

PUBLIC SOURCES OF FINANCE FOR CULTURE AS AN ELEMENT OF CULTURAL SECURITY IN POLAND

Introduction

The culture of a nation is a resource of tangible and intangible heritage. It is recognized as important for the welfare and development of a society, and is therefore considered worthy of protection. Culture is not limited to historic, scientific or artistic events. It can be compared to a huge database that plays an important role in understanding the customs and history of individual communities. Culture is part of the construction of national identity in the political, social and cultural perspectives, without which learning respect for tradition and history would be impossible. Additionally, in a market economy, the cultural sector is considered as a factor that supports regional development and should be financed from public sources.

The aim of this article is to present the public sources of finance for the cultural sector in Poland and to compare the expenditure of various local authorities within the last decade. The article is divided into three parts. The first part contains a literature review which addresses two issues: the problem of cultural safety, and the impact of the cultural sector on the economy. The second part presents the public sources of finance for the cultural sector in Poland. The third part analyses the use of the amount of expenditure of the various local government authorities.

The importance of culture for cultural security

Security, or safety, is one of the greatest values of societies, nations or states. The need for security is felt by everyone - both individuals as well as more or less organized social groups. The task of each country, regardless of its size or importance on the international stage, it is to provide its citizens and entities with the highest level of security in all areas. We can distinguish different types of security, e.g. political, military, economic, social, environmental, energy and cultural.

The essence of cultural safety refers to the ability of a country or wider community of countries to access tools and instruments that can increase, preserve and cultivate values that determine their identity. However, there must also be an environment which provides individuals with the full freedom to enjoy the experiences and achievements of other nations, as well as ensures the acceptance and tolerance of minority cultures.¹

While describing cultural safety, there appears to be one problem which cannot be overlooked: the relationship between cultural safety and cultural danger and threat. Cultural threat is nothing like any hazards that may affect the identity of the people or population of a country.² Jan Czaja, one of the forerunners of research on cultural safety in Poland, lists the following threats to the security of culture: globalization, regionalization, political transformation after 1989, migratory movements, bad management systems in institutions dealing with culture, and problems with the legal status of historical heritage.³ It should be noted that in Poland, there are institutions whose purpose is to look after the state of the culture of Polish society and are therefore responsible for minimizing the risks in this area. These institutions are the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of National Education, and the Ministry of National Defense. An important role in looking after Polish culture is also played by the National Library and the General Conservator. These institutions have created a number of documents that deal with culture, the most important being the Act on Museums (1996), the Act on Libraries (1997), the Act on Protection and care of monuments (2003), and the Act on cinematography(2005).⁴

The growing number of problems concerning culture, including economic problems, initiated the emergence of a new subsector of the economy: cultural economics. The idea of cultural economics was created in the 1960s, when the first scientific article addressing the problem of economic justification for the public financing of arts was published. The discipline continued to grow in

¹ W.Fehler, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne współczesnej Polski: aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*. Warszawa 2012, s.....

² S.Dębski, B.Górka-Winter, *Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa*. Warszawa 2003, s.....

³ J.Czaja, *Kulturowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa*. Kraków 2008, s. 54 -55

⁴ A. Włodkowska, *Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe*, (w:) red. K.A. Wojtaszczyk, A. Materska—Sosnowska: *Bezpieczeństwo państwa*. Warszawa 2009, s. 169 -170

the 1970s and especially in the 1980s due to a greater degree of liberalization in economy and politics during that time.⁵ Research in this field has focused primarily on two topics: firstly, the sources that should be responsible for financing culture, and secondly, how the sector of culture should be organized and managed.

Recognizing culture as a separate subsector of economics has led to culture having a new role in economy. These days, hardly anyone questions the economic role of culture, and it is recognized as a factor of economic development.⁶ Culture is no longer seen as a cost that needs to be incurred, generating only an increased capital outflow in order for it to be maintained. The literature on the subject confirms that culture can play an important role as a strategic factor in the sustainable economic development of a region of a state.⁷ As a result, it has gained a new function and impact on the economic situation of its surroundings. The impact of culture management is manifested in the growth of the income of local entities, in the possibilities of creating new jobs, as well in more and more tourists being attracted to a region or a country.⁸

The literature on the subject of culture, using various models and research methods, is rich in examples of the economic importance of culture.⁹ The literature indicates the existence of two scientific trends in contemporary research in the field of cultural management: the Platonic (instrumental) trend and the Aristotelian trend. According to the Platonic trend, the quantity and quality of cultural management is dominated by the fundamentals of business management, while according to the Aristotelian trend, the management of culture can only act as a supporting tool to art. Advocates of the Platonic trend support the idea of launching into the cultural sector both organizational issues from the public sector as well as principles of new public economics. Aristotelian researchers believe that transferring management tools from other sectors of the economy to the cultural sector is too mechanical. They emphasize the intangible values of culture, as well as point out a contradiction between the simultaneous increase of commercial functions and the broadening of the range of artistic exploration in cultural institutions.

According to P.Bendixen, culture "affects the whole economy." Culture is the "economic background which sets the direction and motivation, without which the economy would not be able to function". Moreover, culture "can create value only because it is more than focused only on emphasizing the importance of economic background because its actual value does not fit in economic calculation."¹⁰ According to J.Hausner, an advantage of culture is the "creation of new needs investment and consumption, thus stimulating additional domestic demand." In addition, in Poland there is a need for a new understanding of culture, for it to be treated as a long-term economic investment that brings income and increases employment. For many years, the traditional understanding that culture is a non-profit area that absorbs the funds of the state budget and local government has dominated. The desirability of developing this sphere was considered solely in terms of artistic and social development.

The National Strategy for the Development of Culture for the years 2004 - 2013 highlighted the role of culture in the economy as an important factor of economic development. It affected the attractiveness of living in and localizing regions for residents and investors, determined the development of tourism, created cultural industries and a larger labor market, multiplied economic processes, codetermined the development of social infrastructure and the functions of metropolitan cities as well as promoted the allocation of human resources in the sectors of development.¹¹ The strategic document covering the next multiannual financial perspective of 2014 – 2020 closely connects culture and its development with general economic development. At the same time it forms the basis for treating culture not only as the result of economic growth, but also as a stimulator of economic development, through the increasing share of the cultural sector in GDP.¹² The analysis¹³

⁵ A.Wieczorek, *Wybrane problemy ekonomii kultury u schyłku XX wieku*, (w:) "Kultura Współczesna". 1996, nr 3-4

⁶ K.Helpa-Liszkowska, *Dziedzictwo kulturowe jako czynnik rozwoju lokalnego*, (w:) „Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia”. 2013, Vol. 1, nr 6 (255)

⁷ K.Broński, *Rola dziedzictwa kulturowego w rozwoju lokalnym: doświadczenia polskie doby transformacji po 1989 r.*, (w:) „Zeszyty Naukowe / Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie”. 2006, nr 706

⁸ M.Murzyn-Kupisz, *Wpływ przedsięwzięć związanych z odnową obiektów i miejsc zabytkowych na gospodarkę lokalną i regionalną*, (w:) Ochrona Zabytków. 2010, nr 1-4, s. 139-156

⁹ M.Murzyn-Kupisz, *Dziedzictwo kulturowe a rozwój lokalny*. Kraków 2012

¹⁰ P. Bendixen, *Wprowadzenie do ekonomii kultury i sztuki*. Kraków 2001, s. 30

¹¹ M.F.Castro, C.Guccio, I.Rizzo, *Public intervention on heritage conservation and determinants of heritage authorities' performance: a semi-parametric analysis*, (w:) "International Tax Public Finance". 2011, nr 18

¹² Uzupełnienie Narodowej Strategii Rozwoju Kultury na lata 2004–2020, Ministerstwo Kultury. Warszawa 2005, s. 59

¹³ M.W. Kozak, *Dwory, pałace i zamki – kosztowne pamiątki czy zasób w rozwoju?*, (w:) „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne”. 2008, No 2; T. Nypan, *Cultural heritage monuments and historic buildings as value generators in a post-industrial economy. With emphasis on exploring the role of the sector as economic driver*, Norway 2004



carried out proves that the impact of culture on economic and social development is a very complex topic and should not be overlooked.

Public sources of finance for the cultural sector in Poland

In Poland, the whole sector of culture is dominated by public entities of an inevitably institutional nature. The state is the main sponsor of cultural activities. However, in practice, sponsoring cultural activities means financing the maintenance of institutional facilities and making donations to other entities if any funds remain after this. The worst thing is that despite many efforts the ministry has still not been able to define precisely a coherent cultural policy based on strategic management.¹⁴

The main public sources of finance for cultural activities in Poland are the state budget, local government units, and the EU and other foreign funds. The Ministry of Culture and National Heritage is responsible for financing 57 institutions: 30 co-financed institutions, 18 museums, 1 library (National), 3 theaters, 1 philharmonic (National), 2 galleries, and 2 institutions for the protection of monuments. These are institutions of national importance. The Ministry also supports other organizations through operational programs. It transfers funds in the form of grants for the implementation of selected cultural events.

As for the ongoing financing of cultural institutions with public funds, the main burden rests on local government units, which have taken over some of the tasks of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage after an administrative reform in 1998. The largest share of expenditure on culture was transferred to the municipality, then the province, while counties fund the cultural sector to a minimal extent. However, the amount these units spend on culture constitutes a small percentage compared to the total expenditure.

Under the Act of 27 August 2009 on public finance, cultural institutions are considered public finance sector units. Through their own revenues, the cultural institutions cover the costs of their current operations and obligations. The institutions' revenues come from their operations, rental and leasing assets, subsidies from the budget (state and local) and funds received from natural and legal persons and other sources. Local governments, similarly to the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, organize competitions for projects in the field of culture.

Additional funding for cultural institutions can also be obtained from foreign funds, such as

- Community programs directly aimed at the cultural sector (currently the Culture Programme 2007-2013) and programs indirectly aimed at cultural environments, for example, EContent, Media Plus, Socrates, and Leonardo da Vinci
- EU structural funds aimed at creating equal development of regions in Europe - the most important are the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF)
- European Economic Area (EEA) funds - the EEA Financial Mechanism and the Norwegian Financial Mechanism. There are also funds from EU programs.¹⁵

Since the aim of the article is to analyze local public expenditure on culture, the next part of this article only considers Polish sources of finance. Foreign sources of finance for culture will be omitted and could become the subject of further research in this area.

Research results

The National Strategy¹⁶ for the Development of Culture indicates inadequate spending on culture in Poland, which was 9 times lower than in Denmark, 7.5 times lower than in France, and 4 times lower than in Germany. The following research analyzes public expenditure according to type of local government authority within a period covering eleven years, between 2003 and 2014. The public sources of finance which are considered include the state budget and local government authorities: municipality, province, counties. The analysis has been carried out in absolute values in terms of amount of spending as well as in relative values to show the spent value per capita or in relation to GDP. It also includes a breakdown by counties and a comparison of the growth in spending. All data come from the Polish Statistical Office.

Within the period from 2003 to 2014, total public spending on culture in Poland grew at a rate of almost 250%, from 2.7 billion PLN in 2003 to almost 7.7 billion PLN in 2014. The expenditure on culture in municipality tripled, while the expenditure in counties and province doubled. The most

¹⁴ M. Buczek, J. Głowacki, M. Gronicki, J. Hausner, K. Markiel, J. Purchla, J. Szeliga-Sanetra, A. Wąsowska-Pawlik, B. Worek, *Kultura w kryzysie czy kryzys w kulturze*. Kraków 2009, s. 24

¹⁵ J. Suchowian, *Problemy finansowania instytucji kultury w Polsce na przykładzie teatru im. St. i Witkiewicza w Zakopanem*, (w:) „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, Finanse, Rynki Finansowe, Ubezpieczenia”. 2011 Nr 38


¹⁶ Narodowa Strategia Rozwoju Kultury na lata 2004 – 2013



important change can be observed in state budget spending. Within only one year, 2004/2003, state budget spending on culture became 12 times higher. This proves the positive impact of Poland's accession to the EU. State budget expenditure grew by around 100% up to 2014.

Breaking down the expenditure of local government authorities into particular counties, it can be seen that the least growth occurred in the county of wielkopolskie, where spending increased by more than 100% only. The leader in terms of growth in spending is the county of dolnośląskie, with a rise of almost 400% (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Expenditure on culture by local government authorities in different voivodships (million PLN)




Reference: Author's elaboration, based on data from <http://stat.gov.pl/>

The growth of expenditure in all counties was definitely higher between 2003 and 2009, and then it slowed down noticeably. In the first period, the average annual growth rate of spending was between 11% y/y and 25% y/y, while in the later period, growth fell from 15% y/y (2010/2009) to -3% y/y (2013/2012). This clearly shows the negative impact of the financial crisis on Polish economy, including the sector of culture. This is proved in the report "Kultura w kryzysie czy kryzys w kulturze" where in 2009, the authors stressed that in previous years, cultural institutions had functioned under a relative abundance of public funds. After 2009, the cultural institutions faced the problem of financial constraints, and it is almost certain that the majority of them were internally financially consolidated to combat these constraints but protested against any attempt to perform deep system changes.¹⁷

An analysis of the expenditure structure by type of local government authority shows that municipalities have the biggest share of expenditure (Figure 2). In 2004, municipalities spent almost 57% of total public expenditure on culture, and in 2014 their share raised even by ca. 9 percentage points (p.p.). The share of other sources of finance has gradually decreased since 2004. However, the situation in 2003 (i.e., before accession to the EU) was completely different. In that year, the share of expenditure for the state budget was similar to that of the provinces (close to 1.5%) and municipalities were responsible for more than 70% of total public spending. The change of the state budget's share is the consequence of access to EU financial aid for Member States.

Figure 2. Structure of expenditure on culture

¹⁷ M. Buczek, J. Głowacki, M. Gronicki, J. Hausner, K. Markiel, J. Purchła, J. Szeliga-Sanetra, A. Wąsowska-Pawlik, B. Worek, *Kultura w kryzysie czy kryzys w kulturze*. Kraków 2009, s. 30



Reference: Author's elaboration, based on data from <http://stat.gov.pl/>

After the administrative reform of 1998, local government units were made to take over many tasks in the area of culture that until then had been the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture. Consequently, the responsibility for financing culture was shifted to them. The Act of 5 June 1998 on local government units imposed on the management of counties the duty including projects in the area of culture.¹⁸ Responsibilities of the local government to exercise tasks related to culture are also recorded by two other laws: the Act on protection and care of monuments¹⁹ and the Law on public spending²⁰. The transfer of the tasks are accompanied by the need to finance them from the local government units' sources. According to a report on the financing of culture and the management of cultural institutions within the structure of budgetary expenditure, there are several subsidies for cultural institutions.²¹ The low share of expenditure on culture by provinces comes from the fact that they finance only few type of culture institutions and not in the whole Poland: libraries (in 16 counties), museums (in 7 counties), theatres and centers of art (in 4 counties). Other authorities of local government units are engaged in financing more cultural institutions, including the reconstruction of historical heritage, cultural centers, and art galleries.²²

Another interesting thing that can be observed in Figure 2 is the increase in the state's engagement in financing the Polish cultural sector from 2003 to 2004. The share of expenditure by the state started at a very low level in 2003 and rose to over 20% of total expenditure in 2004. This is undoubtedly the consequence of European financial support as a result of Poland's accession to the EU in May 2004. In the period of 2004 – 2006, two operational programs constituted a source of finance for culture in Poland, and in the next multiannual financial perspective, there were three programs, not including the programs which were applied at the regional level. The ability to apply for European structural funds entailed the need for financial contributions to be made by local public sources of finance, as less than 20% of the projects had to be self-funded in order not to lose the potential financial aid.

The amount spent on culture per capita is an interesting aspect to consider, and this can be seen in Table 1. The data in Table 1 shows that the highest amount per capita is spent by municipalities. Their spending has increased throughout the whole analyzed period and between 2003 and 2014 it has tripled, while the expenditure of other types of local authority has only doubled.

¹⁸ Obwieszczenie Marszałka Sejmu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 18 września 2001 r. w sprawie ogłoszenia jednolitego tekstu ustawy o samorządzie województwa, Dz. U. z 2001 r. Nr 142, poz. 1590, z późn. zm.

¹⁹ Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 r. o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami Dz. U. Nr 162, poz. 1568 z późn. zm.

²⁰ Ustawa z dnia 30 czerwca 2005 r. o finansach publicznych, Dz. U. Nr 249, poz. 2104 z późn. zm.

²¹ J. Głowacki, J. Hausener, K. Jakubik, K. Markiel, A. Mituś, M. Żabiński, *Raport o finansowaniu kultury i zarządzaniu instytucjami kultury*, *Raport o Stanie Kultury*. Kraków 2008, s. 77

²² http://pliki.nck.pl/badan/institucje_v11.svg

Table 1. Public expenditure per capita (in PLN)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
State budget	1.8	21.8	22.7	26.9	32.6	37.7	41.7	35.7	36.9	44.6	39.3	45.1
Counties	17.4	20.1	2.3	27.4	30.4	33.9	41.2	33.7	35.9	35.1	33.8	35.4
Provinces	1.4	1.6	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.5	3.5	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.0
Municipalities	0.0	56.9	66.2	81.6	91.6	105.8	122.8	144.7	136.1	139.5	142.2	162.2

Reference: Author's elaboration, based on data from <http://stat.gov.pl/>

Expenditure on culture as a share of the total amount of expenditure by each local government unit, as shown in Table 2, should also be looked at. Although this table shows that expenditure by county has the highest share of total expenditure compared to the other entities, it must be stressed that this share has decreased by half within the studied period. Simultaneously, the share of expenditure on culture in municipalities has increased by 33%, from less than 3% of total expenditure to over 4%.


Table 2. Share of expenditure on culture in total public expenditure (in %)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Counties	14.07	13.06	11.21	10.43	10.45	9.93	7.68	8.51	8.47	8.57	7.88	7.48
Provinces	0.32	0.33	0.30	0.35	0.33	0.31	0.30	0.38	0.35	0.37	0.33	0.33
Municipalities	2.95	2.97	3.07	3.30	3.43	3.54	3.71	4.02	3.71	3.78	3.79	4.04

Reference: Author's elaboration, based on data from <http://stat.gov.pl/>

The share of public expenditure on culture in terms of GDP, as presented in Figure 3, should also be analyzed. Public expenditure on culture in 2003 amounted to 3291.3 million PLN, which in relation to GDP accounted for 0.40%. By 2012, this share had increased by 0.07 p.p. The breakdown by county shows that the studied period can be divided into two subperiods: from 2003 to 2008 and from 2009 to 2012. The earlier period is characterized by a relatively lower average of the ratio, at the level of 0.38% GDP. Moreover, in the most of counties there were recorded lower differences between the lowest and the highest values of the ratio, which did not exceed 0.2 p.p. However, in the later subperiod, not only was the average value of expenditure for culture in relation to GDP much higher (over 0.5% GDP), but also range of discrepancies was much more visible – at a level of 0.4 p.p. This proves one favorable thing. Although there were recorded two negative changes in economy: the general economic slowdown and the decreased speed of cultural expenditure growth, their impact on the culture as the economic sector is not visible. The public financial contribution in this area doubled what can be understood as more important role of this sector in the economy as a whole. The lowest average value of the ratio was recorded in mazowieckie. This county also had the lowest absolute increase. The opposite can be noticed in the podlaskie county. Not only did the ratio increase by the most there (by 0.28 p.p. - almost six times more than in mazowieckie), but also this county had the highest average at the end of the analyzed period.

Figure 3. Share of expenditure on culture in GDP (in %) by counties



Reference: Author's elaboration, based on data from <http://stat.gov.pl/>

Analysis of Figure 3 brings with it a further question: is there a relationship between the level of development of a county and the amount of expenditure on culture? In order to answer this question, GDP values and expenditure on culture as a share of total spending need to be analyzed. The maps in Figure 4 present the situation in 2003 and 2012.


Figure 4 shows whether there is a coincidence between the share of spending on culture and the values of GDP. In 2003 there a clear division of Poland into two parts: the western part, with a higher engagement in financing culture and the eastern part, where this engagement was relatively lower. At the same time, this part of the country enjoyed a relatively better economic situation than the other part, as measured by the amount of GDP. However, in the eastern part of Poland, there are two counties (mazowieckie and kujawsko-pomorskie, which are not directly located in this part of the country) where the values of GDP were some of the highest. On the other hand, in five counties out of seven in eastern Poland, the relatively lower engagement in financing culture was related to much lower GDP values.

The situation in 2012 did not change much from that of nine years previously. However, it is clear that in most counties, expenditure on culture, as measured by the share of this kind of expenditure in total expenditure, increased significantly. In all counties the share exceeded 3%, while in 2003 this level was reached only in six counties. Moreover, in 2012 in seven counties, the share of expenditure on culture was more than 4% of total expenditure, with dolnośląskie in the lead with a level of 5.4%. The division of Poland into an eastern and western part is still visible, except for in two counties in the eastern region: podlaskie and lubelskie. The share of expenditure on culture in total regional expenditure in these two counties was higher than in 2003. This is a consequence of additional financial support achieved thanks to EU donations and the need for financial contributions to be made by the counties themselves in order not to lose the potential financial aid.

According to research by Kościelecki²³, we can conclude that in western Poland there are not only historical monuments, but also services related to culture. Furthermore, in the more developed regions, there is a higher demand for wider cultural goods, which contributes to the increase in the supply of products of culture and tourism.

²³ P.Kościelecki, *Kultura w regionach – analiza dokumentów strategicznych polskich województw oraz piśmiennictwa przedmiotu*, (w:) „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne”. 2007, nr 3

Figure 4. GDP in counties and the share of expenditure on culture in the total expenditure budget of local government units
2003 2012



Cartogram: The share of expenditure on culture in the total expenditure budget of local government units (%)

Cartodiagram: GDP in million PLN

Reference: Own compilation based on Strateg dated 10th Dec. 2015.



Conclusions

Discussions on culture should not be based on the role of culture in regional development or its importance for social security. Literature is rich in these areas of research of research. Currently, local authorities should try to use culture as an element of the infrastructure required for economic development.

Within the time period studied in this paper, expenditure on culture increased threefold, and as a share of total spending, exceeded 3% in 2014. The period of economic slowdown after 2009 brought with it less growth in expenditure on culture, which confirms that there is a relationship between expenditure on culture and GDP. It is important to stress that the rising engagement of various local government units in financing culture proves the increasing importance of this sector in the economy.

Further studies should focus on two dimensions. One should be to check which areas of culture have been successfully financed with public sources. The second should aim to discover what the economic output of the sector of culture is, in terms of increasing employment, attracting tourists or adding value to an area.

Summary

Culture is an important element of the country, playing an important role both for its security and the economy. It cannot be only seen as a cost-creating sector, but may be a significant factor in economic development. For this to happen, it is necessary to create a system of financing this economic sector. This article's aim is to analyze the use of funds from public sources in Poland to finance culture-related activities. The analyses were based on data obtained from GUS, for the period of 2003 – 2014. Within the time period studied in this paper, expenditure on culture increased threefold, and as a share of total spending, exceeded 3% in 2014. The period of economic slowdown after 2009 brought with it less growth in expenditure on culture, which confirms that there is a relationship between expenditure on culture and GDP.

Key words: cultural security, economy of culture, public expenditure for culture

Streszczenie

Kultura stanowi ważny element systemu państwa, ogrywając istotną rolę zarówno dla jego bezpieczeństwa tożsamościowego, jak i dla gospodarki. Nie może ona już być tylko postrzegana jako sektor kreujący koszty, ale może stanowić istotny czynnik rozwoju gospodarczego. Aby tak się stało, koniecznym jest stworzenie systemu finansowania tego sektora gospodarczego. Celem artykułu jest przeprowadzenie analizy wykorzystania środków finansowych ze źródeł publicznych w Polsce na działania związane z kulturą. Analizy oparto na danych uzyskanych z GUSu, za okres 2003 – 2014. Badanym okresie, wydatki na kulturę wzrosły trzykrotnie, jak również ich udział w całkowitych wydatkach sektora publicznego przekroczył 3% w roku 2014. Okres spowolnienia gospodarczego po 2009 przyniósł ze sobą mniejszy wzrost wydatków na kulturę, która potwierdza, że związek pomiędzy wydatkami na kulturę i PKB.

Słowa kluczowe: bezpieczeństwo kultury, ekonomika kultury, wydatki publiczne na kulturę

Literature

- Bendixen P., *Wprowadzenie do ekonomiki kultury i sztuki*. Kraków 2001
- Broński K., *Rola dziedzictwa kulturowego w rozwoju lokalnym: doświadczenia polskie doby transformacji po 1989 r.*, (w:) „Zeszyty Naukowe / Akademia Ekonomiczna w Krakowie”. 2006, nr 706
- Buczek M., Głowacki J., Gronicki M., Hausner J., Markiel K., Purchla J., Szeliga-Sanetra J., Wąsowska-Pawlik A., Worek B., *Kultura w kryzysie czy kryzys w kulturze*. Kraków 2009
- Czaja J., *Kulturowe czynniki bezpieczeństwa*. Kraków 2008
- Castro M.F., Guccio C., Rizzo I., *Public intervention on heritage conservation and determinants of heritage authorities' performance: a semi-parametric analysis*, (w:) “International Tax Public Finance”. 2011, nr 18
- Dębski S., Górka-Winter B., *Kryteria bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego państwa*. Warszawa 2003
- Fehler W., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne współczesnej Polski: aspekty teoretyczne i praktyczne*. Warszawa 2012
- Głowacki J., Hausener J., Jakubik K., Markiel K., Mituś A., Żabiński M., *Raport o finansowaniu kultury i zarządzaniu instytucjami Kultury, Raport o Stanie Kultury*. Kraków 2008, s. 77
- Hełpa-Liszkowska K., *Dziedzictwo kulturowe jako czynnik rozwoju lokalnego*, (w:) „Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia”. 2013, Vol. 1, nr 6 (255)
- Kościelecki P., *Kultura w regionach – analiza dokumentów strategicznych polskich województw oraz piśmiennictwa przedmiotu*, (w:) „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne”. 2007, nr 3
- Kozak M.W., *Dwory, pałace i zamki – kosztowne pamiątki czy zasób w rozwoju?*, (w:) „Studia Regionalne i Lokalne”. 2008, No 2

Murzyn-Kupisz M., *Wpływ przedsięwzięć związanych z odnową obiektów i miejsc zabytkowych na gospodarkę lokalną i regionalną*, (w:) Ochrona Zabytków. 2010, nr 1-4

Murzyn-Kupisz M., *Dziedzictwo kulturowe a rozwój lokalny*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie, Kraków 2012.

Nypan T., *Cultural heritage monuments and historic buildings as value generators in a post-industrial economy. With emphasis on exploring the role of the sector as economic driver*, Norway 2004

Suchowian J., *Problemy finansowania instytucji kultury w Polsce na przykładzie teatru im. St.i. Witkiewicza w Zakopanem*, (w:) „Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, Finanse, Rynki Finansowe, Ubezpieczenia”. 2011 Nr 38

Włodkowska A., *Bezpieczeństwo kulturowe*, (w:) red. K.A. Wojtaszczyk, A. Materska—Sosnowska: *Bezpieczeństwo państwa*. Warszawa 2009

Wieczorek A., *Wybrane problemy ekonomii kultury u schyłku XX wieku*, (w:) "Kultura Współczesna". 1996, nr 3-4

Uzupełnienie Narodowej Strategii Rozwoju Kultury na lata 2004–2020, Ministerstwo Kultury. Warszawa 2005

Narodowa Strategia Rozwoju Kultury na lata 2004 – 2013.

Obwieszczenie Marszałka Sejmu Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 18 września 2001 r. w sprawie ogłoszenia jednolitego tekstu ustawy o samorządzie województwa, Dz. U. z 2001 r. Nr 142, poz. 1590, z późn. zm.

Ustawa z dnia 23 lipca 2003 r. o ochronie zabytków i opiece nad zabytkami Dz. U. Nr 162, poz. 1568 z późn. zm.

Ustawa z dnia 30 czerwca 2005 r. o finansach publicznych, Dz. U. Nr 249, poz. 2104 z późn. zm.

http://pliki.nck.pl/badan/institucje_v11.svg z dnia 20.12.2015

