, according to this argument, brings the aesthetic experience. It may not lead to anything but a beautiful elevated experience, a meeting with the incomprehensible, the religious experience. But this in itself is something, and it is the receiver that experiences this not the art work.

The only way not to define art in connection with its uses and abilities for the receiver, is to define it as a process for the artist. To paint or write for oneself and for no-one else, to turn the canvas towards the wall when finished or to place the great novel in a desk-drawer rather than with a publisher. But somehow, even here, the process of creating cannot help serving a purpose, namely that of the artist's contentment or personal development. And then that is just as much part of a social welfare policy as using art for the community.

Cultural policies will have to keep in mind that culture is both unifying and every day life, and that the cultural policies are to enable arts and culture to be a

force for the individual within society; not for society to use as a force against the individual. Both Denmark and Britain should keep this in mind.

But it must not be forgotten that without taking the user into consideration when supporting culture, the liberating forces of art and culture will be stunted. Britain should keep this in mind and look to for instance Denmark and the BBC in order to develop a Public Service Dissemination tradition.

Denmark on the other hand will have to keep an eye on the balance between creativity and dissemination. The artistic climate is in itself valuable through its communication with past and future traditions, but it is also valuable for providing something to disseminate.<sup>201</sup>

Before starting on this discussion of Public Service Dissemination and its place and implications for cultural policies, I noted that the uses of the concept of culture had influenced cultural policy practices.

As I noted, in Denmark, the turning from disseminating high culture to everyone was not only a result of the Rindal debate, but part of a move to using a new concept of culture. A development which is not purely Danish. It can be exemplified by the European Council, whose Council for Cultural Co-operation (CCC) has followed the same trends.

The Council for Cultural Co-operation is a policy-making, guiding body, without any political power. Its aims are to analyse cultural policies in its member countries, to support the creators, i.e. the artists and to target the addressee of the arts, i.e. the general public. Again, the last two groups are recognisable from both Danish and English debates on cultural policies. To support the arts and their creators and to disseminate this to a public.

Looking at the cultural policies of the CCC, it becomes clear that it works with at least two concepts of cultural policy. One is the idea of a democratisation of culture. This concept embodies a "need to guarantee to the greatest possible number an access to the heritage culture and the elite culture"<sup>202</sup> This is the model where culture is fine arts disseminated to the public. This concept is recognisable from The Arts Council's "Few but roses" and its elitism. It is also to be found in Jennie Lee's White Paper, when she says:



There is no easy way of bringing [the appreciation of art] about, the more so as too many working people have been conditioned by their education and environment to consider the best in music, painting and sculpture and literature outside their reach.<sup>203</sup>

This is also the concept which Rindal and the Danish population protested against.

During the 1970s there was a shift in the cultural policies concept the CCC worked with. Instead of talking of democratisation of culture, it took up the concept of cultural democracy where "culture is about communication and quality of life in daily social relations, particularly at the level of these numerous cells, which in daily life can show signs of real social relationships, imagination, emotional life and *joie de vivre*"<sup>204</sup> This is the same idea which lies behind the community arts movement and the folk or local culture movement in Denmark. Also cultural democracy means that all forms of culture are of value, not only high culture.

Both Danish and English cultural policies, and European Council policies have at their roots the idea of being in opposition to mass-market culture, in opposition to the American cultural industry. Both Denmark, England and the CCC have the concept of democratisation of culture, that is high art disseminated to the masses. Both Denmark and the CCC have the concept of cultural democracy, embodying the anthropological concept of culture as a way of life and an emphasis on the process of cultural production within this. Britain has to a certain extent incorporated the concept by accepting other art forms such as photography and moving visual arts such as film and video art. But the Arts Council works primarily from a democratisation of culture concept, whereas cultural democracy has been devoluted to the Regional Arts Boards.

The two concepts have since the seventies been part of cultural policies, and the opposition to mass-culture has been an element alongside them. But in the CCC and in Danish cultural policies a fourth concept of culture has arisen from the cultural democracy concept and the opposition to mass culture. Jose Vidal Beneyto in his paper to the Arts Without Frontiers conference calls it popular culture, the equivalent to folklore.<sup>205</sup> In Denmark it is the folk culture and as a cultural policy it is used in

the Culture Foundation which funds local amateur projects in co-operation with professional artists.

In Britain this concept is as good as non-existent within cultural policies. Though the community arts movement has been taken up by the Arts Council, it never fully accepted the philosophy of the movement, and the folklore concept does not become a concept on its own. Rather, the emphasis on popular culture is to be found in an opposition to "the establishment" of cultural policies in the cultural studies movement.

This academic movement's founding texts are Raymond Williams' *Culture and Society* and Richard Hoggart's *Uses of Literacy*. It became influential with the Birmingham School, particularly under Stewart Hall's leadership. The school has its roots in the Leavis concept of literature as part of and a reflection on society, and as an improving force within culture.

In Hoggart's study of working class culture a regret of loss of this culture in the face of mass-culture, is expressed. In this sense it is a study within the cultural democracy concept and the folklore concept, including the opposition to mass-culture, and its emphasis on - not folk culture - but working class culture. Over time the cultural studies movement has moved away from the Leavisite concept of a (literary) culture to the anthropological concept of culture as a way of life. The school has gone on to study the lived culture and its cultural forms, among other things focusing on sub-cultures and youth cultures - an example of this is Dick Hebdige's *Subculture and Style*. But it has also gone on to analysing the uses of mass-culture, mainly within television, but also in fiction. For instance, women's use of soap operas has been analysed and so has women's reading of romance fiction<sup>206</sup>. In these studies there is no discussion of the quality of the cultural product, the emphasis is on the use of popular culture. This is in opposition to earlier times mass-media infusion theories; it is to take a non-value-laden look on the uses of cultural products and in this sense an opposition to the ideas of high culture's hierarchical structure of culture. But by rejecting the notion of quality, and by accepting products of mass-culture as part of popular culture, it - rightly or wrongly - excludes the notion of a genuine, living folklore.

But what cultural studies is, apart from aligning itself with the leisure/education tradition, is a healthy opposition to the policies, as embodied by the Arts Council, where culture equals art. Here the emphasis is on quality and excellence. Where excellence and uses enter a consensual discourse in the Danish Public Service Dissemination tradition, in Britain they oppose each other. The opposition, cultural studies focuses entirely on the processes of uses of popular culture, but does not discuss any artistic value or quality of the products. It is both healthy opposition to Arts Council policies, but also a deepening of the conceptual splits in the British cultural funding system.

Where British notions of culture have split in a cultural policy emphasising excellence and the product, and an opposition emphasising the uses of culture, Danish cultural policies have embodied all four concepts of culture. High culture, culture as a way of life, folklore and mass-culture enter a continuous (un)easy discourse.

In spite of the similarities in cultural policies in Denmark and England, caused by the similarities in the definition of culture used, Danish and British cultural patronage have differed. As cultural policies have been fragmented in England, so have the concepts of culture. In Denmark both cultural policies and concepts of culture have been incorporated in a consensus since the Rindal debate. Again, as with institutional structures, constituting the two support systems, there are historical reasons for the fragmentation or incorporation of the concepts of culture.

The concept of culture in Britain has roots to the Arnoldian idea of culture as "a pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world"<sup>207</sup> has had a strong influence. F.R. Leavis, influential in the development of English studies, and writing in the 1950s, kept this elitist thought in his idea of literature as a reflection and critique of society. And the Arts Council's founder John Maynard Keynes' shared these perceptions of art. Therefore, under Keynes' influence, the Arts Council has followed the Arnoldian tradition. This has been possible because the Arts Council has been able to lead an arts policy rather than having been part of

a consensual cultural policy. The fragmentation of the concepts of culture has emphasised the general split within cultural policies in England.

In Denmark also, culture has its roots in the narrow concept of culture, but at the same time other traditions have influenced it. British tradition as in the culture studies movement, focuses on the class-based society (not without reason, I hasten to add), whereas Denmark has focused on the common history of the Danish people early on. Though it has Hoggartian/Benjaminian connotations of looking for an ideal, lost past, it does make sense in the way it makes sense for the British to focus on the class-based society.

There are visible traces of past existence of "the Danes" in the Danish landscape as the word "Dane" is to be found far back in history. Burial mounds are scattered around the country, the Danevirke protected Danish country. The lurs were excavated and today they are found on Danish lurpack butter - not to mention that the Dannebrog is the world's oldest flag. In contrast, Britain and Britons are 18th century notions. Where Britain was England, Scotland and Wales with each their history, and where the past is peopled with groups such as the Saxons, Normans, Danes and Romans, Denmark could look back on a homogenous Danish society in a country where nation and state were the same. Though these signs of Danish-ness in no way stood for what Denmark or Danish-ness signify today, the mythology of the roots of the people came to play an important part after the loss of Norway in 1814 and the Schleswig-Holstein duchies in 1864. Grundtvig wrote his Nordic Mythology in 1808, but he was not the only one to focus on folk culture. For instance, a Just Mathias Thiele published in the years 1818-23 Danish sagas and folk beliefs.

In 1879 a major exhibition on art and industry focused on folk-culture. This exhibition led to the establishment of the Danish Folk Museum and Danish Folklore Collection, which studied, and study, Danish folklore. The people, the folk, has since then been the living spirit of Denmark.

Coinciding with this focus on folk culture the international trend of culture as high culture flourished. Torben A. Vestergaard in his essay on culture in Danish cultural research says about the exhibition:

The exhibition in 1879 was as phenomenon modern and confirmed in this way the developmental stage which entitled us to membership of the developed nations' community. The subject of the exhibition on the other hand, demonstrated the peculiarity which differentiated us from the others and made us a single nation among those we compared us to. This peculiarity was found in the continuous and the traditional which had taken root in our country - with the common people/peasants.<sup>208</sup>

Denmark has strong traditions of consensus. With "the historical compromise" which resulted in the formation of the Ministry of Culture, the oppositional movement of Cultural Radicalism had its founding values of artistic integrity and excellence incorporated. The emphasis on folk culture as exemplified here is inherent in the Social Democratic/Grundtvigian traditions. With or without the Rindal debate, new ways of viewing culture would have had to be incorporated and put to use if they had contained ideas of the people or folk. Therefore concepts of culture such as cultural democracy and folklore would have to be incorporated in the Danish consensus.

Britain, on the other hand with traditions and structures with roots in the Industrial Revolution and the Victorian era, with its class-based society and its inherent elitism, could easily dismiss these ideas when forming policies for the arts. In a society such as the British with a strong class-consciousness this has led to an opposition strongly emphasising what the Great and the Good have left out, namely that of the uses of the users. But it has also meant that art and the people have never formed part of an - even - idealistic consensus. The Arts Council has therefore, secure in its knowledge of being the establishment been able to continue its "few but roses" policies.

During the 80s cultural policies seem to have taken a new turn which does not seem to be influenced by a new concept of culture, but rather because of changing values in society. The setting up of the Ministry of Culture in Denmark and the Arts Council in Britain was part of a general move towards the welfare state. The new trends are in the same way a general shift in society rather than in concepts of culture. With the fall of affluence in the late 70s and early 80s Peter Duelund saw Danish cultural policies becoming:

Because of unemployment, social problems and disintegration-tendencies in the political democracy, public support to culture and art is increasingly motivated economically, socially and politically. During the 80s arts and culture were made goal-orientated and instrumentalised.

Cultural policies of the 90s have continued the trend from the 80s. The market-orientation and economic orientation have increased.<sup>209</sup>

The market-orientation and economic orientation influenced the cultural climate in Denmark. The library laws were changed so that the financial responsibility was lessened for both state and local authorities and the carrot principle was changed to a 70%-30% deal instead of a fifty-fifty deal. The state justified this by announcing the end of the establishing phase in Danish cultural policies. But it can also be seen as a reflection of the general right-turning of Danish politics. As a matter of fact, it is the Danish version of the enterprise culture.

During the eighties quite a few cultural houses were built by local authorities in Denmark. Cultural houses build in the seventies were called "borgerhuse" citizen houses, and in the more political climate of the 70s they were aimed at bringing the local community together and encouraging the citizens' culture. The cultural houses on the other hand, are imposing postmodern buildings in which the professional arts thrive.

In a postmodern perspective, these houses can be seen as an attempt to replace the town squares in the decentralised society of the postmodern condition. A place for debate and active exchange of ideas instead of the postmodern "town squares" - the shopping centres. But this is about cultural policies, and other than postmodern trends show.

The aim of the cultural houses are to profile the particular local authority, to bring prestige to the area, and thereby turn the area into a place which will attract the right kind of people, i.e. those who traditionally enjoy the arts, the well-educated and often high-earning part of the population. The culture houses bring culture to the local community and prestige to the area.

The idea is also that these houses become self-financing, that they are not a burden to the local authorities they are profiling. This is a general trend in Danish cultural policy during the eighties. Culture is used for profiling, and it has to bring economic benefits. It may be justified by the reason that the establishing phase in

cultural policies are over, but it is just as much a sign of the right-turn in Danish politics, and more or less the Danish version of the enterprise culture.

In Britain, the influence of the Thatcher years constitute the genuine Enterprise Culture, where "increasingly, all aspects of social life - including the arts - were seen through the lens of economic anxiety" and where "the basis of the enterprise culture lies with the restoration of the individual"<sup>210</sup>. Monetary value has entered the arguments for culture. It is partly an international movement as can be seen in the increasing research within the field of cultural economics. Art takes on an utilitarian value where it has to create jobs and increase tourism rather than having an inherent value or be for the spiritual good of society. Part of this utilitarian move is that art has to validate itself to the business community by attracting funding from this community<sup>211</sup>. This is in line with the Danish cultural houses in so far as art can 1) bring the right people for the economy to the area/country and 2) it can profile a local authority/company. But in the genuine enterprise culture of Britain it goes further. It extends to a reliance on business sponsorship in the funding of the arts. Denmark had a brief flirtation with the idea in the public debate in the late 80s, but in Britain it has become part of the established funding system through the Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts.

Even the Arts Council has entered the spirit of sponsorship by wanting to match and attract funds for the arts from what it calls partners or partnerships. In *Partnership - Making Arts Money Work* it says:

The Arts Council wishes to help these creative partnerships flourish by contributing to their health and growth in three main areas - marketing, planning and investment. Its experience, ambition, and perhaps most importantly its national perspective, puts the Council in a unique position to work effectively with clients, RAAs and the marketplace to explore new ideas and new avenues, to test new techniques in their marketing and promotion, and to provide for the arts nationwide. It will continue to push for high quality of work, efficient management and maximising the earning potential of the activities in which it invests the public's funds.<sup>212</sup>

In 1992, Britain's first ministry of culture, the Department of National Heritage was founded, and it has endorsed the enterprise turn of the 1980s cultural policies, but does not seem to have done much to promote culture. It has curbed the power of

the Arts Council by tightening the purse strings and by changing it from the Arts Council of Great Britain to the Arts Council of England. It has set up the National Lottery, and though this will benefit the arts, it also seems to have upset the balance of Britain's extensive network of charity organisations. Under David Dorrell's leadership it saw its role as "a catalyst to generate other forms of funding, from business sponsorship, local authorities and improved earnings through the box office".<sup>213</sup>

The Department of National Heritage - the British ministry of culture - seems intent on promoting culture on the basis of utilitarian values.

The present Minister for Heritage, Virginia Bottomley, stressed at the 1995 Conservative party conference the need for Britain to excel in the technology of satellite broadcasting. She also derided political correctness but stressed the importance of giving access to the English heritage such as Shakespeare and Wordsworth to children through education in schools. It seems the British traditions of legislating for industry, emphasising high culture - and in that connection elevation to a common culture rather than uses of leisure - still hold, but now with the addition of having to justify itself to the business community.

The trends in Denmark, have not gone as far as in Britain. The consensus is still there. Culture has gained more prestige. The current Minister for Culture, the Social Democratic Jytte Hilden is shaking up the whole system through highly unpopular appointments of primarily non-establishment people who are primarily women (though that is not what makes them unpopular). Her initiatives are far ranging from ideas on including cooking in her field of responsibility to securing more money on the Budget and ordering a thorough analysis of the whole area. Her style is confrontational and whether most of her ideas will lead to actual policy implementation is doubtful. Nonetheless, she has stirred up the debate. But as usual it is within the consensus on cultural policies.



## 8) STATE FUNDING OF LITERATURE

This chapter looks at the funding of literature in Britain and Denmark. It traces the influences which have shaped the funding system for literature. It does this both as a supplement to the previous chapter, but also because the funding system is an agent in creating the national climate for the production of literature from which texts for translation are drawn. Where this chapter deals with the production of literature, the next chapter deals with the second leg of a cultural policy, namely dissemination. The chapter finds that because of British traditions of supporting the performing arts and institutions, support for literature has not gained much recognition. Nonetheless the Literature Department at the Arts Council has managed to develop a rounded, innovative policy though author support - support for the creative artist - is slightly under-developed. In Denmark the long and strong tradition for creator support has meant that this side of the system is well-developed. Initiatives have been taken to supplement existing schemes in accordance with changing perceptions of the creator so that also illustrators and translators can obtain support. But the system suffers from having no coordinating body. The chapter also analyses Public Lending Right and finds that the development of the British rights scheme and the Danish cultural support scheme are results of the two differing traditions for support of literature.

Public funding for literature can take various forms. In his book *Bogen og Læseren* (The Book and the reader), Robert Escarpit identifies three parts in what he calls the literary process. The three parts are production, distribution and consumption.

Production is the authors who produce the literature. In a funding system, this part can be strengthened through bursaries, literary awards and author rights over their creations.

The second part of Robert Escarpit's literary process is distribution, and this includes publishing and distribution. To distinguish the two aspects of distribution - production of enumerable copies by publishers and actual distribution to readers - I will call the publishers producer-distributor. Public support for publishing can take the form of funding a particular aspect of the publishing business such as the printing or the promotion. Or it can take the form of supporting the publishing of particular titles such as classics or experimental literature. Distribution on the other hand, involves making the titles available for the reader, whether through bookshops or libraries. Within the funding system this can mean support for bookshops in sparsely populated areas or support for public libraries.

The last part of Robert Escarpit's literary process is the reader. The reader is to my knowledge never sponsored in the funding system. There are no grants available for the readers to take time off from work for the purpose of reading a good or worthy book. But the funding system is most often in its values geared towards the reader. It is the reader who - through contemplation and reflection - is to benefit from the literature made available. Sometimes the funding system will support education for the reader so that the reader can enjoy the offered literature.

As with support for other art forms the support for literature is shaped by traditions. It is shaped by the traditions of what is thought important both with regards to which art forms are prioritised, but also in literature by which link in the literary circle is considered worthy or correct to support, and hopefully by the actual situation of the art form.

The Danish and British systems for support of literature differ. In Denmark the system is conceptually two tier under the Ministry of Culture. There is support for the producer, the author. This tradition for support of authors is old and strong. This tradition is today continued in the support given through The Danish State Art Foundation. The other conceptual tier is the public libraries which are aimed at the reader. Between these traditions the 1980's have seen new support schemes arise which aim to cover what is left or has arisen between these two traditions. Though it should be pointed out that this, rather than being a stated policy has been an "in response" policy.

Where the Danish schemes are both very old and very new, the British system is fairly new. The Literature Department at the Arts Council is responsible for all support. Because all areas have been assembled under this one department it has opened up for the possibilities of forming a rounded policy. Britain has a strong public library tradition as well, but instead of taking over the responsibility of Public Service Dissemination of quality fiction as the Danish system has, it has developed in a more community service orientated direction<sup>214</sup>. This does not mean that it hasn't been considered in connection with support for literature, but instead of being seen as part of the support system, it has been used as an excuse for not supporting literature in any other way. For instance Raymond Williams states that John Maynard Keynes did not include literature in the Arts Council because the difficult situation of writers "could be masked and rationalised by the fact of the provision of public libraries".<sup>215</sup>

The Arts Council's work for literature has not been analysed to any great extent before. I shall therefore start with a fairly short description and analysis of this work.<sup>216</sup>

The Arts Council of Great Britain is the body for support of literature in Britain. But within the structure of the Arts Council, literature has lived in the shadow of the performing arts. It is the major influence on support for literature in Britain that the system is geared towards the performing arts. The latest example is the lottery money which for the arts can only be used for buildings. This has benefitted institutions such as the Royal Opera House and Saddler's Wells. Were lottery money to be used on literature it could only be for library buildings, but it is difficult to imagine a library with as high a profile as The Royal Opera House and Saddler's Wells. There is only one such library, namely The British Library. But this library is not aimed at providing the general public with fiction for use in their leisure time.

The Arts Council of Great Britain did not support literature from its beginnings right after the Second World War. This is definitely because of Keynes' ambivalence towards this art form, though CEMA had not supported literature either. In fact the

Council did not establish a Literature Panel, later called the Literature Department, until 1965, where it took over from the Poetry Panel which was established in 1950.

The Poetry Panel came about because of the Council's commitment to the Festival of Britain in 1951. In connection with this a competition for poetry written in English was arranged by five poets. Cecil Day-Lewis was one of these poets, and he became the chairman of the Poetry Panel. The Poetry Panel had only modest sums allocated, and its policies during most of its time do not resemble an arts policy as such.

The Arts Council had sponsored poetry before. In 1947 it gave financial help to the English Festival of Spoken Poetry and the Apollo Society which arranged poetry recitals. When the Poetry Panel was allocated money for the first time in the financial year 1951/52 it continued along those lines by subsidising public readings and recitals. The beginnings of support for literature was therefore support which emphasised what can be termed the public and/or performing aspect of literature, and therefore in line with support given in the categories of music and drama.

The next initiatives taken were the Poetry Panel as commissioners of art. In 1953 the Poetry Library was established and steps were taken to establish the Poetry Book Society which was to select four books of poetry a year and distribute them to a list of members.

The policies behind the recitals, the poetry festivals, the Poetry Library and the Poetry Book Societies were not clearly expressed in policy terms, but ideas behind the initiatives were expressed in connection with the opening of the Poetry Library, where its purpose was seen as:

Being the simple one of helping the reader of poetry, (...) to get into easier and closer touch with the public verse of his contemporaries<sup>217</sup>

Through its lifetime this was what guided the work of the Poetry Panel. The attempt to reach the reader, to form a forum for poetry. The Department was slowly developing this forum from a performance with an artist on stage in front of an audience to a more natural forum for literature where artist and reader meet via the text. Though the work of the Poetry Panel slowly developed into a form more closely associated with the art form than Arts Council traditions, there was no

attempt to reach a wider audience than the cultural elite. Towards the end of its life the Poetry Panel began funding magazines which is another way of creating a public forum. The tradition of supporting a forum for writer and reader through magazines has been in existence ever since.

Whatever support was given to the poet or the publisher was indirect through sales. One exception to this was the triennial poetry prize given to a first book of original English poetry and a book of original English poetry. But otherwise it was spoken poetry and reaching the reader which was the focus of the work of the Poetry Panel.

In 1964 one yearly bursary for poetry was made available. But the times were changing. In 1965 the Poetry Panel became the Literature Department. Also in 1965 Jennie Lee became Minister for Arts and Libraries, and her White Paper *A Policy for the Arts*, changed the policies of the new Literature Department. In the White Paper Jennie Lee highlights the problems of the artists and suggests an increase of grants to writers.

The Literature Department took this seriously and from the middle of the 1960s there was an increase in bursaries for writers. This trend continued through the next ten years where the main focus of the Department was the conditions of the writer, though institutions such as the Poetry Book Society were still supported. From 1969 a few grants were given to publishers, but the main focus was the writer:

(...) in other words, to make more favourable the conditions under which writers work and can have that work published.<sup>218</sup>

During the second half of the 1970s where community arts were developing, the Literature Department also started to focus on reaching communities. There was a slow shift in focus. Experiments were made with non-profit distribution points such as community bookshops, support to projects in commercial bookshops was considered, but discarded. From 1975/76 there was a major increase in grants to publishers. But the Arts Council was not only supporting the distribution link in the literary process. In 1974/75 a scheme for creative writing fellowships was instigated and developed substantially.

On the whole, the policies of the Arts Council in the mid- to late seventies can be characterized as all-rounded and innovative. There were the traditional grants to writers, that is, support to the artist. But the writing fellowships which is the American idea of artists in academia, a scheme which supports the artist as well as promoting an interest in the arts - supplemented this. The publishers, that is the producer-distributor is supported so that books which were not economically viable could be published. In addition the Department explored non-traditional ways of supporting literature by looking at distribution. By trying to make literature available through non-traditional outlets such as community shops, the Department tried to expand the distribution network - or put another way - expand the access points for the readers.

It seems that this fairly rounded literature funding of the mid- to late seventies was more accidental than planned, because in 1980 the Literature Department had a major policy review. This policy review shifted the focus of the funding from an all-rounded, but writer inspired policy to a reader orientated policy because:

It cannot be argued that there is a shortage of books: rather a decline in an audience committed to buying them. The Council therefore decided to concentrate its funds on readers rather than writers, through increased subsidy for the publication and distribution of books.<sup>219</sup>

This meant a severe cut in grants to writers. The writing fellowships were kept, but with the emphasis now on stimulation of students' interest in reading. On the other hand there were increased subsidies to publishers. And slowly libraries were recognised as promoters of literature.

The Department followed this policy for the next five years, and though the support for writers slowly increased it never reached the level of pre-1980.

In 1984 the policy statement *The Glory of the Garden* was published. This was to prove devastating for the support of literature. *The Glory of the Garden* took a "realistic" view of arts funding. Support for the Arts would have to be considered within the existing funds. The result of this was that funds for literature were cut by 50%. It is interesting to see how all the usual reasons for not supporting literature is utilised in *The Glory of the Garden*. Not only is it not a performing art, but it is supported through the publishing industry, libraries and so forth:

Yet the Council finds it difficult to satisfy itself about the value of much of its present support for literature.<sup>220</sup> (...)

If there were no public subsidy for opera, it is very unlikely that large-scale opera performance would take place at all outside a limited annual season at the Royal Opera House. English literature, on the other hand, is sustained by a large and profitable commercial publishing industry. It is a basic ingredient in the school curriculum. It is available to the public through the public library system. In these circumstances, the impact of the Arts Council's subsidy for literature other than poetry is highly marginal.<sup>221</sup>

*The Glory of the Garden* expects the publishing industry to keep an often economically non-viable literature alive. Yet ten years later, the present literature director Alistair Niven says that the Literature Department will consider supporting smaller imprints within the huge profit-making conglomerates because it simply cannot be taken for granted that the conglomerate will use the profits of, say, Agatha Christie to support a new and interesting but loss-making translated novel.<sup>222</sup>

In 1984 *The Glory of the Garden* led to a virtual shut-down of the Literature Department. Basically, support to the writers in residence, book shops, libraries and writers' tours were discontinued and grants to writers, publishers and various events were reduced so drastically as to be as good as non-existing. The Literature Director Charles Osborne left the Arts Council after having worked in the Literature Department, first as assistant to the director and later as director, since it was established in 1965.

Charles Osborne was at the time seen at the culprit for making it possible to write a statement such as it was expressed in *The Glory of the Garden*. But it must also be kept in mind that literature always had been a bit of a stepchild in the Arts Council. Charles Osborne was a despotic director who did not believe in the subsidy of writers. His dislike for writers is probably one of the reasons for the change in aim in 1980. He believed in a state publishing house but this idea never won any support.<sup>223</sup>

In spite of Charles Osborne, the Literature Department developed and tested various schemes during its first twenty years. It is a development which is characterised not only by extending the first performing orientated events of the Poetry Panel, but for most of the time keeping the tradition of the Arts Council of not supporting

individual artists. This is not to say that artists have not been supported, but most of the schemes have been tours, festivals and writers in residence schemes. That is to say schemes which would give the author an income through work related to his art but not so much aimed at creating work-free time for writing.

Two years later the present Literature Director, Alistair Niven, was appointed, and the Arts Council renewed its commitment to supporting literature:

The Council has looked very searchingly at the role of literature within the arts and now takes a positive and optimistic view of it, aware of its particular value to the Council's educational and multi-cultural policies. Underlying this is a recognition that literature past and contemporary is one of the glories of the nation.<sup>224</sup>

The new literature policy of the Arts Council emphasised an entirely new aspect. Instead of focusing on the literary process, it focused on diversity in the products available. The focus is on multi-culturalism and internationalism. This has meant that for the first time translations are a priority. - And that cultural studies and democratic culture has finally entered the Arts Council in the form of multi-culturalism and The Raymond Williams Prize for Community Publishing.

According to The Arts Council itself, this is the aim of its funding for literature:

We aim to support new writing as well as help people gain access to books through formal and informal education, through a range of magazines and publishers who publish new work, and through our public libraries system and the media.<sup>225</sup>

This aim takes into consideration all aspects of the literary process except for the main commercial distribution form of book shops and book clubs. A closer look at the grants and schemes offered show how the Arts Council in practice support literature.

As part of the Arts Council of England's grant package for literature in 1995/6 are two projects in which the funds are for the whole spectrum of arts supported by the council. This is Education Projects and General Projects. The other nine are: Independent Publishers, Library Fund, Literature Touring, Writers in Prison,



Raymond Williams Prize for Community Publishing, Writers' Awards, Translation Scheme, Magazines and Regularly Funded Organisations.

Regularly Funded Organisations is the most important post on the Literature Department's budget. Over 40% of its funding goes to this scheme. It supports a variety of institutions within the literary process such as Book Trust, British Centre for Literary Translation, the Federation of Worker Writers and Community Publishers, two presses and seven magazines. On the whole this is a stable continuous form of support to selected representatives of the distribution part of the process.

The Independent Publishers grant is aimed at helping publishers with marketing and publicity, but the grant can also be used for educational purposes such as courses for publishers and editors of magazines.

The Arts Council hardly ever sponsors individual titles it informs in the fact sheet for independent publishers. This means that there is no support for classics or books which are not economically viable such as first novels and experimental fiction. On the other hand by supporting independent presses in their publicity and promotion work, it is giving these presses a chance to sell their titles to bookshops and to create an interest for them in the newspapers and thereby, through reviews, alerting a potential readership to the existence of their titles. As the chapter on publicity and promotion in this thesis has highlighted, publicity is extremely important in selling the titles, and a problem area for small underfunded publishing houses.

Like the publicity grant, the library fund focuses on the availability of fiction for the reader. It does not support book buying, but ways of promoting literature, for instance in partnership with organisations such as arts organisations and booksellers and through what Alistair Niven calls literature development workers. As explored in this thesis in the next chapter, British libraries do not have obligations to promote literature in the same way Danish libraries have. By making funding available, the Arts Council goes some way towards enabling the libraries in reaching a readership, if not in supporting the publishing of fiction through purchases of titles.

Magazines have a readership which coincides or is different from the readers of novels, but as a medium in connection with fiction, they can highlight titles for readers. They are also extremely valuable as a forum for new trends and new

authors. On the whole they are an important part of the public climate in which authors and readers debate and experience new literature. They are therefore part of creating and promoting literature. They are seldom economically viable, and the public support of them is therefore important.

Writers are supported through Writer's Awards through which fifteen writers can receive bursaries of £7000. These bursaries are given to authors who have previously published at least one title, and they are given to writers who "need finance for a period of concentrated work on their next book"<sup>226</sup>. This grant, then, supports the production of specific titles, but at the roots so to speak, by supporting the producer. The grant, by supporting work in progress, comes with an in-built guarantee for the Arts Council itself, that it will have something to show for the money it has invested. Nonetheless, here is a grant which can buy a writer time to write, and it therefore also supports the producer.

The Raymond Williams Prize for Community Publishing is in support of both authors and publishers. It is an annual prize awarded to a work which "reflects the values of ordinary people and their lives".<sup>227</sup> Quite untraditionally it is only open to non-profit making publishers. The prize of £ 3000 is divided with 2/3 going to the author and 1/3 to the publisher. This award, though giving funding to an author, is more in line with the support for multi-culturalism than a direct attempt to support authors.

Also the last scheme which supports authors is primarily aimed at the readers rather than supporting authors. The scheme is Writers in Prison. There are at least eight residencies in prisons for writers. This scheme supports the author financially at the same time as putting his profession to use in the community.

On the whole the schemes which make up the Arts Council's support to literature are not geared towards supporting the production or the production-distribution parts of the literary process, rather it is aimed at the reader part of the literary process through the distribution link and it is doing this for the purpose of multiculturalism and internationalism. Multiculturalism and internationalism is expressed in the Raymond Williams Prize, the Writers in Prison Schemes and in the Literature Touring scheme which mainly focus on writers from abroad. The aim of

these tours is to "encourage interest in as wide a range of literature as possible and to give audiences more opportunity to listen to new and exciting live performances"<sup>228</sup>.

Whereas in the early days of the Poetry Panel recitals and festivals were supported to encourage public forum for a cultural elite, the modern version encourages reading in a wider circle of readers than those already interested. This is done through the Library Fund, the Writers in Prison schemes and Literature Touring Scheme, and in this way the Arts Council does support the distribution network for fiction.

Though the Council supports distribution, its support to production is limited. Even though both the Writers Grants, The Raymond Williams Prize and the Writers in Prison schemes directly and indirectly support authors, the support does not lend itself to long term planning or support.

As for publishing, the Council supports small presses because it targets the problem area of publicity in small presses, as it to a certain extent supports diversity through this scheme, since most innovative publishing is done by small presses. It also supports publishers, because it promotes diversity through its Translation Scheme where individual titles can receive funding.

The question is whether this is adequate. A publisher's list is made up of other titles than translations and bestsellers. In order for a country to have a dynamic literature, experimental books and first time authors must be published. There is no support for the publishing of this in the Arts Council scheme. There is no support for the re-issues of classics either, the backbone of a literary tradition. But on the other hand, the market seems full of 99p cheap edition classics.

All in all the support scheme the Arts Council offers promotes literature to the reader. It brings diversity to literature and the literary circle, and here the keywords are multiculturalism and internationalism. The scheme is innovative, supporting untraditional links such as publicity for small presses and using untraditional schemes such as the writers in prisons scheme; and it tackles recent problem areas such as libraries and, again, publicity. But by not focusing on the more traditional links in the literary process such as authors and publishers it is in danger of undermining

British literary tradition partly such as it was and is, but more importantly such as it will become.

Where the Arts Council has been developing a rounded policy with the emphasis on the reader through distribution, Denmark has built on a very old tradition for support of artists and on public libraries with a clearly stated cultural policy.

The strongest area of support for literature in Denmark is the support for authors. Today this support is administered through the Danish State Art Foundation, but the tradition goes back to the absolute monarchy, where the first grant was given in 1772.

Through its long history author grants have primarily been given in the form of gifts of honour (*hædersgaver*), life long grants on the Budget, three-year grants and travel stipends.

The Danish State Art Foundation administers the current version of author support. The main criterion for all awards is literary quality. These are Three year grants given to "young artists so that possibilities are created for incontestable talents to develop and mature in peace", production awards (*produktionspræmier*) as an "acknowledgement in connection with works where the financial gain is not reasonable compared to the artistic effort"; and travel- and work stipends (*rejsestipendier og arbejdslegater*) "of varying size to more mature artists in the interim until a permanent yearly benefit on the Budget can be gained".<sup>229</sup> The last variation of grants-in-aid to authors is the permanent benefit on the Budget. These too are administered by the Arts Foundation, but are not part of their own budget but as the name says of the Budget. These grants are given to "artists who have such a production behind them that the artist in question has placed him or herself conclusively as artist. The bestowal is based solely on an evaluation of quality in the artistic production".<sup>230</sup> At the moment there are 73 permanent awards. One of the last to have received it was the very successful author Peter Høeg.

Though the support administered by the Arts Foundation cannot feed and clothe a whole author population, it does support a variation of authors. That is, it supports the producers of Danish quality literature when they are starting out through the three year grants without regards, though surely with the hope of, a product in the

end. The authors of products are supported through the production awards. This award is strongly biased towards books which are not economically viable, but through the main criterion of quality. The permanent awards are no longer called awards of honour, but since they are given on the basis of the literary production and quality for the duration of the author's life, they are not only an award given with the future production in mind, but also with past important production. The first to receive this sort of award was Hans Christian Andersen in 1838.

On the whole then, the schemes for author support in Denmark are geared towards developing, sustaining and awarding Danish quality literature through the producers, the authors. Furthermore, the authors which this part of the funding system addresses are the artists. The writer as author is understood under the fine arts definition; the producer of art in line with the painter or the composer. It does not support other creators such as illustrators and translators. There are in this way two criteria. First and foremost is quality as defined by the fine arts concept. Secondly the creator is an artist as under the same definition.

Though the scheme may seem ideal, in practice it has only nearly worked. Or if one prefers to be positive: The scheme works fairly close to the intentions, because on the whole the support given to Danish authors is remarkable in its roundness and farsightedness. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt has in her masters thesis analysed the awards given through the 1970s<sup>231</sup> Here she finds that the Arts Foundation has added the criterion of quantity to that of quality. That is, the authors awarded have been extremely productive. In this way marketforces have influenced which authors were awarded. Secondly, instead of being on the forefront in supporting avant garde and new literary traditions, the Foundation has held back and has not supported the completely new until it had been publicly recognised for a couple of years. Nevertheless, Worsøe-Schmidt adds in her latest survey that during the last ten years, the Foundation has supported younger artists often with only one book published.<sup>232</sup> That is, the Foundation does not play it as safe as before and thereby comes closer to the intentions of supporting a living and innovative literature which allows for a future living and innovative literature.

The traditions for supporting artists, in particular authors is strong in Denmark. The tradition in England has been to support the performing arts and institutions rather than individual artists, and literature has been the least favoured art form for support. In Denmark it is the opposite. Artists have been supported and in particular authors. There are two reasons for this. The founding reason has to do with the size of Denmark and its population. The first Minister of Cultus pointed out in 1850 that:

(...) but there is one thing that I have to draw attention to, namely that there is something in Denmark which must be precious. There are certain things which a little people can never have for comparatively the same buy as the big nation because the expenses for this must be distributed and because the small nation must have the same as the big without being able to distribute the expenses thereof in the same way. But to this in particular one other thing is attached; if Denmark wants a national literature and if it wants something close to a national art, then it will bring expenses, because our circumstances according to the size of our people is so that the national literature and art cannot be itself in the same way as in other places.<sup>233</sup>

A small nation is disadvantaged if it wants to compare itself to a big nation. A small language group cannot as easily support a literature in that language as a large language group. That seems obvious. What is less obvious is why Denmark would favour authors in particular. One reason is that this support already had been instigated under the absolute monarchy. Another point to be made is that the visual arts could move across borders without interpreters. It did also have two wealthy private patrons in Denmark in Heinrich Hirschsprung and Carl Jacobsen.<sup>234</sup> The performing arts were taken care of through the Royal Theatre, and no-one ever questioned the rights of this institution of national and high culture.

The importance of literary support is also connected with the times. The bourgeois novel had broken through and literature was becoming the medium of bourgeoisie. In the new democracy, these people came to lead the country. Since the support given to culture at the time was before the arm's-length-principle was thought of, it was the responsibility of the Ministry of Cultus to decide which authors were to receive grants. But the ministry was not left in peace to do this. The Treasury interfered on several occasions. In the 1870's it became purely political where the party "Venstre" would appoint its preferred authors for grants and oppose

those of other parties. Aage Rasch has chronicled these debates in his book *Staten og Kunstnerne* and he concludes:

This led to somewhat increased funds, but it also meant that the debate from the 1870's and all the way up to the 1930's primarily dealt with the authors while the other artists were almost forgotten. For, of course, everybody understood literature! But even further, it resulted in that the ministers [from the party] "Right" found out that they could "trade" with [the party] "Left" after the principle that if one party got a man, then the other one should have one as well. These trades took place in The Finance Committee. (...) The Finance Committee became an "aesthetic Supreme Court" (...).<sup>235</sup>

This mixing of politics and arts led in 1930 to a *Select Committee on the Support by the State for Fiction Writers*. This committee suggested that an Advisory Committee was established. This happened in 1931. On the Committee were members of Parliament and civil servants which made it easier to keep literary discussions out of official politics.

The Report from the Select Committee established some of the principles carried on in policies of today. It emphasised quality and diversity in the literature supported<sup>236</sup>. It was also the beginning of the separation between state and art in literary support. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt also concludes that the work of the Committee meant that the support to literature was researched and debated far earlier than other art forms, which again meant that authors were favoured over other artists.<sup>237</sup>

Denmark, then, has a strong tradition for supporting authors, that is the producer link of the literary process. In comparison with the English tradition, it is quite obvious how this tradition could come about partly because it was established at a time where the book was the primary medium for a new group of influential men, but also because it did not have to compete with other art forms for its validation such as literature did in the Arts Council.

Where Danish support for authors has a long and strong tradition, expressed in the Arts Foundation, other forms of support for literature are not as strongly represented or formalised. As mentioned earlier, public libraries have been the other leg in the funding system for literature in Denmark. Nonetheless several support

schemes outside the Arts Foundation and the public libraries exist. Helvinn Høst, special consultant for literature and the visual arts at the Danish Ministry of Culture calls these various schemes instigated directly through the Ministry of Culture a "patchwork quilt"<sup>238</sup>. That is, the schemes in existence have come in to existence to patch up holes as they became visible rather than being part of a policy.

The schemes in the patchwork quilt have come into existence since 1983. They have often started out as provisional schemes funded through receipts from the state football pools, but have become permanently funded through the Budget. The schemes in existence are Support for Danish Literature Information Center (Dansk Litteraturinformationscenter), The Cultural Magazine Center (Kulturtidsskriftscentret) and The Author School. These three organisations have their own boards and the two centres administer various schemes. Further there is the publishing series for classics which is administered by the Danish Language and Literature Society (Dansk Sprog og Litteraturselskab) in co-operation with a publishing house. The Committee for Support to literature for children and youth (Kommiteen til uddeling af støtte til børne og ungdomslitteratur) administers schemes for these age groups. In addition Literature Policy Initiatives, 1995 (Litteraturpolitiske initiativer, 1995), a three year provisional scheme which has just been made permanent.

The schemes cover the areas of translated fiction, primarily from Danish to a foreign language, cultural magazines, a living backlist for classics and producer support. In this sense it forms a fairly rounded policy, though when added to the support through the Arts Foundation, the support to producers is over-represented.

The idea of the patchwork quilt is to be seen in the history of the support schemes. They are responses to the public debate and suggestions put forward by organisations and individuals within the literary world.

The history of these schemes start, as mentioned earlier, in 1983. In 1983 a Select Committee report on *Bøger i Danmark* (Books in Denmark)<sup>239</sup> was published. It had been under preparation for more than ten years! The Committee had been appointed in 1972 when the debates on the crisis in publishing started. Until then, and still, the Danish system for literature support was seen as support to the producers, the authors and with the public libraries as Public Service Disseminators.



The perceived crisis within the bookworld led to an empty space between the living conditions of authors and the work the libraries were able to do.

The report published in 1983 was thorough in examining production, distribution and the uses of books. The committee carried out surveys of the author population, interviewed key people in the industry and used available statistics to analyse the book production. It also researched dissemination both through libraries and other channels such as television and the press. Nevertheless the report never led to any political initiatives or changes in literature policies. In spite of the thorough research underpinning the report, neither the public nor the politicians took the report seriously. This was partly because of the time it had taken in production, but mainly because the committee could not agree on its recommendations.

The majority of the committee found that the trend within the bookworld was a concentration with fewer publishing groups publishing the largest share of literature and that fewer new titles were published. It found that the shelf life of titles became increasingly shorter.<sup>240</sup> On the whole the majority of the committee identified the keywords of concentration and contraction which have defined the debate on books in Denmark during the 1980s and early 1990s.

The majority suggested a book fund (Bogfonden) as an administrative and policy-debating organisation for the literary policies of the state. It suggested increased producer support and support to various genres. But most dramatically it suggested a broad but selective producer-distributor support. This was very much against the Danish traditions which have focused on the producers and on supply to readers through the libraries, but in line with initiatives taken in Norway and Sweden.

The minority consisted of members of the industry. They disagreed with the majority in its analysis of the bookworld. Instead it found that it had never been as healthy as it was, and never had so many books been published. It found that the majority's suggestion of producer-distributor support would be too much like state intervention. If the state wanted to support the bookworld it could do so by removing VAT from books.

The majority and minority interpretations and recommendations are typical of what has followed in later debates. Academics, librarians and other Public Service Disseminators have focused on literary fiction, cultural non-fiction and children's fiction in their debates and analysis. That is, they have focused on the publishing and distribution of "valuable" but not economically viable publications when analysing the bookworld and debating state support. This is very much in line with the overall criterion of quality within Danish cultural support.

The industry on the other hand, focuses on the production as such. This includes not only the above mentioned categories, but also quality bestsellers, self help books, hobby books and airport literature. Its suggestions for support are as unselective as its analysis. The removal of VAT is as not a selective quality orientated cultural support, but a general help to an industry.

The recommendations in the report never resulted in any political initiatives, but the ten year long wait came to an end and the present schemes have since then slowly made up the patchwork quilt.

One of the initiatives, the classic series administered by The Danish Language and Literature Society is a direct result of the recommendations in the report. The other result was the formation of the Literary Institution (Den Litterære Institution), a group of individuals from the bookworld; librarians, authors and other people with knowledge of, and interest in, the bookworld. This group has met once a year and has functioned as an unofficial advisory panel for the Ministry of Culture. Special consultant Helvinn Høst has been invited to their yearly meeting in which he has taken part.

The most visible result of the work of the Literary Institution is the Cultural Magazine Centre. The centre is based on a proposal which the Literary Institution delivered after having consulted interested parties. The Centre administers grants-in-aid to magazines, but also functions as a consultative body on production, marketing and financing through two magazine workshops.

The Cultural Magazine Centre, the initiatives for children and youth and the classic series all aim at various aspects of the literary process. The last two schemes are aimed at the producers.

The Author School was established on the initiative of influential Danish authors, in particular Poul Borum. It is not a creative writing course. Only students with proven talent can enrol. Proven talent is not measured by published novels, short stories or poems. Very few have actually published anything when they start the two year course, but 75% of students have published since leaving the school. The institution is a form of elitism seldom seen in Denmark where the few and talented seldom take precedence over the many. It is nevertheless in line with the overall philosophy of having a body of national quality literature primarily supported and encouraged through the producer.

The last scheme is Literature Policy Initiatives 1995. These initiatives consist of seven schemes for producer support. The schemes are aimed at groups of producers which are not eligible for support through the Arts Foundation. One scheme is work in progress grants, that is grants for authors in order to finish a particular project. Another scheme is travel stipends for fiction translators and a third is for translation of cultural non-fiction. There is one scheme for poets and one for dramatists. The last two schemes incorporate both producer support, namely to illustrators and cartoonists and production support to these two expensive art forms. The groups singled out here are a reflection of a widening awareness of how many people other than authors, as understood under the fine arts definition, contribute to the creation of works of literature, and that these groups, like the traditional author, find it difficult to live on what their work brings in. It is of course also a recognition of how their work contributes in keeping a varied, quality literature.

On the whole the patchwork quilt is composed of support to genres (classics, cartoons, illustrated books), support for books aimed at a particular group (children and youth) and producers (author school, Literature policy initiatives, 95).

The strong tradition for author support is visible within these schemes. This is quite clearly the perceived way of supporting fiction. The arguments are never that authors can be supported through increased sales or through for instance an increase in author tours and other public engagements. This is not to recommend these forms of author support as an alternative to the grants-in-aid from the Arts Foundation, far from it since author tours are time-consuming and therefore must be viewed as

Public Service Dissemination, as a forum for author and reader to meet, rather than support for authors. But these support schemes do show how strong the tradition of author support is in Denmark. It is so strong that one Stig Dalager, author and member of Danish Fiction Authors, sees support to the publication of titles recommended in a new report as taking money from authors and giving them to publishers:

(...) The Bill [The committee set up their recommendations as a bill] makes the usual mistake of not distinguishing between authors and the books they write. For the same reason the core piece of the bill is also the mentioned support scheme for book subsidy, a recommendation which first of all will benefit the publishers and not the authors.<sup>241</sup>

Whereas producer support is represented in the schemes, what seems to be lacking is the Public Service Dissemination aspect. Except for the Children and Youth programme none of the schemes are directed towards a particular reader group, and none of the schemes are aimed at promotion to the readers. But then again, the public libraries are seen as the Public Service Disseminators.

There is very little producer-distributor support included in the patchwork quilt schemes even though one of the major recommendations in the report from the select committee in 1983, and the new one in 1994, was support to a large number of titles which would not be economically viable. But the industry has so far shown little interest in this, fearing state interference and claiming that all worthy titles were published.

Taking the external circumstances into consideration, the patchwork quilt of support schemes for literature show some innovation such as the advisory function under the Cultural Magazine Centre. It also attempts to fill in the gaps in author support. It does not interfere where the industry does not want it, though consideration for the industry is not necessarily consideration for the public.

What is problematic is not so much the schemes as what is implied with the phrase "patchwork quilt". There is no overall policy or overall coordinating body working on the arm's length principle. Suggestions are made and coordinated primarily by the special consultant at the Ministry of Culture, though some of course are made directly to the Minister of Culture. There is no doubt that the present special consultant, Helvinn Høst, is a knowledgeable man who takes a great interest in his

field. Nevertheless, in a country which prides itself in participation and openness, it is problematic that primarily one man is the bottleneck through which all suggestions have to pass. The lack of a coordinating body also makes it more difficult for outsiders to keep informed about the area since the Ministry of Culture is not accountable to, well, another Ministry of Culture. There are no annual reports, no policy statements or evaluations easily accessible.

In connection with my study of support for translated fiction I rang the Danish Literature Information Center asking for lists of supported titles. The administering secretary Martin Dyrholm very kindly made print-outs from his computer of the lists usually found in the appendices to the annual reports. In the informal letter accompanying the lists he informs me that the lists include support from when the Centre took over the support schemes for translated fiction. Grants before then are only registered in the archives of the Ministry of Culture, but he wouldn't recommend my bothering them over there in the Ministry. I probably wouldn't make myself too popular.

The implications are not that the Ministry of Culture would be unhelpful, but that I would set them a rather labour-intensive task in extracting the relevant information.

The Ministry of Culture has - as every other institution of public support I have contacted - been helpful in spite of being very busy. The only exception is perhaps the Department of National Heritage. When I rang them up, they did not quite know what to make of a question concerning the Department's thoughts, work and policies on the support of literature. They also found it difficult to identify a person within the Department who could answer my questions and did not, in that case, refer me to the Arts Council.

The situation of the patchwork quilt in Denmark is probably about to change. As I have indicated earlier a new select committee was appointed to examine the possibilities for a new literature law. The Committee was appointed in 1993, the international year of the book and it submitted its report *En Politik for Litteraturen* (A Policy for Literature) in March, 1994. Its main recommendations were, as it is in the 1983 report, support to titles which are not economically viable and the creation

of a council whose function it would be to co-ordinate initiatives within the field and advise the minister. It also recommends producer support in line with what is presently known under Literature Policy Initiatives, 1995 and as something new it recommends Public Service Dissemination initiatives primarily through author tours and lectures and through a review magazine. The idea is not, as in Britain to send out literature development workers to libraries. Though the critique of Danish libraries has been huge during the last couple of years because of the results of a survey on libraries' book-buying<sup>242</sup>, it has never been thought necessary to inspire or teach librarians how to promote literature. The idea expressed here is, as a stated policy, new to Denmark, but old to England. This is the performance inspired festivals and tours which are introduced into a Danish context.

The recommendations are not going to go through exactly as suggested in the report, but a somewhat circumscribed version is likely to be passed by Parliament during the 1996 spring session.<sup>243</sup> The main areas in the bill are, as in the report, alternative support to producers, support to the publishing of individual titles, support to Public Service Dissemination and a Literature Council for co-ordination and policy debate. The bill works with a much lower budget than the Select Committee. The Select Committee foresaw a budget of 45.5 million kr (approx. £ 4.55 million) whereas the bill operates with a budget of 15 million kr. It is especially producer-distributor support which has taken drastic cuts.

Nonetheless, the passing of this bill will mean that a policy-making, coordinating council will be in existence and that literature will not be as dependent on the political or personal likes and dislikes of various ministers of culture.

The Literature Department at the Arts Council can be seen as a mini-version of a council as suggested in Denmark. It co-ordinates and takes initiatives to new schemes. This has led to experimentation and innovation over the years. In spite of the development of the patchwork quilt, the Danish system does not seem quite as innovative as the British. There has been no small press support, and up til now no initiatives to support the distribution link. This is based, as has been indicated several times, in the strong traditions within the Danish system, which have meant that perceptions of what support is, have been strongly rooted in these traditions. But not

only is it based in the split tradition of public libraries and author support, but also in the resistance from the industry towards state interference.

The new council can, if the bill is passed, even out this situation. The industry will also get publishing support whether it likes it or not. Most likely small presses and publishers of non-profitable titles will take advantage of this. After all, the industry as speaking with one voice consists of more publishers of profitable publications than not.

Where tradition in Denmark to a certain extent may have stifled innovation, it has also brought continuity. This is continuity in the support for authors, and continuity in a cultural objective for public libraries. This does not only mean that quality fiction has been supported, but that this support has become visible, accepted and expected of both authors and the general public. It would have been impossible for a policy statement in Denmark to declare what *The Glory of the Garden* did in England that "The Council finds it difficult to satisfy itself about the value of much of its present support for literature."<sup>244</sup>

The Literature Department at the Arts Council has existed in a climate where support of culture is frowned upon and where the support of literature is even more frowned upon. Its funding has come out of a bulk of money given to the arts as such, of which literature has been the least appreciated. Where Denmark will benefit from having a coordinating council for literature to bring in innovation and policy, England could benefit from such a council to bring it stability and visibility.

Both funding systems, though based in different traditions have been geared towards the area it has served. There is more of a strong need in England for support to publicity and libraries. There is a strong need for author support in a country like Denmark where the potential readership consists of a mere 5 million people worldwide. But there is also no doubt that Denmark is far more geared towards, not only cultural support, but in particular support for literature.

This is clearly expressed in the case of Public Lending Right. This has been the flagship of Danish literary support in the 1990s where a new scheme has been thought out and is from 1996 fully implemented. Denmark has had a Public Lending

Right scheme since 1946 while the first payment of Public Lending Right in England was paid in 1984 after an act enacted in 1979.

In the question of Public Lending Right, one issue is inherent, namely that of whether it is a form of cultural state support to authors or whether it is a right. The issue is whether the fee paid for the borrowing of books is a fee paid as compensation for the lending of books in libraries. That is for the uses of the author's intellectual property, or whether it is support offered by the state to an artistic community.

In Britain the campaign for Public Lending Right and the legislation quite clearly favour the first version. Victor Bonham-Carter has chronicled the long campaign leading to the passing of the act in 1979, and he states the case for a Public Lending Right along the lines of a copy-right in the following way:

It is simply, that under copyright, all such transactions are conditional.

Thus, when an author writes a book, he creates a piece of artistic/intellectual property which is protected by law, so that when someone buys a copy he does not automatically acquire the right to do what he likes with it. (...)

Public lending constitutes further use of artistic/intellectual property which, for historical reasons, had not been covered by copyright legislation, but which in natural justice copyright was designed to protect.<sup>245</sup>

The British campaign for Public Lending Right started in 1951, where novelist John Brophy demanded payment for library use of his books. He suggested that libraries were to pay 1 penny a loan. The campaign was soon known under the term "The Brophy Penny"

The Public Libraries and The Library Association strongly opposed "The Brophy Penny". This was mainly because the idea was for readers to pay the penny per loan, which meant that the Free Public Libraries were no longer free. But other arguments opposing the copy-right idea were put forward. From a cultural policy perspective it was pointed out that libraries by their book-buying made it possible to publish young authors and other authors who wrote for a restricted market. But most importantly, the authors had already received right on sale by the sale of the book to the library.



On the whole the British debate on whether to introduce Public Lending Right is a clear opposition to a cultural policy of supporting authors. In the liberal Britain authors became producers of goods over which they had rights. Since their products were intellectual products, their rights were intellectual rights, and therefore Public Lending Right (PLR) was a form of copyright. The public library opposition likewise opposed PLR because they, as an institution, represented support to readers. Since the idea was for either the readers or public libraries to pay the fee, the opposition was strong because it would mean either a violation of the free public library idea or - and this must be said to be the strongest reason for the opposition - it would mean a depletion of library funds. The idea of charging the borrower was not abandoned until 1965 when Jennie Lee in an informal talk with representatives of the authors and publishers made it clear that under the present Labour Government, libraries would have to remain free.<sup>246</sup>

The campaign for PLR took place after the British cultural funding system was established in the form it has had up until recently. As shown in the previous chapter it was a system based on councils such as the Arts Council and on legislation for industry. Within this system there has never been a tradition for supporting the individual creative artist. Though the knowledge of this was not specifically stated in the arguments for a copy-right legislation, it was wise of authors to see PLR as a copy-right rather than cultural support from the funding system. Even seen from the angle of securing the rights of the producer, it took the presentation of nine bills before the act was finally passed in 1979. Victor Bonham-Carter in his history of the campaign for PLR notes with frustration how the various plans and bills one by one fail partly through governmental or civil servant somewhat silent but persistent opposition. Of a plan presented by the Arts Council, which supported PLR, to Lord Eccles in 1970, he notes from the campaign in 1971:

(...) but people were beginning to think that Lord Eccles, who had been sitting on the latest PLR proposals since October 1970, might all too easily follow the example of his predecessor and take refuge in masterly inaction.<sup>247</sup>

One of the most persistent supporters of PLR was Hugh Jenkins, Labour Minister for Arts and Libraries. He himself has described the frustrating fight for the

right in his autobiography *The Culture Gap*. In 1976 he was replaced before he was able to bring the bill before parliament, and Bonham-Carter notes in connection with this that:

The fact was that, apart from Michael Foot, no one in the Cabinet thought PLR important, and that in turn was a symptom of the philistinism of Government. Hugh Jenkins was right when he wrote in his book that 'politics is not yet about the arts in Britain'.<sup>248</sup>

In Denmark the history of what I will call the Library Fee<sup>249</sup> started in 1918 where the author Thit Jensen demanded that each reader should pay 5 øre (aprox. ½ a penny) pr loan. Though the libraries opposed the idea and The Danish Author Association sent a committee to the Government with a proposal, nothing of importance happened until the 1930s. An author named Peter Freuchen took the idea of intellectual rights on books on loan to its furthest implications by winning a case in the Supreme Court allowing him to forbid the loan of his books from public libraries.

Though this did not lead directly to the introduction of a Public Lending Right, it led to a mixing of the two arguments of copy-right and state support for authors. In 1932 a spokesman for the Finance Committee said:

It has been asked of me by an unanimous Finance Committee to declare that the authors demanding a fee on loan of their books should not receive grants-in-aid on the Budget.<sup>250</sup>

The authors, already supported by government were perceived as part of the national cultural network, and not as producers of goods. By not allowing their books to be on loan, they boycotted this. At the same time it removed the debate on Public Lending Right from a discussion between various interested parties such as libraries and authors to a debate between state and authors.

Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt notes that the occupation of Denmark during World War II changed the attitude of the state towards the renegade authors because the state realised that the authors were of substantial importance to the national feeling of union.<sup>251</sup> In 1941 a committee came up with a proposal which Government accepted in 1946. In connection with this it is interesting to note that Sir John Maud, permanent secretary at the Ministry of Education during the early years of the British

Public Lending Right Campaign noted that "if the thinking had been done during the war, there is no saying what we could have achieved during 1945-48."<sup>252</sup>

In Denmark, the disorder war brought led to a comparatively swift end to a not too strenuous debate. The Library Fee became part of library legislation and the money were taken from library funds and topped up by money from the Budget, thereby symbolically placing the Library Fee between state support and copyright.

The Library Fee has a far longer story than the Public Lending Right in Britain, and it has been through various amendments. These amendments have primarily been to enable more contributors such as illustrators, translators and second authors to receive money through the Library Fee.

The first version of the Library Fee was primarily a copyright fee. In the instructions to the first law from 1946 the fee is seen as "Compensation to (...) Danish authors (...) for the loan of the books, taken place through the libraries, of the authors in question."<sup>253</sup> But it was also to support authors who were valuable for society.

Various organisations such as The Publishers Association and the Authors Association have wanted the Library Fee to become a copy-right law rather than a cultural policy law. The arguments for this have primarily been for the right of more people involved, such as translators and illustrators, to receive funding for their intellectual work.<sup>254</sup>, rather than the inherent right of all intellectual property owners. In 1985 a Report on Library Fees according to copyright was published.<sup>255</sup> The recommendations of this report were not taken up because it would prove too expensive.

Nevertheless, the system has slowly moved towards a cultural policy based system. In 1982 a graduation of payment was introduced. This meant that authors with more than 20.000 books in the public library system would receive half the amount for the next 20.000. This amendment to the act also introduced a special fund through which contributors not eligible through the main fund could apply for money.

The graduation of payment was in response to a general dissatisfaction with the amounts paid to certain authors. Within the artistic community also, dissatisfaction

was to be found. One argument was that poetry and well-researched books and/or experimental work received less than for instance text-books which were bought by libraries in larger amounts. The argument was that this literature is very labour intensive and was not rewarded according to this.

Here the literary community mixed the cultural policy argument into their wish for a copy-right system. But this must be seen in the Danish context of literary support. As shown in the previous chapter Denmark has a consensus about cultural policies. Within this consensus is also the artistic community. All the same, the previous chapter also showed a trend within the system which favoured artists' rights. It can seem contradictory for authors to wish the interference of cultural policies, in their rights within a system such as the Library Fee, which could be concerned with what could be author's rights full stop - a copy-right which has nothing to do with the cultural policies of the country. But it must be kept in mind that the authors wishing a change in the Library Fee were not the, so to speak, bread and butter writers, those who did not think of themselves as artists or who did very well within the demand and supply aspect of the library service. Instead it was among those writers who already expected funding from the state.

There is a strong tradition in Denmark for author support. And among Danish authors there is a strong sense of the importance of the literary art and of the financial and living circumstances of authors. This is expressed in *Kunstnernes Kulturbetænkning* (The Cultural Report from Artists), in which artists inform about and discuss the importance of their work in society. The report is prepared by the Danish Artist Council. In the introduction it says:

When the Danish Artist Council publish this book, it is not to make a new official Cultural Report obsolete. On the contrary, seen in the light of the political development it would be valuable with an up-to-date expression of the authorities wishes and options. What Danish Artist Council here presents, is the artists' view on the case.

A democratic cultural policy must obviously be based on the point of view of others as well, but since the work of the creative and performing artists is one of the essential starting points for the cultural policy, and since the cultural policy in considerable degree influences the working conditions of the artists, it can only be in the interest of all to have the situation of the artists illuminated.<sup>256</sup>

Therefore when Danish authors wish to "have their cake and eat it too", it is an expression of their awareness of their work in the marketplace and their rights in the marketplace, and their awareness of their rights within the cultural funding system.

In 1991 the Minister for Culture took the consequences of the development within the Library Fee and changed it from a system which was somewhere between a copy-right and a cultural policy to one which was a cultural policy. The reasons given for this from the Minister for Culture, was that a pure copy-right system would be too expensive.<sup>257</sup> Also a new consideration has entered the debate, namely that of the EU. The European Union does not allow positive discrimination of nationalities.<sup>258</sup> On the whole though, the Minister for Culture at the time, Grete Rostbøll said:

The present legislation has the character of a statutory fee to Danish authors for the use of their books which takes place in the libraries. Since this arrangement can lead to doubt in connection with foreign countries, the Ministry of Culture finds that it should be specified that the Library Fee has the character of a cultural support scheme in the line of other support schemes (music, film etc) within the resort of the Ministry of Culture.<sup>259</sup>

It is (...) my hope, that there later on will be possibilities for supplementing the support to literature, which the Library Fee is an expression of, with other literature policy initiatives.<sup>260</sup>

The system was changed from paying a set rate per title with graduation according to the number of titles, to one which favoured certain kinds of work such as poetry and contemporary authors. The system is based on titles and numbers of pages where for instance poetry receives more points per page than a novel, and it pays half the amount to for instance works of deceased authors than to contemporary authors. In order to discriminate positively without breaking EU directives the system has been changed from considering Danish authors eligible to considering works written in Danish eligible.

In connection with translated fiction, it is interesting to note that the translators have gone from being able to apply for money through a special fund, to being entitled to a fee. Because the scheme favours living authors, translators are only entitled to 1/3 of the full amount allocated a title. Nevertheless, translators are in this

way seen as the Danish language originators of the work and in this way it is an acknowledgement of the intellectual input of translators.

In Britain the system is based on loans rather than titles. There is no graduation of amounts paid. Compared to the Danish system, which has always been based on titles, the British system is closer to the spirit of the British legislation because it favours the use rather than what has been bought.

The Swedish Professor Svante Bergström has studied Public Lending Right according to the Berner Convention on copyright. He finds that a system independent of the use of the work in question and especially independent of the kind of use and the extent of use is not a copyright (*beføjelse*) system.<sup>261</sup> According to this, the Danish system which does not pay according to use, and which favours certain works to others is, as intended, far removed from copyright legislation. The British system on the other hand, does favour the use and the extent of the use by paying by loans rather than by title, and is therefore closer to a copyright law. This, again, was the intention.

Though the two systems work according to the intentions behind them, it is interesting to note how the Danish system has changed from being somewhere in between the copyright and the cultural policy version of Public Lending Right to a cultural policy version. Officially, it has been explained as changes made according to EU law. Britain too is a member of the EU but has not had to change their system and have no intentions of changing it to a cultural support scheme. The British system can pass EU requirements because authors, editors and translators are only eligible for the PLR scheme if they are resident in the UK at the time they register for the fee for that particular book. That is, if an author has one book bought by the library system while he or she is living in the UK, he or she is eligible, but if the author has moved abroad when the next book is bought, he or she cannot register for that title. In this way the regulations discriminate against all nationals or none.

This does not mean that Britain does not want to open up its PLR system for other authors, British or of any other nationality living abroad. Britain has a reciprocal agreement with Germany and would like to form more of these agreements, or

for all countries in the EU with a PLR system, to enter a reciprocal agreement. This is not pure goodwill from Britain. The reciprocal agreement with Germany has meant that roughly £ 7,500 are paid annually to German authors by Britain, but British writers receive £ 150,000 from Germany<sup>262</sup>. No wonder Britain would like more reciprocal agreements because as it is stated in the annual PLR Review:

Given the strength and popularity of English language material on the Continent and of UK books in translation, there is likely to be the same, if not a greater, imbalance in payments in favour of UK authors where other European authors are concerned.<sup>263</sup>

This introduces another aspect into the cultural support/rights discussion. Namely that of a major national culture being able to profit on its popularity, and of a minor national culture, like the Danish, trying to safeguard its own national literature by excluding other languages. But it does not change the main argument, that Denmark would have been able to set up a rights based fee which would exclude the main bulk of other nationals without breaking EU directives. Because that is what Britain has done.

The overall reasons in the change in the Danish system are therefore rather to be found in the fact that the consensus for public support for culture was formed after the system. When the system was established there was a long and strong tradition for cultural support to authors, but a general cultural policy did not exist. The public debate in the late 1970s and early 1980s was not about whether the Library Fee should exist or not, but about the amounts paid out and about what kind of authors received the main bulk of the money. Even Danish authors have debated within the consensus rather than opposing a cultural support policy version of the Library Fee in favour of a rights fee.

In comparison, British supporters of the Public Lending Right still vehemently argue for the right as a right rather than a subsidy. But where the campaigners for the introduction of the system did this in order to get the system introduced in liberal Britain, the present argument is based on the fear, that Public Lending Right might replace other forms of subsidy. That is, it is based within the awareness of the weak tradition for literature support in England. F.R. Ward puts it the following way:

The point I am making is that from a government point of view literature, it appears, is taken care of by a combination of a private-sector publishing industry and the public library system; no more is required, especially now that the Government has introduced PLR funding. (In other words there is a danger in that by some it can be considered as a form of subsidy and therefore as a further substitute for a positive Arts Council policy).<sup>264</sup>

In Denmark Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt has taken the consequences of changing the system to a cultural support scheme to its conclusion by critiquing it on the basis of this. In her book *Litteraturens Situation*<sup>265</sup>, she points out that though the new scheme does reflect the work required in writing, because the new system takes the length of the work into consideration, it rewards all authors represented in the public libraries, without regards to quality, fiction or non-fiction. Because libraries to a certain extent do buy according to demand, among other ways through the numbers of each title bought, it means that the Library Fee still follows marketforces. As Worsøe-Schmidt points out, because the fee is not governed by an overall criterion for selection, such as the criterion of quality, it goes against the overall idea of support for authors and art, which is based on quality and disregarding marketforces. If the Library Fee is to be seen as a cultural support scheme this is questionable, especially since the fee makes up more than 2/3 of the Ministry of Culture's expenditure on authors and artists.

This leads to the last point to be made about Public Lending Right in general. Whether it is seen as a copy-right or a cultural policy, it seems to be a hybrid form. Both in Britain and Denmark a fixed amount of money is set aside every year on the Budget for the scheme. In both countries authors have to register for the scheme and there is a maximum amount paid out to each author, in Britain £ 6000, in Denmark 200,000 kr (approx. £ 20,000).

In a copyright system such as the British, it could be expected that the state paid a fixed amount per loan, recognising its use of books through public libraries without regard to who wrote the book or had registered for the system. A publisher pays the same royalty rate per copy sold in accordance with royalty agreements, and with no regard to the amount of books sold. Within Public Lending Right the rate paid is fixed within the budgeted money and shared within a ratio. That is, depend-





## 9) PUBLIC LIBRARIES AS PUBLIC SERVICE DISSEMINATORS.

*This chapter discusses public libraries as Public Service Disseminators of literature. It finds that Danish public libraries are conceptually linked to the cultural funding system. The system is based in a strong library philosophy which was very similar to the founding philosophy of the Ministry of Culture. Danish public libraries are seen as an enlightening force in Danish society and literature of quality is part of this enlightening force. British public libraries are not conceptually linked to the funding system. The founding philosophy was based in the educating/leisure tradition but extremely weak. The development has been a tug of war between pure goal directed education and pure leisure but has not perceived the public library's function as being an enlightening force in leisure time. Today British public libraries focus on the wishes of the community and public libraries have become primarily community and leisure centres. They are therefore not linked to the support system for fiction.*

In the Danish cultural funding system, public libraries are the Public Service Disseminators. In Britain, as the previous chapter has exemplified, libraries are either used as an excuse for not supporting literature in other ways, or as with the Arts Council, they are seen as needing help in fulfilling a role as promoter of literary fiction.

These perceptions are reflections on the public libraries as promoters of high art. But this is not necessarily the only function of libraries which after all also stock amounts of non-fiction. An interesting thing about public libraries is that they are the meeting point for conceptions and theories of literary support, of the functions of literature in society and of theories on readers' needs and wants and the library's perceived role in fulfilling these needs and wants. It is product meeting user and it is theories on product and user meeting each other. A library philosophy can take its

starting point in either philosophy or users, or both. But before moving on to discuss the history, philosophy and legislation which have formed the two different library systems of Britain and Denmark, I will discuss the public library's role in connection with the publishing industry.

Jens Thorhauge notes that in the literary process the public library has two roles. It manages the literary production and it disseminates it.<sup>266</sup> Management of the literary production, according to Thorhauge, is in collecting and making available, whereas dissemination is the promotion done by the library.

Thorhauge has here identified two aspects of the public library's function in the literary process. Stock consists of cultural products bought in the marketplace. Stock and availability are part of the library's role as gatekeeper, because this sets the limits both for what the library can promote, but also for what the readers can find at the library. The gatekeeper role is therefore intermingled with the library philosophies which decide the role of the public libraries.

In particular the collecting function of the libraries can influence what the publishing industry makes available, because of the sales this collection function accrues. Especially in a small language market like the Danish where margins are important libraries' book buying policies can be important, but also in the British market they can play a part for the not so profitable publications such as literary fiction and hardbacks.

I shall therefore preface the exploration of the history and traditions of the British and Danish library systems which have led to the two different systems - one, the British, based on the users, and the other, the Danish, based in cultural policies - by a look at the influence of the collection functions on the two publishing industries. This is also an example of how Danish public libraries are perceived as being supporters of literary fiction and how British public libraries are not seen as an instrument of cultural policies by anyone but opposers of support for literature.

Both in Denmark and Britain, the publishers agree that they cannot depend on the libraries for the books which are not economically viable in the marketplace. The reason given for this is that the libraries have had major cutbacks in their funding. In

Britain this is particularly seen in the cutbacks in opening hours, but in both Denmark and Britain there have also been cutbacks in the bookfunds.

There is no doubt that cutbacks have diminished the libraries' buying power in Britain. Paul Wellman explains that in Britain the first significant budget cuts came in 1975/6, and "Public libraries began to buy lower priced books and by so doing, were able largely to maintain the number of books acquired"<sup>267</sup> Since 1975 bookfunds have been cut further and libraries are not always able to maintain the same number of books as before, even by buying lower priced books. Nonetheless the buying of lower priced books by libraries has been important for the publishing industry.

Libraries have traditionally bought hardbacks. They are stronger than paperbacks and can therefore be issued more times than a paperback can. But because of diminishing funds, libraries are now buying more paperbacks. A publisher like Harvill still publishes a small hardback print-run for libraries and reviewers. But in the future the diminished buying of hardbacks could mean that titles which could survive in the traditionally small print-run of the hardback, may not be published because they are not economically viable in the larger paperback print-run. The issue is compounded by the fact that books which may not have sold well because of price or content in the bookshops, were at least available from the libraries.

This was the only way British publishers interviewed for this thesis saw the libraries as supporting or not supporting the literary fiction, by the implications the loss of hardback sales had on the small print-run literature.

In Denmark the connection between libraries and publishers has been part of the public debate for a couple of decades. In the 1970s the then director of the Publisher's Association, Bo Bramsen, blamed the public libraries for ruining the ecological balance in the world of books, because the free library loans meant less sales. This had changed by the end of the eighties and early nineties, where the libraries were blamed for not supporting the "narrow quality fiction"<sup>268</sup>, and thereby diminishing the chances of this being published.

In 1990 Statens Bibliotekstjeneste, The State's Library Service, ordered a survey of library book selection. This survey was published in 1992<sup>269</sup>, and one of its conclusions was:

The libraries leave out the worst and prefer quality, that is if it is combined with popularity. But that harms the narrow quality fiction, which get a lower priority than the broad entertainment novel, and in this way quality is failed to the advantage of demand.<sup>270</sup>

This survey fuelled the public debate about quality fiction and the libraries. The Ministry of Culture held a conference on the basis of this survey and in the following publication of the papers given at the conference, a list of articles and other contributions to the debate in the newspapers were published. The list which covers the first six months after the survey was published, is seven pages long.<sup>271</sup>

The Danish public libraries then, are seen as not supporting the narrow quality fiction sufficiently. A Danish publisher is not afraid of stating this, he even goes so far as to blame the libraries for creating a new market:

It is the buying-policy of the libraries which is the cause of the "vacuuming" of especially the British and American crime fiction market for authorships, which no Danish publisher would have touched otherwise, partly because they aren't good enough, partly because there wasn't a market for them.

Now loads and loads of them are being translated, and why? Because the libraries have shown themselves to be faithful buyers of more or less everything published of that kind.<sup>272</sup>

The public Danish debate and Danish publishers have pointed out that the libraries have an influence on what is being published, and that the libraries are not supporting the narrow quality fiction. In this debate no one is forgetting that the Danish libraries have had cuts in their funding, but the focus is on what is being bought for the money in the book-funds. This is a clear indication that the Danish public, including publishers, expects Danish public libraries to support quality fiction through their collection function.

The British debate, on the other hand, is sporadic, mainly a few comments from publishers about the falling library sales, and a general debate in library circles about the deterioration of the whole system.

There is one book which bridges the gap and discusses library stock and content, namely *The Strange Rise of Semi-Literate England*. In this the author, W.J. West concludes:

The public library has lost its soul because it has been absorbed into the modern semi-literate culture and because it did not have the knowledge and experience gained across generations that the old private libraries had to enable them to cope with the world of mass circulation popular fiction (...).<sup>273</sup>

*The Strange Rise of Semi-Literate England* was published in 1991 and the Danish survey *Biblioteket og Den gode Bog*, was published in 1992. But here the comparison stops. W.J. West shows no understanding of what the functions of a public library are. The methodology behind his conclusions is, to put it mildly, questionable. Nevertheless, the book could have led to a public debate, as did the Danish survey, but the book has only spun two articles.

One is *The Librarians New Clothes* by Richard Boston in Guardian. This article is a resumé (much clearer than the book itself) of West's book, which it generally agrees with. It ends by suggesting that libraries become an election issue.

The other is from The New Statesman, where Imogen Forster takes a critical view of West, saying he has a partial view and that the reading community is "no longer composed of white gentleman scholars".<sup>274</sup>

The British public then, does not take issue with the buying policies of its libraries, neither do British publishers expect support from the library system to the extent Danish publishers do.

Danish publishers' expectations of the libraries as supporters of quality fiction and the Danish public's outrage when this role has been perceived as not fulfilled is a clear indication of Danish public libraries as conceptually being part of the cultural funding system. The British debate on the other hand quite clearly shows that British public libraries are not seen as the natural supporters of quality fiction. To put it bluntly, it is not the function of British libraries to keep quality fiction on the market, but the Danish libraries are perceived as having that role. Interestingly enough, the two previous chapters have shown and the next will show that all institutions of arts support, whether Danish or British, operate with a quality

criterion when assessing and deciding support for the production of art. Danish libraries too in their book-buying policies apply a quality criterion. But British libraries do not.

This leads to the thought that the opposition to support for literature in Britain, when claiming that libraries and the publishing industry give sufficient support, either does not see literature as art or has not understood the role of British public libraries. Because the support and promotion of printed works as such, is not support or promotion of literary fiction. And the perceived role of public libraries decides their collection policies and their promotion policies. This role is defined by the acts concerning the libraries, the interpretation of these acts and government reports relating to them; and by the tradition and history of the public library. Here the Danish and the British public library roles differ. This is quite interesting given the fact that the Danish library movement looked to both Britain and the USA when they campaigned for and developed the Danish public library.

The foundation of the public libraries, the acts, the passages concerning the purpose and how the purpose is to be fulfilled are in British and Danish library law set out below. For England and Wales the Museums and Libraries Act of 1964 states:

(1) It shall be the duty of every library authority to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for all persons desiring to make use thereof:

provided that although a library authority shall have power to make facilities for the borrowing of books and other materials available to any persons it shall not by virtue of this subsection be under duty to make such facilities available to persons other than those whose residence or place of work is within the library area of the authority or who are undergoing full-time education within the area.

(2) In fulfilling its duty under the preceding subsection, a library authority shall in particular have regard to the desirability -

a) of securing, by the keeping of adequate stocks, by arrangement with other library authorities, and by any other appropriate means, that facilities are available for the borrowing of, or reference to, books and other printed matter, and pictures, gramophone records, films and other materials, sufficient in number, range and quality to meet the general requirements both of adults and children.<sup>275</sup>

For Denmark<sup>276</sup>:

[(1) The objective of the public library is] to promote the spread of knowledge, education and culture by making books and other suitable materials available free of charge.

[(1a)] The objective of the public libraries must be fulfilled by observing quality, comprehensiveness and topicality in the selection of materials to be made available. These criteria alone, and not any religious, moral or political views expressed in the materials, should be a decisive factor.

Before moving on to an interpretation of the acts, a few words on terminology. The above translation of the Danish library act is taken from W.J. Murison's *The Public Library*. The terminology he uses is adapted to a British library philosophy rather than reflecting the Danish traditions. As will become clear through this chapter Danish library philosophy incorporates various ideas which are also incorporated in the general cultural funding system.

The possibility of translating a term from one language into another without losing the connotation and at the same time keeping the transparency of the translation in the foreign language is a clear indication of the differing cultural traditions embedded in the terms of both the importing and exporting language. Murison's translation is one of the few official translations of acts or other official publications relating to the Danish cultural funding system in English, and it can therefore exemplify not only how Danish and British traditions differ, but also how culture-bound differences are.

Lawrence Venuti in his book *The Translator's Invisibility* explains that today Anglo-American traditions of translation emphasise fluency or transparency. That is, the text reads as if it was written in English. This way of domesticating the text, of bringing the text to the reader is "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values"<sup>277</sup> Lawrence Venuti advocates visibility for the translator through foreignising the text which, making the reader come to the text, is "an ethnodeviant pressure (...) to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad"<sup>278</sup>. That is, by using terminology closer to the connotations of the originating language the translated text reflects the original culture-boundedness. Venuti advocates foreignising the text as a "strategic cultural



intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others."<sup>279</sup> My intentions in foreignising the translation of the Danish terms are not so much to fight Anglo-American hegemony, but to show the different traditions embedded in the original terms, and also to emphasise the point that though Denmark and Britain may both be West-European industrialised societies, there are cultural differences which are so deeply embedded in traditions that the terms connoting them cannot be translated directly from one language to another. It is in this way also a reflection on the cross-cultural comparative research methodology which in a sense is a constant translation of one tradition into another and therefore a constant meeting with the subjectivity of these traditions.

Murison uses the term public libraries for the Danish "Folkebiblioteker", the direct translation is folk libraries, which reflects both the Danish conception of the people as being one class and the cultural roots of a farming country which have been incorporated into the modern Danish self-understanding. A translation into the "People's libraries" have connotations of Marxism and revolution which is foreign to the Danish conception of union between the people, state and country. Therefore folk libraries it is.

The objectives of the folk libraries are in Murison's translation "the spread of knowledge, education and culture". The Danish term "Oplysning", here translated as "knowledge" can be translated directly as enlightenment. It is a term not used as much in English as in Danish. In Danish it is not only the seventeenth century Enlightenment, but a term which connotes broadening of the mind and resembles the idea of the cultured man as in the early conceptions of culture. It is embedded in the Grundtvigian inspired enlightenment tradition which sees the common man as capable of making the right decisions when presented with the facts.

The last word to bring up here is the criterion which Murison has translated with "comprehensiveness". This is easily confused with the "comprehensive" of the British Library act. But the Danish term "Alsidig" does not so much connote covering sufficiently as it connotes diversity. It is an expression of the next sentence in the Library Act, of freedom of expression without regards of any religious, moral

or political views. It is the same diversity which is incorporated in the founding philosophies of the Ministry of Culture as artistic freedom.

The aspects of the union of state, country and people in Denmark and the Danish enlightenment tradition have already been discussed in chapter 7, the implications of "Alsidig" as diversity as in freedom of speech will be discussed again later in this chapter. On the whole the importance of, if not of the translation, then of the traditions these concepts are based on will become clearer as this chapter progresses.

And now a return to the acts defining the functions of the Danish and British public libraries.

The British library act states that the service is to be comprehensive and efficient, the Danish that it is to promote the spread of enlightenment, education and culture. The Danish act gives criteria for the selection of this material, namely the criteria of quality, diversity and topicality. The British act does not give any criteria for selection, but it does define the community which the library is to serve, namely the people living, working and undertaking education in the area.

The difference, then, is that the duties of the British public library at its legislative roots are much closer to the community than the Danish folk library is. This is not only in its various functions but also in its book selection. The Danish library must supply books of quality in order to promote enlightenment, education and culture, whereas the British public library must supply what is comprehensive in relation to its community.

This means that the Danish collection policies will emphasise literary fiction and that the Danish folk libraries are not able to stock for instance romances such as Barbara Cartland and Mills and Boon no matter how much its readers would like to read them. British libraries on the other hand only has their reader groups as a defining criterion and must therefore stock according to their perceived wants.

The British emphasis on efficient and comprehensive and the defined user group is a reflection of British library history.

The first British library act was passed in 1850. It was an enabling law which allowed local authorities to establish public libraries, but it did not allow for spend-

ing money on a book collection. As Thomas Kelly points out the act was valuable because it established a principle, but in practice it imposed restrictions. He sees subsequent development as directed to the removal of these restrictions.<sup>280</sup> R.J.B. Morris in his *Parliament and the Public Libraries* puts it in the following way:

In fact the overwhelming impression of the legislation of the first 25 years after the founding statute is of consistent effort to make the Acts more attractive for adoption and more readily available to any local community that might be willing to adopt.<sup>281</sup>

British public libraries have for as long as the system has been in existence been the responsibility of local authorities. It has therefore been necessary to define the group of readers who were able to use the service paid for by a particular local authority. Since the founding act was enabling, not statutory, and since there was no financial provision from the state, British library history is one long struggle to secure a comprehensive and efficient service. This struggle has also meant that a closer scrutiny of the purposes of these libraries have been secondary. It is the functions of the libraries and debates on these which have given objectives and criteria a prominent place in Danish legislation.

The first Danish library legislation was not passed until 1920, that is 70 years after the first British law was passed. But the libraries had received state support since 1882. Where public libraries in Britain have always been the domain of the local authorities, the folk libraries in Denmark were perceived as one system and the ideal was of a an even service all over the country. Therefore there was no need to define a user group.

The different services provided by Danish and British libraries are reflections of the traditions they build on. First and foremost, the first British library act passed in 1850 was an attempt to solve some of the problems of industrialisation. The popularity of the public houses among the working classes was seen as a problem in an industrialised society which needed its workers to be able to conform to the restrictions of factory life. In 1834 James Silk Buckingham, MP, was able to set up a select committee which was to enquire into "the extent, causes and consequences of the prevailing vice of intoxication among the labouring classes in the United Kingdom"<sup>282</sup> Buckingham's committee recommended the introduction of three bills. One

was control on alcohol. That is restrictions on the working-classes favourite but disruptive leisure activity - drinking. The two other bills recommended were attempts to provide healthy leisure pursuits. One was on public walks, gardens and open spaces. The other was on libraries and museums. All this led to the passing of the Museum Act in 1845 and an extension of this in the 1850 Library and Museum Act.

British library philosophy is characterised by a split between recreation or leisure and education, where leisure is seen as mindless escapism and education as acquiring technical skills. Though opinions have been expressed of something in the middle, as in enlightenment, a general broadening of the mind, the stark dichotomy of escapism and skills have been the prevalent conceptualisation of the role of public libraries, not necessarily as either or, but as a constant tug of war as to which should be the priority.

Two issues have influenced this. Partly, as John E. Pemberton has pointed out, that if libraries "eschewed their educative function they might deprive themselves of a vital link with a powerful branch of the execution".<sup>23</sup> That is a point reflecting the long struggle of British public libraries to gain size and status. The other issue is the somewhat vague and altruistic reasonings by the founding fathers.

In 1891 John Greenwood published his book *Public Libraries* in which he argues for the role of libraries. Thomas Kelly summarises his argument in the following way:

He [John Greenwood] argues in favour of libraries, firstly on economic grounds - "knowledge is power", secondly, on cultural grounds - "knowledge, like virtue, is its own reward" and thirdly, on social grounds, because "want of amusement drives men to vice and crime".<sup>24</sup>

John Greenwood's arguments for public libraries reflect the reasoning of James Silk Buckingham's Select Committee and the times in which the libraries were conceptualised. The economic grounds is the argument behind education as skills. That is libraries could be part of promoting capable workers, which would be good for themselves of course, but also for the economy of the country. Greenwood likens knowledge to virtue, and this was one of the main aims of the movements so strong at the time such as the constructive recreation movement and the temperance movement. To install virtue in the working-classes, to elevate them through construc-

tive leisure pursuits so that they, being virtuous, would not want to seek out public houses. Furthermore if libraries failed to elevate the working classes, then at least the possibility of reading escapist literature could keep them away from the public houses.

The reasons have changed and intermingled, and though the middle-class philanthropic movements of the time found it difficult to accept the idea of a pure entertainment purpose reason for the libraries, this has come to form part of the education and leisure dichotomy in the conceptualisation of the role of public libraries. The conceptualisation of education has come to entail more than skills and technique and has included formal education. But the conceptualisation is centred on formal, on goal-directed, on seeking specific information. Likewise the move from recreation to leisure has been a move to remove the implications of the paternalistic charity organisation of the mid-nineteenth century of virtue and moral, into the conceptualisation of leisure as free time with no restraints. That is, as times have changed the overt paternalistic attitudes expressed in the founding philosophies have been opposed by a change in attitude which emphasised the right to choose and the validity of other cultural expressions than middle-class expressions, such as it is expressed in for instance the cultural studies tradition.

Robert Snape has studied the "Great Fiction Question" in the period from the first act in 1850 to the inception of World War I in 1914<sup>285</sup>. He shows that the question in the mid- to late nineteenth century was on whether libraries should provide fiction at all. By the turn of the century this has changed into a question of what sort of fiction libraries could or should provide.

The selection committees from the outset of the library movement and until World War II were not composed of professional librarians, but of individuals from the "higher socio-economic groups"<sup>286</sup> such as cotton manufacturers, landed gentry and professional men. Since the British public library system is not, one system, but composed of a number of small systems where the provision of fiction was based on the interpretations and priorities of the individual local authorities, the provision varied according to the perceptions of the individual local selection committees, and in the early years "everywhere supervision [was] exercised by the librarian and the

committee in order to keep out what is immoral, or of a low sensational character"<sup>287</sup> Through the period investigated by Robert Snape the question seems to have crystallised into one of whether the libraries should provide valuable literature as conceptualised in the high and low arts dichotomy or whether libraries should draw a larger group of readers through providing entertainment. The following quote from Snape's book concludes this, at the same time as it exemplifies the modern conception of libraries as leisure centres:

[Some] committees placed a higher priority on populating the library and consequently provided novels in bulk. However some library committees perceived a primary duty not to provide a community-oriented recreational service but to promote fiction of literary merit and to direct popular reading patterns, persuasively or coercively. Such committees had few qualms in assuming the role of cultural gatekeeper, and public libraries provided idealistic opportunities for the implementation of their values and beliefs.<sup>288</sup>

Snape's modern-day conceptualisation of libraries as community-oriented recreational services which do not function as gatekeepers keeping out bad taste and which do not implement middle-class or hegemonic values or beliefs is, as mentioned above, opposed by the education conceptualisation of the role of the public libraries. But what is not prevalent in British Library philosophy are the views expressed by the McColvin Report:

"Their value lies in enabling men to do, think, feel and understand better than they could if they depended solely on their individual experience and that of those with whom they were in immediate contact"

"Indeed, democracy depends upon the universal existence of the ability to participate in democratic government and its cardinal aim is to give equality of opportunity. No other qualities can avail if access to so important a means of individual development is not full and universal.

The maintenance of a sound public library service is therefore as important to the community at large as to each of its members"<sup>289</sup>

This way of broadening the experiences on which thinking, feeling and understanding are based, and linking them to equality and democracy has hardly ever existed - and has disappeared - as a verbalised conception of the role of the public

library in the tug of war between education and leisure. But as we shall see, this has been the foundation of folk libraries in Denmark.

The McColvin Report from 1942 was extremely influential, but not for the role it saw public libraries as having but for its many suggestions as to how a library service could become sufficient and comprehensive. And this must not be forgotten. The main issue for the public libraries was to become established. The issue of leisure and education played into this, but was never the main focus. It is the struggles of establishment which were finally rewarded and affirmed in the 1964 Act by finally making it a duty "to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service". It is the structure of the library system based on local authorities which has given public libraries their selection criterion of a community, not the conceptualisation of the role of the public libraries.

After World War II, libraries became more closely linked to education. In 1957 the Roberts Report could state that "Causal recreation remains a perfectly legitimate public need and it is the business of the public library to meet it; but (...) it is no longer the basic motive of library use."<sup>290</sup>

As libraries became more consolidated during the 1950s, they began expanding their collections to incorporate non-print based media such as records. Slowly the focus moved from a focus on recreation and education to one on the readers or the community such as it was facilitated in the 1964 act. This, the newly introduced non-print media and the focus on community did in a sense also move the libraries closer to the leisure definition of libraries. R.P. Hillard notes that "the emphasis in the development of public library services in the golden years (...) from 1960 to say 1973 was on the provision of recreational services"<sup>291</sup>. From the mid 1970s community librarianship "was coined as the term to describe a style of library service provision that emphasised the importance of identifying people's needs and attempting to meet these rather than simply providing those resources and services which professional librarians thought they ought to have."<sup>292</sup> These changes in focus have facilitated the politically correct community-orientated recreational services indicated in the quote by Robert Snape.

The Educational role of public libraries has not disappeared but the focus is squarely on the community. It has become part of local authorities' leisure facilities, with all this entails of ideas of freedom to choose and limitations by choices made available. This poses a problem to the idea of public libraries as promoters of fiction, of public libraries as the Public Service Dissemination branch of support to literature.

If Public Service Dissemination is to provide quality artistic expression in the form of fiction which matches the wishes of the readers, this is almost impossible when the focus is so squarely on the readers' wants. Because this means that the service as a whole is geared towards these wants which may be video-films, community information service and "a good read" instead of, to paraphrase Richard Hoggart's "Hard Listening - but worth it"<sup>293</sup>, Hard reading - but worth it. In discarding the top-down paternalistic traditions of the mid-nineteenth century libraries have gone to the other extreme in not daring to think that what used to mean "better" may also today mean better, but also that it without a doubt means different. Libraries do buy and make literary fiction available, but it is not a priority and the idea of promotion is too entangled in the ideas of the top-down leisure/educating tradition to seem feasible.

Danish folk libraries are as steeped in its history and traditions as the British public libraries are in their history.<sup>294</sup>

The folk libraries in Denmark were until 1983 set up as one system. The first library act was passed in 1920, but it had received financial support from the state since 1882. Though the Danish Library movement struggled to get libraries recognised and professionalised all over the country, the founding philosophy was well in its place before it was explicitly stated in the 1964 Act as objectives of promoting enlightenment, education and culture, and where in the instructions the criteria of topicality, diversity and quality were stated.

Danish public libraries were not a response to industrialisation, but to democracy and enlightenment. Its philosophy gained prominence in a coup de grace to another tradition.



Most libraries in Denmark were the so-called *almuebogssamlinger*, peasant book collections. These libraries were aimed at the farming population, they were small and were run by either the vicar or the schoolteacher. These peasant book collections were run without financial support in the name of the local community, and their aim was to supply easily read, informative books. By the beginning of this century they formed the organisation "Danmarks Folkebogssamlinger", Danish Folk Book Collections.

Another movement consisting of professional librarians primarily from the cities stood in opposition to Danish Folk Book Collections in Denmark's Library Association. One of its young and promising members was Thomas Døssing who strongly opposed the wish of Danish Folk Book Collections to supply first and foremost easily read books and then informative books. Thomas Døssing's ideas have been extremely influential in the formation of the Danish library philosophy.

To Thomas Døssing the sort of libraries he wanted would "aim at giving all citizens the books necessary for the appropriation of general knowledge, to familiarise oneself with society's conditions, to guidance in the practical business life and finally to formation of the mind, especially through the valuable part of our fiction."<sup>29</sup> To him the difference between the old libraries and his vision, was what he saw as a "clash of interests between the old and new times' views of the enlightenment work for the people". The old one was a "cosy march in the same place" and because of this "a great deal of, in artistic respect, completely indifferent literature has been allowed to put its mark on our folk libraries and has been given the label 'good reading for the people'. In view of this perception books which are irreplaceable for the understanding of the people's culture have been kept out."

To Thomas Døssing the old peasant book collections had kept out quality by regarding the peasants as children who were not able to make up their own minds or understand the finer points of valuable books whether fiction or non-fiction. Døssing's opposition was therefore to the paternalism he found in the old peasant book collections. He took the same view with regards to the content of books. Døssing quoted Grundtvig saying: "Frihed fra Loke såvel som for Thor". - Freedom for Loke as well as for Thor. That is freedom for the demi god Loke who teased the gods and

tried to ruin whatever he could; as well as freedom for Thor, the good, noble and great god. To Døssing this is:

A democratic viewpoint not in the sense that for instance the folk libraries should be the expression of a particular political or social understanding, on the contrary, the folk libraries should in their book collection represent all views, but democratically thereby that the grown population are regarded as adults.<sup>296</sup>

Døssing's thoughts on the folk libraries are strongly Grundtvigian inspired. Enlightenment was elevating in the sense that it was a broadening of the mind of the population so that they could be responsible for themselves and the society they were part of. Like Grundtvig he acknowledges the capabilities of this population. His ideas on diversity are also based in this as are his ideas on enlightenment. Because like Grundtvig before him, he placed this enlightenment as part of a democratic society:

When workers and farmers take part in the running of the borough and the state, every enlightenment work can and must be for the whole people. (...) Intellectual possibilities for development are found in all classes of the population, and upbringing should bring up and not be a nice cosy march in the same place<sup>297</sup>.

This founding philosophy of the folk libraries was not threatened by the formation of the Ministry of Culture, on the contrary, it fitted right in. But what the welfare state's emphasis on a cultural policy did, was to emphasise the conceptual link between culture as a way of life with that older notion of culture as high culture. Therefore Døssing's idea of quality, that is that quality books were the best means of enlightenment, acquired connotations of pure aesthetic quality. It also combined the quality criterion with the opposition to (American) mass-culture which was part of the general cultural policy. This is what made the public debate following the publication of Annelise Japsen's survey *Biblioteket og den Gode Bog* so fierce because the survey showed that the libraries bought quality as long as it was combined with popularity, but less was bought of the quality fiction with a narrow or small readership.<sup>298</sup>

Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt sums up the implications of this report and of the folk libraries as part of the cultural funding system in *Litteraturens situation*.<sup>299</sup> She

points out that folk libraries, whether they wanted to or not have come to be regarded as a safety net for new Danish quality literature, but that this function - the collection function discussed in the beginning of this chapter - is in decline because the folk libraries by their book-buying have changed so that they are supporting market forces rather than counteracting them.

The quality criterion in the Danish library law is the most hotly debated issue within the system. It keeps a constant focus on the role of the folk libraries because it epitomises the split between artistic production and Public Service Dissemination, between the theoretical idea of art as an analytical and critical force within society and the actual wants of the population.

Claus Secher has analysed the debate on the quality criterion from the 1950s until today.<sup>300</sup> During the 1950s and early 60s there was an agreement on a national high culture whereas Library book-buying was a compromise between this and a more pedagogic enlightenment. Though the debate in the early to mid-sixties criticised this and emphasised a purely literary quality criterion, this was only a short-lived debate. Far more influential was the anti-authoritarian ideas culminating in 1968. Young librarians wanted a broader quality criterion than high culture which would allow genres such as thrillers and science fiction to be included in library stock. This was followed by the materialistic tradition promoted in the late sixties which led to a focus on the small history, the writing of women and workers in a style far removed from the more literary works.

The trends from the 1960s have broadened the quality criterion, but they have not abolished it. It is the best of thrillers which are bought and it is the best of women's writing. Claus Secher finds that book selection in the 1980s and 1990s have been influenced by postmodern trends with their emphasis on media and the collapse of the distinction between high and low culture. This is what has led the libraries to a more demand orientated book-buying.

This demand orientated book-buying is what the public debate calls "Tivolisering" which to a certain extent can be translated with the concept of "McDonaldalisation" by its implications of the changing society and the postmodern idea of a collapse of values. But "Tivolisering" is very much in the debate a harking back to

the old values of a national high culture and an emphasis on the promotion of aesthetic quality in cultural policies.

Claus Secher's own ideas are based on a broad quality criterion and an understanding of the enlightenment idea and the Public Service Dissemination tradition. His call to the profession is part of the on-going debate on libraries as part of the cultural funding system and as Public Service Disseminators:

What is needed today is of course not librarians who nostalgically try to re-establish a narrow high culture. (...) What is needed in connection with fiction today is a knowledge of both the conditions of literature and its possibilities of creating experience and insight. What is needed is commitment, enthusiasm (...) and an infectious dissemination. (...) The libraries should not forget that their buying should be in relation to a bigger horizon of time, and that quality fiction most often has a longer afterlife than a *Scarlett* or *The Butcher*. If the librarian is committed, then that will be infectious.<sup>301</sup>

The collapse of the national high culture and the new demand-orientation are, as Secher notes as well, not only combined with a post-modern condition, but also with a decentralisation of the folk library system. In 1983 a new act was passed in which the main responsibility for libraries went from the state to local authorities. A new clause was included in the instructions. The libraries' selection has to be "under hensyn til virkeområdets karakter" in consideration of the character of the field of activity. This is the Danish way of defining a community to the size of a local authority. This spelled the end of the idea of the Danish library system as one system and the end of the idea of folk libraries as universal libraries.

Since the libraries are now to cater for the local community certain trends are recognisable from the British library system, such as the focus on the user group. As Jens Thorhauge points out, folk libraries are changing from being collection-based to being user-based.<sup>302</sup>

Thorhauge sees libraries moving towards being resource centres, updated electronic libraries where, as he says in a "polemic formulation": "The task is not to make books available, but to solve the customer's problem. (...) The libraries profile themselves more clearly, many must find new niches, new ways of co-operation with the target-groups and a division of work between libraries must be developed".<sup>303</sup>

But the electronic library is not the only vision of the future. A dichotomy seems to have arisen in the now decentralised Danish library system. On the one hand there is the librarian as information disseminator and on the other the culture disseminator. The information disseminator is probably working in Thorhauge's electronic library. They are seen as "the hard, technology fixated, system-world preserving, market-directed knowledge engineers"<sup>304</sup> The other idea is that of the librarians as culture disseminators who are "the soft, humanistic life-confirming (and by the opposition perceived as somewhat starry-eyed and reactionary) book-lovers"<sup>305</sup>

In many ways this is the dichotomy which is seen in the British system. The British education strand is in many ways turning into similar visions to that of the Danish information centres. But the Danish culture centres are, in spite of the increased demand-orientation, not turning into leisure centres in the British version. There is, within this vision, still a strong emphasis on the enlightening force of art. One librarian discussing this issue makes the following remarks:

I still think quality is a key concept for libraries. Increased demand-orientation is not to be understood as a way of transforming the libraries into centres for light entertainment. It is to be understood as increased demand-orientation on the basis of which the libraries operate. The libraries are to deliver what the competition does not do so well. That is quick and correct information and it is the knowledge which all thirst for in the middle of the information flood. Put in another way it is the possibility for absorption.<sup>306</sup>

Even in the conceptualisation of the changing roles of libraries, the links to cultural policies are strong, with an insistence on quality and on being an alternative to the commercial market.

Danish libraries have from the beginning incorporated ideas which the Ministry of Culture later incorporated in its founding philosophies. These traditions are specifically Danish, in the same way that the circumstances of industrialisation which shaped the formation of public libraries are specifically British.

Danish folk libraries have been influenced by being incorporated in a cultural policy. This has linked the quality criterion to a narrower aesthetic conception than first conceptualised. But in spite of this, the quality criterion has been in constant

dialogue with the aesthetic quality criterion and the Public Service Dissemination tradition - which was visualised from the outset - and also with the opposition to mass-culture embodied in the cultural policies.

British public libraries on the other hand are no less typical of the lacking cultural policy tradition in Britain. Had such a tradition existed the libraries may have been moving towards cultural centres as Danish libraries may be today. Instead British libraries have shed the paternalistic ideas of its foundation and have become linked to leisure and community rather than to culture and art. This is also facilitated in the Act governing library provision which is a result of structures rather than library philosophy.

## 10) SUPPORT TO TRANSLATED FICTION

*This chapter analyses support to translated fiction and promotion of national fiction abroad. It finds that both the Arts Council and Danish Literature Information Center support translations but that they do this through responsive schemes. This means that the translations supported are primarily from major languages such as French, German and English rather than from languages which are under-represented on the markets. The chapter also finds that promotion of national literature abroad is based on the quality criterion as all other cultural funding. This holds true whether the promotion is done by an institution such as Danish Literature Information Center which is part of the cultural funding system or by an organisation such as the British Council under the Foreign Office. But the chapter also finds that international relations influence which countries are prioritised in the promotional work.*

Support to translated fiction is traditionally thought of as support given to the translation and publishing of titles written in a foreign language. Both Denmark and Britain have this kind of support scheme.

But there is a second kind of support where a country promotes its national fiction to other countries. Denmark has an agency for this, namely the Danish Literature Information Center under which the support for translations of titles into Danish is also placed. In Britain there is no agency specifically promoting British fiction, but the British Council promotes British culture abroad and within this literature is included.

In this chapter both the support for translated literature and the promotion of literature abroad will be analysed, as will the underlying reasons for the support. Much of the chapter is based on interviews, since state funding for the support of translations has not been the focus of in-depth studies before.

I have interviewed three key-figures, who altogether represent the support for translated fiction in Denmark and Britain and the promotion of national literature abroad. The interviewees are Lise Bostrup, Danish Literature Information Center; Alistair Niven, literature director, the Arts Council; Neil Gilroy-Scott, literature director, British Council. In addition the chapter uses statistics compiled on the basis of lists obtained from the Arts Council and the Danish Literature Information Center.

Support to translated fiction in Britain is administered by The Arts Council. When the Literature Department had been fully established again after the cuts caused by *The Glory of the Garden* it embraced the new policies of internationalism and multi-culturalism by setting up a scheme for the support of translated fiction. Behind the internationalism and multi-culturalism policies lie reasons of cross-cultural understanding, of opening up to the outside world:

(...) [The Arts Council's] job is of course to promote the arts within this country. British Council's task is to support the arts abroad. And so, when we say we have an international policy it is to inform the arts of this country, which we believe are better informed by bringing writers or visual artists or actors or whatever from other countries to this country from time to time. Or to support anything that widens public knowledge of the international arts community. In our case, literature, translations would be a major way of doing this.<sup>307</sup>

When the literature department started its scheme for translated fiction it gave special priority to books written in Asian, East European and Scandinavian languages. In the choosing of these three language groups it emphasised the cross-cultural aspects of the policy. Asian languages were chosen because Britain has a large Asian community and as Alistair Niven points out, "We should be more familiar with literatures of India in particular and to some extent China and Japan"<sup>308</sup>. East European languages were selected because of the changes that were going on in these countries. Lastly, Scandinavian languages were chosen as "a major European literature that was severely neglected in this country". This policy of priority has since been abandoned because applications for translation subsidy have come in in connection with literature from all over the world and "it really is as important to get knowledge of contemporary French literature, or Paraguayan literature as it is of Danish or Indian."



In Denmark, subsidy to translations has been placed under The Danish Literature Information Center, whose main aim is to promote Danish literature abroad. The Center was established in 1990 as a result of a Select Committee Report from 1987 on cultural export.<sup>309</sup> It was in fact one of the few results of this report.

It is interesting that the report was given in 1987, the same year the Arts Council decided on its international policy. Both this policy and the report are indications of the changing times where satellite television was becoming a force to be reckoned with, where the then EC was slowly becoming stronger and the Global Village was becoming increasingly more obvious.

The Select Committee Report expressed fears of Danish culture being swamped by imported culture. It also expressed a wish for Culture to profile Denmark in the international business environment. Thankfully this idea has been abandoned as a stated policy, and support for Danish cultural export works through the same criterion as all other support of culture in Denmark, namely that of artistic quality. What the report stated and which still holds, is that in an international society Denmark needs to place itself on the map. When the Report is not advocating culture as a way of profiling Denmark in aid of the Danish business community, it sees culture as furthering cross-cultural understanding in the increasingly international society:

(...) Cultural exchange and information in its broadest sense is a means to bringing peace and understanding between nations. By the spontaneous insight that there can be other ways of thinking and creating, tolerance and openness is heightened. Increased insight therefore leads to heightened understanding and thereby contributes to overcoming prejudices.<sup>310</sup>

The Danish Literature Information Center (DLIC) is therefore, like the international policy of the Arts Council a sign of the internationalisation of the world in which cross-cultural understanding plays a part in overcoming national differences. DLIC is also the result of the small nation in the international community in so far as it was established to "promote the interest in Danish literature abroad"<sup>311</sup>, not to promote Danish literature abroad and foreign fiction at home.

Nonetheless, translations from other languages into Danish have been placed under the Centre. According to Lise Bostrup, the centre director<sup>312</sup>, this has led to

some advantages because it has meant that the Centre has a knowledge of which Danish publishing houses publish what kind of translated fiction. This means that the Centre can be of assistance to the publishing houses abroad to which they try to promote Danish literature.

Applications for translation subsidy are discussed by the Translation Committee (Oversætterkomiteen). There is no stated policy of priority, but according to Lise Bostrup they try not to support fiction in English and give priority to third world languages.

In the subsidy of translation, Denmark and Britain share certain features. Most importantly, though the incentive for the schemes may have been internationalisation and cross-cultural understanding, the overall criterion is that of literary quality. In the question of prioritising between titles other literary issues are taken into consideration. A title is supported if it is important to a particular authorship rather than peripheral. With old titles which a publishing house may wish to publish in a new translation it can be taken into consideration whether the title or author have been influential for other authors or literatures either in the home country or internationally. Both schemes are also implicitly and partly explicitly trying to support fiction which would not otherwise be translated. That is, they want to further the diversity of literature by helping in introducing little known languages and cultures. This is partly explicitly stated through which languages are prioritised, but also through the fact that the schemes tend to subsidise publications which are not economically viable. That is, worthy titles which cannot survive on the marketforces but which add a new dimension and diversity in what is available.

Besides the overall quality criterion and considerations of literary tradition, there are some very practical limitations to the subsidy schemes. The two schemes only give grants to cover the translation fee. That is, they subsidise the expensive extra aspect translated fiction has in comparison to fiction written in the language of the country. They also demand that the translator is given a proper contract. It may seem obvious that the translator is to be properly paid for the work he or she does. It is also becoming obvious but there has been and still is a tendency to underpay translators. Also, since translators are often idealistic people with a love for the

literature of their preferred language, they may find it more difficult to demand proper payment because they want to see the title published.

On the whole the Danish and English schemes are alike and it would be interesting to see whether the schemes have actually led to diversity in what has been translated and whether the schemes have actually led to promoting literature in languages other than those of strong nations and cultures such as Britain, France and Germany.

The following statistics, represented in table 1 and 2 on pages 216 and 217, are compiled on the basis of lists of grants from the Arts Council and Danish Literature Information Center. The period is 1990-1995 for DLIC and 1990/91-1994/95 for the Arts Council. The tables are divided into West European, East European, Spanish/Portuguese and other languages. For Denmark, English has its own category and for Britain, Scandinavian has its own category. These categories represent 25 languages for Britain, including such languages as Swedish, German, French, Bulgarian, Russian, Bengali, Hindi, Arabic and Japanese. For Denmark the categories represent 18 languages including English, French, Turkish, Russian, Czech, Arabic and Chinese.

No clear conclusion can be made from the languages alone as to who is the most diversified. But the main variation in pure language coverage is that Denmark has supported a few titles in Turkish and Estonian (two titles all together) whereas Britain has not. Britain on the other hand has supported a few titles in Bengali, Hindi and Urdu (five titles in Bengali and one in each of the other two languages) which Denmark has not. The very tentative conclusion which may be drawn from this, is that it is a reflection of Britain's connections to the Commonwealth, whereas Denmark, through guest workers, has connections to Turkey and among the East European countries in particular to the Baltic states of Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia.

The English category in the table from DLIC does not represent British fiction alone, But it is a clear indication of the strong Anglo-American influence in Denmark.

Spanish/Portuguese have been kept as a separate category because, they are partly an indication of a literary trend which favours magic realism by such authors

as Isabel Allende and Gabriel Garcia Marquez and because Spanish and Portuguese are the languages of some old colonies which were previously parts of Empires.

Those titles are therefore not an expression of interest in West-European Spain and Portugal.

Spanish and Portuguese have been kept separate from the West-European category in order not to distort the figures. For the same reason anthologies translated from various languages supported by the Arts Council have not been included in the statistics. These include *South Asian Writings* and *From Baltic Shores*. Some of these languages are as it is represented with only one title or none, and the addition of even one title would distort the figures when they are presented in percentages. Hereby also a note of caution concerning percentages. As the number of titles are small in statistical terms results must be treated with some reservation. One title may one year represent 20% as it does for DLIC in 1993 where only five titles were supported, or 3% as it does for the Arts Council in 92/93 where the council supported 31 titles. Nonetheless, with the varying number of titles supported percentages are the only way to show the larger picture.

Before moving on, a note on the Scandinavian category for Britain. Since no Danish title had been supported by the Arts Council, and since the Council to begin with gave priority to Scandinavian, rather than in particular Danish or, say, Finnish, I have kept Scandinavian languages as a separate group.

It is disappointing to see that no Danish titles have been supported. One could hypothesise that this is because no great literature comes from Denmark. But then it could also be hypothesised that no great literature comes from former Yugoslavia or Afghanistan. It is arrogance and ethnocentrism to believe that the reason why all the under-represented or not represented languages in the statistics are left out, is simply that no worthy quality fiction has been produced in those languages. When stated like this the argument becomes obviously ridiculous.

Danish books have been translated during the time the Arts Council scheme has been in operation. The examples used in this thesis are *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg and *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was published by Harvill, then part of the HarperCollins conglomerate.

Besides being published by an imprint under a very profitable conglomerate it was also deemed a likely profitable success by the publisher.

*Brother Jacob* on the other hand, was published by the small, independent Maryon Boyars. Maryon Boyars did apply for Arts Council money for the translation, but was turned down. The main reason for this was probably that Maryon Boyars did not follow the standard contract for translators. Though Maryon Boyars and the translator both found that the arrangement they had set up would have been more profitable for the translator than the standard contract, the Arts Council insisted on a standard contract.<sup>313</sup>

One turned-down Danish title does not mean that the Arts Council is unwilling to support Danish fiction.

A more valid point to be made is that the Literature Department at the Arts Council gave priority to Scandinavian literature, not Danish. Though Denmark is fairly well known in Britain for bacon, butter and beer, it does not have an image of being an interesting country. However, when it comes to being known as a country, Sweden is famous for the welfare state, and Swedish represents most of the titles in the Scandinavian category in the tables. This is not to say that Denmark does not have a well-developed welfare state, but that the image of the Scandinavian welfare state seems synonymous with Sweden. On the whole the image of Denmark suffers from the "nice but boring" syndrome.

The Literature Department relies on a translation advisory committee when selecting titles for subsidy. Since the beginning this group has had a Scandinavian expert. Patricia Crompton, the original member, was competent in Swedish and Danish. The present member Joan Tate is a translator of Swedish. Though the Scandinavian experts on the panel have had Swedish as their main language, it does not necessarily mean that it automatically leads to a favouritism of Swedish.

Most people who have been taught a Scandinavian language at that level have been taught about the other Scandinavian languages and countries as well. Lise Bostrup has noticed in her work with translators of Danish that they often switch languages. A translator who usually translates from Swedish may start translating from Danish. Though the translator may have greater proficiency in Swedish, he or she is

able to read and understand the Danish language and knows enough about Danish culture to be able to translate from Danish into his or her mother tongue. Likewise Swedish experts on the Arts Council advisory panel know enough of Danish culture not to be prejudiced against it. Added to this is the fact that the Literature Director Alistair Niven has taught at a Danish university, still has friends in Denmark and shows an interest in Danish projects such as this. On the whole, too many people involved in the subsidy of fiction in Britain are too knowledgeable of Denmark to fall under the spell of the "bacon, butter and beer" image and the "nice but boring" syndrome. Scandinavian books in the Arts Council tables are therefore drawn out as a separate category to indicate, if not exactly the coverage of Danish literature, then the coverage of the group in which Danish is conceptualised. That is, as a representative of Scandinavia, in line with Bulgarian being a representative of East-Europe.

**Table 1**  
**Percentage of the Arts Council's subsidy to translated fiction**

Language	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	Total period
Scandinavian	20	17	16	16	5	15
West European	27	17	32	44	45	35
Spanish/Portuguese	27	25	16	28	20	22
East European	13	25	26	4	20	17
Other	13	16	10	8	10	11
In all	100	100	100	100	100	100
In actual figures	15	12	31	25	20	103

**Table 2**  
**Percentage of Danish Literature Information Center's subsidy to translated fiction**

Language	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	Total period
English	36	24	20	38	33	32
West European	32	43	-	24	44	33
Spanish/Portuguese	5	5	20	19	-	8
East European	23	14	60	14	17	20
Other	4	14	-	5	6	7
In all	100	100	100	100	100	100
In actual figures	22	21	5	21	18	87

What the figures show is that there is no particular trend of change over the five years. This is interesting in connection with the Arts Council because they started out with a priority of Scandinavian, East European and Asian languages. DLIC tries not to support fiction in English, but this group is as big as the rest of the West-European languages together. For both countries, in spite of stated or implicit policies, West European languages are the most supported. From the Arts Council, Scandinavian and East-European languages receive more or less the same amount of support. In both Denmark and Britain the whole wide world situated outside of Europe receive the least support.

What the results do not show is that the languages receiving most support by the Arts Council are French (16%), German (12%) and Spanish (19%). Swedish, Italian and Russian represent 7% each of the whole. In the support given by DLIC English comes in at number one with 32% whereas French, Italian, German, Russian and Polish all come in at number two with 7%.

All in all, this mini-survey of the support given to translated fiction by the Arts Council and the Danish Literature Information Center shows that the languages primarily supported represent West-European countries and languages coming from the most influential countries such as Britain, the USA, France, Germany, Russia

and Sweden. And it does this in spite of stated or implied policies of priority in support.

The issue here, is that the support to translated fiction in both Denmark and Britain is responsive. The responsive policy is basically a follower of existing trends rather than an active force. Even though overall objectives of both support schemes have been to further diversity in the literature available, they could only fail with or without explicit or implicit aims of giving priority to certain language groups, simply because there have not been enough titles in the selection pool to create diversity. Because both the Danish translation committee and the Arts Council's advisory group can only take into consideration the books for which there are applications, they can only support what the publishers show an interest in. As Lise Bostrup says:

The Danish publishers are in love with English literature, and that is what they want [to publish]. They are not that interested in literature from Uganda so they don't seek it out. And therefore there are no applications [for the support of this].<sup>314</sup>

This does not mean that the two institutions have not promoted translations per se, because even titles in the main European languages are more expensive to publish than books written in English and Danish. Nonetheless, it seems that if Denmark and Britain want diversity in the translated fiction they support, a more interventionist policy is needed.

A pure interventionist policy would be to commission books for translation. The Arts Council has done this by initiating a partnership with Heinemann around the *Asian Writers Series*. The *Asian Writers Series* is a series of anthologies of Asian writers which contain texts written in languages such as Bengali, Urdu and Tamil. It is published by Heinemann and subsidised by the Arts Council. The Arts Council in this way expands the available titles in the languages it gives priority to.

Another way to create diversity is by creating an interest for fiction from other cultures. Because, as Lise Bostrup points out, if the publishers are not interested, they do not seek it out. Therefore if an interest were created among publishers they



would want to publish more. - If it were economically feasible. Another group to target for the creation of interest is therefore the general public.

The Arts Council has taken this into consideration in its policies. It has arranged tours for writers from abroad. In June 96 a tour of Finnish writers is to take place. The Council is also considering a Scandinavian, or perhaps a Danish tour. Besides the tours the Arts Council place foreign writers in residence. In December 95 a writer from Trinidad and one from Somalia had residencies in Britain which were paid for by the Arts Council.

Furthermore, the Arts Council has also supported Norvik, the publisher of Scandinavian fiction in translation, through its Small Presses grant.

Through its interventionist policies the Arts Council has given support to language groups other than the main European languages. What it has not been able to do through its responsive policies it has done through its interventionist policies. Though it may not have created diversity in what is being published, it has at least created diversity in what it supports.

Danish Literature Information Center has no other schemes for the promotion of translated fiction in Denmark. The Centre has as its objective to promote Danish literature abroad and not to promote foreign fiction at home. On the whole more books are translated in Denmark than in Britain and there is not the same aversion to translations. Nonetheless most of what is translated is primarily from English and then from the other main European languages. As with the Arts Council, DLIC can only follow this trend with its responsive policy, not change it. This does not pose a problem for English fiction in translation in Denmark, the main subject of this thesis, but Denmark too could benefit from a more diverse body of translated fiction.

The question is though, how much good do the interventionist policies of the Arts Council actually. There is no doubt that a little is better than nothing. There are limited funds for bodies such as the Arts Council to work with. What the Arts Council is doing with its interventionist policies is to try and create an interest and awareness of another culture. The question is whether the limited funds and the traditional support schemes are enough to create awareness of foreign cultures, to create interested and avid readers and publishers of foreign fiction and cultures.

Within promotion of literature and culture other methods are used. It is a different kind of support because these institutions promote their own culture and literature abroad, but the basic aim of creating interest for a foreign culture is the same.

Both Denmark and Britain have their institutions for the promotion of the respective countries abroad. The British Council is to promote British culture abroad, whereas the Danish Literature Information Center is to promote Danish literature abroad.

Danish Literature Information Center has now been in existence for more than five years. Its director Lise Bostrup has run the Centre since its beginning. The Centre is financed by the Ministry of Culture which has increased its funding over the years.

That the Centre is under the Ministry of Culture not the Ministry of Foreign Affairs clearly indicates that though it is to promote Danish literature abroad this is not the same thing as promoting Denmark abroad. It is part of the Danish cultural support system, and its main criterion is therefore quality.

Lise Bostrup strongly rejects the idea of exporting a kind of Danishness. This would leave out authors born in other cultures, but living in Denmark, writing in Danish, from the background of the two cultures. Rather than promoting Danishness, the Centre seems to work from a set of criteria which puts literary quality first and then focuses on diversity, an impression of what is happening in Denmark and a Danish view of the world. Lise Bostrup says:

(...) there should be things which are Danish as well, of course, but first and foremost it has to be good literature and then it wouldn't hurt if it says something about the debate in Denmark.<sup>315</sup>

The literary criterion is strong, but as already indicated other factors are taken into consideration. Besides diversity, the almost impressionistic expression of Denmark rather than Danishness, the Centre also takes into consideration what may be successful abroad. It is not a "Will they buy this?" consideration rather it is a "will this come across, will this be understood?" Though an author or a book may be the latest hit in Denmark it may not come across in other countries where another

culture or other literary traditions give a different frame of reference. In this way the Centre takes in to consideration the idea expressed by publishers in this thesis, that a book will have to be able to travel culturally.

All in all what emerges is a nuanced set of criteria which is centred around literary quality, diversity and cultural understanding rather than a propagandistic, stereotypical propaganda for Denmark. It is promotion, but it is literary promotion from one literary culture to another. This last point is important, because it must not be forgotten, that Danish literature abroad becomes part of other bookworlds with publishers, reviewers and readers. It does not become part of a structured campaign to promote cross-cultural understanding.

Put like this it is obvious that a Centre like DLIC should have the sort of criteria it does, but nonetheless the idea of a literature information centre was a recommendation from a select committee which not only spoke of cross-cultural understanding but also of using culture to improve the conditions of Danish industry abroad:

It is my understanding that a good Denmark-picture abroad is of great importance for the export. As is generally known we must exist through the export of knowledge, the service industry, industrial-, agricultural-, and fishing-products.<sup>316</sup>

It is in everybody's interest to maintain this connection [between culture and the trades and industries] which is a basic condition. It is important to become aware of this and increase the possibility for an advantageous co-operation between culture and the trades and industries.<sup>317</sup>

The Report may have seen culture as a means to help improving the conditions of export abroad. This may be an added bonus, but in line with the traditions of the arm's length principle and artistic freedom in Danish cultural policies this is not an objective of the Danish Literature Information Center.

The Centre uses several fairly traditional cultural support schemes such as travel stipends to translators and promoting literature through writers' visits abroad. Besides this Lise Bostrup also visits book fairs and literature festivals abroad, partly to get a knowledge of the international bookworld, but primarily to promote the

Centre and its work. In a community which thrives on personal contacts this is invaluable work.

One important scheme is a result of the Danish language. Very few publishers outside Denmark read the language. It is a major obstacle, because it means that the publishing house has to find a reader just to get a general idea of the quality of the book. Therefore The Danish Literature Information Center funds test translations of a chapter or two of the book in question. This means that the foreign publisher can actually read part of the text and not dismiss it straight away.

DLIC is not the only centre of its kind in existence. Holland has a centre called The Foundation for the Promotion of the Translation of Dutch Literary Works. This foundation works in a different way from DLIC. Every year it commissions the translation of five books which it then promotes abroad. The advantage of this centralised approach is that the Dutch centre can launch an intensive campaign for its selected titles.

Danish Literature Information Center has chosen a decentralised way of working. Instead of concentrating its efforts around a few selected titles, it aims to establish a general awareness and knowledge of Danish literature in bookworlds abroad and to create a network of promoters abroad.

The general awareness and knowledge is primarily sought created through the magazine *Danish Literary Magazine* and its supplement *Danish Children Literature Magazine*.

*Danish Literary Magazine* is a literary magazine written in English and published as a tabloid sized newspaper. It contains reviews, extracts, essays and author interviews. It also lists recently published translations of Danish fiction. The magazine concentrates on contemporary fiction in a mixture of established and new authors. In its selection it follows the same cultural view discussed above. The subject of the magazine and the reader-group - Danish literary fiction for a foreign reader without extensive previous knowledge or interest in the subject - shapes the magazine so that it is both introductory and user-friendly for the busy reader. Nonetheless it is primarily a literary magazine, though for the interested reader rather than the Danish expert.

Like most of the Centre's work, the magazine is aimed at the professional bookworld. It has a print-run of 10.000 copies of which the Centre distribute 5.000 to various publishing houses with special interest in translated fiction, magazine editors, literature houses, cultural houses, directors of literary festivals and fairs. These are contacts made over the years through the work the Centre does and through visits to various book fairs and festivals abroad. DLIC keeps copies to hand out at these fairs and festivals, and the rest go to embassies and Danish lectures abroad. New names are continuously added to the mailing list as the international bookworld changes, but all in all the central names in the world of translated literary fiction are covered.

Since most publishers do not seek out Danish literature, the magazine in itself is a constant reminder that it exists as a fully fledged national literature. Because of the "nice but boring" image Denmark tends to have, it is also an advantage to emphasize literature rather than Denmark, and the magazine through its choices does also emphasize the quality and diversity of the literature.

The idea of a Literary Magazine as promoter of a national literature abroad is not new. Finland for instance sends out *Books from Finland* and Sweden publishes *Books from Sweden*. Compared to these the *Danish Literary Magazine*, as the title says, puts a stronger emphasis on "Literary" than "Denmark". But far more innovative and interesting than the magazine is the work the Centre does for and with the translator.

The translator is notoriously underrated. He or she is often hardly perceived as a part of the creative process. But translators can make or break a book by the quality of the translation. Translation is not just substituting a word in one language to the equivalent in another. In some cases it is a question of re-writing the book in order to stay true to the tone of the language and of the original without changing the meaning. Translation is not only a craft it is also an art. It demands thorough research and knowledge of the culture the book in question comes from.

Most translators of literary fiction are authors or academics. They have often lived or been on extended visits in their second language countries and do in general have a great knowledge of the culture they translate from. - Not to mention a

knowledge of the culture they translate into. They also tend to have a passion for the literature of their chosen language and an idealistic wish to see as much as possible of this translated into their own language.

The Danish Literature Information Center recognises this and cultivates the translator. This is done through seminars where translators are invited to Denmark to discuss Danish literature and translation problems and to meet Danish authors and other translators. This in itself is valuable because it creates a connection so that the translators can see themselves as part of an extended network which shares the same interest.

But as the Centre writes in its annual report from 1994, "The problem for Danish literature in the smaller European countries is foremost a lack of translators and professional disseminators with a thorough knowledge of Danish literature."<sup>318</sup> The Centre has therefore established a course in literary translation for selected young translators "with a proven ability to formulate themselves in a literary way in their own language and with a good knowledge of Danish"<sup>319</sup>. It is a one month course where the students are taught Danish literature, Danish language and grammar, every day culture, and dissemination of literature. They also meet publishers and authors, and visit libraries and theatres. The young translators are also encouraged to choose a book for translation while they are in Denmark.

The course ran in 1994 and 1995 and so far translators from The Baltic countries, Spain, Italy, Rumania, Hungary, The Czech Republic, Albania, Russia and Poland have attended the course. The course not only creates new translators with a knowledge of Denmark and the Danish language, but it also encourages and widens the knowledge of Danish literature. That is to say it creates a variety both among translators, so that there are both younger and older translators. This again means that the variety of interests and knowledge has been expanded and thereby the possibility of diversity in what can be translated. A 60 year old professor of Danish does not have the same interest in Danish youth culture as a 23 year old who has recently been on a translator course in Denmark. The scheme does also create diversity in the languages which Danish literature can be translated into. Because, as Lise Bostrup points out, a book can't be published abroad if there isn't a translator.

But the opposite point can also be made, that no matter how many translators there are, a book will not be published if no publisher wishes to publish it. DLIC has taken this point into consideration and has started another innovative scheme which utilises the translator's enthusiasm for Danish literature.

The scheme gives financial support to translators for the effort of trying to get publishers interested in a particular title (*støtte til opsøgende arbejde*). This is not a lump sum paid to a translator who might think it would be a good idea to have a particular title published at home, but the grant is not dependent on the result. A translator has to have a good idea of which publishing houses to approach and why they might be interested in the particular title. That is, the translator has to have good knowledge of his or her homemarket and also have considered why the title in question may do well on the homemarket.

Through this scheme DLIC acknowledges and uses the bi-cultural translator. That the translator is bi-cultural is what makes the scheme workable. Publishers tend to listen more to colleagues from the international publishing network than to interested parties such as literary agents and professional promoters. Nonetheless a knowledgeable third party with a good track record is more trustworthy than for instance an official body such as DLIC with a clear aim and no in-depth knowledge of that particular publishing world. The translator becomes something in between a literary agent and a scout. A literary agent represents the author but knows the publishing world. A scout works abroad for the publisher searching out new noteworthy titles before they are published so that the publisher can secure the rights. Under the DLIC scheme, the translator like the agent is working on behalf of the title. Like the scout, he or she knows what is going on in the Danish publishing and literary world, and what is happening in his or her home publishing and literary world and can ideally convey his or her knowledge of the title in a Danish context into the context of his or her home country and publishing world.

The Danish Literature Information Center has, by focusing on the translator, formed a network of capable Danish literature promoters abroad. It is a promotion biased towards the professional literary world. Where Danish lecturers abroad

promote knowledge of Denmark by teaching students, that is members of the general public, the translators are linked to the publishing world.

The two innovative schemes are fairly new and Danish books are still primarily published in North-West European countries such as the Scandinavian countries and Germany and in the USA, but the scheme will most likely bring more translations in a greater variety of languages.

The role of the translator has finally been acknowledged. There is no doubt they can do good work for Danish literature abroad. Norvik, the publishing house specialising in translations of Scandinavian literature publishes a bit more Swedish literature than Danish and Norwegian, even though the publishing house has editors who are experts in each of the three languages. This is because the Swedish Translator Association in Britain is strong - and forceful.<sup>320</sup>

The importance of the schemes comes across most clearly when it is seen in the context of the responsive policy of supporting translations according to applications. As discussed earlier these schemes do promote translated fiction, but only the trends which already exist. The translator-orientated schemes under DLIC are interventionist in a constructive, lasting way. They may not give immediate results, but the schemes work from within the bookworld and expand past the existing links into new areas of the world.

DLIC also has more traditional schemes for support of Danish fiction abroad. It subsidises translations into foreign languages. The English titles subsidised are mainly translated by American publishing houses. Few have been published in Britain. Peter Høeg, the author of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* has had two books published by Harvill since the success of the first one, but the translations have not been subsidised through the Centre, though travel expenses for Peter Høeg have. The Centre does not give priority to Britain or the States, quite the contrary, but it has had a seminar for English language translators. In another way the English language once again turns out to be an advantage. *Danish Literary Magazine* is published in English and here several British translators have translated for the magazine. This keeps the contact between the Centre and the translators.



In the context of this study - Danish fiction in Britain - more promotion of Danish literature is necessary. Very little is being published. But seen in the context of Danish in translation worldwide this is not unusual or very little. Since DLIC is to promote Danish Literature per se, and not just to certain specified countries, Britain is not necessarily a priority. Instead DLIC has given priority to other smaller countries primarily in East Europe.

The case of East Europe is interesting. Europe is back to its old size, with new powers to be reckoned with. It is not only new powers to be reckoned with, but cultures which were once part of European culture. These cultures have by West European standards changed somewhat, but they have also fallen behind. This is an ethnocentric statement because it assumes that communist culture has not been able to produce great art or develop infra-structures for cultural dissemination; or that they have not been able to develop these in a satisfactory or appropriate way. Leaving the whole discussion of the truth or falsity of this statement aside, it is nonetheless true that the former East European communist countries now wish to embrace capitalism; a paradigm which the West European countries, including the USA are very familiar with. West European countries are anxious to welcome the East European countries into the world of capitalism in a way which would be advantageous to them.

There are two issues. One is that both East and West European countries perceive a cultural need in East European countries in connection with the shift in paradigm. In Denmark this has led to the establishing of Baltic Media Centre which consults the Baltic countries on developing television. Also DLIC has been to the Baltic countries.

In 1995 the Centre had a children's book tour to the Baltic countries and Russia. According to Lise Bostrup there is not a basis in these countries for promoting experimental poetry, but they are very interested in children's books because they have had a socialist realism tradition which they cannot use anymore. Lise Bostrup says:

These are the years where one should go in and become part of it (...) And then you try to go in and launch some of those Danish [children's books] authors and make them as famous as Astrid Lindgren and then hope that it sticks. And at the same time get our name placed as someone who knows something interesting about children's books."<sup>321</sup>

The other issue is political. The West European world would like to develop the East European countries in a way which is to their advantage. This is not so much deciding how the East European countries should be run, as to the East European countries developing in a way and to a level where they become possible trading partners and allies in the World Society. This is nothing new. USA had the huge Marshall Plan after World War II and Third World Countries have received development help from the Western World.

Denmark too is involved in the international relations. But the DLIC is not a centre under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it is under the Ministry of Culture. This ministry does have certain countries it targets. These are the Baltic Countries, Germany, France and USA. As Lise Bostrup says, the ministry would prefer if the Centre followed this policy. It also means that there is more money available for projects aimed at these countries.<sup>322</sup> The Centre does not necessarily follow these guidelines. It has sent authors to France. In Germany, Lise Bostrup says, "so many books have been published that we by now are searching our brains to find new good Danish books that haven't been optioned yet."<sup>323</sup> Most of the books published in English are published in the States where there is a small but strong lobby of Danish translators, and there is also the commercially successful publishing of Peter Høeg. And lastly, there are the Baltic Countries in which the children's books launch has taken place.

When culture gets involved in international relations it is called cultural diplomacy. Britain has its own institution for this, namely the British Council. It is the British promoter of among other things, literature abroad.

The British Council is to:

...promote the understanding and friendship between the peoples of different countries by encouraging the study of languages and cultures, and by promoting the exchange of ideas and information.

promote a wider knowledge of the United Kingdom and the English language and to encourage cultural, scientific, technological and educational co-operation between the United Kingdom and other countries.<sup>324</sup>

Literature is part of the cultural package. From the head office of the British Council in London, the aim of the work done in the area is defined in the following way:

The main aim of the British Council's work in literature is to further the appreciation of British and Commonwealth literature, particularly the work of contemporary writers overseas. This work is undertaken by our overseas offices in partnership with Literature Department.<sup>325</sup>

The British Council was founded in 1935. In his account of the first fifty years of the British Council, Frances Donaldson explains how the British Council was finally founded because the attitude of the German and Italian governments in the East and South America was so hostile that it was damaging to British interests. Also:

In the atmosphere of the time the idea that a truer understanding of Great Britain might be contributed to by a non-political, educational programme, specifically designed to spread knowledge of the English language and of British arts, science, Parliamentary institutions, technological achievements and a way of life held out some, if only a small attraction.<sup>326</sup>

The British Council is a true body of cultural diplomacy. This raises the question of whether it is also a body of propaganda, promoting the most useful picture of Britain. It raises the question of whether uses of arts and culture become more important than the nature of art, that is of the inherent critical forces of art.

As seen with the Danish Literature Information Center - a body for the promotion of literature as part of the cultural funding system - it is possible to have a concept based on diversity and quality rather than national image. But where DLIC is a centre for the promotion of literature within a cultural funding system, the British Council is a cultural diplomatic body under the Foreign Office. It aims to improve Britain's international relations.

Interestingly, Frances Donaldson points out that what made Britain hesitate in following in the footsteps of for instance France and use culture in international relations was not only the British, almost instinctive, suspicion of arts and culture. It

was also its own use of propaganda during the First World War, of which it was not too proud. According to Frances Donaldson, Britain "established for general use the most sinister of several meanings of the word propaganda."<sup>327</sup> Before World War I, propaganda meant to inform truthfully and objectively. During World War I, it came to mean to inspire patriotism, persuade men to fight and keep up morale. That is, it came to mean what we associate with the word today: To feed the public certain beliefs at the cost of the truth. It is the same aversion which after World War II led to the introduction of the arm's-length-principle in the funding of arts through the Arts Council. The British Council then, started out with a strong aversion to propaganda. It was the best of Britain, but also the true Britain.

The picture which emerges of what the Literature Department promotes, is very similar to that which is funded by the Arts Council. The authors who the British Council sends abroad on tours and seminars are authors such A.S. Byatt, Ted Hughes and Doris Lessing. These are established authors, but the Council also publishes an anthology of new writings each year. The anthology is edited by a commissioned editor. To this Neil Gilroy-Scott, head of the Literature Department says that the anthologies are expressions of what is going on in British literature at the moment, "warts and all". He goes on to say that

When we commission an editor, we do not tell them that they have to say all British writing is wonderful. We accept that they are independent critical beings and they are going give their picture of what they see.<sup>328</sup>

The Literature Department, like other funding bodies, operates with a fine arts definition. The emphasis is on literary quality and then on diversity in what is promoted, but not on the appropriateness of the content. As DLIC had the added consideration of what would come across abroad, so the British Council have additional considerations.

One is the former Commonwealth countries which it supports, in among other ways through the *African Writers* anthologies. The historical links to the old Commonwealth countries are strong. But these historical links have also had an impact on British fiction of today, not only in content, but also through authors where for

instance Ben Okri and Hanif Kureishi are established British writers. It is a diversity brought to the concept of British fiction.

Another consideration is that the British Council promotes the English language. To Neil Gilroy-Scott this means that it is more important to promote the teaching of writers in English than to support translations into other languages.

The teaching of English has played an important part in the department's work and it still does. Historically the Council was orientated towards the arts and several writers and artists worked for it. But in the fifties it became involved in aid and development. This meant a shift towards education. The Literature Department was part of the English Language division and it has kept its ties to education even though it is now part of the Arts division.

This means that the department produces a lot of educational aids such as bibliographies, directories of literature courses in Britain, and it has recently set up a database of British writers. Recently it has also taken up *Writers and their Work* a series which the department produced in the 1950s. The series describes and analyses a writer and his or her work. It is written by experts and is used both in Britain and abroad. So far 25 have been produced, but the Department plan to publish 200 all together.

Since the Department does not promote translations and since its roots in the teaching of English are so strong, it is difficult to see whether the British Council can do anything for the promotion of translated fiction. But Gilroy-Scott sees the different areas such as the teaching of English, the promotion of English writers and the publishing industry as inter-linked:

What we do is to support the whole British literary industry to achieve its purposes to work more effectively overseas. The publishing industry, the writing industry, the academic industry. (...) You can't support British writers, without in a sense supporting British publishers. Similarly if you support the teaching of literature it is going to have a knock on effect with booksellers and so on.<sup>329</sup>

This is the same reasoning as behind the writer tours and writers in residence of the Arts Council. By promoting literature to readers through the writers, they are (indirectly) supporting the authors because they are paid a fee.

The British Council does promote translated fiction, but it is neither through the centralised or decentralised models of the Dutch and Danish literature centres. It is indirectly through spreading the knowledge of English literature as done through the teaching aids, the writers-in-residence schemes and the exhibitions of British writers and fiction. These schemes are aimed at academia, students and the general reader and can create a greater interest. This is quite different from the Danish way of interesting the professional bookworld.

The Literature Department does also try to interest the professional bookworld in English fiction. Each year two seminars are held in England. One is aimed at teaching, but the other is aimed at the professional bookworld. Here about 60 carefully selected editors, publishers, translators and other professionals attend a 10 day seminar where top British writers, novelists, poets and dramatists come and give readings. It is a way of familiarising people who are involved with literature in their own countries with the latest of what is happening in Britain. Though it is difficult to say whether this leads to actual publications, but there is no doubt that a big event like this creates interest. To be invited abroad to meet prominent authors and other prominent guests can only create attention. Neil Gilroy-Scott is aware of this:

It is promoting knowledge and information. And a lot has come out of that. The editors and the publishers who are there may decide they would like to publish Antonia Byatt's latest novel. The translator may decide that he or she wants to translate it into Serbocroat or something like that. So it generates that activity because people who are attending are very carefully chosen.<sup>330</sup>

The department also arranges smaller seminars in various countries. All in all this is the most important work the Council does for the promotion of translated fiction. It is not nearly as intensive or innovative as that of the Danish Literature Information Center. But the two organisations also have different aims. It must also be kept in mind that British fiction sells well abroad. It is simply not necessary to promote it to the degree Danish fiction needs to be promoted.

In Denmark, British fiction sells well without promotion and it does not need the support that Danish fiction needs in Britain. The British Council in Denmark does not do much to promote fiction in Denmark. The efforts of The Literature

Department tend to be aimed at countries and areas with no or little tradition for literature teaching and translation. Because, as Gilroy-Scott points out, in Germany, France and Italy things will always happen with or without British Council involvement, because the links are there. The Council has held a seminar in Singapore and it is arranging one in Vietnam, a country which has had virtually no contact with outside literature for the last 30-40 years.

What seems to be decisive for the work of the department is partly which countries are interested. This, rather than being a responsive policy which strengthens existing trends, is an expression of the council's tradition of aid and development. Literature Department still focuses its attention on places where there are "no links" and as Neil Gilroy-Scott said about the poster exhibitions the department produce "they go where people generally don't go."<sup>331</sup>

British Council is as discussed earlier an arm of British international relations. Therefore the Foreign Office has a say in which countries the Council give priority to. This has meant that British Council efforts in Scandinavia have been reduced. It is now a Nordic Directorate with the main office in Copenhagen. There are small offices in the other Scandinavian countries with local staff, but no British Council officers. Gilroy-Scott thinks this is because Scandinavia has not been part of the European Union. It is more likely that Scandinavia has no power because it has not been unified outside of the Union. What has become politically important is East Europe and this is where the Foreign Office prefers the Council to gather its efforts.

Nonetheless, it is discouraging to see Britain take so little interest in cultural relations with Denmark. The British Council has been in Denmark since the end of World War II, and did promote British culture intensely right after the war. Today supralateral organisations such as the EU have become more important than the bilateral relations between the two countries. But in spite of the failing interest in Scandinavia, the strong connections made during the long bilateral relationship between Denmark and Britain are still strong. Danish publishers are in love with British fiction. And where literary fiction and fine culture loses its grip, British popular culture is ready. There is no doubt that British Council involvement in

## Denmark would not make much of a difference to British culture in Denmark or to British books in translation.

The main feeling is that the British people have a very different attitude to the world and to the future. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.

The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.

The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.

The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.

The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.

The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes. The British are very much more interested in the future than the Danes.



## 11) CONCLUSION

The world is changing. The Global Village is drawing the world together through its commercial information and technology-led venture. The European Union is drawing (West)-Europe together in a political union in its attempt to form a United States of Europe.

The advanced technology of the Global Village leads to a polarisation in core and peripheric jobs, whereas the international conglomerates and the union of nations under EU both lead to increased power distances between workers, populations and the power elites. Across the blurred borders of nation-states a migration of cultural products and people are taking place.

In many ways the restructuring of the world is an indication of drastic changes in the human condition. They seem to be changes from an industrial society to an information society, from a modern society to a post-modern society, from a nation-state World Society to a post-nation-state World Society. These issues are hotly debated and this in itself is a sign of how difficult it is to correctly register and interpret changes as they are taking place.

Individuals and populations are reacting to the powerlessness and insecurities brought on by change. The results of constantly meeting the Other under these circumstances are xenophobia, racism and reactionary nationalism.

But where the cultural products of the Global Village travel easily, the political initiatives of the European Union are met with resistance. They touch the part of identity which is national. Nation-ness is a way of structuring the world which has legitimised itself by becoming part of individual and collective identity.

The changes from an agricultural, oral pre-nation-state World Society to an industrial, literate nation-state World Society were drastic for the human condition. If the world is changing from an industrial, literate nation-state World Society to an information, audio-visual, post-nation-state World Society, then these changes will be just as drastic. National identity can therefore not be ignored. Life takes place in the present, it does not wait for the future.

The success of the Global Village's media venture and the import of British produced cultural products in Denmark quite clearly show that cultural products can travel across the borders of nation-states and be accepted as part of every-day life in a way that immigrants are not. Foreign produced narrative cultural products are not perceived as expressions of Otherness. These expressions are chosen out of interest, for what they through subject have in common with the receiver, rather than for their differences. Nonetheless they are still culture-bound and show this in culture-bound perceptions and solutions to problems and through settings.

The example of British cultural products in Denmark also show that these foreign produced narrative cultural products can be part of creating cross-cultural understanding both in general and in the particular. They can be part of furthering openness towards the Other, familiarity with and knowledge of the Other.

The translated literary novel is one such foreign produced cultural product. If it is to form a part of the foreign produced narrative cultural products on offer, it has to be available.

The translated literary novel is made available through a commercial publishing world. The chapters on publishing in Denmark and Britain show that availability is dependent on market and selection. Though market influences selection they are not necessarily the same.

The British market has become more commercial through mergers and conglomerates. It has gone from being product-led to being market-led with an emphasis on the bottom-line. Because translated fiction does not sell in Britain, the market in itself is not accommodating to it. Though most translated fiction is published by small publishing houses which are still publishing as they were before the capital strong conglomerates, they have to survive on the conditions created by the mergers.

The case study on *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg and *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup clearly shows how important an intensive and expensive promotion and publicity campaign is on the British market. Where *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* is still widely available, *Brother Jacob* hardly made it into the bookstores because the small publishing house of Marion Boyars could not promote

it to extent the HarperCollins owned Harvill could promote *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*.

The Danish market is very small compared to the British. It is still product-led, focusing on authorships, backlist and a balance between loss and profit-making titles. It is a cottage industry in which the gentleman's agreement and the Net Book Agreement are still alive. But though these structures may be conservative, they do not hinder the publishing of British fiction in Denmark because British fiction sells as well as Danish.

When it comes to selection criteria there is no hindrance on the Danish market for British fiction. Publishers speak the language, they are familiar with the culture and can judge quality in the original language. They can access the British market both through the old boy's network of the international publishing world and through British newspapers and trade papers.

For Danish fiction on the British market the overall selection criteria of quality, which Danish and British publishers share, is complemented by the criterion of a title having to be able to travel culturally. British publishers cannot read the Danish originals or access the Danish market through newspapers and trade papers. This means that the old boy's network of the international publishing world takes on increased importance. But it also means that Danish fiction is handicapped by its culture and language.

In the selection criteria, the issue is familiarity with culture. This is what makes Danish publishers favour literature in English. And this is what makes British publishers favour literature from other English-speaking cultures. And what makes publishers in general favour literature in a language they speak.

But it is also part of the issue of national cultures of major and minor importance in the World Society. As the chapter on Danish openness towards Britain showed, this started by bilateral connections through Danish export of agricultural products to Britain. But it was also a result of changing language tuition, where the rise of English to lingua franca through the Empire and the USA's rise to power played an important part. So does the export to Denmark of British cultural products such as pop music and humour.

Therefore the major/minor dichotomy is playing a part in creating openness and familiarity towards, in particular, major national cultures. The fact that the British publishing industry has become more commercial is ironically also an effect of being a major culture. Its links to other English-speaking countries through language means that it is a far more profitable market to invest in for international media conglomerates than the small Danish market. The major/minor dichotomy is also evident in the cultural funding system. In the context of Public Lending Right, Britain advocates more reciprocal agreements between countries because British books are so well-represented abroad that it would be beneficial for British writers. Denmark on the other hand has changed its scheme in a way which does not conflict with EU requirements of non-discrimination against foreign nationalities, but also in a way which means that it still favours Danish language originators such as translators.

When markets and general circumstances hinder the publishing of translated fiction, the cultural funding system becomes the agent of change. But the chapter on support and promotion of translated fiction shows that the schemes set up by the Arts Council and Danish Literature Information Center (DLIC), because they are responsive, emphasise existing trends of publishing titles from major cultures as expressed in the languages of French, German and English.

Nevertheless, both the Arts Council schemes and DLIC are examples of awareness of the changing world. They both originate from 1987 where the Arts Council began to focus on internationalism and multiculturalism and where a select committee report on export of culture was published in Denmark. As a result of this report DLIC was established to promote Danish literature abroad.

Danish Literature Information Center promotes Danish literature abroad in a decentralised fashion to the international publishing world. It creates awareness through the Danish Literature Magazine and builds a network of translators in under-represented countries and utilises the bi-cultural knowledge of the translators by support schemes for placing titles with publishers abroad. Its focus of attention is East-Europe and in particular the Baltic Countries.

British Council promotes literature abroad as part of its cultural diplomacy. But the promotion done here clearly shows its roots in development and aid, English

language tuition and its connections to The Commonwealth. Rather than building up a network in the professional bookworld it produces exhibitions, directories and teaching aids on literature. It attempts to create links to non-European countries, and more recently to East Europe.

The British Council as a body of cultural diplomacy is an example of an institution set up by a country of major importance, whereas DLIC is an example of a minor country trying to increase knowledge and awareness in the World Society. That both institutions focus on East Europe is a reflection of changes in the World Society. But the priority of the Baltic countries and the Commonwealth are reflections of different national histories and geography.

Britain and Denmark are examples of closely related, but different West-European national cultures. Both have roots in Christianity, modernity and industrialisation and are therefore both part of a larger West-European culture. They are both welfare states, but they are also different.

The chapter on Danish openness towards Britain showed how the export of agricultural products changed infrastructure and facilitated English language tuition in Denmark. But also within the borders of nation-states the structuring of institutions is based not only in a larger West-European culture, but is also influenced by specific values, traditions and history. This is exemplified through the cultural funding system.

The British cultural funding system has since 1992 been based under the Department of National Heritage. But the system is very much as it was before. It is characterised by conceptual splits into different traditions. There is legislation for industry, the educating/leisure tradition and councils for artistic content.

The educating/leisure tradition has roots in the Industrial Revolution and the split between work and leisure. It sought to morally elevate the working classes so that they could be productive workers. The tradition was later mediated through the welfare state's emphasis on the rights of citizens to have access to leisure pursuits and came to focus on access and availability rather than moral elevation as in the top-down, middle-class, philanthropic movement of the Victorian era.

The Arts Council was a result of the welfare state, but its structure is based in the ideals of the philanthropic charity organisations with the value of personal responsibility to do right by others, rather than others having rights. It is private public support by the Great and the Good.

The council of the liberal welfare state and the educating/leisure tradition of the Victorian era never connected conceptually, and the Arts Council was able to lead an arts policy with emphasis on artistic excellence without developing a Public Service Dissemination tradition.

Because of the emphasis on artistic excellence and the lacking Public Service Dissemination tradition, the Arts Council never included cultural democracy and folk culture as working concepts of culture. It continued using the concept of democratisation of culture. This again is a top-down perception, though of culture rather than society.

As a result of the top-down perception of culture in general, the strong class-consciousness in Britain and the heterogenous society created through class and immigration from the Empire in decline, the cultural studies movement arose to study culture as a way of life mediated by class, gender and race. This movement is in opposition to the Great and the Good and the high culture of the Arts Council, and forms part of the many conceptual splits. But because it does not concern itself with quality but with uses of culture, it aligns itself with the educating/leisure tradition. That is, the polarisation of artistic excellence and the uses of culture are intact. They do not engage in a debate on providing what is right for a particular user of the best available. In a hierarchical society this cannot be conceptualised as other than a paternalistic control of citizens.

In one way this is accentuated by the permuted Victorian values brought to the fore again as a legitimisation of the Thatcherite Enterprise Culture. With the focus on individualism and the liberal marketforces, the idea of a Public Service Dissemination tradition becomes even more an expression of state paternalism and control.

The values of the Enterprise Culture have also influenced the cultural funding system. Support is no longer based solely in concepts of culture but have acquired utilitarian values of promoting tourism, creating jobs and attracting funding from the

business community. This is the development the Department of Heritage is advocating, rather than unifying the conceptually split cultural funding system.

The conditions created for the support of literature are of course influenced by the general funding system. Literature is a creative art performed by individuals.

This sits poorly with the Arts Council which has a tradition of supporting the performing arts and institutions.

Opposition to support of literature both outside and within the Arts Council sees the publishing industry and public libraries as sufficient support for literature.

The general opposition is so strong that Public Lending Right has been promoted as a right in order to get the scheme established and continues to be seen as such in order not to cause further cuts in cultural support for literature.

But publishing is not support but a highly commercial venture which increasingly sees literature as a commodity rather than as art.

Public libraries have roots in the educating/leisure tradition and are today seen as leisure services provided by local authorities. Public library philosophy has since the outset been split in an education/elevation conception and a leisure conception.

But the move to a leisure service was facilitated by the legislation which reflects library history rather than philosophy.

The publishing industry obviously cannot be seen as a support to literature, but neither are libraries conceptually linked to the funding of literature. This means that the support from the Arts Council is the actual support for literature. The schemes for author support developed by the Literature Department clearly show the tradition for supporting institutions and the performing arts in primarily being indirect support through schemes such as writer in residence and tours. Nevertheless, the Department has managed to develop schemes which are aimed at problem areas such as small presses, publicity and libraries.

The Danish cultural funding system is conceptually united under the Ministry of Culture. It is a rounded, consensual system and the Ministry of culture legislates for culture, emphasises artistic excellence and Public Service Dissemination. The ministry was set up in 1961 as part of the welfare state, but it included existing trends in its founding philosophy. The compromise which led to the founding

philosophy was based in Grundtvigianism, Social Democrat ideology and Cultural Radicalism. In the founding philosophy was included the right to a fulfilling leisure time, equal access, the Danish enlightenment tradition, artist's rights, the rights to self-organisation, artistic excellence and freedom, and art as a critical force in society.

Denmark did not have an industrial revolution to deal with. But it did have to deal with the loss of Norway and Schleswig-Holstein. This led to a focusing inward. Because of the homogeneity of the Danish people, because nation and state occupied the same territory, and because both territory and history showed traces of Danes far back, a perception of union between country, state and people could be forged. In this the Danes rather than country became the sober, sensible backbone of the nation-state.

At the same time democracy was being introduced and this led to an enlightenment tradition where the starting-point was the sensible, sober-minded peasant and farmer rather than a top-down tradition of elevation. Social Democrat ideology incorporated the image of the peasant/farmer and became for the people rather than the workers.

This Grundtvigian and Social Democrat focus on the people had to be included in the Danish Social Democrat welfare state and its Ministry of Culture. The emphasis of, not to the people but for the people, was supplemented by Cultural Radicalist ideas of artistic excellence and art in society. The Ministry of culture would therefore have to develop the excellence of artistic production but also conceptually link this to the concept of the people. This resulted in the tradition for Public Service Dissemination which included the enlightenment tradition and the poles of artistic excellence and uses which have continuously interacted through the changing times.

Because of the incorporation of these traditions, arts policy could not be led by the Great and the Good for the people since the people was the Great and the Good. Instead the Grundtvigian-inspired principle of self-organisation was used in councils such as the Arts Foundation. And because the enlightenment tradition took its



starting point in the people, the Public Service Dissemination tradition could not be perceived as paternalistic state control.

Likewise, as new concepts of culture such as cultural democracy and folk culture gained recognition, they would have to be incorporated in Danish cultural policies, simply because they focused on the people. The utilitarian values of the Enterprise Culture also gained ground in Denmark, but they have been strongly mediated in cultural policies by the Social Democratic welfare state and the Grundtvigian traits in national identity. Values of individualism and free market forces do not easily become incorporated in a culture which emphasises solidarity, consensus and the people.

Support for literature in Denmark is self-evidently also influenced by the general philosophies of the cultural funding system. The strong tradition for artist support has led to a perception of support for literature as support for authors. This creator-focused view is also visible in additional schemes directly under the Ministry of Culture. It is also visible in the changes made in the Library Fee, from a scheme in between copy-right and cultural support to one which is a cultural support scheme. This is also a result of the consensus around cultural policies.

Public libraries are perceived as the Public Service Disseminators of literature. The founding philosophies of the folk libraries were also based in democracy and a conception of the people as capable of making the right decisions for themselves, folk libraries were therefore easily incorporated in the cultural funding system. During the 1980s and 1990s folk libraries have, through restructuring come to focus more on the local community. But the debate on excellence and uses which is part of the Public Service Dissemination tradition, and which within library circles has been debated in connection with the quality criterion, has not been abandoned. Rather it has enforced the links to the cultural support system.

The idea of a Public Service Dissemination tradition highlights fundamental differences in British and Danish national cultures. In Britain, a heterogenous society with a strong class-consciousness and an emphasis on individuality, it is seen as paternalism and control.

In Denmark, a homogenous society with a perception of union of state, country and people, and an emphasis on consensus and solidarity, this is more or less the purpose of cultural policies.

A valid critique of Danish culture as embodied in this tradition is that it conceals and legitimises prevalent ideologies and hegemony. This is to a certain extent mediated by the cultural democracy concept and folk concept, but a more explicit debate on these issues should form part of the Public Service Dissemination tradition.

Likewise, the lack of a Public Service Dissemination tradition in Britain is to a certain extent to make cultural policies obsolete or at least a confirmation of the elitist policies of the Arts Council. Cultural studies have highlighted valid points about ideology and hegemony and the validity of other cultural expressions than those accepted under a fine arts definition. But to exclude the products of high culture from an interaction with people of all classes is another way of showing disrespect.

### Points of originality

The thesis contains several points of originality both in approach and in the findings.

- It is based in the traditions of Cultural studies - a tradition which does not exist in Denmark - and in a tradition strong in Denmark namely the Literature and Society strand of Sociology of Literature. This means that it is possible to see the cultural funding system in connection with the commercial publishing world. It also means that institutions within the cultural funding system can be read as texts, as signs of society.
- The thesis employs a cross-cultural comparative methodology. This means that questions which cannot be asked within an objectified subjective reality can be asked from the viewpoint of the other culture.

- The cross-cultural comparative angle has made it possible to point to the fact that the Danish publishing market is primarily product-led while the British has become market-led.
- The publishing of translated fiction has not been researched in a qualitative study before. This has made it possible to identify the importance of cultural knowledge in the selection process. The study shows that publishers publish primarily from languages they speak and thereby from cultures they are familiar with. The study also provides evidence for the importance of the common knowledge held by the international publishing world.
- The importance of publicity and promotion is a commonly held belief within the British publishing world, but this study provides the evidence for this point of view.
- The analysis of the cultural funding systems in Britain and Denmark draws attention to the importance of national consciousness. For example Public Lending Right in both Britain and Denmark are widely discussed within the national framework of thinking. This study shows with the help of the comparative methodology how based in an objectified subjective reality they are. The same goes for the two different versions of the arm's length principle and the inclusion and exclusion of concepts of culture.
- The British cultural funding system is under-researched. It has not been researched as one system before. This study is able to show that the system is not conceptually linked. In particular the identification and analysis of the educating/leisure tradition are new. This analysis shows that the conception of enlightenment through arts in the leisure time has not been conceptualised in British thinking. On the basis of the comparative angle it has also been possible to point out that there is no Public Service Dissemination tradition in Britain



## SUMMARY

The thesis studies the publishing of translated literary novels and the cultural funding system in Denmark and Britain. Denmark and Britain are examples of closely related West-European national cultures and they are examples of cultures of major and minor importance in the World Society. The thesis aims to explore how different industry structures and values within the publishing world facilitate or hinder the publishing of translated fiction. It also aims to explore how different traditions, values and history within closely related West-European national cultures have influenced the structures of state institutions in different directions. This is explored through the cultural funding systems because the thesis also aims to explore how the differences in the cultural funding systems, based in their different values, traditions and history, have created different conditions for artistic production and availability.

Chapters 2 and 3 set the framework for the thesis. Chapter 2 studies the contemporary changing world, the problems it creates between national cultures and between different ethnic or racial groups. In this context the chapter discusses cross-cultural understanding and openness and the role of cultural products in this.

The world is globalising through information and technology-led commercial ventures. Through the media the world is drawn together across national borders by a huge export of primarily Anglo-American productions and by channels such as MTV and CNN aiming at sub-cultures across borders. These commercial ventures are only possible if the consumption of their products is big enough to create profit. They are therefore an example of how major changes in the world are accepted by populations and of how foreign produced cultural products are accepted and non-threatening.

Nonetheless the information and technology globalisation also leads to a polarisation between core and peripheric workers who are often of other nationalities and ethnic minorities within the borders of nation-states. The globalisation also leads to an increased distance between populations and power elites. All in all, the lack of contact with power elites and the presence of the Other lead to a feeling of powerlessness and an animosity towards the Other.

The European Union is a political organisation which is also drawing the world together. It has had an increased influence on the citizens of the nation-states involved in its attempt to form a United States of Europe. This again leads to animosity towards the Other and to reactionary nationalism.

Nevertheless, nationalism is other than reactionary. It is part of the contemporary political organisation in nation-states and it is part of contemporary collective and individual identities. A shift to a post-nation state, information and audio-visual World Society is a shift as drastic as the shift from a pre-nation-state, agricultural and oral World Society to a nation-state, industrial and literate World Society.

Within the contemporary changes in the world a constant meeting with the Other is taking place. Therefore the focus must be on cross-cultural understanding. That is, on an openness towards the Other, an understanding of the Other and an acceptance of and respect for differences.

In this understanding, foreign produced narrative cultural products can play a part in forming a cross-cultural frame of reference of openness and understanding. Foreign produced narrative cultural products chosen for consumption during leisure time are chosen for subject dealt with or plot rather than their foreignness. However, externalities to plot, such as setting and the way the foreignness in the narrative is perceived by characters as ordinariness and the culture-bound perceptions of problems and solutions, can lead to an openness and acceptance of what is foreign and an understanding of foreign cultures.

Chapter 3 deals with Danish openness towards Britain. It explores the influence of a major culture - the British - on a minor - the Danish - through specific and universal historical developments. It explores how these, combined with the use of popular culture products, have led to an openness and knowledge of the other culture.

Because of the Industrial Revolution, Britain needed to import agricultural products. This it did from Denmark. This proved important to the development of Denmark which stayed primarily agricultural until well after World War II. Denmark changed and rationalised its agricultural production in response to British preferences. It became a modern and affluent society through agricultural export.

The English language was not thought to be of sufficient importance to be taught at the learned schools. But it grew from being the last modern language introduced, to the most important because of Britain's increased importance through the rise of the Empire and because the culture of Victorian bourgeoisie gained recognition. The rise of English to lingua franca because of the Empire and later because of the importance of the USA also influenced this.

Language teaching also changed from teaching modern languages as dead languages to teaching national cultures, to emphasising internationalism, the meeting with own and foreign culture. That is, it changed to teach culture as well as skills.

After World War II agricultural export to Britain slowly decreased while the import of cultural products increased. This has been an import of television programmes, British humour and British pop music. The import of British cultural products and the language tuition create a cross-cultural frame of reference for Britain in Denmark which is expanding, facilitating more and more imports. It creates anglophiles and its influence is to be found in Danish fiction.

Translated literary novels are part of the export and import of foreign produced narrative cultural products. Industry structures and values influence availability. The publishing industries and the publishing of translated fiction are the subjects explored in chapters 4 to 6.

Chapter 4 analyses the two publishing worlds in general to see whether the conditions of publishing are accommodating to the publishing of translated fiction, since translated fiction has to survive on the same marketforces as all other publishing.

Publishing used to be the gentleman publisher who was part of the same bourgeois culture which read the books. He would nurture authorships out of love for literature but also have a shrewd business sense which meant he could live off his business of publishing.

British publishing has gone from being product-led to being market-led. The industry has been through upheaval and mergers and is now a commercial industry rather than a cottage industry. This means that instead of focusing on authorships, backlist and steadyselling, it now focuses on the bottom-line.

The industry has contracted in order to be capital-strong and uses all available ways of profiting on the profit-making titles. This has meant mergers into publishing conglomerates and a vertical structure rather than a horizontal, so that conglomerates now own both hardback and paperback imprints and subsidiaries in other English speaking countries. In addition retailing has contracted into chains. This has led to such powerful conglomerates as HarperCollins, Random House and W.H. Smith which together in 1995 undermined the Net Book Agreement to the extent that it was abandoned.

Many small presses still publish in the old way of focusing on authorships and backlist with an occasional bestseller, but they have to publish on the conditions created by the conglomerates. Since translated fiction is not profitable and is often published by small publishing houses, the British publishing industry is not accommodating to it.

Where British publishing has a potential market of 56 million people and overseas export to other English speaking countries, Danish publishing has a potential market of 5 million Danes.

As within the British publishing world, the debate in Denmark is on contraction and bestsellerism, but it is essentially still a cottage industry. It is still product-led, focusing on authorships, backlist and the balance between loss-making and profit-making publications.

The Danish market for publishing is so small that the industry has always been vertical and since it can only find new ways of selling within Denmark it is dependent on paperback sales and book clubs. In spite of this, publicity does not play a major role. The market is no bigger than all new books are available from bookshops. The net book agreement is still very much alive.

The Danish market is conservative in its structure, but not in what it chooses to publish. Since British fiction sells well, either as well or almost as well as Danish fiction, the Danish market is as accommodating to this as to Danish fiction.

Chapter 5 focuses on the factors which influence the selection of fiction for translation. These factors are selection criteria and sources of information and considerations of the market.



For both Denmark and Britain the main source of information is the old boys network of the international publishing world. The network is based on mutual trust and knowledge of each others publishing profiles. The network functions as a grapevine which provides information on titles, but more importantly it indicates which titles are the most interesting. This is done through recommendations and based on whether other countries have published a particular title.

In particular in Britain the network is important for Danish fiction because British publishers do not read Danish. They tend to publish in languages they speak such as French and German. In Denmark the network is supplemented by the reading of British newspapers and trade papers. The publishers all read English and can judge the quality of a British novel in the original language.

The main selection criterion is quality. British publishers have the added criterion of the title having to be able to travel culturally. That is, that it can enter a British cultural frame of reference. British publishers also take into consideration whether they can get all English language rights.

Danish fiction is therefore disadvantaged because of language and culture, whereas British fiction has no disadvantages on the Danish market.

Chapter 6 is a case study on the importance of publicity in Britain. This is done through the example of two Danish titles published in Britain in 1993. The two titles are *Brother Jacob* by Henrik Stangerup and *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* by Peter Høeg.

Publicity and promotion are important both for getting the title placed with bookshops and for getting publicity through the media. This influences information to and access for potential readers.

Both *Brother Jacob* and *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* did well for Danish titles. But *Brother Jacob* only sold about 1/3 of the amount of which *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* did. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* was and is still widely available. *Brother Jacob* never was.

Press coverage showed that *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* received considerably more coverage than *Brother Jacob*.

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* would most likely have sold more than *Brother Jacob*, but the main reason for the huge difference is the publicity campaign behind *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*.

Marion Boyars, the publisher of *Brother Jacob*, promoted the title the way most books are promoted. She sent out press releases and proof copies to the press.

Harvill, the publisher of *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*, invested in a huge campaign for the title which included printing and distributing 2000 proof copies to the trade, sales gimmicks and sending journalists to Denmark. Because the title in this way was highlighted and talked up, the trade was aware of it. Because bookstores were told of this campaign they stocked more titles and displayed them prominently rather than taking none or placing a few copies in the A-Z fiction section.

Chapters 7 to 10 focus on the cultural funding system. The cultural funding system is a part of creation of diversity and availability, but more importantly, this is done differently in different national cultures.

Chapter 7 focuses on the two different cultural support systems of Britain and Denmark. It focuses on traditions, values and history at the roots of the different systems and also looks at reasons for exclusion or inclusion of different concepts of culture.

The British cultural funding system is based under The Department of National Heritage. The British system is split in traditions of legislation for industry, councils for artistic content and an educating/leisure tradition focused on uses. The Danish is consensual and all-rounded under a Ministry of Culture incorporating founding philosophies based in Grundtvigianism, Social Democratic ideology and Cultural Radicalism.

In Britain, the educating/leisure tradition has roots in the paternalistic philanthropy of the Victorian era, in response to problems created by the Industrial Revolution and the split between work and leisure. The tradition sought to morally elevate the working-classes to conscientious workers. The roots were later mediated through the welfare state's focus on the rights of citizens, to become a question of availability of and access to, leisure pursuits.

The Councils set-up for support of artistic content are the British Film Institute, The Arts Council and the Crafts Council. A quango such as the Arts Council is run in the same way as the philanthropic charity organisations. It is public private support by the Great and the Good. This means a compromise of the arm's length principle.

The Arts Council was the first post-war council, set up without ties to industry and as part of the welfare state. Within this council the focus has been on excellence of artistic production. It does not conceptually link itself to the uses of leisure. This has meant an arts policy, not a cultural policy and that a Public Service Dissemination tradition such as expressed in the Public Service Broadcast tradition has not been developed.

Because the Arts Council has led an arts policy and because of the conceptual split between production and consumption, the concept of culture used by the Arts Council has been democratisation of culture. It has not, such as with universal trends, included cultural democracy or folk culture. This is to be found in the cultural studies movement which can be seen as an opposition to the establishment. Here the focus started out as being on the working-class, later including gender and race. The focus has been on uses rather than on content and the tradition therefore aligns itself with the educating/leisure tradition.

General changes in values other than those expressed in the concepts of culture have influenced the funding system. The Arts Council was set up as part of the welfare state's values of providing welfare services for the citizens. Likewise the influence of the Thatcher era's Enterprise Culture introduced utilitarian ideals of creating work and attracting tourism into arts funding.

In Denmark the cultural funding system is united under a Ministry of Culture which was set up in 1961 as part of the welfare state. It incorporated existing traditions of Grundtvigianism, Social Democratic ideology and Cultural Radicalism. The philosophy incorporated a right to a fulfilling leisure time, equal access, the rights of artists, the rights to self-organisation, a horizontal rather than a top-down enlightenment tradition, artistic excellence and freedom, and a perception of art as a

critical and enlightening force in society. It was also a ministry which could and would legislate for culture.

The emphasis on rights and self-organisation and defined structures rather than a reliance on the Great and the Good has led to an arm's length principle which in the Danish State Arts Foundation includes a Representative Committee on which various organisations such as the Author Association sit. The Representative Committee elects two out of the three members sitting on the committees for specific art forms.

The horizontal enlightenment tradition and the right to a fulfilling leisure time has meant that a Public Service Dissemination tradition has been developed which with respect for the users of culture and artistic excellence and freedom of expression seeks to provide and promote cultural expressions. It is a tradition constantly engaging in a debate between the two poles of artistic excellence and uses of culture.

In the Social Democratic welfare state, with a strong perception of union between nation, state and people and with a consensual cultural policy which leans towards focusing on the people (folket or folkelighed) all concepts of culture respecting and focusing on the people would have to be incorporated. Therefore, though starting out implicitly using the concept of democratisation of culture, the Ministry has later incorporated both cultural democracy and folk culture. The Social Democratic welfare state and the consensual cultural policy with philosophies based in the people have also meant that the utilitarian values of the Enterprise Culture have been strongly mediated.

Chapter 8 is an analysis of the funding systems for literature as they are expressed through the Arts Council's Literature Department, the Danish State Arts Foundation, initiatives directly under the Ministry of Culture; and an exploration of Public Lending Right as either part of the cultural funding system or as a copy-right.

Literature was not included under the Arts Council at its foundation. The Arts Council has focused on the performing arts and on organisations rather than individuals. Literature is a creative art and it is produced by individuals. It has always been rather a step-child in the Arts Council. It has been seen as being sufficiently supported by the publishing industry and public libraries.

Nevertheless, the support has developed from the Poetry Panel's performance-inspired schemes to the present fairly rounded and innovative schemes.

In the tradition of not supporting individual artists, this is the weakest point in the schemes for literature. They are either goal-directed or indirect through fees for tours and writers in residence schemes, rather than being aimed at creating time for writing. Other schemes are innovative and focus on contemporary problem areas such as publicity, small presses and libraries. In Denmark, support for literature is split between producer support and Public Service Dissemination through libraries.

The tradition for author support is long and strong. The schemes under the Arts Foundation are aimed at authors and literature as understood under a fine arts definition. These schemes are aimed at funding time for writing and awarding artistic production.

Directly under the Ministry of Culture is a net of schemes, the so-called patch-work quilt. Many of these schemes are aimed at creators other than those eligible under a fine arts definition such as translators and illustrators. This is a clear indication of how support is seen as support for the creator.

The issue of Public Lending Right shows clearly the Danish consensual tradition for cultural policies and the British reluctance to support.

In Denmark the Library Fee has gone from being something in between a copy-right and a cultural support scheme to being a cultural support scheme. This has been seen as necessary because of EU requirements forbidding discrimination of foreign nationalities.

Denmark has had the Library Fee since 1946 whereas the first Public Lending Right payment in Britain was not paid until 1984.

The British scheme was conceived as a copy-right fee. In the liberal Britain this has been more acceptable than a cultural support scheme. It is still seen that way today and the system has not been changed because of EU regulations. The Danish changes must therefore be seen as an expression of consensus on cultural policies and the strong tradition for author support.

Chapter 9 looks at public libraries as Public Service Disseminators for literature. It explores the way in which they are incorporated in the cultural funding system in connection with literature.

In Denmark public libraries are seen as Public Service Disseminators of literature. In Britain, public libraries are by the opposition to state funding of literature, seen as supporting literature.

British public libraries are rooted in the problems of the Industrial Revolution and the split between work and leisure. They were seen as healthy, morally elevating alternatives to drinking in the public houses.

British library history is characterised by a struggle to become established. This, rather than a founding philosophy, has shaped legislation for public libraries.

Public libraries are the responsibility of local authorities. This has meant that the user-group is defined in the legislation. The community defined here has become the selection criterion through which libraries fulfill their duty of an efficient and comprehensive service. This purpose is a result of history rather than philosophy.

The weak founding philosophies were split on education and recreation. Though the interpretations of these two terms have changed, the split has never been overcome. Public libraries went from individually emphasising either education or leisure, to being closer to education. With the modern emphasis on leisure and the introduction of a defined user group and in opposition to the paternalistic roots, public libraries have become leisure centres serving the local community. They are therefore not conceptually linked to the support of literature.

The Danish folk libraries did not have the problems of industrialisation to deal with. They started out with a strong philosophy emphasising the Danish enlightenment tradition in a democracy. This led to the objectives of education, enlightenment and culture through the selection criteria of quality, diversity and topicality.

The founding philosophies were in line with those later incorporated in the founding philosophies of the Ministry of Culture and the folk libraries became the Public Service Disseminators for literature.

The folk libraries were set up as one system but since 1983, have slowly developed into many systems as seen in Britain. Though this has led to a new focus on

local communities it has not led to abandoning the quality criterion. Folk libraries are still conceptually linked to a cultural funding system.

Chapter 10 deals with the support to translated fiction and the promotion done for export of fiction. It is in this way linked to the chapters on the cultural funding system, but it also closes the circle to chapter 1 by identifying influences from the contemporary changing world in support and promotion of translated fiction.

Support of translated fiction in Britain is done by the Arts Council whereas the British Council is responsible for promotion abroad. In Denmark both support and promotion is the responsibility of Danish Literature Information Center (DLIC) though it has as its objective to promote Danish literature abroad.

Both countries support the publishing of translated fiction through funding the actual translation. Both the Arts Council and DLIC have had implicit or explicit priorities of supporting under-represented languages such as African, Asian, Scandinavian or East European languages. That is, almost anything but the strongest West-European languages. But because the support schemes are responsive they have only been able to strengthen existing trends of publishing primarily from dominant languages such as French, German and English.

In the promotion done, the British Council is a cultural diplomacy organisation under the Foreign Office whereas DLIC is part of the cultural funding system under the Ministry of Culture. Both organisations are to promote their national literature abroad and both are doing this through a quality criterion. Rather than promoting a national culture, they are promoting expressions of Denmark and Britain as expressed in the contemporary literary scene.

The work done by the Literature Department at the British Council is deeply rooted in development and aid and in connection to English Language Teaching. It produces exhibitions, directories and books on writers. The promotion of literature per se is primarily done indirectly.

The work of the DLIC is decentralised, focusing on the professional bookworld by building up awareness of Danish literature and by establishing a network of promoters consisting of translators; thereby utilising the bi-cultural knowledge of the translators. This is done through the Danish Literature Magazine, innovative schemes

for new translators in countries with few translators in Danish, and schemes for translators to place books with publishers around the world.

Both the British Council and the Danish Literature Information Center prioritise certain countries. In particular East Europe has become important. This is a reflection of the changing times. Danish Literature Information Center in itself and the translation scheme from the Arts Council are fairly new initiatives, reflecting the increased focus on internationalism.

Both the British Council and the Danish Literature Information Center prioritise certain countries. In particular East Europe has become important. This is a reflection of the changing times. Danish Literature Information Center in itself and the translation scheme from the Arts Council are fairly new initiatives, reflecting the increased focus on internationalism.

Both the British Council and the Danish Literature Information Center prioritise certain countries. In particular East Europe has become important. This is a reflection of the changing times. Danish Literature Information Center in itself and the translation scheme from the Arts Council are fairly new initiatives, reflecting the increased focus on internationalism.



## RESUMÉ PÅ DANSK (summary in Danish)

Denne afhandling undersøger udgivelsen af oversat skønlitteratur, især romaner, og kulturpolitik i Danmark og Storbritannien. Danmark og Storbritannien er eksempler på to tæt beslægtede vesteuropæiske nationalkulturer og de er eksempler på et indflydelsesrigt og et mindre indflydelsesrigt land i verdenssamfundet. Afhandlingen undersøger hvordan forskellige strukturer og værdier i forlagsverdenen muliggør eller hindrer udgivelsen af oversat skønlitteratur. Den undersøger også hvordan forskellige traditioner, værdier og historie i tæt beslægtede vesteuropæiske nationalkulturer har haft indflydelse på den måde statsinstitutioner er opbygget. Kulturpolitikken er brugt som eksempel til at undersøge dette, så at afhandlingen også kan undersøge hvordan disse forskelle har haft indflydelse på de forhold der er skabt for kunstnerisk skabelse og tilgængelighed.

Kapitel 2 og 3 sætter rammen for afhandlingen. Kapitel 2 diskuterer igangværende forandringer i verdenen og de problemer det skaber mellem nationale kulturer og mellem forskellige racer og etniske grupper. I den sammenhæng diskuterer kapitlet tværkulturel forståelse og åbenhed og kulturelle udtryks rolle i dette.

Verdenen af i dag bliver globaliseret gennem informations- og teknologi-ledede foretagender. Gennem medierne bliver verdenen trukket sammen over nationale grænser af en stor eksport af primært anglo-amerikanske produktioner og TV-kanaler som MTV og CNN der henvender sig til subkulturer over grænser. Disse kommercielle foretagender er kun mulige fordi forbruget af deres produktioner er stort nok til at give finansielt overskud. De er derfor eksempler på både hvordan store forandringer i verdenen er accepteret af befolkninger, men også på hvordan udenlandsk producerede kulturelle produkter er accepterede og ikke opfattes som truende.

Ikke desto mindre leder informations- og teknologi globaliseringen også til en polarisering mellem kerne- og perifære arbejdere der som oftest er af en anden nationalitet eller etnisk minoritet inden for nationalstaternes grænser. Globaliseringen betyder også en øget afstand mellem befolkninger og magt eliter. Denne mangel på kontakt med magt eliterne og den fremmede inden for grænserne, leder tilsammen til en følelse af magtesløshed og uvilje mod den fremmede.

Den Europæiske Union er en politisk organisation som også trækker verdenen sammen. Den har fået en øget indflydelse på borgerne i de nationalstater der er involverede i unionens forsøg på at skabe et Forenede Stater af Europa. Dette leder til uvilje mod den fremmede og til reaktionær nationalisme.

Men nationalisme er ikke kun reaktionær. Det er en del af den nuværende politiske organisation af verdenen i nationalstater og det er en del af nuværende kollektive og individuelle identiteter. Et skift til et post nationalstat-, informations- og audio-visuel- verdenssamfund er et skift, der er lige så drastisk som skiftet fra et præ-nationalstat-, landbrugs- og oralt- verdenssamfund til et nationalstat-, industrielt- og skrift baseret verdenssamfund.

I disse nuværende forandringer er der et konstant møde med den fremmede og der må derfor være fokus på tværkulturel forståelse. Det vil sige en åbenhed mod den fremmede, en forståelse af den fremmede og en accept af og respekt for forskelle.

I denne forståelse kan udenlandsk producerede narrative kulturelle produkter spille en rolle i at skabe en tværkulturel referenceramme af åbenhed og forståelse. Udenlandsk producerede narrative kulturelle produkter valgt for forbrug i fritiden er valgt for emnet eller historien, ikke for deres fremmedhed. Men ydre omstændigheder til historien såsom omgivelser, den måde hvorpå det fremmede i teksten bliver opfattet som det normale eller det kendte af karakterne, samt kulturbundne opfattelser af problemer og løsninger kan lede til en åbenhed og accept af det der er fremmed og en forståelse af fremmede kulturer.

Kapitel 3 studerer dansk åbenhed overfor Storbritannien. Det undersøger påvirkningen af en kultur af stor indflydelse - den britiske - på en af mindre indflydelse - den danske - gennem specifikke og universelle historiske faktorer. Det studerer hvordan disse, kombineret med brugen af populær kulturelle produkter, har skabt åbenhed og viden om den britiske kultur i Danmark.

På grund af den industrielle revolution måtte Storbritannien importere landbrugsprodukter, hovedsageligt fra Danmark. Dette var vigtigt for udviklingen af det danske samfund som forblev et landbrugsland til langt efter anden verdenskrig. Danmark ændrede og rationaliserede sin landbrugsproduktion i forhold til britiske

preferencer, og blev et moderne og rigt land gennem eksporten af landbrugsprodukter.

Det engelske sprog blev ikke opfattet som vigtigt nok til at blive inkluderet i undervisningen i de lærde skoler/gymnasier. Men det gik fra at være det sidste moderne sprog introduceret til det vigtigste, pga Storbritanniens øgede indflydelse gennem det britiske imperie, og pga den victorianske borgerlige kultur. Det engelske sprogs øgede vigtighed i fremmedsprogsundervisningen var også et resultat af at dette sprog blev det moderne lingua franca.

Efter anden verdenskrig aftog landbrugseksporten til Storbritannien mens importen af populær kulturelle produkter tiltog. Dette har været en import af tv-programmer, humor og pop musik. Importen af britiske populær kulturelle produkter og sprogundervisningen skaber en tværkulturel referenceramme for Storbritannien i Danmark som udvider sig og gør plads til flere og flere importerede kulturelle udtryk. Den skaber anglofiler og dens indflydelse kan findes i dansk skønlitteratur.

Oversat skønlitteratur er en del af eksport og import af udenlandsk producerede narrative kulturelle produkter. Strukturer og værdier i forlagsverdenen har indflydelse på tilgængelighed. Forlagsverdenen og udgivelsen af oversat skønlitteratur er emnet for kapitel 4 til 6.

Kapitel 4 analyserer de to forlagsverdener generelt for at se om forholdene er imødekommende for udgivelsen af oversat skønlitteratur da oversat skønlitteratur må fungere under de samme forhold som alle andre udgivelser.

Borgerskabets forlægger udgav bøger for borgerskabet. Han fremelskede forfatterskaber som en del af borgerskabets kultur, men var også en forretningsmand, der levede af sin forretning.

Britisk forlagsvirksomhed er gået fra at være produkt-ledet til at være marked-ledet. Området har været gennem forandringer og sammenslutninger og er nu en kommerciel virksomhed i stedet for en lille produkt orienteret forretning (cottage industry). Det betyder at istedet for at fokusere på forfatterskaber, backlist og steadyselling, fokuserer den på finansielle resultater.

Forlagsvirksomhed har trukket sig sammen for være kapital stærk og for at være i stand til at bruge alle muligheder for at udnytte profitable titler. Det har

betydet sammenslutninger i forlagskoncerner og en vertikal struktur istedet for en horisontal, så at koncerner nu ejer både hardback og paperback forlag og forlag i andre engelsk talende lande. Detailhandel har også trukket sig sammen i kæder. Det har betydet at så magtfulde koncerner som HarperCollins, Random House og W.H. Smith i 1995 kunne underminere den faste boglade pris (Net Book Agreement) så meget at den blev opgivet.

Mange små forlag fungerer stadig på den gamle måde med vægt på forfatterskab og backlist med en enkel bestseller nu og da, men de må udgive under de forhold der er skabt af koncernerne. Den britiske forlagsverden er ikke åben for oversat skønlitteratur fordi oversat skønlitteratur ikke er profitabel og tit er udgivet af små forlag.

Hvor britiske forlag har en potentiel læsergruppe på 56 millioner mennesker og salg til andre engelsk talende lande, har danske forlæggere et potentielt marked på 5 millioner danskere.

Ligesom den britiske forlagsverden diskuterer den danske forlagsverden koncentration og bestsellerisme, men det er generelt en lille produkt-ledet forretning, der fokuserer på forfatterskaber, backlist og balancen mellem profitable og ikke-profitable titler.

Det danske marked er så lille at forlagsvirksomhed altid har været vertikal og siden den kun kan finde nye muligheder for at sælge indenfor Danmark er den afhængig af paperback salg og bogklubber. På trods af dette er reklame ikke nær så vigtigt som i Storbritannien. Markedet er ikke større end at alle nye bøger er tilgængelige gennem boghandelen. Der er stadig både fast boglade pris og samhandelsregler.

Det danske marked er konservativt i dets struktur men ikke i hvad der vælges til udgivelse. Derfor er det danske marked åbent overfor engelsk-sproget skønlitteratur i oversættelse da det sælger godt, enten så godt som, eller næsten så godt som dansk skønlitteratur.

Kapitel 5 fokuserer på de faktorer der har indflydelse på udvælgelsen af titler til oversættelse. Disse faktorer er udvælgelseskriterier, kilder for information om titler og hensyn til markedet.

Både for danske og britiske forlæggere er den vigtigste informationskilde den internationale forlæggerverdens netværk af venskaber og bekendtskaber (old boys' network). Dette netværk er baseret på viden om hinandens forlagsprofiler og tiltro til hinanden. Netværket forsyner medlemmerne med viden om titler, men endnu vigtigere er at det giver indikationer om hvilke titler der er mest interessante. Dette foregår gennem anbefaling af visse titler og oplysninger om hvilke andre lande en bestemt titel er solgt til.

Især i Storbritannien er netværket vigtigt da britiske forlæggere ikke kan læse dansk. De udgiver hovedsageligt bøger skrevet i sprog de taler så som fransk og tysk. I Danmark er netværket suppleret med læsning af aviser og fagblade. Forlæggerne læser alle engelsk og kan bedømme kvaliteten af en britisk roman i original sproget.

Det vigtigste udvælgelseskriterium er kvalitet. Britiske forlæggere har desuden et kriterium der siger at en titel skal kunne rejse kulturelt. Dvs at det kan indgå i en britisk kulturel referenceramme. Britiske forlæggere tager også i betragtning om de kan få alle engelsk-sprogede rettigheder. Dansk skønlitteratur er derfor handicappet pga dens kultur og sprog.

Kapitel 6 undersøger vigtigheden af reklame i Storbritannien. Det gør det ved at analysere lanceringen af to danske titler udgivet i Storbritannien i 1993. De to titler er *Brother Jacob* (*Broder Jakob*) af Henrik Stangerup og *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* (*Frk Smillas fornemmelser for sne*) af Peter Høeg.

Reklame er vigtigt både for at få titlen placeret hos boghandlerne og for at få mediedækning. Dette har indflydelse på information til og tilgængelighed for potentielle læsere.

Både *Brother Jacob* og *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* klarede sig godt i betragtning af at de var danske, men *Brother Jacob* solgte kun ca 1/3 af hvad *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* solgte. *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* findes stadig i boghandlen mens *Brother Jacob* ikke på noget tidspunkt har været generelt tilgængeligt gennem boghandleren.

Pressedækningen af *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* fik noget større dækning end *Brother Jacob*.

*Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* ville højst sandsynligt have solgt bedre end *Brother Jacob* under alle omstændigheder, men den store forskel i salg er hovedsageligt pga den reklame kampagne der blev ført i forbindelse med udgivelsen af *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*.

Marion Boyars, *Brother Jacobs* forlægger, lancerede titlen som de fleste titler bliver lanceret. Hun sendte pressemeddelelse og korrektur kopier til pressen.

Harvill, *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snows* forlægger, investerede i en kæmpe reklame kampagne for titlen. Dette inkluderede trykning og distribution af 2000 korrektur kopier til bogverdenen, salgskampagne og at sende journalister til Danmark. Fordi titlen på denne måde var gjort speciel mellem andre titler, og fordi der var skabt generel interesse i den professionelle bogverden, var denne verden klar til at modtage bogen. Fordi boghandlere blev fortalt om hvilken kampagne der lå bag, tog de flere eksemplarer og de udstillede den tydeligt istedet for at placere den i den generelle A-Z sektion.

Kapitler 7 til 10 har kulturstøtten i fokus. Kulturstøtten spiller en rolle i at skabe åbenhed og tilgængelighed, men mere vigtigt, dette er gjort forskelligt i forskellige nationale kulturer.

Kapitel 7 fokuserer på de to forskellige systemer for støtte af kulturen i Storbritannien og Danmark. Det fokuserer på traditioner, værdier og historie der har ledt til forskelle og det ser på grundene for eksklusion eller inklusion af forskellige kulturbegreber.

Den britiske kulturstøtte er under The Department of National Heritage (britisk kulturministerium). Systemet er delt i traditioner for lovgivning for industri, fonde for kunstnerisk produktion og en uddannelses/fritids- (educating/leisure) tradition med brugen af kultur som den røde tråd. Det er kendetegnende at den danske brug af ordet oplysning ikke er gængs i en britisk sammenhæng. Det er indeholdt men ikke det samme som "education". Den danske kulturstøtte er baseret på konsensus og en filosofi baseret på Grundtvigske ideer, socialdemokratisk ideologi og kulturradikale ideer under et kulturministerium.

I Storbritannien har uddannelses/fritids-traditionen rødder til den victorianske tids paternalistiske filantropi. Den var et svar på de problemer som den industrielle

revolution og opdelingen i arbejds- og fritid skabte. Traditionen forsøgte at højne den moralske standard hos arbejderklassen så de ville blive pligtopfyldende arbejdere. Disse rødder blev senere gennem velfærdsstatens fokus på borgernes rettigheder ændret til at blive et spørgsmål om tilgængeligheden af fritidsaktiviteter.

De fonde der er skabt til støtte af kunstnerisk produktion er British Film Institute (British Film Institut), the Arts Council (Kunsthåndværk Fond) og the Crafts Council (Kunsthåndværk Fond). Semi-uafhængige fonde som the Arts Council er styret som en filantropisk velgørenhedsorganisation. Det er offentlig privat støtte som bliver fordelt af den gruppe mennesker der anses for at være samfundsstøtterne (the Great and the Good). I statens direkte udnævnelse af medlemmer af denne gruppe bliver, arms-længde-princippet kompromiteret.

The Arts Council blev etableret efter anden verdenskrig som en del af velfærdsstaten. Dette fond har altid lagt vægt på høj kunstnerisk kvalitet, men er ikke begrebsmæssigt kombineret med uddannelses/fritids-traditionen. Det har betydet at fondet har ført en kunstopolitik, ikke en kulturpolitik, og at en kulturformidlings-tradition ikke er opstået.

Fordi the Arts Council har ført kunstopolitik og fordi kunstnerisk kvalitet og brug begrebsmæssigt ikke har været forbundet, har fondet brugt demokratisering af kulturen som kulturbegreb og har ikke inkluderet kulturelt demokrati og folkekultur. Disse begreber findes i *cultural studies* skolen der kan ses som en opposition til det etablerede. Skolen studerede arbejderkultur og inkluderede senere køn og race. Det har været et fokus på brugen af kultur nærmere end på indholdet af kulturelle produkter, og skolen er på det niveau udtryk for uddannelses/fritids-traditionen.

Ændringer i samfundsværdier andre end dem udtrykt i kulturbegreberne har haft indflydelse på kulturstøtten. Thatcher årenes økonomiske værdier med deres vægt på individualitet og frie markeds kræfter medførte at mere nyttemæssige værdier blev tilknyttet kulturstøtte. Kunst og kultur skulle nu skabe arbejdspladser, tiltrække turister og skabe indkomst fra forretningsverdenen.

I Danmark er kulturstøtte forenet under Kulturministeriet, der blev dannet i 1961 som en del af velfærdsstaten. I et kompromis baseret på den Grundtvigske tradition, socialdemokratisk ideologi og kulturradikalisme, inkluderede den filosofi

Kulturministeriet baserede sit arbejde på, retten til en meningsfuld fritid, lige adgang, kunsternes rettigheder, retten til selvforvaltning, oplysningstraditionen, kunstnerisk kvalitet og frihed, og en opfattelse af kunst som en kritisk kraft i samfundet. Det var også et ministerium der lovgav for området.

Den vægt der er lagt på kunsternes rettigheder og retten til selvforvaltning kan ses i det danske arms-længde-princip, hvor der i Statens Kunstfonds struktur er indsat et Repræsentantskab. I dette Repræsentantskab sidder repræsentanter fra forskellige organisationer og det udpeger to ud af tre medlemmer.

Den danske oplysningstradition og retten til en meningsfuld fritid har betydet at kulturformidling er blevet en vigtig del af dansk kulturpolitik.

I den socialdemokratiske velfærdsstat med en fundamental opfattelse af overensstemmelse mellem stat, land og folk, og med en konsensuel kulturpolitik der gennem kulturformidlingen fokuserer på folket, må alle kulturbegreber, der indeholder respekt for dette folk, indkluderes. Selv om Kulturministeriet implicit byggede sin politik på demokratisering af kulturen, så ændredes dette derfor til at inkludere kulturelt demokrati og folkekultur. Den socialdemokratiske velfærdsstat og den konsensuelle kulturpolitik med en filosofi baseret på en ide om folket har også betydet at de nyttemæssige værdier som har været så indflydelsesrige under og efter Thatcher årene i Storbritannien, er blevet stærkt nedtonede i deres danske version.

Kapitel 8 er en analyse af kulturstøtten til litteratur som den er udtrykt under the Arts Council, Statens Kunstfond og initiativer direkte under Kulturministeriet; og en undersøgelse af biblioteksafgiften som kulturpolitik eller copyright.

Litteratur var ikke inkluderet under the Arts Council fra begyndelsen. The Arts Council har altid prioriteret de udøvende kunstarter og støttet organisationer frem for individuelle kunstnere. Litteratur er en kreativ kunstart og er produceret af individer. Den har altid levet i skyggen af de andre kunstarter under the Arts Council. Af modstandere af litteraturstøtte er det kommercielle litterære system og offentlige biblioteker set som rigelig støtte. På trods af dette har støtten udviklet sig fra Poetry Panelets støtteordninger der var inspireret af de udøvende kunstarter til de nuværende forholdsvis innovative støtteordninger.



I linie med traditionen for ikke at støtte individuelle kunstnere er forfatterstøtten det svageste punkt i støtteordningerne. Forfatterstøtten er enten målrettet eller indirekte f.eks. gennem honorarer fra forfatterturneer, istedet for at have et formål om at skabe tid og plads til at skrive. Andre ordninger er innovative idet de er rettet mod nuværende problem-områder så som reklame, små forlag og biblioteker.

I Danmark er støtte til litteratur delt mellem støtte til forfattere og kulturformidling gennem folkebibliotekerne.

Traditionen for forfatterstøtte er lang og stærk. Ordningerne under Statens Kunstfond er rettet mod forfatter og litteratur som disse er forstået under en fin kulturel definition. Disse ordninger har til formål at skabe tid til at skrive og præmiere kunstnerisk produktion.

Direkte under Kulturministeriet findes et netværk af ordninger, det såkaldte kludetæppe. Mange af disse ordninger er rettet mod en bred forståelse af kunstskaberen som ikke kan få støtte under Statens KunstFond, så som oversættere og illustratører. Dette er et udtryk for opfattelsen af litteraturstøtte som skaberstøtte.

Spørgsmålet om biblioteksafgift viser tydeligt den danske konsensus for kulturpolitik og den britiske manglende konsensus.

I Danmark har biblioteksafgiften udviklet sig fra at være en ordning mellem en rettighed og kulturstøtte til at være kulturstøtte. Dette er sket med den begrundelse at EU regler forbød diskrimination af andre nationaliteter.

Danmark har haft biblioteksafgift siden 1946 mens Storbritannien først indførte Public Lending Right i 1984.

Den britiske ordning har været en rettighed fra starten. I det liberale Storbritannien var det mere acceptabelt end en kulturstøtte ordning. Ordningen er stadig en rettighed og det har ikke været anset for nødvendigt at ændre det til kulturstøtte af hensyn til EU. De danske ændringer må derfor ses som et udtryk for konsensus omkring kulturpolitik og en stærk tradition for forfatterstøtte.

Kapitel 9 studerer folkebiblioteker som kulturformidlere. Det studerer på hvilken måde biblioteker er en del af kulturpolitikken i forbindelse med litteraturen.

I Danmark er folkebibliotekerne opfattet som kulturformidlere. I Storbritannien er offentlige biblioteker opfattet som støtte til litteraturen af modstandere af litteraturstøtte.

Britiske offentlige biblioteker har rødder til de problemer som den industrielle revolution og opdelingen i arbejde og fritid skabte. De var set som sunde, moralsk højnende alternativer til at drikke i pub'erne.

Britiske offentlige biblioteker's historie er hovedsageligt en lang kamp for at blive etableret og anerkendt. Dette nærmere end en grundlæggende filosofi har skabt lovgivningen for offentlige biblioteker.

Offentlige biblioteker ligger administrativt under kommunerne. Dette har betydet at brugergruppen er defineret i lovgivningen. Denne brugergruppe svarer til lokal samfundet og fungerer som det udvælgelseskriterium hvor igennem bibliotekerne opfylder deres formål om at give en effektiv og dækkende service. Dette formål er et resultat af historie, ikke af en grundlæggende filosofi.

Den svage etablerende filosofi var delt i en opfattelse af bibliotekernes formål som enten for uddannelse/dannelse eller for rekreation. Selv om tolkningen af disse termer har ændret sig over årene er den originale opdeling forblevet. Offentlige biblioteker er gået fra at lægge vægt på enten uddannelse eller rekreation, til at være tættere forbundet med uddannelse. Med den moderne velfærdsstats vægt på retfærdighed og introduktionen af en defineret brugergruppe, og i opposition til de paternalistiske rødder, er offentlige biblioteker blevet en del af de fritidstilbud kommunerne tilbyder det lokale samfund. De er derfor ikke begrebsmæssigt forbundet med støtte til litteraturen.

De danske folkebiblioteker havde ikke den industrielle revolutions problemer som ramme. De er baseret på en filosofi der lagde vægt på den danske oplysnings-tradition i et demokrati. Dette ledte til at uddannelse, oplysning og kultur blev formålet som skulle opfyldes gennem udvælgelseskriterierne kvalitet, aktualitet og alsidighed.

Den grundlæggende filosofi passede ind i den som Kulturministeriet baserede sit arbejde på og folkebibliotekerne blev litteraturens kulturformidlere.

Folkebibliotekerne var indtil 1983 struktureret som et sammenhængende system. Siden 1983 har det administrativt hørt til under kommunerne og det har medført en større fokusering på lokal samfundet. Men det har ikke medført at kvalitetskriteriet, der har været med til begrebsmæssigt at tilknytte bibliotekerne til kulturpolitikken, er blevet afskaffet.

Kapitel 10 analyserer støtten til oversat skønlitteratur og arbejdet gjort for at fremme interessen for nationallitteraturen i udlandet. Det er på den måde forbundet med kapitlerne om kulturstøtte, men det lukker også cirklen til kapitel 1 ved at identificere indflydelser fra den moderne verden i forandring i støtten og promoveringen af oversat skønlitteratur.

Støtte til oversat skønlitteratur ligger i Storbritannien under the Arts Council mens British Council er ansvarlig for at fremme viden om britisk kultur i udlandet. I Danmark ligger begge funktioner under Dansk Litteraturinformationscenter (DLIC) selv om det har til formål at fremme interessen for dansk litteratur i udlandet.

Begge lande støtter udgivelsen af oversat skønlitteratur gennem støtte til selve oversættelsen. Både the Arts Council og DLIC har haft en implicit og/eller eksplicit prioritet om at støtte afrikanske, asiatiske, skandinaviske eller østeuropæiske sprog, dvs næsten alt andet end de største vesteuropæiske sprog. Men fordi støtteordningerne er responsive har de kun været istand til at styrke eksisterende tendenser om at udgive hovedsageligt fra store sprog så som fransk, tysk og engelsk.

Promovering er i Storbritannien under British Council, der er en organisation for kultur diplomati under det britiske udenrigsministerium, mens DLIC er en del af kulturstøtten under Kulturministeriet. Begge organisationer har til formål at fremme interessen i deres nationale litteratur i udlandet og begge gør dette på baggrund af et litterært kvalitetskriterium. Dvs at det ikke er nationalkulturen som sådan der er emnet, men de udtryk for Danmark og Storbritannien som den moderne litterære scene fremviser.

Arbejdet udført af British Council har dybe rødder til udvikling og hjælp og til engelsk sprogundervisning. Afdelingen producerer udstillinger, reference bøger og bøger om forfatterskaber. Arbejdet for at fremme viden om britisk litteratur som sådan er hovedsagelig indirekte.

DLIC arbejder decentraliseret indenfor den professionelle bogverden med at opbygge viden om dansk litteratur og ved at etablere et netværk af formidlere der består af oversættere, hvorved oversætternes dobbel-kulturelle viden udnyttes. Dette er gjort gennem *Danish Literature Magazine*, innovative ordninger der udvikler nye oversættere og ordninger for opsøgende arbejde.

Både British Council og Dansk Litteraturinformationscenter prioriterer visse lande. Især Øst Europa er blevet vigtig, hvilket er et udtryk for de politiske forandringer i verdenen. DLIC i sig selv og oversætter ordningerne under the Arts Council er begge forholdsvis nye initiativer som er udtryk for den højnede interesse i internationalisme.

1. *DLIC* p. 73-74

2. *DLIC* p. 107

3. *DLIC* p. 170

4. *DLIC* p. 111

5. *Arts Council* p. 111

6. *DLIC* p. 107

7. *DLIC* p. 107

8. *DLIC* p. 107

9. *DLIC* p. 107

10. *DLIC* p. 107

11. *DLIC* p. 107

12. *DLIC* p. 107

13. *DLIC* p. 107

14. *DLIC* p. 107

15. *DLIC* p. 107

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Hans Gullestrup: *Kultur, Kulturanalyse og Kulturetik*. p 119.

2. Robert Escarpit: *Bogen og Læseren*. p 9.

Det er et klart vekselspil mellem den sociale situation som frembringer af det litterære værk og den gennem det litterære værk fremkaldte sociale situation.

3. Ibid. p 11.

Som sin engelske kollegaer Richard Hoggart og Raymond Williams ser han forskning og kritik, teoridannelse og kulturpolitisk reformarbejde som sider af samme sag.

4. Ibid. p 72-73.

5. Ibid. p 185.

6. Ibid. p 170.

7. Ibid. p 171.

8. Arthur C. Clarke: *How the World was One*. p 196.

9. Ibid. p 199.

10. David Morley and Kevin Robins: *Spaces of Identity*. p 26.

11. Marshall McLuhan and Bruce R. Powers: *The Global Village*. p 94.

12. Jeremy Seabrook: *The Leisure Society*. p 128.

13. Seabrook: *The Leisure Society*. pp 35, 145, 180.  
Morley and Robins: *Spaces of Identity*. pp 83-85.

14. Mel Read and Alan Simpson: *Against a Rising Tide*. p 17.

15. Alec G. Hargreaves and Jeremy Leaman: *Racism in Contemporary Europe* in Alec G. Hargreaves and Jeremy Leaman (eds): *Racism, Ethnicity and Politics in Contemporary Europe*. p 25.

16. See for instance Robert Miles: *Racism* and various essays in Hargreaves and Leaman (eds): *Racism, Ethnicity and Politics*, and Rattani and Westwood (eds): *Racism, Modernity and Identity on the Western Front*.

17. Michel Wieviorka: *Racism in Europe* in Ali Rattansi and Sallie Westwood (eds): *Racism, Modernity and Identity on the Western Front*. p 183.

18. Robert Miles: *Racism*. p 1.
19. Morley and Robins: *Spaces of Identity*. p 84.
20. Read and Simpson: *Against a Rising Tide*. p 33.
21. Here quoted from Thomas Wilson: *An Anthropology of the European Community* in Thomas Wilson and Estelle Smith (eds): *Cultural Change and the New Europe*. p 29.
22. Joan Kaplinski: *The Future of National Cultures in Europe* in Jyrki Iivonen (ed): *The Future of the Nation State in Europe*. p 118.
23. Karlheinz Reif: *Cultural Convergence and Cultural Diversity as Factors in European Identity* in Soledad Garcia (ed): *European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy*. p 141.
24. Ibid. p 145.
25. Ibid. p 141.
26. Ibid. pp 133-134.
27. Thomas Wilson: *An Anthropology of the European Community* in Wilson and Smith (eds): *Cultural Change and the New Europe*. p 29.

Thomas Wilson's essay charts not only the development of the EU, but also explores the intergovernmentalist/federalist issue in the rebuilding of Europe after the Second World War. He concludes:

"In short, due in no small part to the influence wielded by the UK, the organizations founded in the 1940s represented the triumph of intergovernmentalism over the more idealistic federalism". p 28.

28. Joseph Llobera: *The Role of the State and the Nation in Europe* in Soledad Garcia: *European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy*. p 77.
29. Peter Alter: *Nationalism*. pp 28-35.
30. Ibid. pp 23-27.
31. Ibid. pp 18-23.
32. Benedict Anderson: *Imagined Communities*. p 5.
33. Ibid. p 4.
34. David Lowenthal: *Identity, Heritage and History* in John R. Gillis (ed): *The Politics of National Identity*. pp 40-57.

35. Ibid. p 47.
36. Ibid. p 43.
37. Anthony D. Smith: *National Identity*. p 40.
38. Hans Gullestrup: *Kultur, Kulturanalyse og Kulturetik*. p 119.
39. Daniel Norman: *The Cultural Barrier*. p 6.
40. Ronald Inglehart: *Trust Between Nations - Primordial Ties, Sociatal Learning and Economic Development* in Karlheinz Reif and Ronald Inglehart (eds): *Eurobarometer*.

The Eurobarometer has measured trust in own country and in other countries. Denmark is the most trusting country, whereas Britain favours other English speaking countries like the USA. Ireland is an exception to this. Also, Denmark is the second most trusted country, whereas Britain is number 8 of the 17 nationalities tested. This is probably due to the different sizes of the two countries, and the significance Britain has within the community. The study clearly shows that Northern European countries are more trusted than Southern European countries.

Inglehart links the trust in the Northern European and more affluent countries with their affluency, and the trust of small Northern European countries with their affluency and knowledge of other countries.

Italy, as the only country has no trust neither in themselves nor others. Inglehart quotes a 1953 study of Italy as having no trust in anybody but the nearest family, and sees this as the roots of the distrust to be found in Italy today.

41. Ibid. p 145.
42. Herlitz, Gillis: *Kulturgrammatik*. p 30.
43. Ibid. p 31.
44. Ibid. p 35.
45. Raymond Williams: *Keywords*. p 32.
46. Nelson Goodman: *Languages of Art*. p 249.
47. Lothar Bredella: *Understanding a Foreign Culture through Assimilation and Accommodation - Arthur Miller's The Crucible and its Dual Historical Context* in Rüdiger Ahrens and Heinz Antor (eds): *Text-Culture-Reception*. pp 475-523.
48. Ibid. p 85.

49. Eileen Green Et al: *Women's Leisure, What Leisure*. p 5.
50. Ibid. p 6.
51. These studies are represented in C. Chritcher et al (eds): *Sociology of Leisure* by excerpts of their work.  
 John R. Kelly: *Leisure and the Family*. pp 44-54.  
 R and R Rappaport: *Leisure and the Family Life Cycle*. pp 67-70.  
 Stanley Parker: *Towards a Theory of Work and Leisure*. pp 28-28.
- Another useful book for an introduction to leisure studies is Haywood et el. (eds): *Understanding Leisure*.
52. Quoted from Peter Duelund: *Hvor Står Vi Nu*. pp 24-26.
53. See for instance Kenneth Roberts: *Great Britain* in Chritcher et al (eds): *Sociology of Leisure*. pp 6-20.
54. Joffre Dumazedier: *Sociology of Leisure*. pp 75-76.
55. Ibid. p 76.
56. Elias Bredsdorff: *H.C Andersen og England*. See Chapter 1 *H.C. Andersen og Engelsk Litteratur*.
57. Birgit Nüchel Thomsen: *Dansk-Engelsk Samhandel*. p 131.
58. Ibid. p 83.
59. Ibid. p 120.
60. For British-Danish relations during World War I see Tage Kaarstad: *Storbritannien og Danmark 1914-1920*.
61. Susan Seymour: *Anglo-Danish Relations and Germany 1933-45*. p 95.
62. For an in depth survey of Danish-British relations before and during World War II see Susan Seymour: *Anglo-Danish Relations and Germany 1933-1945*.
63. See Jørgen Sevaldsen: *Culture and Diplomacy* in Jørgen Erik Nielsen (ed): *The Twain Shall Meet*. pp 9-46.
64. Ibid. p 2.
65. For a socio-cultural understanding of the development of the teaching of modern languages, the best introduction is Karen Risager: *Mellem Tradition og Modernisering* in Marianne Kristensen (ed): *Umoderne Sprog*. pp 9-52.



66. Karen Risager: *Sprogfagene mellem Nationalisme og Internationalisme* in Marianne Kristensen: *Umoderne Sprog*. p 114.

I løbet af 2. halvdel af 1800 tallet skiftede indholdet i de moderne sprog karakter, så der efterhånden blev fokuseret mere på den nationale litteraturhistorie. Litteratur havde man også læst i undervisningen i de klassiske sprog; men mens litteraturundervisningen her var kosmopolitisk - man referede til en fælles oprindelig kultur, som ikke længere eksisterede - så blev litteraturundervisningen i de moderne sprog let nationalistisk: nu tog man sine forbilleder i eksisterende kulturer, og vurderingen af litteratur og kultur kunne inddrages i den samtidige revalisering mellem de europæiske lande.

67. Ibid. p 116.

England har i hvert fald siden mellemkrigstiden været det store forbillede, englænderne har i hovedsagen været fremstillet som et frihedselskende, retfærdigt folk, som levede i et velfungerende demokrati. Samfundsformidlingen har været meget koncentreret omkring beskrivelsen af den engelske nationalkarakter, retsvæsenet og universitetsverdenen. Endnu i 1970erne spillede nationalkarakterbegrebet en stor rolle i samfundsbeskrivende fremstillinger i engelskundervisningen. Også den engelske imperialisme - hvis ideologiske sider ligger i forlængelse af nationalismen - indtog en del plads og fremstilledes indtil for en halv snes år siden i et overvejende positivt lys: det engelske herredømme betegnedes som tolerant og universelt respekteret.

68. Ibid. p 30.

69. *Engelsk - Kvalitet i Uddannelse og Undervisning*. p 21.

... at eleverne bliver i stand til at forstå ligheder og forskelle mellem deres egen erfaringsverden og den verden de møder i engelsksprogede tekster

70. Ibid. p 14.

Den sætter eleverne i stand til at orientere sig om mennesker i andre lande - og giver dermed et grundlag for international forståelse

71. Jørgen Sevaldsen: *Culture and Diplomacy* in Jørgen Erik Nielsen: *The Twain Shall Meet*. p 12.

72. Peter Bacher et al: *Danskerne og Fremmedsprog*. p 13.

Lidt over halvdelen af danskerne kan føre en almindelig hverdagssamtale på engelsk. Omkring hver tredje er i stand til at føre en almindelig hverdags-samtale i tysk

73. Thomas Cable: *A History of The English Language*. p 3.

74. Magnus Ljung: *Skinheads, Hackers och Lama Ankor*. p 36.

Förklaringen till varför det just är engelskan som har fått denna världsomfattande spridning är rent utomspråklig. Det var utvecklingen af det brittiska imperiet och - under detta sekel - överförandet af den politiska, ekonomiska och teknisk-vetenskapliga dominansen från Storbritannien till USA som bäddade för engelskans dominans idag.

75. Randolf Quirk and Gabrielle Stein: *English in Use*. pp 61-62.

76. Peter Knoop Christensen et al: *Amerikaniseringen af det Danske Kulturliv i Perioden 1945-58*. p 248.

Men da styrkeforholdet mellem imperialistmagterne ændres radikalt gennem 2. verdenskrig, og Danmark eksplicit indlemmes i den amerikanske indflydelsesfære, forandres billedet kvalitativt: På det ideologiske og kulturelle område betyder dette forhold, at USA først og fremmest kommer til at fungere som fascinationsfaktor.

77. Søren Schou: *The Charisma of the Liberators - The Americanization of Postwar Denmark* in Roger De La Garde et al (eds): *Small Nations, Big Neighbour*. pp 65-79.

78. Susan Seymour: *Anglo-Danish Relations and Germany 1933-1945*. p 234.

79. Jørgen Sevaldsen: Culture and diplomacy in Jørgen Erik Nielsen (ed): *The Twain Shall Meet*. pp 9-47.

80. Jacob Dahl: *Let Us Be Lovers*. p 19.

Det slår mig, at vi tit spillede vores skuespil på engelsk. Alle de gode udtryk findes så let på engelsk. Vi lærte hurtigt udtrykkene for sorg og glæde, floskler, der glider let over læben, men som er svære at oversætte uden de kommer til at lyde klodsede. Vi var de lærenemme elever af de billige film.

81. It is a common-held theory that the novel as an expression of bourgeois ideology has been dethroned by the electronic media in the postmodern society. For instance, when interviewing the editor Liv Bentsen from Ringhardt og Lindhof she told me how, in her youth, "everyone" would read the latest novel by for instance Claus Riffbjerg or Leif Panduro, and how these invariably would set the topic for conversations at dinner parties.

82. Preben Sepstrup: *TV i Kulturhistorisk Perspektiv*. p 285.

83. Jeremy Tunstall: *The Media are American*. p 41.

84. Preben Sepstrup: *TV i Kulturhistorisk Perspektiv*. p 322.

85. Ibid. p 321.

86. Jakob Levinsen: *Genrebilleder fra Ungdomsland*.

De er midelaldrende, desillusionerede, som regel overvægtige, og som regel også enten fraskilte eller enkemænd - samt helst med en eller anden lidt følsom hobby, så som digte, opera eller jazzmusik. Og der er mange af dem i disse år, de engelske politifolk ved navn Morse, Resnick, Frost, Taggart, Dalgliesh eller Wexford, der i en højere enhed af bog- og TV-branche trænger sig på, som det nedslidte imperiums sidste nostalgiske modspil til de hårdkogte amerikanere og deres kynisme, som en slags 90er-deprime riddere af den bedrøvelige medfølelse.

87. For an explanation of assimilation and accommodation see chapter 2

88. Henrik List: *Dansegulvet som Medie* in Ole Lindboe (ed): *Medieeksplosionen*. pp 56-66.

89. Henrik List: *London Non Stop*. p 28.

Min drengeforkærlighed for den angelsaksiske krimi og min mormors anglofile påvirkning var selvfølgelig forlængst blevet blandet op med en interesse for 70'ernes og 80'ernes britiske eksportprodukter: Punk, fodboldhooliganisme, gademode, electropop, stilmagasiner, natklubkultur osv. Rastløs som så mange andre unge af interrail- og chartergenerationen var jeg. Selvom et par ture til New York havde fyret gevaldigt op under den indre kosmopolit, følte jeg instinktivt, det var i London det rykkede. Der stod de gode historier og hang på gadehjørnerne! Endnu en freelanceskribent var dermed født... Han ville rejse incognito! Han ville være øjne og ører og registrator for de nye pionerer! Han ville frygtløst kaste sig ud i storbyens malstrøm.

90. Benn Q. Holm: *Til Verdens Ende*. p 128.

Og langsomt var også musikken blevet gyldnere mens de sidste sorte stjerner faldt fra. Sid Vicious var død af overdosis, Ian Curtis af selvmord. Michael Strunge der var sprunget ud af et vindue med Bowies *Starman* blæsende fra ghettoblasteren. Det var noget længe glemt der dukkede frem. (...) Måske var det de dystre elektriske guitarer fra dengang der rungede i vores ører som et uvirkelig ekko. Tøjet, sminken, de sorte lodenfrakker. Hash og øl. Rotter og edderkopper. Tatoverede smil og forstadsvrag ude fra Helvedes Forgård der sniffede lim og lightergas. Vi andre var taget på café i den indre by, havde indtaget universitet og Kunstakademiet. Havde sniffet os ind i en stigende søvn af voksendom og forfalden husleje. Et eller andet sted var der en ubetalt restance, jeg kunne mærke det.

91. *The Euromonitor Book Report 1993*.

92. *Dansk Bogfortegnelse*, 1991.

93. *PA Trade Year Book*, 1992

94. Erik V. Krustrup: *Bøgernes Danmark*. p 15.
95. Per Gedin: *Literature in the Marketplace*. p 17.
96. Ibid. p 58.
97. Giles Clark: *Inside Book Publishing*. p 65.
98. Tim Waterstone: *In Response to the Doom Merchants*. Bookseller 31.03.95.
99. *The Euromonitor Book Report 1993*. p 117.
100. Niels Birger Wamberg: *Digterne og Gyldendal*.
101. Instituttet for Fremtidsforskning: *Bogens Fremtider*. p 32.
102. Eric De Bellaigue: *The Seven Sisters - Clones or Cousins?* The Bookseller 17.02.95. pp 62-73.
103. Michael Lane: *Books and Publishers*. p 53.
104. W.H. Smith *Hammers Last Nail into NBA coffin*. Bookseller 29.09.95. pp 7-9.
105. Eric de Bellaigue: *The Seven Sisters part two*. Booksellers 24.02.95. pp 29-31.
106. Phillipa Harrison: *Towards the Nineties* in Peter Owen (ed): *Publishing - The Future*. p 53.
107. *PA Trade Year Book*, 1992.
108. Peter Owen: *Independent Publishing* in Peter Owen (ed): *Publishing - The Future*. p 25.
109. Georgina Henry: *Going Soft on the Hardback*. The Guardian 16.03.92.
110. J.A. Sutherland: *Fiction and the Fiction Industry*. p 92.
111. Tina Pihl: *Gyldendal Koncernen*. p 33.  

Det er allesammen mennesker som ved meget om forlagsvirksomheden. Og det er en stor, stor fordel, fordi der er ting som kan lykkes og der er ting, der ikke kan lykkes. Det ved de. Så derved forstår de hele mekanikken i et forlag. Det er en meget stor fordel. Så jeg har haft meget, meget glæde af at Gyldendal var dem, der blev ejere.
112. Eric de Ballaigue: *The Seven Sisters - Clones or Cousins*. Bookseller 17.02.95. pp 62-73.
113. Ibid. p 70.

114. Ibid. p 70.
115. John Feather: *Book Publishing in Britain*. p 170.
116. PR: *Bøger med Bred og Almen Appel*. Bogmarkedet 16.10.95, nr 42. p 12.

Hos Bog og Idé har vi ingen snævre kulturelle eller litterære forpligtelser. Vi går efter bøger med bred og almen appel, ikke bøger til begrænset målgrupper. (...) Til gengæld ser vi ikke på, hvilket forlag der har udgivet en bog. Vi går efter det salgbare.
117. J.A. Sutherland: *Fiction and the Fiction Industry*. p 174.

The history of Penguin is the subject of Allan Lane and Penguin in which a detailed description of the list and its success can be found.
118. Hans Hertel: *Den Daglige Bog*. pp 55-56.
119. Harry Eyres: *Readers Upgrade to Club Class*. The Times 26.11.92.
120. Kurt Fromberg in a lecture at the Royal School of Librarianship, Denmark. 24.03.92
121. Dan Franklin: *The Death of the Hardback* in Peter Owen (ed): *Publishing Now*. p 26.

Consider also the lack of statistics on fiction in translation as opposed to the detailed Danish statistics in this area.
122. Danish Literature Information Center: *Literature from Denmark - Published between 1980-1991*.
123. Sven H. Rossel: Introduction in *Literature from Denmark*. p 5.
124. In connection with my dissertation (Tina Pihl: *Gyldendal Koncernen*) I spoke to publishers of fiction from the Gyldendal group. At the time I interviewed, among others, Claus Clausen from Tiderne Skifter and the former publisher for Samlerens Forlag
125. Interview with Niels Bjervig from Gyldendal

Vi går rundt og bekræfter vores interesse. Vi laver aftaler om bøger vi har læst, får snakket med folk og får dyrket det sociale netværk som er så uendelig vigtigt, prøver at få kommet i kontakt udover med de sædvanlige personer (...). Dem der har med foreign rights at gøre fra forlagene og fra agenterne, og så komme i kontakt med redaktørerne for at høre hvad sådan lidt længere ude i fremtiden, og sidde og snakke, få drukket lidt vin, spist nogle middage og få nogle bajere ud på aftenen, gået på nogle cocktail parties. Sendt de rigtige

130. signaler ud og modtage [signaler] og prøve at komme i kontakt med nogle ny mennesker. Det er der det uventede sker, for hvis kun man laver det ventede, så, ja så får man kun det man forventer, højst. (..) Fordi hvis man ikke tager alt det der small talk og en lille champagne hist og et lille glas vin der i stedet for at gå til et møde hvor man ved hvad man får at vide. (..) Derfor er det også en utrolig personlig geschäft vi er i.
126. It seems unlikely that a publisher would employ a scout for the Danish market only, since this is very small. Since Danish, Swedish and Norwegian are closely related languages a scout for this language group would be a possibility.
127. Interview with Lindsey Evans from *Serpent's Tail*.
128. Merete Riis, *Rosinante*. Interview.
- Vi er jo ligesom alle mulige andre danskere, vi kan læse sproget, vi kan forholde os til det, vi kan vurdere kvalitet meget mere sikkert på det sprog end de fleste af os kan på nogen andre sprog fordi jeg tror ikke det er der er ret mange andre danske forlæggere der er fuldstændig flydende i fransk eller fuldstændig flydende i tysk.
129. My information about Michael Larsen's book comes from my interview with his Danish publisher Peter Holst. Peter Holst could not remember which British publishing house had the book on option. I didn't press the issue since "on option" does not mean bought. Another British publisher may therefore end up publishing the book, or it may not be published at all.
130. Jeremy Beale from *Quartet Books*. Interview
131. Guido Waldman, *Harvill*. Interview
132. Instituttet for Fremtidsforskning: *Bogens Fremtider i Danmark*. p 33.
- Et vist marked for engelsksproget litteratur eksisterer imidlertid, og størrelsen heraf er tilstrækkelig til at vække til debat. Problemet er, at de amerikanske/-engelske eksportudgaver af nye romaner når til Danmark, dels lang tid før den oversatte version af bogen og dels til priser, som er konkurrencedygtige med den danske version. Salget af sådanne eksportudgaver kan dog næppe antages at være af en størrelsesorden, som udgør nogen reel trussel mod den senere danske version, omend der naturligvis er et marginalsalg, som bortfalder. Bundlinien er dog den, at de engelske versioner kun kan forventes at sælge i større oplag i Danmark når der er tale om salgsuccesser, som også vil manifestere sig i et betydeligt salg af den danske version.
133. Jacqueline Graham: *Publicity* in Peter Owen (ed): *Publishing Now*. p 129.
134. Gary Spence, *Dillons*. Interview.

135. Private correspondence with Eric Lane from Dedalus.
136. Lindsey Evans, *Serpent's Tail*. Interview.
137. Jeremy Beale, Quartet Books. Interview.
138. According to Marion Boyars none of Henrik Stangerup's novels have been able to pay for themselves.
139. As for the 13 Danish books published in Britain from 1980 to 1994 I have only found reviews on Henrik Stangerup's *The Man Who Wanted to be Guilty* and *The Seducer*. Helle Stangerup's *Christine* received one and Herman Bang's *Tina* received two.  
 In spite of this I can only conclude that Danish fiction is not widely reviewed, but I cannot say that Danish books are hardly ever reviewed since it is difficult to find reviews. There is no central index for British reviews. All British broadsheets are indexed from 1986 in Clovers which is available at public libraries. But this index does not index magazines. There is no other publicly available index covering the whole period of 1980-1994.  
 I should have all reviews for *Brother Jacob* and *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow* since the publishers of these two books have let me have the reviews I wasn't able to find through various indexes. The publishers I have spoken to would all have been helpful with providing reviews except they either do not keep them that long or they have been put in storage away from the publishing house.
140. Robert Nye: *Penance of a Saint*. The Times 03.05.93.
141. Christopher Stace: *Maker of the Mexican Waves*. Daily Telegraph 20.03.93.
142. Euan Cameron: *A Great Dane in a Savage World*. The Independent 01.05.93.
143. Eric Christiansen: *Something Splendid from the State of Denmark*. The Spectator 18.09.93.  
 Aidan Day: *European Evils*. The Times Literary Supplement 30.04.93.
144. Euan Cameron: *A Great Dane in a Savage World*. The Independent 01.05.93.
145. Bailey, Kathryn: *A Danish Mystery*. Today 02.09.93.  
 Berlins, Marcel: *The Snow Queen*. The Sunday Times 05.09.93.  
 Chappel, Simon: *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*. Time Out 02.09.93.  
 Francis, Claire: *How to Despatch a Charging Polar Bear*. Daily Telegraph 04.09.93.  
 Jones, JDF: *Thrills in the Snow*. Financial Times 04.09.93.  
 McCue, Jim: *Arctic Nights*. Time Literary Supplement 17.09.93.  
 Trelawney, Nicholas: *Mysteries of Life*. Mail on Sunday 05.09.93.  
 Whiteside, Shaun: *Prints In the Snow*. The Guardian 05.10.93.

- Williams, John: *Fire and Ice*. New Statesman Society 03.09.93.
146. Jim MacCue: *Arctic Nights*. Times Literary Supplement 17.09.93.
147. Interview with Marion Boyars.
148. In her essay on publicity, Jacqueline Graham mentions these promotion gimmicks and gives as an example of other gimmicks for up-market books a pair of frilly pink knickers sent out with Tamara Janowich's *The Male Cross-Dresser Support Group*. In Peter Owen (ed): *Publishing Now*. p 131.
149. Paul Binding: *Dreaming About Footsteps in the Snow*. The Independent 27.08.93.  
Ian Penman: *Peter Høeg*. Sunday Times, The Magazine 05.09.93.
150. Claire Messud: *Following the Prints of Multi-Racial Feet in Snow*. European 16-19.09.93.
151. Paul Binding: *Dreaming about Footsteps in the Snow*. Independent 28.08.94.
152. See for instance essays in Kevin V Mulcahy and C. Richard Swain: *Public Policy and The Arts* or in Alan Peacock and Ilde Rizo: *Cultural Economics and Cultural Policies*.
153. Alan Sinfield: *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*. p 2.
154. See Margaret Dickinson and Sarah Street: *Cinema and State - The Film Industry and The Government 1927-84*. Chapter 1.
155. Quoted in Tom Burns: *The BBC*. p 1.
156. For analysis of government involvement, museums and for the working class, see  
Tony Bennett: *The Birth of the Museum*. Tony Bennett analyses museums, space and government according to Foucaultian theories.  
Nicholas Pearson: *The State and The Visual Art*. Nicholas Pearson uses Gramscian theories for his analysis.
157. Frances Borzello: *Civilising Caliban*. p 36.
158. Janice Radway: *Reading the Romance*.
159. Though the focus on leisure provision as part of the cultural funding system and the focus on the split between education and leisure are mine, this discussion is informed and inspired by other researchers.

For a discussion of Leisure and Government see:  
Ian P. Henry: *The Politics of Leisure policy*.  
Fred Coalter: *Recreational Welfare*



172. These books also include an outline of Government involvement with leisure since the Industrial Revolution. So does Haywood et al: *Understanding Leisure*.
173. For a discussion of Arts and Leisure in the nineteenth century and with these implications for the Arts Council policies see:  
 Frances Borzello: *Civilising Caliban*.  
 In the context of libraries this is discussed in:  
 Robert Snape: *Leisure and the Rise of the Public Library*.  
 See also chapter 9 in this thesis, especially for further discussion of the education/leisure split.
160. Fred Coalter: *Recreational Welfare*. p 17.
161. Robert Hutchison: *The Politics of the Arts Council*. p 14.
162. *A Policy for the Arts*. clause 76 (iv).
163. Hugh Jenkins: *The Culture Gap*. p 124.
164. M.C. Cummings: *Government and the Arts in the Modern World* in M.C. Cummings and R.S. Katz (eds): *The Patron State*. p 354.
165. Arts Council, 8 Annual Report, 1952-1953. p 7.
166. Hugh Willat: *How the Arts are Promoted* in John Pick (ed): *The State and the Arts*. pp 21-47.
167. Ibid. p 28.
168. Nicholas Pearson: *The State and the Visual Arts*. p 74.
169. M.C. Cummings: *The Government and the Arts in the Modern World* in M.C. Cummings and R.S. Katz: *The Patron State*. p 354.
170. Harry Hillman Chartrand in his essay *Christianity, Copyright and Censorship in English-Speaking Cultures* in Andrew Buchwalter (ed): *Culture and Democracy* says:  
 At the end of World War II, the English world faced clear evidence of the power of art in the hands of Hitler and Stalin. This led to modification of the traditional policy by creating a unique English compromise: the arm's length arts council - funded by, but independent of, the state. p 192.
171. Aage Rash: *Staten og Kunstnerne*. p 43.  
 alt hvad der staar i forbindelse med nationaldannelsen og statens aandelige interesser overhovedet.

172. Hans Fink: *Et Hyperkomplekst Begreb* in Hans Hauge and Henrik Horstbøll (eds): *Kulturbegrebets Kulturhistorie*. p 13.
173. Henning Silberbrandt: *Den danske syge - Kritik af Dansk Selvforståelse*. pp 46-61.
174. Det, der binder dem sammen (...) er et ideologisk fællesskab, der på en eller anden måde tilsiger dem, at de er en slags arbejdere, eller deres forældre har været det, *samtidig med at de i forhold til den traditionelle arbejderklasse i England, Frankrig og Tyskland tænker og handler som bønder*. Den ideologiske integration af arbejderklassen i en bondekultur er noget specielt dansk (...). p 60.
174. In this account I am indebted to Peter Duelund and his analysis of the traditions in what he calls the "historical compromise" that became the ministry of culture.  
See for instance: Peter Duelund: *Kunstens Vilkår* or Peter Duelund og Trine Bille Hansen: *Hvor står vi nu?*
175. Johan Fjord Jensen: *Homo Manipulatus*. p 12.  
For det første et syn på mennesket som et socialt væsen, som del af sociale helheder af underordnede eller overordnede grader: familien, klassen og samfundet. For det andet et syn på mennesket som individ med individets ret til uden hensyn til disse sociale helheder at udfolde sig efter sine egne forudsætninger og behov.
176. Erik Bjarke Jensen: *Kulturradikal Litteraturkritik*. p 98.  
At kunst først og fremmest skal være kunst, og at den netop i kraft af sine rent kunstneriske virkemidler har en vækkende og stimulerende funktion, der rækker langt ud over det æstetiske felt.
177. Ibid. p 119.
178. Robert Hewison: *Culture and Consensus*. p 248.
179. Arnold Goodman: *Tell them I Am on My Way*. p 280.
180. Ibid. p 289.
181. F.F. Ridley *Tradition, Change and Crisis in Great Britain*. in M.C. Cummings and R.S. Katz (eds): *The Patron State*. p 236.
182. It has been researched as part of the series *Kulturens Politik*. Unfortunately the Report *Statens Kunstfond - Verdens Bedste Kunstlov ?* by Jørn Guldberg, had not been published at the time of writing. According to the publishers it is not

likely to be published, but the main results are related in Duelund: *Den Danske Kulturmodel*. pp 110-120.

183. F.F. Ridley: *Tradition, Change and Crisis in Great Britain*. in M.C. Cummings and R.S. Katz (eds): *The Patron State*. p 236.
184. Most recently in the series *Kulturens Politik* where his *Den Danske Kulturmodel* is an analysis and summing up of the 17 reports written by other experts on different areas of cultural policies.
185. The latest and fullest document is a *Creative Future* a somewhat incoherent document which does not chart the whole system, but deals primarily with the Arts Council. Though looking to the Future it does this on the basis of the immediate past. It is mainly a policy statement.
186. *En Kulturpolitisk Redegørelse/* afgivet af Ministeriet for Kulturelle Anliggender/ Betænkning nr 517/ Copenhagen, 1969.
187. "i forbindelse med udgivelse af værker, hvor det økonomiske udbytte ikke står i rimelig forhold til den kunstneriske indsats".  
Bekendtgørelse nr 319 af 6 nov. 1964 §5,2.
188. Anne Marie Kastrup and Ivar Lærkesen: *Rindalismen*. p 344.

Materialet fortæller os om konfrontationer mellem underuddannede og veluddannede, mellem mennesker med et slidsomt, monotont arbejde og mennesker med et selvvalgt, statusgivende og nogenlunde fleksibelt arbejde, mellem provins og hovedstad, mellem land og by, mellem folkelig og uforståelig - uvedkommende - finkultur.

189. *En Kulturpolitisk Redegørelse*. p 71.

Den folkelige protestbevægelse, der opstod, da kunstfondloven skulle føres ud i livet, viste på den ene side det positive, at befolkningsgrupper, der ikke i tidligere tider havde haft overskud til at interessere sig for, hvordan statsmidler blev anvendt til støtte af kunst og kultur, nu betragtede det som en anliggende, der vedkom dem. På den anden side afslørede protestaktionerne det negative fænomen, man har kaldt kulturkløften, men som måske snarere var - og er - en brist på kommunikation. De afslørede, at der var gjort alt for lidt på kulturformidlingens felt, at der var et enormt behov for information og for en langt nærmere kontakt mellem kunstnerne og deres publikum.

190. Andrew Sinclair: *Arts and Cultures*. p X.
191. Arts Council of Great Britain, Seventeenth Annual Report, 1961/62. p 12.
192. Asa Briggs. Here quoted in Tom Burns: *The BBC*. p 36.

193. For a short introduction to the tradition of Public Broadcast Service see James McDonnell: *Public Service Broadcasting*.
194. For a thorough examination of the concept see Dorte Scott-Hansen: *Folkekultur og Kulturpolitik*. In particular pages 22-44.
195. Arts Council of Great Britain, Thirtysecond Annual Report 1976/77. p 9.
196. Geoff Mulgan and Ken Worpole: *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*. p 75.
197. Marit Bakke: *Spillet om kulturen*. p 140.  
(...) Konklusion[en] er, at den allerstørste andel af statsstøtten er blevet fordelt til kulturformidlende institutioner på bekostning af skabende virksomhed.
198. For instance: "The belated decision by the Arts Council, however, to return to maintain its standards of excellence and to turn community arts and arts centres into local responsibilities was probably wise as a strategy for survival. (...) But on other policies of social welfare for ethnic minorities and the disabled, the Arts Council could not devolve such problems of national concern." (Sinclair: *Arts and Cultures*. p 296.)
199. Peter Duelund: *Kunstens Vilkår*. p 57.
200. Peter Duelund: *Den Danske Kulturmodel*. p 82-83.
201. It should be noted that Peter Duelund in the above mentioned *Den Danske Kulturmodel* concludes that nothing has been taken from the artistic community in order to further dissemination. Nevertheless there is an imbalance between arts and dissemination.
202. *Arts Without Frontiers*, Seminar 13, Glasgow, 1990  
Raymond Weber p 3
203. *A Policy for the Arts*. Clause 7.
204. *Arts Without Frontiers*, seminar 13. p 3.
205. Ibid. p 5.
206. One of the first studies on women viewing soap operas is Dorothy Hobson's *Crossroads - The Drama of a Soap Opera*, where she analyses both content, production and viewer's reaction. Within women's reading of romance fiction, especially Janice Radway's *Reading the Romance* has been an important study. In this she mainly looks at a group of enthusiastic romance readers use of this fiction, but also analyses the romances content as a sign of rebellion within patriarchy.

207. Hans Hauge: *Begreb Culture* in Hans Hauge and Henrik Horstbøll (eds): *Kulturbegrebets Kulturhistorie*. p 31.
208. Torben A. Vestergaard: *Kultur i Dansk Kulturforskning* in Hans Hauge and Henrik Horstbøll (eds): *Kulturbegrebets Kulturhistorie*. p 82.
209. Peter Duelund: *Kulturens Vilkår*. p 91.
210. Robert Hewison: *Culture and Consensus*. p 212.
211. See for instance Nigel Whiteley's interesting essay on the influence of the values expressed in the Design Museum in London in the rebuilding of the, in the Victorian era rooted, Victoria and Albert Museum.  
Nigel Whiteley: *High Art and the High Street - The 'Commerce-and-Culture' Debate* in Russel Keat et al (eds): *The Authority and the Consumer*.
212. The Arts Council: *Partnership - Making Arts Money Work Harder*. p 16.
213. Robert Hewison: *Culture and Consensus*. p 300.
214. See chapter 8 for further discussion of the role of public libraries in the funding system.
215. Raymond Williams in The Arts Council: *Politics and Policies*. p 11.
216. This analysis is primarily based on the annual reports from the Arts Council.
217. Arts Council, 8th annual report, 1952/53. p 46.
218. Arts Council, 25th annual report for the year ending March 1970. p 23.
219. Arts Council of Great Britain, Annual Report 1980/81. p 22.

220. *The Glory of the Garden*. p 28.
221. Ibid. p 29.
222. Interview with Alistair Niven
223. Charles Osborne has in his autobiography *Giving It Away* given an account of his years with the Arts Council, including his version of and a defence of the events surrounding *The Glory of the Garden*.  
For further comments on Osborne's version see Andrew Sinclair: *Arts and Cultures*. pp 275-277.
224. Arts Council, 43rd Annual Report, 1987/88. p 16.
225. The Arts Council of England: *Literature Grants 1995/96*. p 2.
226. Arts Council: *Literature Grants 1995/96*. p 14.
227. Ibid. p 11.
228. Ibid. p 12.
229. The objectives for the grants-in-aid are here quoted from Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt: *Litteraturens Situation*. p 22.  
  
Treårige stipender "til unge kunstnere, så der skabes mulighed for, at uomtvistelige talenter kan udvikles i ro og mag".  
  
Produktionspræmier som "anerkendelse i forbindelse med værker, hvor det økonomiske udbytte ikke står i rimeligt forhold til den kunstneriske indsats".  
  
Rejsestipendier og arbejdslegater "af variabel størrelse til mere modne kunstnere i tiden indtil en fast årlig finanslovsydelse opnås"  
  
The history and nature of support to authors in Denmark is in-dept documented. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt has researched the field. In particular her master thesis from the University of Copenhagen from 1986 which deals with the state and support to authors in the 1770's, 1870's and 1970's and the above quoted *Litteraturens Situation* are of interest, but also her book *Forfatter i Danmark* deals with the subject.  
Yet another important source is "Staten og Kunstnerne" by Aage Rasch which very thoroughly analyses primary sources in exploring the support from the Danish State to artists since the absolute monarchy until the foundation of the Ministry of Culture.  
Most of the following is based on these books though some information has been drawn from primary sources such as The Danish State Art Foundation annual reports and governmental reports.

230. Worsøe-Schmidt: *Litteraturens Politik*. p 24.

Livsvarig ydelse på finansloven "tildeles kunstnere, der har en sådan produktion bag sig, at vedkommende har placeret sig afgørende som kunstner. Tildelingen sker alene på grundlag af en vurdering af kvaliteten i den kunstneriske produktion"

231. Worsøe-Schmidt: *På Sporet af Litteraturens Betydning*. pp 219-242.

232. Worsøe-Schmidt: *Litteraturens Politik*. p 23.

233. Quoted in Aage Rasch: *Staten og Kunstnerne*. p 44.

(...) men een ting maa jeg gjøre opmærksom paa, nemlig, at det er noget som i Danmark maa være kostbart. Der ere visse ting som et lidet folk aldrig kan faae forholdsmæssigt for samme kjøb som den store nation, fordi udgifterne dertil maa fordeeles, og fordi den lille nation maa have det samme som den store, uden at kunne fordele udgifterne dertil paa samme maade. Men hertil knytter sig specielt en anden ting; vil Danmark have en national literatur, og vil det have noget, som nærmer sig til national kunst, maa dette medføre udgifter, fordi vore forhold efter vort folks omfang ere saa, at den nationale literatur og kunst ikke kan være sig selv paa samme maade som andetsteds.

234. Heinrich Hirschsprung was a wealthy tobacconist whose collection contained several of the Danish Skagens painters. This collection is today housed in the Hirschsprungske Samling.

Carl Jacobsen is also known from the brewery Carlsberg. He built the art museum "Glyptoteket" in the centre of Copenhagen to house his collection. It houses among other artworks classic Greek sculptures and impressionist paintings.

235. Aage Rasch: *Staten og Kunstnerne*. p 190.

Det førte til noget øgede bevillinger, men også til, at diskussionen fra 1870'erne og helt op til 1930'erne fortrinsvis kom til at dreje sig forfatterne, medens de øvrige kunstnere næsten blev glemt. For alle forstod sig selvfølgelig på litteratur! Men det resulterede yderligere i, at højreministrene fandt ud af, at man kunne "handle" med venstre efter det princip, at når den ene part fik en mand, skulle den anden også have én. Disse handelser foregik i Finansudvalget. (...) Finansudvalget blev en "æstetisk højesteret" (...).

236. The report by the committee is:

*Betænkning vedrørende Statens Forfatterunderstøttelse*. (Select Committee report regarding The States Author Support).

237. Worsøe-Schmidt: *På Sporet af Litteraturens Betydning*. p 161.

238. Interview with Helvinn Høst

Much of the information on and understanding of how these support schemes came about are taken from the interview with Helvinn Høst. Helvinn Høst is special consultant in The Ministry of Culture. He has worked here since 1984 and has been party to the development of all additional support schemes.

240. For additional information see Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt's brief description in *Litteraturens Situation*.

239. Bogudvalget: *Bøger i Danmark*, betænkning nr 969.

240. For the recommendations and the background for these from both the majority and the minority of the committee see *Bøger i Danmark*. pp 182 - 210.

241. Stig Dalager: *Pixi-Betænkningen Rammer Ved Siden Af*. Information 21.02.95.

(...) begår lovforslaget den sædvanlige fejl ikke at skelne mellem forfatterne og de bøger, de skriver, af samme grund er lovforslagets kernestykke også det nævnte støtteforslag til bogtilskud, et støtteforslag, der i første omgang vil komme forlæggerne og ikke forfatterne til gode.

242. The debate started after a survey was published in Annelise Japsen: *Biblioteket og Den Gode Bog*. The survey found that the public libraries bought books of quality, but favoured books with a broader readership.

243. This is privileged information which cannot be quoted publicly until the bill has been passed. Interview, Helvinn Høst.

244. *The Glory of the Garden*. p 28.

245. Victor Bonham-Carter: *The Fight for Public Lending Right 1951-1979*. p 5.

246. Ibid. p 31.

247. Ibid. p 46.

248. Ibid. p 65.

249. The Danish term "Biblioteksafgiften" cannot be translated directly as Public Lending Right. In *PLR in Practice* by John Sumsion it is translated as The Library Royalty (p 151). This is too close to the copyright and rights idea of Public Lending Right to adequately reflect the history of the concept in Denmark. In Danish literature on the subject, two words are used: "afgift" meaning duty, tax or fee and "Vederlag" meaning compensation. To reflect the indecisive nature of the philosophy behind the Danish legislation, I choose the less value-laden word of fee. Therefore The Library Fee.



250. Here quoted in Worsøe-Schmidt: *På Sporet af Litteraturens Betydning*. p 161.

Det er mig paalagt enstemmigt af Finansudvalget at udtale, at de forfattere, der kræver udlånsafgift af deres bøger ikke bør oppebære understøttelse på finansloven.

251. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt: *Forfatter i Danmark*. p 258.

252. Here quoted in Bonham-Carter: *The Fight for Public Lending Right*. p 8.

253. Worsøe-Schmidt: *Forfatter i Danmark*. p 259.

Vederlag til (...) danske Forfattere (...) for det gennem Bibliotekerne stedfundne Udlaan af de paagældende Forfatters Bøger.

254. See for instance *Biblioteksafgiften*, Betænkning no 1148, 1988. The section on Problems in connection with the present system is on pp 13-16.

255. *Ophavsretlig Biblioteksvederlag/ 5. delbetænkning fra udvalget vedrørende revision af ophavsretslovgivningen/ Betænkning nr 1038, Kbh, 1985.*

256. *Kunstnernes Kulturbetænkning/ Udarbejdet og Udgivet af Dansk Kunstnerråd/ Fremad, Denmark, 1981. p 3.*

Når Dansk Kunstnerråd udsender denne bog, er det ikke for at gøre en ny, officiel kulturbetænkning overflødig. Tværtimod, set i lyset af den politiske udvikling ville det være værdifuldt med en ajourført tilkendegivelse af det offentliges ønsker og muligheder. Det Dansk Kunstnerråd her fremlægger, er kunstnernes syn på sagen.

En demokratisk kulturpolitik skal naturligvis også bygge på andres synspunkter. Men eftersom de skabende og udøvende kunstneres arbejde er et af de væsentlige udgangspunkter for kulturpolitikken, og eftersom kulturpolitikken i væsentlig grad præger kunstnernes arbejdsbetingelser, må det være i alles interesse at få kunstnernes situation belyst.

257. *Biblioteksafgiften*, Betænkning nr 1148, 1988, p 15.

258. Rome Treaty, art. 7.

259. Lovforslag nr L 116, Folketinget 1990-91 (2. samling). Bemærkninger til lovforslaget p 6. In appendix to Lise Sørensen and Niels Erik Wille: *Omlægning af Biblioteksafgiften 1991-97.*

Den gældende ordning har karakter af et lovfæstet vederlag til danke forfattere for den benyttelse af deres bøger, som finder sted på bibliotekerne. Da denne ordning kan give anledning til tvivl i forhold til udlandet, finder Kulturministeriet, at det bør præciseres, at biblioteksafgiften har karakter af en kulturstøt-

- teordning på linie med andre støtteordninger (musik, film m.v) indenfor Kulturministeriets område.
260. Lovforslag L 116, Folketinget 1990-91 (2. samling) skriftlig fremsættelse/-written presentation. p 2.  
Det er (...) mit håb, at der senere kan vise sig mulighed for at supplere den støtte til litteraturen, som biblioteksafgiften er udtryk for, med andre litteraturpolitiske initiativer.
261. *Ophavsretlig Biblioteksvederlag/ betænkning nr 1038*, 1985. p 13.
262. *Public Lending Right*, Annual Review 1993-94. p13
263. Ibid. p 13.
264. F.R. Wand: *Public Lending Right* in David Fuegi (ed): *Public Lending Right and the Book World*. p 36.
265. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt: *Litteraturens Situation*. pp 52-53.
266. Jens Thorhauge: *Luk Op for Skønlitteraturen - Om Skønlitterær Formidling i Folkebiblioteker* in Erland Munch-Petersen (ed): *Litteratursociologi*. p 174.
267. Paul Wellman: *Public Library Selection* in Hilary Spiers: *Public Library Selection Policies*. p 53.
268. In the recent Danish debate quality is defined by literary quality and readership, i.e. "narrow quality fiction" would be fiction with a small readership, whereas fiction of quality with a broad readership would be "broad quality fiction" the closest equivalent in English would be "middle-brow" and "high-brow". Besides this the Danish debate also operates with "entertainment literature" or genre literature as for instance in crime fiction and historical novels. Here quality is judged by genre-traits and the readership is taken for granted as being large.
269. Japsen Anne Lise: *Biblioteket og den gode Bog*.
270. Ibid. p 113.  
Bibliotekerne sorterer det dårligste fra og foretrækker kvalitet, hvis den vel og mærke er kombineret med popularitet. Men det går ud over den smalle kvalitetslitteratur, der prioriteres lavere end den brede underholdning og for så vidt bliver kvaliteten altså svigtet til fordel for efterspørgslen.
271. *Biblioteket og Den Gode Bog*, Kulturministeriets Konference.

272. Riis, Johannes: *En Politik for Litteraturen?* Politiken 07.04.94.

273. Det er bibliotekernes indkøbspolitik, der er skyld i at navnlig det engelske og amerikanske krimimarked på det seneste er blevet støvsuget for forfatterskaber, som ingen danske forlag tidligere har villet røre, dels fordi de ikke er gode nok, dels fordi der intet marked var for dem.

274. W.J. West: *The Strange Rise of Semi-literate England*. p 33.

275. Imogen Forster: *Life on the Shelf*. New Statesman 13.03.92.

276. Library and Museums act of 1964

277. Quote and translation from: W.J. Murison: *The Public Library*. p 85.

278. Lawrence Venuti: *The Translator's Invisibility*. p 20.

279. Ibid. p 20.

280. Ibid. p 20.

281. Thomas Kelly: *History of British Public Libraries*. p 20.

282. R.J.B. Morris: *Parliament and the Public Libraries*. p 59.

283. Here quoted from Nicholas Pearson: *The State and the Visual Arts*. p 28.

284. John E. Pemberton: *Politics and Public Libraries in England and Wales 1850-1970*. p 16.

285. Thomas Kelly: *History of Public Libraries*. p 112.

286. Robert Snype: *Leisure and the Rise of the Public Library*.

287. Ibid. p 133.

288. Ibid. p 51.

289. Ibid. p 99.

290. Both quotes from page 1 in Lionel R. McColvin: *The Public Library System*.

291. Ministry of Education: *The Structure of the Public Library*. p 8.

292. R.P Hillard: *Librarianship and the Politics of Leisure* in Bob Usherwood (ed): *Libraries and Leisure*. p 19.

293. Patricia Coleman: *Much More than Books* in Maggie Aschroft and Alex Wilson (eds): *Public Library Policy and Strategic Planning for the 1990's*. p 20.

293. Ibid. p 21.
294. For Danish library history see  
 Hvenegaard-Lassen: *De Danske Folkebibliotekers Historie 1876-1940*  
 Leif Thorsen: *De Danske Biblioteker 1940-83*.
295. Døssing, Thomas: *Hele Befolkningens Biblioteker*. p 41.
- De gamle biblioteker var i overvejende grad beregnede på tilfældig læsning: skønlitteratur, suppleret med populær rejseskildringer, populær historisk og religiøs litteratur. De nye biblioteker tilsigter at give alle samfundsborgere de bøger, der er nødvendige til tilegnelse af almene kundskaber, til orientering i samfundets forhold, til vejledning i det praktiske erhvervsliv og endelig til åndsdannelse, særlig gennem den værdifulde del af skønlitteraturen.
- Men forskellen ligger dybere, Den er et modsætningsforhold mellem en gammel og en ny tids synspunkter for folkelig oplysningsarbejde. Dem der kan kapere det højere åndsliv og dem, der ikke kan og skal have det tilbudt i særlig form.
- Når arbejdere og bønder deltager i kommunernes og statens styrelse, kan og må ethvert oplysningsarbejde være for hele folket. (...) Åndelige udviklingsmuligheder findes i alle befolkningslag, og opdragelse skal drage opad og ikke være en jævn hyggelig marsch på stedet. I ly af den her skitserede opfattelse har en stor i kunstnerisk henseende fuldkommen ligegyldig litteratur fået lov til at præge vore folkebiblioteker og fået prædikatet "god folkelig læsning". I ly af denne opfattelse har man holdt bøger ude, som var uundværlige til forståelse af folkets kultur.
296. Ibid. p 42.
- Et demokratisk synspunkt, ikke i den forstand, at fx de nye folkebiblioteker skulle være udtryk for en særlig politisk eller social opfattelse, tværtimod, folkebibliotekerne skal i deres bogbestand repræsentere alle opfattelser, demokratisk derved, at den voksne befolkning betragtes som voksne mennesker.
297. Ibid. p 41.
298. Anne Lise Japsen: *Biblioteket og den Gode Bog*. p 115.
299. Lisbeth Worsøe-Schmidt: *Litteraturens Situation*. pp 47-49.
300. Claus Secher: *Folkebibliotekerne og den Litterære Kvalitetsdebat i Danmark* in Erland Munch-Petersen: *Litteratursociologi*. pp 150-172.
301. Ibid. p 170.
- Hvad der er behov for idag er selvfølgelig ikke bibliotekarere, der nostalgisk forsøger at reetablere en snæver dannelseskultur. (...) Hvad der er behov for i

forbindelse med skønlitteratur er viden om både litteraturens vilkår og muligheder for at skabe oplevelse og erkendelse. Der er brug for engagement, begejstring (...) og smittende formidling. (...) Bibliotekerne skal heller ikke glemme, at deres indkøb bør foregå i forhold til en større tidshorisont, og at kvalitetslitteraturen ofte har en længere levetid end en *Scarlett* eller *Slagteren*. Hvis bibliotekarerne har engagement, skal det nok smitte.

302. Jens Thorhauge: *Bibliotekerne i Kultur- og Informationspolitikken*. p 58.

303. Ibid. p 9.

Polemisk formuleret: Opgaven er ikke at stille bøger til rådighed, men at løse kundens problem. (...) Biblioteket må profilere sig tydeligere, mange må finde nicher, nye former for samarbejde med målgrupperne og arbejdsdeling mellem biblioteker må udvikles.

304. Marianne Andersson and Dorte Skot-Hansen: *Det Lokale Bibliotek*. p 13.

(...) informationsformidlerne var de hårde, teknologifikserede, systembevarende, markedsrettede kundskabsingenører.

305. Ibid. p 12.

de bløde, humanistiske livsverdenbekræftende (og af modstanderne opfattet som noget verdensfjerne og bagstræberiske) bogelskere.

306. *Biblioteket mellem Skylla og Karybdis*. p 15.

Jeg tror stadig kvalitet er et nøglebegreb for bibliotekerne. Øget efterspørgselsstyring skal ikke forstås som et middel til at forvandle bibliotekerne til centre for lettere underholdning. Det skal forstås som øget efterspørgselsstyring på det grundlag, som biblioteket opererer på. Biblioteket skal leverer det som konkurrenterne ikke er så gode til. Det er hurtig og korrekt information, og det er den kundskab, som alle tørster efter midt i informationsfloden. Med andre ord er det mulighed for fordybelse.

307. Alistair Niven, Literature Director, The Arts Council. Interview.

308. Interview with Alistair Niven.

Further explanations for the reasons for giving priority to Asian, East European and Scandinavian languages are taken from this interview.

309. *Betænkning om Kultureksport*. Betænkning nr 1106.

310. Ibid. p 11.

(...) Kulturudveksling og information i bredeste forstand er et middel til at bringe fred og forståelse mellem folkeslagene. Ved det umiddelbare indblik i at der kan være helt andre måder at tænke og skabe på, højnes tolerancen og åbenheden. Øget indsigt medfører derfor øget forståelse og bidrager herved til at overvinde fordomme.

311. Dansk Literaturinformationscenter, årsberetning, 1994. p 4.

Det formål at fremme interessen for dansk litteratur i udlandet.

312. Lise Bostrup has been the centre director since the Centre was established in 1990. By April 1st 1996, she will be replaced by Tine Smedegaard Andersen. She has as yet no plans for her work at the Centre, though she finds it important to continue the Centre's work in East Europe and would find it a challenge to do more for Danish literature in Britain and the USA. (Henrik Aagaard, Berlingske Tidende 09.02.96)

Since Tine Smedegaard Andersen did not start at Danish Literature Information Center before this thesis was completed, the analysis of the Centre's work is based on the interview with Lise Bostrup and other available information.

313. This is taken from the interview with Maryon Boyars. This paragraph cannot be quoted without prior consent from Maryon Boyars.

314. Interview, Lise Bostrup.

De danske forlag er forelsket i engelsk litteratur og det er det de vil [udgive]. De er ikke særlig interesserede i litteratur fra Uganda, så de opsøger det ikke. Så kommer der ikke ansøgninger [på støtte til det].

315. Interview, Lise Bostrup

Selvfølgelig skal der også være ting, der er danske, bevars, men det skal være det der er godt først og fremmest, og så må det gerne sige noget om debatten i Danmark.

316. *Betænkning om Kultureksport*. p 15.

Det er min opfattelse, at et godt Danmarksbillede i udlandet er af stor betydning for eksporten. Vi skal som bekendt eksistere gennem eksport af viden, serviceydelser, industri-, landbrugs- og fiskeriprodukter.

317. *Betænkning om Kultureksport*. p 13.

Det er i alles interesse at fastholde denne sammenhæng [mellem kultur og erhvervsliv] som er et grundvilkår. Derfor gælder det om at gøre sig den bevidst og øge muligheden for et udbytterigt samarbejde mellem erhvervsliv og kulturliv.

318. Dansk Litteraturinformationscenter, Årsberetning 1994. p 9.

Problemet for dansk litteratur i de mindre europæiske lande er i høj grad manglen på oversættere og professionelle formidlere med et grundig kendskab til dansk litteratur.

319. Ibid. p 9.

(...) med dokumenterede evner til at formulere sig på deres eget sprog og gode dansk kundskaber

320. Interview with Janet Garton from Norvik.

321. Lise Bostrup, Interview.

Det er de her år hvor man skal gå ind og blive en del af det. (...) Og så prøver man at gå ind og lancere nogle af de der danske [børnebogs] forfattere og gøre dem lige så berømte som Astrid Lindgren og så håbe at det kommer til at sidde fast. Og samtidig få vores navn banket fast som nogen der ved noget interessant om børnebøger.

322. Ibid.

323. Ibid.

Der er jo snart kommet så mange bøger at vi efterhånden er ved at vride hjernen for at finde store nye gode danske bøger som der ikke er option på endnu.

324. *British Council - 50 years in Denmark*. Leaflet from the British Council office in Copenhagen.

325. News Letter from Literature Department, British Council, London.

326. Frances Donaldson: *The British Council - The First Fifty years*. p 4.

327. Ibid. p 12.

328. Neil Gilroy-Scott. Interview.

329. Ibid.

330. Ibid.

331. Ibid

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aagaard, Henrik: *Hun Skal Sælge den Danske Litteratur*. Berlingske Tidende 09.02.96.
- Ahrens, Rüdiger and Heinz Antor: *Text-Culture-Reception - Cross-Cultural Aspects of English studies*/ Carl Winther Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg, 1992.
- Alter, Peter: *Nationalism*/ 2nd edition/ Edward Arnold, England, 1994.
- Anderson, Benedict: *Imagined Communities - Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*/ Revised Edition/ Verso, London, 1991.
- Andersson, Marianne and Dorte Skot-Hansen: *Det Lokale Folkebibliotek - Afvikling eller Udvikling*/ Folkeoplysning og Voksenundervisning, Denmark, 1994.
- The Arts Council - Politics and Policies*/ C.B. Cox and Raymond Williams/ The 1981 W.E. Williams Memorial Lecture Given at the National Theatre on 3 November 1981.
- The Arts Council of England: *Literature Grants 95/96*
- The Arts Council of Great Britain: *Annual Reports 1946-1995*.
- Arts Without Frontiers*/ Seminar 13: *Council of Europe Policies - The Work of the Council for Cultural Co-operation*/ A conference on the effects on arts of the European Single Market held in association with The Sunday Times and the British Council/ Glasgow, March, 1990.
- Ashcroft, Maggie and Alex Wilson (eds): *Public Library Policy and Strategic Planning for the 1990's* / Capital Planning Information, Lincolnshire, 1991.
- Bacher, Peter et al.: *Danskerne og Fremmedsprog - En Undersøgelse af den Voksne Befolknings Sprogfærdigheder*/ Udviklingscenteret for Folkeoplysning og Voksenundervisning, Denmark, 1992.
- Bailey, Kathryn: *A Danish Mystery*/ Today 02.09.93.
- Bakke, Marit: *Spillet om Kulturen - Dansk Kulturpolitik 1945-1985*/ Århus Universitetsforlag, Denmark, 1988.
- Bennett, Tony: *The Birth of the Museum - History, Theory, Politics*/ Routledge, London, 1995.
- Berlins, Marcel: *The Snow Queen*/ The Sunday Times 05.09.93.



- Betænkning vedrørende Statens Forfatterunderstøttelse* afgiven af det af Undervisningsministeriet nedsatte udvalg af 25 april 1930.
- Biblioteket mellem Skylla og Karybdis* - Indlæg om Bogvalg og Formidling på Biblioteksledermødet 1988/ Bibliotekstilsynet, København, 1989.
- Biblioteket og Den Gode Bog*: Kulturministerens Konference i Eigtveds Pakhus den 23. marts, 1992.
- Biblioteksafgiften/ Betænkning fra udvalget til revision af den gældende biblioteksafgiftsordning/ Betænkning nr 1148*, Copenhagen, 1988.
- Billig, Michael: *Banal Nationalism*/ Sage, London, 1995.
- Binding, Paul: *Dreaming about Footsteps in the Snow*/ The Independent 27.08.93.
- Bjarke Jensen, Ernst: *Kulturradikal Litteraturkritik* - Litteratur og Samfund i Mellemkrigstidens Kulturradikale Debat/ Udgivelsesudvalgets Samling af Studenterafhandlinger vol. 7/ Odense 1976.
- Bogudvalget: *Bøger i Danmark*/ Betænkning nr 969, Copenhagen, 1983.
- Bonham-Carter, Victor: *The Fight for Public Lending Right 1951-1979*/ Exmoor Press, Somerset, 1988.
- Borzello, Frances: *Civilising Caliban* - The Misuse of Art 1875-1980/ Routledge, London, 1987.
- Boston, Richard: *The Librarian's New Clothes*/ Guardian 22.02.92.
- Bredsdorff, Elias: *H.C. Andersen og England*/ Roskilde og Baggers Forlag, Copenhagen, 1954.
- British Council, Denmark: *British Council* - 50 years in Denmark/ Leaflet published by British Council, Denmark, 1995.
- British Council, Literature Department: *Literature*/ News letter from 1995.
- Buchwalter, Andrew (ed): *Culture and Democracy* - Social and Ethical Issues in Public Support for the Arts and Humanities/ Westview Press, USA, 1992.
- Burns, Tom: *The BBC* - Public Institution and Private World/ MacMillan, London, 1977.
- Cable, Thomas and Anthony C. Baugh: *A History of the English Language*/ 3rd edition/ Prentice Hall International, 1990.
- Cameron, Euan: *A Great Dane in a Savage World*/ The Independent 01.05.93.

- Chappel, Simon: *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*/ Time Out 02.09.93.
- Chritcher, C., P. Bramham and A. Thomlinson (eds): *Sociology of Leisure*/ E and FN Spon, London, 1995.
- Christiansen, Eric: *Something Splendid from the State of Denmark*/ The Spectator 18.09.93.
- Clark, Giles: *Inside Book Publishing*/ 2nd edition/ Blueprint, London, 1994.
- Clarke, Arthur C.: *How the World Was One - Beyond the Global Village*/ Gollanz, London, 1992.
- Coalter, Fred with Jonathan Lang and Brian Duffield: *Recreational Welfare*/ Avebury, UK, 1988.
- A Creative Future - The Way Forward for the Arts, Crafts and Media in England*/ co-ordinated by the Arts Council of Great Britain on behalf of the English Arts Funding System/ HMSO, London, 1993.
- Cummings, M.C. Jr. and R.S. Katz (eds): *The Patron State - Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*/ Oxford University Press, New York, 1987.
- Dahl, Jacob: *Let Us Be Lovers*/ Rosinante, Copenhagen, 1988.
- Dalager, Stig: *Pixi-Betænkningen Rammer Ved Siden Af*/ Information 21.01.95.
- Danish Literature Information Center (Dansk Litteraturinformationscenter): *Årsberetning*, 1994.
- Danish Literature Information Center: *Literature from Denmark Published in English between 1980 and 1991*/ Danish Literature Information Center, June 1991.
- Danish State Arts Foundation (Statens Kunstfond): *Beretning 1967-1990*.
- Day, Aidan: *European Evils*/ The Times Literary Supplement 30.04.93.
- De Bellaigue, Eric: *The Seven Sisters - Clones or Cousins?*/ The Bookseller 17.02.95, p 62-73.
- De Bellaigue, Eric: *The Seven Sisters - Part Two*/ The Bookseller 24.02.95. pp 29-31.
- De La Garde, Roger et al (eds): *Small Nations, Big Neighbor - Denmark and Quebec/Canada Compare Notes on American Popular Culture*/ John Libbey, London, 1993.

- Dick, Philip K.: *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep*/ Panther, London, 1977.
- Dickinson, Margaret and Sarah Street: *Cinema and State - The Film Industry and The Government 1927-84*/ BFI, London, 1985.
- Donaldson, Frances: *The British Council - The First Fifty Years*/ Jonathan Cape, London, 1984.
- Døssing, Thomas: *Hele Befolkningens Biblioteker - Udvalgte tekster af Thomas Døssing, samt bibliografi ved Poul Dalsgaard*/ Bibliotekscentralen, Ballerup, 1990.
- Duelund, Peter: *Den Danske Kulturmodel*/ Politikens Kultur 18/ Klim, Denmark, 1995.
- Duelund, Peter: *Kunstens Vilkår - Om de Kulturpolitiske Tendenser i Danmark og Europa*/ Akademisk Forlag, Denmark, 1994.
- Duelund, Peter og Trine Bille Hansen: *Hvor Står Vi Nu?*/ Kulturens Politik/ Klim, Denmark, 1994.
- Dumazedier, Joffre: *Sociology of Leisure*/ Elsevier, Oxford, 1974.
- Engelsk - Kvalitet i Uddannelse og Undervisning*/ Undervisnings- og Forskningsministeriet, Denmark, 1990.
- The Euromonitor Book Report 1993*/ 1993 ed/ Euromonitor plc, London, 1993.
- Escarpit, Robert: *Bogen og Læseren - Udkast til en Litteratursociologi*/ Udvidet Dansk Udgave - Med Tillæg om Det Litterære System i Danmark ved Hans Hertel/ Hans Reitzel, Copenhagen, 1972.
- Eyres, Harry: *Readers Upgrade to Club Class*/ The Times 26.11.92.
- Feather, John: *Book Publishing in Britian - An Overview*/ Media, Culture and Society, vol 15, Sage, 1993. pp 167-181.
- Forster, Imogen: *Life on the Shelf* New Statesman 13.03.92.
- Francis, Claire: *How to Despatch a Charging Polar Bear*/ Daily Telegraph 04.09.93.
- Fuegi, David (ed): *Public Lending Right and the Book World*/ Papers given at a seminar held 23rd June, 1989/ British National Bibliography Research Fund, Report 48, 1990.

- Garcia, Soledad (ed): *European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy*/ Pinter Publishers, London, 1993.
- Gedin, Per: *Literature in the Marketplace*/ Faber, London, 1975.
- Gibson, William: *Johnny Mnemonic*/ HarperCollins, London, 1996.
- Gillis, John R. (ed): *The Politics of National Identity*/ Princeton Press University, New Jersey, 1994.
- The Glory of the Garden - The Developments of the Arts in England - A Strategy for the Next Decade*/ Arts Council of Great Britain, 1984.
- Goodman, Arnold: *Tell them I'm on my Way*/ Chapmans, London, 1993.
- Goodman, Nelson: *Languages of Art - An approach to a Theory of Symbols* / Hackett, Indianapolis, 1976.
- Green, Eileen, Sandra Hebron and Dianna Woodward: *Women's Leisure, What Leisure?*/ MacMillan, London, 1990.
- Gullestrup, Hans: *Kultur, Kulturanalyse og Kulturetik - Eller Hvad Adskiller og Forener Os?* / Akademisk Forlag, Denmark, 1992.
- Hargreaves, Alec G. and Jeremy Leaman: *Racism, Ethnicity and Politics in Contemporary Europe*/ Edward Elgar, England, 1995.
- Hauge, Hans and Henrik Horstbøll (eds): *Kulturbegrebets Kulturhistorie*/ Århus Universitetsforlag, Århus, 1988.
- Haywood, Les et al: *Understanding Leisure*/ Stanley Thornes, Cheltenham, 1989.
- Hebdige, Dick: *Subculture - The Meaning of Style*/ Routledge, London, 1988.
- Henry, Georgina: *Going Soft on the Hardback*/ The Guardian 16.03.92.
- Henry, Ian P.: *The Politics of Leisure Policy*/ MacMillan, London, 1983.
- Herlitz, Gillis: *Kulturgrammatik - Kunsten at Møde Andre Kulturer* / Munksgaard, Denmark, 1991.
- Hertel, Hans: *Den Daglige Bog - Bøger, Formidlere og Læsere i Danmark gennem 500 år*/ Christian Ejlers' Forlag, Copenhagen, 1983.
- Hewison, Robert: *Culture and Consensus - England, Art and Politics since 1940*/ Methuen, London, 1995.
- Hobson, Doroty: *Crossroads - The Drama of a Soap Opera*/ Methuen, London, 1982.

- Høeg, Peter: *Miss Smilla's Feeling for Snow*/ Harvill, London, 1993.
- Hoggart, Richard: *The Uses of Literacy - Aspects of Working-Class Life*, with Special Reference to Publications and Entertainments/ Chatto and Windus, London, 1957.
- Holm, Benn Q.: *Til Verdens Ende*/ Forlaget Per Kofod, Denmark, 1994.
- Hutchison, Robert: *The Politics of the Arts Council*/ Sinclair Browne, London, 1982.
- Hvenegaard-Lassen H.: *De Danske Folkebibliotekers Historie 1876-1940*/ Dansk Bibliografisk Kontor, København, 1962.
- Iivonen, Jyrki (ed): *The Future of the Nation State in Europe*/ Edward Elgar, England, 1993.
- Instituttet for Fremtidforskning: *Bogens Fremtider*/ Den Danske Forlæggerforening, København, 1994.
- Japsen, Anne Lise: *Biblioteket og Den Gode Bog - Hvad Styrer Folkebibliotekernes Anskaffelsespolitik*/ Gyldendal, Copenhagen, 1992.
- Jenkins, Hugh: *The Culture Gap - An Experience of Government and the Arts*/ Marion Boyars, London, 1979.
- Jensen, Johan Fjord: *Homo Manipulatus - Essays omkring Radikalismen*/ Gyldendal, Copenhagen, 1966.
- Jones, JDF: *Thrills in the Snow*/ Financial Times 04.09.93.
- Kaarsted, Tage: *Storbritannien og Danmark 1914-1920*/ Odense University Press, Odense, 1979.
- Kastrup, Anne Marie og Ivar Lærkesen: *Rindalismen - En Studie i Kulturmønstre, Social Forandring og Kultursammenstød*/ Hans Reitzel, Copenhagen, 1979.
- Keat, Russel et al (eds): *The Authority of the Consumer*/ Routledge, London, 1994.
- Kelly, Thomas: *History of Public Libraries in Great Britain 1845-1975*/ Library Association, London, 1977.
- Knoop Christensen, Peter et al: *Amerikanisering af det Danske Kulturliv i Perioden 1945-58*/ Ålborg Universitetsforlag, Ålborg, 1983.
- Kristiansen, Marianne et al (ed): *Umoderne Sprog - Om Fremmedsprog i Gymnasiet*/ Gyldendals Sprogbibliotek, Denmark, 1984.

- Krustrup, Erik: *Bøgernes Danmark* - Statistiske Hovedtræk om Bøger og deres Benyttelse/ Den Danske Forlæggerforening, Denmark, 1992.
- Kultureksportudvalget: *Betænkning om Kultureksport/* Betænkning nr. 1106/ Copenhagen, 1987.
- En Kulturpolitisk Redegørelse/* Afgivet af Ministeriet for Kulturelle Anliggender/ Betænkning nr. 517/ Copenhagen, 1969.
- Kunstnernes Kulturbetænkning/* Udarbejdet og udgivet af Dansk Kunstnerråd/ Fremad, Denmark 1991.
- Lane, Michael with Jeremy Booth: *Books and Publishers* - Commerce against Culture in Postwar Britain/ D.C. Heath and Company, U.S.A, 1980.
- Levinsen, Jakob: *Genrebilleder fra Undergangsland/* Berlingske Tidende 11.11.94.
- Lindboe, Ole and Niels Frid-Nielsen (eds): *Medieeksplosionen/* Gyldendal, Copenhagen, 1992.
- List, Henrik: *London Non Stop* - Stemninger og Tidsbilleder/ Hovedland, Denmark, 1990.
- Ljung, Magnus: *Skinheads, Hackars och Lama Ankor* - Engelskan i 80-talets Svenska/ Bokförlaget Trevi, Sweden, 1988.
- McCabe, Colin and Olivia Stewart (eds): *The BBC and Public Service Broadcasting/* Manchester University Press, England, 1986.
- McColvin, Lionel R.: *The Public Library System of Great Britain* - A Report on its Present Condition with Proposals for Post-War Reorganisation / The Library Association, London, 1942.
- McCue, Jim: *Arctic Nights/* Times Literary Supplement 17.09.93.
- McDonnell, James: *Public Service Broadcasting* - A Reader/ Routledge, London, 1991.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Bruce R. Powers: *The Global Village* - Transformations in World Life and Media in the Twentyfirst Century/ Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992.
- Messud, Claire: *Following the Prints of Multi-Racial Feet in Snow/* The European 16-19.09.93.
- Miles, Robert: *Racism/* Routledge, London, 1989.

- Ministry of Education: *The Structure of the Public Library Service in England and Wales* - Report of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Education / [Roberts Report] / CMND 660, 1957.
- Morley, David and Kevin Robins: *Spaces of Identity* - Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries/ Routledge, London and New York, 1995.
- Morris, R.J.B.: *Parliament and the Public Libraries* / Mansell, London, 1977.
- Mulcahy, Kevin V. and C. Richard Swain (eds): *Public Policy and the Arts*/ Bowker Publishing Company, England, 1982.
- Mulgan, Geoff and Ken Worpole: *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning ?* - From Arts to Industry - New Forms of Cultural Policy/ Comedia, London, 1986.
- Munch-Petersen, Erland (ed): *Litteratursociologi*/ 2nd edition/ Dansk Bibliotekscenter, Denmark, 1995.
- Murison, W.J.: *The Public Library - Its Origins, Purpose and Significance*/ 3rd edition / Clive Bingley Ltd, London, 1988.
- Nielsen, Jørgen Erik: *Den Engelske Litteraturs Dyrkere i Holsten omkring 1820* - Et Formidlende Led mellem England og Danmark/ G.E.C. Gads forlag, Copenhagen, 1966.
- Nielsen, Jørgen Erik: *Den Samtidige Engelske Litteratur og Danmark 1800-1840*/ Nova, Copenhagen, 1976.
- Nielsen, Jørgen Erik (ed): *The Twain Shall Meet* - Danish Approaches to English Studies, Department of English, University of Copenhagen, 1992.
- Norman, Daniel: *The Cultural Barrier*/ University of Edinburgh Press, Edinburgh, 1975.
- Nye, Robert: *Penance of a Saint*/ The Times 03.05.93.
- Ophavsretlig Biblioteksvederlag*/ 5. delbetænkning fra udvalget vedrørende revision af ophavsretslovgivningen/ Betænkning nr 1038, Copenhagen, 1985.
- Osborne, Charles: *Giving It Away* - The Memoirs of an Uncivil Servant/ Secker and Warburg, London, 1986.
- Owen, Peter (ed) : *Publishing* - The Future/ Peter Owen, London, 1988.
- Owen, Peter (ed): *Publishing Now* - A Definitive Assessment by Key People in the Book Trade/ Peter Owen, London, 1993.

- PA Book Trade Year Book - A Summary of Statistics about Book Publishing in 1991 and the Past Ten Years/* compiled by Dr Francis Fishwick/ The Publisher Association, England, 1992.
- Partnership - Making Arts Money Work Harder/* The Arts Council, London, 1986.
- Peacock, Alan and Ilde Rizo (eds): *Cultural Economics and Cultural Policies/* Kluwer Academic Publishers, London, 1994.
- Pearson, Nicholas: *The State and the Visual Arts/* Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1982.
- Pemberton, John E.: *Politics and Public Libraries in England and Wales 1850 - 1970/* The Library Association, London, 1977.
- Penman, Ian: *Peter Høeg/* Sunday Times, The Magazine. 05.09.93.
- Pick, John (ed): *The State and The Arts/* City University, England, 1980.
- Pihl, Tina: *Gyldendal Koncernens Udgivelsesprofiler - En Undersøgelse af Koncernens Forlags og Bogklubbers Skønlitterære Udgivelsesprofiler/* Unpublished thesis from Royal School of Librarianship, Denmark, 1992.
- A Policy for the Arts - The First Steps/* Cmnd 2601, 1965.
- En Politik for Litteraturen/ Betænkning for kulturministeriets litteraturpolitiske arbejdsgruppe/* Copenhagen, March, 1994.
- PR: *Bøger med Bred og Almen Appell/* Bogmarkedet 16.10.95, nr 42, pp 12-14.
- Public Lending Right - Annual Review, 1993-94.*
- Quirk, Randolp and Garbrielle Stein: *English in Use/* Longman, Harlow, 1990.
- Radway, Janice: *Reading the Romance - Women, Patriarchy and Popular Literature/* Verso, London, 1987.
- Rasch, Aage: *Staten og Kunstnerne/* Universitetsforlaget, Århus, 1968.
- Rattansi, Ali and Sallie Westwood (eds): *Racism, Modernity and Identity on the Western Front/* Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- Read, Mel and Alan Simpson: *Against a Rising Tide - Racism, Europe and 1992/* Bertrand Russel House, England, 1991.
- Reif, Karlheinz and Ronald Inglehart (eds): *Eurobarometer -The Dynamics of European Public Opinion - Essays in honour of Jacques-René Rabier /* MacMillan, London, 1991



- Riis, Johannes: *En politik for Litteraturen? / Politiken* 07.04.94.
- Seabrook, Jeremy: *The Leisure Society/ Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1988.*
- Sepstrup, Preben: *TV i Kultur-Historisk Perspektiv 1954-1994/ Kulturens Politik* 12/ Klim, Denmark, 1994.
- Seymour, Susan: *Anglo-Danish Relations and Germany 1933-1945/ Odense University Press, Odense, 1982.*
- Shelley, Mary: *Frankenstein/* edited and introduced by Paddy Lyons/ 1818 edition/ Everyman's Library/ Dent, London, 1992.
- Silberbrandt, Henning: *Den Danske Syge - Kritik af Dansk Selvforståelse/ Hovedland, Denmark, 1993.*
- Sinclair, Andrew: *Arts and Cultures - The History of the 50 Years of the Arts Council of Great Britain/ Sinclair-Stevenson, London, 1995.*
- Sinfield, Alan: *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain/ Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1989.*
- Smith, Anthony D.: *National Identity/ Penguin, England, 1991.*
- Snapé, Robert: *Leisure and the Rise of the Public Library/ Library Association Publishing, London, 1995.*
- Sørensen, Lise og Niels Erik Wille: *Omlægning af Biblioteksafgiften 1991-97 - En Undersøgelse af Konsekvenserne af den Nye Lov om Biblioteksafgift/ Statens Bibliotekstjeneste, Denmark, 1993.*
- Stace, Christopher: *Maker of Mexican Waves/ Daily Telegraph* 20.03.93.
- Stangerup, Henrik: *Brother Jacob/ Marion Boyars, London, 1993.*
- Stevenson, Robert Louis: *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde/ Dover Thrift Edition/ Constable, London, 1991.*
- Sumsion, John: *PLR in Practice - A Report to the Advisory Committee/ 2nd edition/ Registrar Office of Public Lending Right, 1991.*
- Sutherland, J.A.: *Fiction and the Fiction Industry/ University of London, The Athlone Press, 1978.*
- Thomsen, Birgit Nüchel and Thomas Brinley: *Dansk-Engelsk Samhandel - Et Historisk Rids 1661-1963/ Universitetsforlaget i Århus, Århus, 1966.*

- Thorhauge, Jens: *Bibliotekerne i Kultur- og Informationspolitikken - Museer eller Ressourcecentre?*/ Klim, Århus, 1994.
- Thorsen, Leif: *De Danske Biblioteker 1940-1983*/ Dansk bibliotekscenter, Denmark, 1992.
- Townsend, Sue: *The Queen and I*/ Methuen, London, 1992.
- Trelawney, Nicholas: *Mysteries of Life*/ Mail on Sunday 05.09.93.
- Tunstall, Jeremy: *The Media are American - Anglo-American Media in the World*/ Constable, London, 1977.
- Usherwood, Bob (ed): *Libraries and Leisure*/ Association of Assistent Librarians, Middlesex, 1979.
- Venuti, Lawrence: *The Translator's Invisibility - A History of Translation*/ Routledge, London, 1995.
- Wamberg, Niels Birger: *Digterne og Gyldendal - Kapitler af et Forlags Historie*/ Gyldendal, Denmark, 1977.
- Waterstone, Tim: *In Response to the Doom Merchants*/ Bookseller 31.03.95, pp 16-19.
- West, W.J.: *The Strange Rise of Semi-Literate England - The Dissolution of the Libraries*/ Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., London, 1991.
- W.H. Smith *Hammers Last Nail into NBA Coffin*. (No author) Bookseller 29.09.95, pp 7-9.
- Whiteside, Shaun: *Prints in the Snow*/ The Guardian 05.10.93.
- Williams, John: *Fire and Ice*/ New Statesman Society 03.09.93.
- Williams, Raymond: *Culture and Society - Coleridge to Orwell*/ New Foreword by Author/ The Hogarth Press, London, 1987.
- Williams, Raymond: *Keywords - A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*/ Revised and expanded/ Fontana, London, 1983.
- Wilson, Thomas and M. Estelle Smith (eds): *Cultural Change and the New Europe - Perspectives on the European Community*/ Westview Press, UK, 1993.
- Worsøe-Schmidt, Lisbeth: *Forfatter i Danmark 1894-1994*/ Dansk Forfatterforening, Denmark, 1994.

Worsøe-Schmidt, Lisbeth: *Litteraturens Situation og Litteraturpolitikken 1961-93/*  
Kulturens Politik 7/ Klim, Denmark, 1994.

Worsøe-Schmidt, Lisbeth: *På sportet af Litteraturens Betydning for det Borgerlige*  
*Hegemoni - Statens Forfatterstøtte i 70'erne, 1770'erne, 1870'erne,*  
*1970'erne/ Unpublished thesis, University of Copenhagen, 1986.*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

Gregory, David: *From the Margins to the Center*

## **PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

Alistair Niven, Arts Council.

Christopher MacClehose, Harvill.

Gary Spence, Dillons, Charing Cross Road, London.

Georgia De Chamberet, Quartet Books.

Guido Waldman, Harvill.

Helvinn Høst, Danish Ministry of Culture.

Jack Noe, Waterstones, Charing Cross Road, London.

Jane Thurlow, Harvill.

Janet Garton, Norvik.

Jeremy Beale, Quartet Books.

Lindsey Evans, Serpent's Tail.

Lise Bostrup, Danish Literature Information Center.

Liv Bendtsen, Ringhardt og Lindhof.

Marion Boyars, Marion Boyars.

Merete Riis, Rosinante.

Neil Gilroy-Scott, British Council.

Niels Bjervig, Gyldendal.

Peter Holst, Samlerens Forlag.