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First, the cultural sector by its nature depends significantly on public or philanthropic funds, not because it is inefficient, nor because its products are not in commercial demand, but for a variety of reasons – most critically because it produces public value.

“Science will...produce the data..., but never the full meaning. For perceiving real significance, we shall need...most of all the brains of poets (and) also those of artists, musicians, philosophers, historians, writers in general.”

Lewis Thomas, Scientist
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Foreword

The Creative Economy in Zimbabwe though very buoyant and vibrant, has for a long time remained largely ignored and unrecognised in terms of its economic value hence the moribund public and private funding regime availed to this sector. The country’s funding system for the Creative Economy is largely uncoordinated in its approach. What cannot be disputed is the fact that funding from the various funders that inter alia include donors, private sector organisations, UN agencies and individuals available to the creative industries lacks a properly coordinated approach underpinned by the relevant policies and guidelines at governmental level and its agencies notably at parent Ministry level (Ministry of Sport, Arts and Culture) and the National Arts Council of Zimbabwe. In addition, funding levels to this sector have remained low compared to other sectors of the economy resulting in large and glaring gaps in the funding process.

That the sector is largely fragmented and operating in an informal manner has not helped the situation. Consequently, embassies accredited to Zimbabwe and other funding agencies have been availing funds to the sector in a very partisan manner and usually based on the funder’s preferred thrust. The end result of this fragmented funding mechanism leads to unreliable quality of the arts products, antagonism within the sector and non-tangible outputs from the investment. In addition, it has also added to the view and attitude by communities that the arts have no other benefit to them other than as mere entertainment.

The research findings and recommendations contained in this document therefore provide a clear trajectory for agenda setting as well as the effective funding process for the Creative Economy in Zimbabwe devoid of any gaps imaginable. Stakeholders, particularly funders in the Creative Economy need to embrace and take note of the fundamental issues raised in this research document. Policy-driven funding mechanisms for the arts and culture sector breed a professional pool of artists and cultural practitioners ensuring sustainable growth of the sector.

The outcomes of this research represents an extension of the National Arts Council of Zimbabwe 2007 Research Report: An Assessment Of The Contribution Of Arts And Cultural Industries To Economic Development In Zimbabwe as Culture Fund of Zimbabwe Trust’s sanctioned Base Line Study of 2009. A common recommendation
was the conducting of further research into the Creative Economy focusing on specific issues like funding of the sector. Such further studies fall under the ambit of professionalization of the arts and culture sector that the Council has been pushing for all these years. The onus therefore falls on arts institutions in the mould of Pamberi Trust and others of their ilk to commission further collaborative studies and researches whose findings lead to the concrete formalisation of the Creative Economy.

It is my fervent hope and that of the sector as a whole moves forward and drawing lessons from the findings and recommendations of this research process (as well as previous ones), enabling funding to the sector becoming policy-driven and programme based as opposed to being project-driven. Adequate and sustainable funding mechanisms are what the Creative Economy is yearning for.

National Arts Council of Zimbabwe is happy that the research finding are coming at this time when Zimbabwe is developing a Culture Policy that will allow for the professionalization of the arts and culture that we have been championing for the last fifteen years. Council stands ready to work together with arts and culture stakeholders in making the findings beneficial in improving the welfare, remuneration of artists as well as the development and promotion of the arts in Zimbabwe.
1. Preamble

This paper aims to firstly provide funding and arts organisations, groups and individual artists with a solid overview of gaps and needs in the Arts and Culture sector in Zimbabwe; and secondly, map what has been funded, in what way, by whom and how, to support strategic decision-making and planning by all stakeholders.

In 2011, the initial research for this paper was commissioned and carried out for the British Council with analysis on gaps and needs from a wide cross section of Zimbabwean perspectives. This aimed to enable cohesive and locally rooted cultural relations programming. The resulting paper began to build a picture of essential requirements and financial support for the sector. It was clear that further research was necessary to complete this picture.

Many artists and groups interviewed in 2011 stated that there was limited access to information on available funding. One respondent noted: ‘It is entirely unknown how much income there is from external sources in the sector.’ Many respondents were unable to say what specific funding priorities and what processes are, because those priorities and processes are often unclear. Respondents expressed feeling disadvantaged as a result. In addition, lack of coordination and information being shared between funding bodies was often cited as a weakness. A number of artists and cultural funders suggested that more informed decision-making is essential.

The development of this research has also been carried out in response to the commonly held view that external financial support for arts and culture is more reactive and sporadic, than proactive and strategic. A more strategic and effective approach to spending and programming is needed. The conceptual basis therefore is that improved access to information across the sector can lead to a more cohesive and rewarding approach to working across the divides – especially in terms of closing the gap between artists and ultimate decision makers.

The framework for this paper is guided by existing literature and national processes. For example, The Baseline Study on the Culture Sector in Zimbabwe conducted by the Culture Fund in 2009 made a strong recommendation for further research into the financing of the sector, and draws on the Zimbabwe Creative Civil Society’s Strategy in the Formulation of a Plan of Action for Arts and Culture (NPAAC), which is coordinated by Nhimbe Trust in its capacity as the secretariat of NPAAC. This paper outlines key trends and perspectives, for use by stakeholders across the sector.
from individual artists to organisations, public institutions and funding partners.

Recommendations are then distilled from a cross section of perspectives in the sector and do not necessarily represent the views of the author. The author does however highly recommend a more comprehensive mapping of the cultural economy, and all income streams – both current and potential – into the sector.

It is received opinion that the Arts and Culture sector in Zimbabwe is fragmented, economically challenged, and suffers from weak strategic vision and governing structures. Funding for the arts lacks cohesion and many donors tend to operate outside and without any guiding, or long-term policy frameworks – in terms of cultural development. If there are guiding frameworks, these are more likely to be determined by the funding partner or by that institution’s country head office than by national priorities for Arts and Culture in Zimbabwe. This is also because development goals for culture in Zimbabwe are not yet clearly defined. This research aims to support existing efforts by leading arts organisations, such as Nhimbe Trust, and government bodies, such as the National Arts Council, in strengthening the sector.

A major challenge facing the sector is that demand for funds far exceeds the capacity of donor agencies. This is well illustrated by the gaping disparity between applications received and funds awarded by the Culture Fund. Between 2007 and 2010, 5456 proposals were received requesting a total of 37 million USD: 447 of these were awarded through disbursements amounting to 798,256.11 USD. SIDA’s annual support to Culture Fund during this period was 1 million USD. Of this, an average of less than 300,000 USD, or 1 third of the whole fund was given in grants.

Comparative donor analysis provides funders as well as key players in the sector a basis from which to review policy and could also be used to guide how projects are selected and implemented.

This paper aims to be made widely available and be an online resource for the sector, providing both a source and a platform for information that can be kept up to date with new opportunities, directions, funding objectives, available funds and significant changes to the funding landscape.
2. Executive Summary

The information presented in this paper demonstrates that 2009 – 2013 represents a period of cumulative stability. Despite the economic context, contracted democratic space and diminished resources experienced in the decades prior, between 2011 and 2013 at least, there has been general stabilization and even growth in the arts sector, characterized by a period of increased investment and more responsive programming by key funders.

Some funders have responded to major gaps and needs as pin-pointed by the Culture Fund Baseline Survey 2009: namely weak policy frameworks, poor training and management. For example, Pro Helvetia, Africalia, Mimeta and the Culture Fund have increased the amount of support available for the development of policy. The question remains whether indeed these policy initiatives have achieved improvements to national policy and/or governing frameworks themselves. It is argued that too high a proportion of cultural development funding is spent on cultural policy, without tangible benefit to the sector. In addition, although management and infrastructure is repeatedly cited as weak, funding of this is often felt to be wasteful or disproportionate.

The findings of this paper may be of use in defining benchmarks for mid to long term policy goals for cultural development, in terms of, for example: investment and growth attained per sub-sector, the percentage of practitioners formally employed, the level of export, the number or percentage of professionally trained practitioners.
The summary of key contributing donors to the Arts and Culture sector in Zimbabwe shows that, on the whole, decision-making remains exclusive, consultation is often limited to discussion between funding partners and sector leaders, decisions made regarding the majority of grant support for the sector rarely include local artists and of the limited funds available in the short and mid-term, most of it is tied up – leaving negligible amounts of funding for the majority of artists to compete over.

Indicative annual donor funding is:

- 2011: 2.8 million USD
- 2012: 4.8 million USD
- 2013: 5.1 million USD

Of this, it is estimated that around 500,000 USD or less per annum is available for artists or groups nationwide in open application, despite the relative increase of incoming funds generally to the sector.

Other significant findings are that:

- Large variations exist in the way donors and stakeholders in the sector operate.
- Opportunities are missed, lost, not known about and/or not taken due to misconceptions, lack of information, and lack of open channels.
- Sector reliance on donor support is inadequate for real sector growth.
- A lack of coordination and consultation between leading institutions, funders, audiences and artists results in duplication, undefined national targets, and waste; or simply: ‘Shooting in the dark.’
- The relationship between artists, groups and funders presents various challenges and frustrations – on all sides.
- Vast difference of opinion in what funding priorities should be.
- Significant misconceptions on what funding is available and on what support goes where.

Cultural development remains largely undefined leading to significant support being wasted on activity that doesn’t necessarily contribute to sectoral growth. It is often argued that money is wasted on bringing foreign acts in to Zimbabwe, and that HIFA and the Embassies, particularly European and American, are largely responsible for this. In fact, cultural support from European funders as a whole, invests more in Zimbabwean cultural development than perceived. It is argued that there is more significant waste in over-financing administration or holding one off workshops – which do not necessarily achieve cultural development goals.

The findings indicate that a low proportion of available funds support actual cultural activity. Though it is a common complaint that infrastructure and administration do not receive enough
investment, a larger proportion of funds are received by organizational structures, than by artistic projects directly. That said, relatively few organizations receive core financial support: between 10 and 15 including HIF, Nhimbe Trust, Pamberi Trust, Dance Trust of Zimbabwe, the National Gallery among them.

Organisations like the Culture Fund are in a position to bridge gaps, but many respondents perceive the Culture Fund as maintaining a top down funder-recipient relationship, and that they spread their funds too thinly across the sector.

It is strongly felt by individual respondents that alternatives are necessary to subsidize the sector, and it can also be suggested that artists themselves across Zimbabwe represent the largest capital contributors. Further mapping is required to quantify and value the largely informal contribution by individuals and artists to the development of the sector. It should be noted that ZIMSTATS and the Culture Fund carried out a Cultural Statistical Survey in 2012 the results of which ‘can be reliably used as pointers to the cultural industry’s contribution to the economy.’
3. Methodology

This strategy paper has been developed through a combination of:

- Key informant interviews with donors, cultural institutions, embassies, implementing partner arts organisations, and individual artists.
- A literature review – of existing guiding documents and extensive online research.
- Recommendations based upon perspectives gathered from across the sector.

The literature review looked at available policy documents, evaluations by the NORAD and SIDA, a 2010 review of the Culture Fund, the Culture Fund Baseline Survey 2009, the 2010 Artist’s Charter, 2006 Arts, Cultural Policy and NPAAC. As this paper builds upon existing efforts and intends to avoid duplication, it relies extensively upon on the Culture Fund’s Baseline Survey of the Culture Sector 2009.

An analysis of social, economic and political conditions in Zimbabwe keeps recommendations within realistic parameters, and simple reference to what people think, keeps this paper as plain talking as possible.

**Questions in key informant interviews asked the following:**

- Where are the gaps and challenges in the sector?
- What is funded?
How would you advise young artists to make a sustainable living from their craft?

What do artists need most to fulfil their potential? If you had to prioritise? How could this be possible?

What does society want to experience in terms of the arts? What does the public want?

What role should funders play?

How do funders operate?

How should funders decide what they support?

How has the arts & culture sector changed in the last 10 years?

The content of tables in section 7 outline funding partner mandates, objectives, activities and budgets: this information has mostly been provided by institutions themselves, or summarized from official online or document sources. Embassies, cultural institutions and donors who support the arts were sent questionnaires with the following questions:

What is the institutional mandate and guiding policy for supporting the arts and culture in Zimbabwe?

What has been spent on Arts and Culture 2011/2012/2013, and which activities were supported?

What is the average grant size and process of application?

What do you perceive the gaps and needs in the sector to be?

Are there missed opportunities between your institution and the country of origin (if foreign donor) and Zimbabwe? If so, what are these?

This overview is set next to perspectives from within the arts and culture sector in Zimbabwe and used to analyse the responsiveness and relevance of funded activity.
Limitations

Time

An initial 10 day period was allocated for interviews and write up in 2011, following this a further 10 days. It is highly recommended that this research project is continued, with the information gathered updated to enable a thorough and full picture to be available for all key stakeholders.

Lack of Statistical Data

It is unknown how many donors and institutions, whether internal or external, are in fact financing the sector. There is also a lack of general contextual data, partly due to the informal nature of the sector, such as: the number of arts organisations and individuals that receive funding and for what, the number of people in Zimbabwe earning a living from the arts and on what economic scale, and how much each sub sector requires to function sustainably and grow.

Lack of Information

A number of embassies either refused or were unable to provide information on how much money is spent on cultural activity, or what activity funds are spent on in Zimbabwe – most notably the American Embassy Public Affairs department were only able to say that it supports local culture, wherever it can, and tries wherever possible to fund arts activity for other development purposes – such as HIV/AIDS awareness raising to increase their support to culture, but were unable to provide concrete information on what is funded or with what budget parameters. A few institutions, such as the Spanish Embassy, were not certain of upcoming annual budgets, as this is determined by their head office periodically throughout the year, and a number of international funders don’t have a Zimbabwe specific mandate and therefore do not categorise information by country.
Contact

International funders are hard to pin down, and even harder to develop a relationship with, without unlimited office resource – the challenges experienced researching this paper reflect the challenges many Zimbabwean artists also face in connecting with the international market.

Focus

The focus of this study is limited to funders, cultural institutions and embassies who are key contributors to financing the arts. Commercial sponsors have not been mapped – but this would be an extremely worthwhile exercise. The Harare International Festival of Arts (HIFA) is 70% financed by corporate sponsorship – and whilst it is felt by many that corporate investment and subsidy in the arts is too HIFA-focussed, there is corporate sponsorship of arts events throughout the year (Delta sponsor major cultural events such as the Chibuku music competition). Furthermore, the income generated by institutions such as REPS theatre, the National Gallery and the National Ballet has not been mapped, and the impact not understood – this would also be an extremely useful exercise. The information gathered here can demonstrate trends and provide a clear indicative picture, but further research is required to understand and quantify:

- How much the sector is worth and how much the sector can contribute to GDP
- How much added value arts and culture can contribute to, for example: the country’s image, development, society, education, well-being, productivity, economy
- Where the missed opportunities are
- What national cultural development targets should be
- What is required to reach cultural development targets
5. Context

Economic and Political Context

It is received opinion that Zimbabwe’s economic situation has had significant impact on the Arts and Culture sector. ‘In line with global and national economic trends, real income in the culture sector has declined in the recent past, this has been compounded by the economic downturn.’ The last 15 years have seen considerably less spending power amongst audiences, the national touring network has been and remains ‘decimated’ and average earnings in the sector remain inadequate. In 2009, over 40% of the country’s artists were recorded as earning between 10 USD and 100 USD a month. Though the situation has not dramatically improved, it has somewhat stabilised during the period of power sharing 2009-2013.

The extent to which Zimbabwe’s economic decline has affected the amount of money available in the sector had not been documented in 2009. The recent ZIMSTATS-Culture Fund of Zimbabwe Trust study supported by UNESCO, provides a thorough and detailed overview of employment in the arts, imports/exports, cultural contribution to the economy and reveals some positive trends, for example: exports have generally increased.
**Exports of Cultural Products by Domain from 2009-2012, CSS Zimbabwe, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Natural Heritage</td>
<td>14 216 902</td>
<td>10 220 808</td>
<td>8 400 962</td>
<td>10 733 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Celebration</td>
<td>40 847</td>
<td>115 787</td>
<td>57 971</td>
<td>338 679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>2 094 217</td>
<td>2 851 726</td>
<td>3 695 435</td>
<td>3 573 828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Arts and Publishing</td>
<td>71 680</td>
<td>121 064</td>
<td>81 521</td>
<td>91 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film, Audio-Visual and Interactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Creative Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 423 646</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 309 384</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 236 929</strong></td>
<td><strong>14 741 558</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Exports (All Products)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 249 754 511</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ZIMSTAT

In addition, a study commissioned by Africalia on the economy of the arts in Harare provides useful insights into what is working. That said, there is still a lack of proper records, poor national coordination, lack of transparency in general, plus a huge percentage of informal groups and artists, which makes it difficult to draw an accurate picture of the cultural economy.

The political atmosphere around 2011 was characterised by both a clamping down on freedom of expression, and at the same time, increased assertion of governing frameworks, such as regulations for festivals, by authorities. The former, described as being fuelled by tension caused by 2013 elections, the latter driven by a discernable shift by governing authorities to recognise the importance of the cultural industries. Notably, incidents of censorship of expression and intimidation of artists decreased between 2011 and 2013. This does not mean however that censorship and intimidation no longer have an impact on the sector.

NANGO reported in 2011 that the situation ´mirrored the atmosphere that prevailed during the run-up to the June 2008 elections where NGOs were raided, opposition activists arbitrarily arrested and tortured, the period (referred to) could easily be described as a reincarnation of 2008.´ Indeed, there were a number of threatening incidences for artists, organisations, leaders of major arts events in 2010-11, including the arrest of the Rooftop performers of the reconciliation play Rituals (2010), Owen Maseko’s arrest following his exhibition on Gukurahundi in Bulawayo (2010), the Director and senior project team being called in for questioning after the opening HIFA show (2011). The HIFA team also noted that the environment in 2011 was the most threatening they’ve experienced in over 10 years of running the festival.

However, whilst censorship has a strong presence in policing the arts and culture sector, it should be noted that artists have not been targeted as seriously as activists, opposition, or senior ‘trouble makers’ and there is still space to make and perform controversial, critical work. Examples of acts,
artists and venues include:

- Harare Files by Two Gents Productions based on testimonies from Murambatsvina 2011;
- HIFA opening 2009-2010-2011; The Great Escape by Andrew Whaley (performed 2011);
- Of the Two Leaders I know by Rooftop Promotions 2011-2013;
- Book Café as a venue has been frustrated by conditions but still exists as a space for free expression;
- Comrade Fatso as a critically engaged performing artist;
- Magamba as an organisation producing satirical and subversive news show;
- Artists for Democracy as an organisation.

2012/2013 saw increased restrictive measures on ‘foreigners’ working in the arts sector, but general opinion indicates that intimidation and censorship are less of an issue than the challenges presented by the operating environment in general: especially concerning regulations and taxes.

Cultural Policy in review

“Zimbabwe’s culture policy was launched in 2007 just before the launch of the Culture Fund of Zimbabwe Trust but was not a result of sufficient consultation and is therefore being revised. The National Arts Council Act is currently up for review and so there is currently a loose framework guiding the development of the cultural sector, which is about to be revived. The past decade has been mainly characterized by the low level input of public finance to the sector, although the infrastructures of the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture and the National Arts Council of Zimbabwe remain.”

Cultural Policy in Zimbabwe from 2006 demonstrates that governing authorities in Zimbabwe recognise the importance of the Arts and Cultural Industries. It is recognised that Arts and Culture: “over the past few years emerged as one of Zimbabwe’s major sources of foreign currency, employment and tool to assert the people’s national identity. They have contributed immensely in attracting tourist inflows and in building the country’s image.” This is viewed as being a positive development in terms of elevating the status of the arts, but negative as arts and culture are seen by authorities as being a way of generating extra revenue. This appears to result in increased taxes, regulations, eking out whatever “extra milk can be squeezed from a very thin cash cow.”

Cultural policy crucial for an enabling environment

Donors are more likely to invest in sustainable initiatives that make money, or have matched investment. A national cultural policy that aims to achieve a government subsidised arts industry is more likely to generate income and contribute more to overall GDP.

Accommodation of cultural heritage and contemporary contextual trends
The draft Cultural Policy emphasises colonial history and the preservation of tradition as vital:

“Zimbabwe has a rich cultural heritage built up over a long period of time. The defeat of indigenous people by settler colonialists witnessed some erosion of our traditions. Our rich cultural heritage, which withstood this onslaught, has to be promoted and preserved as it defines us as a people within a global community.”

Whilst this policy statement recognises the importance of tradition and cultural heritage, it also highlights a conflict of interest in the industry as many young artists are keen to challenge tradition and are inspired and influenced by contemporary global art forms. In addition to this, a large proportion of financial support to the sector favours contemporary art forms or artistic work. This is a matter of concern and debate as the Cultural Policy for Zimbabwe is developed further, and it is important that all voices are included in this process, as the draft itself emphasises. This statement also reveals sensitivities connected to Zimbabwean identity and the perceived role that the cultural industries play in this. It has been strongly suggested that this in turn should translate to a key consideration for major funders and players in the industry. The Cultural Policy has the potential to be a guiding framework for donor support to the sector.

It is important to note that at the time of writing, key institutions are involved in an ongoing process of developing a cohesive, national arts and cultural policy, and the industry generally views itself as being in a state of ‘development’ and ‘growth’. Crucial to this process is consultation with artists and cultural practitioners themselves, though the Culture Fund Baseline survey reveals that knowledge about policy issues amongst artists is low.
Gaps and challenges

Overview and analysis of Zimbabwe’s arts and culture sector reveal where efforts could best be put and identify clear challenges.

A summary of analysis:

- Positive and high impact efforts by many
- Vibrant annual festival network
- Rich cultural heritage
- Lack of cohesion amongst funders and arts and culture stakeholders
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Lack of proper management in professional companies
- An abundance of talent and potential
- Large number of emerging and young groups in contemporary performing arts
- Dilapidated sectors due to economic breakdown
- Disproportionate support of particular institutions or one off events
- Lack of training and professional development opportunities
**Perspectives**

- **Gender inequality** across the entire sector is a major issue – there is a distinct and perceivable absence of women leading arts projects that are successfully funded. Few organisations are initiated or run by women, with the exception of CHIPAWO, Dance Foundation Course (DFC) and THE WOMENS IMAGES FILM FESTIVAL.

- There is consensus across all sub-sectors that there is a distinct **lack of good artistic leadership** and a **lack of training opportunities**.

- **Management** of groups is a major challenge. Splits and rivalries are common and financial mismanagement is the most cited conflict zone.

- General lack of exposure to international standards and practice.

- Common frustration around **artists’ attitude** to their craft, with unprofessional ethics, inflated egos and arrogance cited as prevailing. This is not helped by ad hoc funding of projects, which contributes to the instability many feel. It was noted that this is most prevalent in sub-sectors where there is less training opportunity.

- **Full time vocational training programmes** exist for Visual Arts, Music and Contemporary Dance, with only degree programmes being offered for Theatre and Film. Even where there are training programmes, young professionals have **little opportunity** once the training is complete. Many look to get out of Zimbabwe as quickly as possible, and the most talented to emerge from certain long term training programmes, DFC (Dance Foundation Course) for example, do so.

- **Lack of government support** has been consistently referenced as a major impediment to growth in the performing arts sectors: “If our very own Zimbabwean government and authorities can’t open spaces and support the development of the arts, who are we to criticise what the donors decide to do?”

- **Decision-making is monopolised by an elite** few, and funders are heavily criticised from across the sectors for supporting the same groups, the same individuals, regardless of their talent or the quality of the work they produce. This can also be attributed to a lack of expertise in arts management; some attribute it to development agendas such as the sustainable livelihood objective in the Culture Fund support from SIDA.

- Conflict and confusion between activity focussing on ‘poverty alleviation’ or a ‘development agenda’ and purely arts based activity.

- **Artists are not maximising their ability to earn a living.** This is attributed to a general lack of knowledge of how to diversify income sources – for example using the art form in either the commercial or development sector, and poor market access. In 2009 it was established that ‘the amount of income received by individual artists also depends on the market they were
accessing. 67% of respondents interviewed market their products locally, 2.4% concentrate on the export market while the remainder depends on both markets.”

- A number of groups who perform for weddings, promotional or corporate events, feel their work is sidelined both in the context of the event, and by the sector as a whole – this demotivates performers to push the boundaries of their art form.

- Absence of inspiring role models and professional development for artists in the mid-careers.

- “Artists just want money” is a common perspective. At the same time, many don’t see the value of participating in ad hoc workshops. This is largely due to a lack of consistency and a lack of follow up – as in training events are often stand alone.

- A number of donor partners cited the following gaps:
  - A lack of curiosity about forms from outside Zimbabwe, or the SADC region
  - Not enough discipline amongst musicians, dancers, actors, in developing skills

**Summary of perspectives ... on how these gaps and challenges: towards setting priorities for a mid-long term strategy:**

Each weakness is given a rating in terms of how easy this would be to address, this has been surmised through key informant interviews:

- 0: virtually impossible
- 1: possible
- 2: quite possible
- 3: likely
- 4: very likely
- 5: easily achievable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Recommendations for this could be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under exploitation of commercial sponsors by most groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Through artists linking with associations/institutions with strong track records of achieving this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management and promotion of talent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sharing best practice, training, mentorship and exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of critical thinking amongst artists</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Growth of current programmes where forums for artists’ discussions are regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience divided and limited</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simple, regular incentives and initiatives moving productions and spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups proprietorial leading to lack of synergy in planning activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group consultation by leaders and funders, guiding national frameworks strengthened through consultative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented sector lacking cohesive policy framework</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increased government support to the sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor dependency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increased commercial support, improved access to local and international markets and alternative business models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of excellence underexposed internationally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enhanced marketing and producing capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient funds in the industry to sustain artists living</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diversifying income streams and improved business skills in promoting and developing talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training opportunity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strengthened links to international training opportunities and development of Zimbabwean vocational training strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huge gap between artists and ‘leaders’ in the industry – in terms of finance and agenda setting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>More forums for dialogue across the sector; more open channels of communication; consultative processes established in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor audience attendance throughout the year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increased touring; more focus on events outside festivals; taking work into new or unused spaces; developing passions for the arts throughout the education system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper data on available funds</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enhanced commitment to publishing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly of funds by major organisations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increased capacity of upcoming groups or companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak associations and coordinating bodies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increased government support for the structures and demand from artists in each sector for representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touring network within Zimbabwe ‘decimated’</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very few suggestions made on this apart from increased investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development agenda affecting the quality of artistic products</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clear lines drawn between investment in economic development through selling artistic product, using the arts for development purposes and producing quality artistic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited knowledge of the tangible benefits and value of the sector Zimbabwe as a whole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thorough mapping of the cultural economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...donors operating in the Arts & Culture Industry
## Comparative overview of donors operating in the Arts & Culture Industry

### MANDATE, PROGRAMME GUIDELINES AND ACTIVITY CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS SUPPORTING CULTURE IN ZIMBABWE

This can be used as a tool for fundraising through matching project proposal objectives to the mandate, guidelines and classification of activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Culture Fund** | Investing in Zimbabwean cultural, artistic and heritage initiatives, with the aim to create a greater wealth and well-being for Zimbabweans. To be an all-encompassing vehicle that has capacity to coordinate various initiatives in Zimbabwe’s cultural and creative sector. To promote a dynamic, diversified and sustainable culture sector imbued with Zimbabwean values and identity. To contribute to the growth of the culture sector in Zimbabwe by providing finance and technical support to cultural practitioners, institutions and activities. | To identify talent and create platforms for innovation and space to grow the culture sector. To provide access to finance, markets and capability, skills for culture agents. Culture Fund’s main source of income is SIDA and EU – both funds set out strategic guidelines.. | By 10 Key Result Areas
- Arts Education, Training, Development
- Gender – Women & Youths Empowerment
- Community Empowerment
- Talent Search, Development & Showcasing
- National Pride, Identity & Heritage
- Human Rights, Artists’ Rights Promotion
- Leadership & Management Skills Development
- National Strategy For the Arts & Culture
- Production & Access To Markets
- Information Access & Knowledge Management                                                                 |

Table 7.1 Comparative overview of donors operating in the Arts & Culture Industry
Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro Helvetia</strong>&lt;br&gt;Johannesburg</td>
<td>The liaison office of the Swiss Arts Council in Southern Africa. Set up at the beginning of 1998, and the second base on the African continent besides Cairo. The Johannesburg office is set up to cover the whole of Southern Africa. Through an agreement with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) in Pretoria, the office in Johannesburg also supports local capacity building and encourages cultural interaction between Southern African countries.</td>
<td>To promote Swiss arts and exchange with Swiss arts (professional, contemporary) in the Southern African region. SDC: The Pro Helvetia Southern African Programme for Arts and Culture aims to create a specific impact on the cultural sector of the region through the various projects that are supported in the short and long-term. The intention is to strengthen the professional contemporary arts scene in the region. The activities granted support are regional cross-border projects initiated by arts organisations, with a focus on either advocacy or mentoring.</td>
<td>Activity is classified by project objectives 1: Improved capacity of professional art networks to dialogue, exchange skills and influence cultural policy 2: Art networks increasingly collaborate and exchange on projects that build the administrative and technical capacity of art professionals 3: More artists in the region, making high quality and relevant work, reach more audiences through larger distribution of their work within the region (esp. Zim – SA – Moz)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall programme objective for SDC is the formation and development of a strong, independent, well-networked and organized and high quality arts sector in the region, that manages to create livelihoods for innovative young professional artists, who play an important role for the professional arts in providing an independent voice in society.

The general objective is relevant and strong networks of arts professionals in the region, and more specifically in Zimbabwe and South Africa (and potentially Mozambique) have a significantly increased ability to advocate the interests of their sector, share resources to increase the capacity of the sector.
Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africalia</td>
<td>In partnership with local cultural organisations, Africalia runs a negotiated multi-year structural development programme. “Art and culture are essential elements in a sustainable human development process.” This is what Africalia stands for, running result-based programmes conceived in collaboration with its partners in Africa. Africalia’s mandate subscribes to European Development Aid policies and - the Millennium Development Goals; - the Paris Declaration on aid efficiency; - the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity. The institutional policy is structural and civil society oriented, so the direct local partners need to be established in the form of NPO or Trust or similar, with operational Board members and General Assembly.</td>
<td>Culture is intimately linked with creativity, it stimulates intercultural dialogue and increases positive identity awareness. Culture also represents market potential and educational value, so it can play a considerable part in the fight against poverty. Moreover, culture acts on behavioural change. Through its three-year programmes, Africalia supports professional organisations and networks in Africa that contribute to the flourishing of artists, that in turn play their social and societal role in strengthening democracies. MYP (2012-2014) has this specific objective: The conditions of production, dissemination and distribution of mainly 3 Zimbabwean cultural operators (namely Pamberi Trust, Nhimbe Trust and Dance Trust Zimbabwe), were professionalised in view of free cultural expression by a wide diversity of young or emerging semi-professionals active in the arts and culture sector from around the country.</td>
<td>A result-based structural programme with related planning tools like a logical framework, activity plans and timelines, has been established for the period 2012-2014 and is operational in collaboration with the 3 main local partners. Those plans get updated on a 4-monthly basis and the programme targets professionalization in the performing arts (theatre, dance, music, festivals, etc.). Add-ons and shifts in the programme are negotiated and overseen by SCAZIM (Steering Committee to the Africalia Programme in Zimbabwe, an informal meeting between the main Africalia partners, which loosely classifies activity into Contemporary Dance, Music and Theatre.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Africalia was set up in 2001. The association’s objective is to achieve the goal of sustainable human development. The association will help to promote socio-economic and socio-cultural development and a reinforcement of the social foundations in partner countries as well as create awareness among Belgian public opinion. Largely supported by the Belgian Development Cooperation, Africalia supports professional organisations and networks in sub-Saharan Africa that contribute to the flourishing of artists that in turn play their social and societal role in strengthening democracies. Africalia cooperates with a limited number of partners working to high professional standards on the production and dissemination of artistic output from seven African countries: South Africa, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Kenya, DRC, Senegal and Zimbabwe.
Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HIVOS       | HIVOS support to culture in Zimbabwe falls under the mandate of their global Expression and Engagement programme which aims to:  
1. expand the space for free expression and freedom of speech, including critical and alternative views  
2. strengthen citizen engagement  
3. increase the efficiency of civic strategies through knowledge production and dissemination. | Hivos trusts in the creativity and capacity of people. Quality, cooperation and innovation are core values in programme development and business philosophies. Hivos is committed to people in Africa, Asia and Latin America who are systematically blocked from rights, opportunities and resources. A lasting improvement in their situation is the ultimate measure for the work. One of the guiding principles of Hivos’s philosophy is strengthening the social position of women.  
Aiming in Zimbabwe to promote participatory citizenry through creating opportunities for free expression. | Cultural programming under ‘Expression and Engagement’ falls into two categories: Festivals and Cultural Spaces, and Cultural Production. Hivos stimulates cultural (co) productions by aiding art education and workshops, stimulating new talent, setting up or supporting national and international cultural exchange projects, and by further professionalising (local) cultural organisations.  
Support for activity is guided by priority areas: outreach, audience building, developing platforms and infrastructure. |
The European Union is actively engaging with Zimbabwe. The EU partnership with the people of Zimbabwe is longstanding. The EU supported its struggle for independence and after independence the EU delegation contributed to the impressive improvements of social services for all Zimbabweans.

The mandate can be summarised as follows: To empower a diversified and sustainable society with values that contribute positively to identity development, national healing, reconciliation and wealth creation in Zimbabwe through the growth of the arts and culture sector and in particular its creative industry component.

Prior to this, the EU facilitated links with other EU funds available for culture (e.g. EU-ACP, see below) and made small grants available for special projects.

In 2013, the European Union delegation in Zimbabwe launched a cultural development programme for the sector in Zimbabwe to advance the creative economy and establish sustainable links between Europe and Zimbabwe.

1) Increased democratic space and improved policy framework
   - Enhanced role of the arts and culture in promoting freedom of expression, civic rights and rule of law, diversity preservation, reconciliation and national healing.
   - Increased government accountability in implementing the Culture Policy
   - Effective implementation and monitoring of the Civil Society Plan of Action for Arts and Culture
   - Domestication of the UNESCO Convention and other international commitments
   - Progress towards repealing legal provisions oppressing freedom of expression

2) Improved sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction amongst creative industry workers
   - Increased opportunities for Zimbabwean creative industry workers
   - Transfer of skills in production, marketing and commercialisation of cultural goods
   - Improved framework for the protection of the artists’ rights

3) Improved mutual understanding between Zimbabwe population and cultural groups
   - Increased access to cultural events, information and workshops with a specific emphasis on disseminating cultural expressions to areas usually disaffected by such initiatives
   - Empowerment of vulnerable and disenfranchised groups, and strengthening of cultural identity

Cultural events held in or outside Zimbabwe promoting creative cultural exchange between Zimbabwe, the region, and Europe
### Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIDA</strong></td>
<td>Sida’s mandate for support of culture in Zimbabwe is handed over to local partners who will know and define local priorities. In addition to this the Swedish Embassy puts emphasis in supporting platforms where Swedish groups can perform in Zimbabwe – HIFA, Rooftop Promotions and Film Festivals.</td>
<td>Sida used to support a number of national institutions and organisations directly, who would participate in strategic planning (Amakhosi, Rooftop Promotions, Zimbabwe Book Development Council, CHIPAWO, ZIFT and the College of Music). Since 2009 Sida has channelled support for culture through the Culture Fund. A key underlining objective of this is sustainable development.</td>
<td>This is generally defined by the local partner, Culture Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Norwegian Embassy</strong></td>
<td>The main objective for Norway in Zimbabwe is to assist in the continued work on political and economic stabilisation and progress by supporting the Government of National Unity (GNU) and the Global Political Agreement (GPA) through dialogue and participation. In Zimbabwe, Norway plays a key part in the important areas of peace building, democratisation and reconciliation. In addition, the strategic focus areas are - Energy and environmental and climate questions - Human rights work and supporting independent media - Humanitarian assistance - Women’s rights and equality questions - Culture Norway’s mandate in terms of culture is to develop the arts and culture sector in Zimbabwe by building local capacity, increasing the quality of artistic and cultural expression, facilitating exchange between Norway and Zimbabwe, and utilizing culture as an instrument of development.</td>
<td>The overall goal for the programme is “to contribute to a strong and participatory civil society, culture and media sector.” Norway does not have a bilateral programme with Zimbabwe, meaning there is no support to the country’s ‘institutional frameworks’. However, the Embassy’s strategy aims to strengthen institutional frameworks of key organisations including four different areas or levels: - improved policies and regulatory mechanisms within the sector - strengthened networking between partners within and between sectors. - strengthened organisational structures - improved individual knowledge and skills. Government of Norway has released first White Paper on Culture</td>
<td>There is no specific categorisation. Funds go to leading national Zimbabwean cultural institutions, and the main bulk of this is channelled through Hivos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity used to be categorised by partners as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.1 continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The British Council**      | A non-departmental UK government body, registered as a charity in the UK, the British Council is the UK’s international organisation for educational opportunities and cultural relations. The organisation builds engagement and trust for the UK through the exchange of knowledge and ideas between people worldwide. | This falls within the overall mandate to create worldwide opportunity, build trust and understanding and keep channels open for UK/Zimbabwe dialogue. The British Council’s mandate for support to culture specifically to provide a unique space for UK/Zimbabwe cultural dialogue and exchange and establish creative partnerships with three major Zimbabwean festivals, showcasing UK talent and fostering local artists. | Activity essentially falls into partnerships that provide or match funds for the British Council, or programmes that the British Council are implementing with local partners in which the British Council will provide a management fee to the local partner for implementing, as a vendor, a British Council project.

Outside of this, small-scale projects can be supported that fall within the British Council mandate. |
<p>| <strong>Alliance Francaise</strong>        | The Alliance Française de Harare (and Bulawayo) is an independent, non-profit language and cultural organisation promoting Franco-Zimbabwean exchange since 1951. | Alliance Francaise takes its mandate from the UNESCO principal of cultural diversity, and promotes mutual understanding between France and Zimbabwe. The main mission of Alliance Francaise is to teach French, promote French and francophone connections and foster the arts in Zimbabwe. | With a local board, made up of half Zimbabwean nationals and internationals, Alliance Francaise maintains a locally driven strategy, offering a professional space for local artists to create and present high quality work. The centre is driven by facilitating opportunities between producers of cultural products. |
| <strong>Zimbabwe German Society</strong>   | ZGS is a German language and culture centre with a global reach. ZGS is a local organisation and a subsidiary of The Goethe Institute. The Goethe Institute operates 158 institutes including 12 liaison offices overseas. Each institute is assigned to a Regional Institute (for example New Delhi for the region of southern Asia) and offers language, cultural and information services focussed on the respective locations. | The ZGS mandate is to provide language courses and opportunities, and cultural events with the dual mission to develop professionalism in the local cultural sector and promote exchange between Zimbabwe and Germany. | ZGS provides space for Zimbabwean cultural activity and runs programmes that provide a professional platform for Zimbabwean artists to showcase their work. |
|                              |                                                                                                          | ZGS provides space for Zimbabwean cultural activity and runs programmes that provide a professional platform for Zimbabwean artists to showcase their work. | ZGS splits its activity between regular events such as the Acoustic Night and the Artists Management Forum, and one off special events such as the Flame Festival. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNESCO</strong></td>
<td>National Commissions operate, on a permanent basis, for the purpose of associating their governmental and non-governmental bodies in education, sciences, culture and communication with the work of the organization. The network plays a significant role in the liaison with partners, the coordination of activities and the promotion of UNESCO’s visibility at the country level. The UNESCO Commission in Zimbabwe was established on the 3rd of March 1987 by Presidential Decree.</td>
<td>Objectives in Zimbabwe unclear or not readily available</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP</strong></td>
<td>Dialogue and Democracy project supports Culture Fund to improve the image of Zimbabwe internationally: <em>My Zimbabwe Story</em>. Otherwise, there is no specific mandate for cultural support</td>
<td>No specific guidelines for culture. More scope for cultural activity to support strategic objectives of UNDP.</td>
<td>No specific classification for culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAID</strong></td>
<td>USAID objectives for Zimbabwe do not make a distinction for culture</td>
<td>No specific guidelines for culture. More scope for cultural activity to support strategic objectives of USAID.</td>
<td>No specific classification for culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIFEM</strong></td>
<td>UN mandate for gender equality - which does not make a distinction for culture</td>
<td>More scope for cultural activity to support strategic objectives of UNIFEM</td>
<td>The cultural ambassador for women’s rights is Albert Nyathi who coordinates activities – awaiting his outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Embassy – Public Affairs</strong></td>
<td>Improving bilateral relations between Zimbabwe and the US</td>
<td>Refused to give information</td>
<td>Refused to give information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Embassy</strong></td>
<td>The Canadian Embassy doesn’t have a specific cultural programme, but does work with different people and organisations that do cultural activity, to explore development issues.</td>
<td>Embassy programming aligns with Government of Canada in developing human rights, good governance, civil society, freedom of expression.</td>
<td>Small special projects depending on what is requested. Canada Fund for Local Initiatives (CFLI), which can support cultural activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands Embassy</strong></td>
<td>A special projects fund can support cultural activity with a locally driven mandate. Cultural relations programming is mandated to promote Dutch culture in Zimbabwe; linking Netherlands and Zimbabwe cultures in a more visible way.</td>
<td>Objectives defined per project</td>
<td>By discipline and type of activity; i.e. linking Netherlands and Zimbabwe culture. Successful applicants have been able to demonstrate positive impact as a result of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Embassy</strong></td>
<td>Promotion of good relations between Germany and Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>Special projects fund, which can include cultural activity with high impact.</td>
<td>Activity is generally split between showcasing German culture at platforms with the widest reach (eg HIFA) and small projects that also meet a development objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Embassy</td>
<td>There is currently no specific mandate for supporting cultural activity due to severe budget cuts. In the past the mandate of the cultural attaché was split between achieving understanding of Spanish culture and history in Zimbabwe and supporting locally driven initiatives.</td>
<td>Still to provide information</td>
<td>Still to provide information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Embassy</td>
<td>Promotion of Chinese Culture in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Promotion of Chinese Culture</td>
<td>Promotion of Chinese Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Embassy</td>
<td>Promotion of Czech culture and mutual understanding between the Czech republic and Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy of Switzerland</td>
<td>Support to culture makes up a small component of Embassy activity, which houses the Swiss Development Cooperation.</td>
<td>Mutually defined by development portfolio and applications as they are submitted.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Embassy</td>
<td>Largely undefined and reliant upon personal taste and skill of cultural attaché.</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Embassy</td>
<td>No specific cultural mandate in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Still to provide information</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTSIDE ZIMBABWE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **THE EU-ACP SUPPORT PROGRAMME TO CULTURAL INDUSTRIES IN ACP** | EU-ACP is set up to reinforce the capacities of policy and decision makers, cultural operators and certain domains of culture and cultural industries in the ACP countries, and it is structured around three complementary components:  
- the establishment of an ACP Cultural Observatory as a mechanism for providing technical advice and information in order to improve the policy, legal and institutional frameworks of the sector;  
- an ACP/ILO/UNCTAD/UNESCO joint project to strengthen the creative industries in 5 selected ACP countries (Fiji, Mozambique, Senegal, Trinidad and Tobago and Zambia), implemented by the UN agencies;  
- a grant scheme seeking to reinforce the technical, financial and managerial capacities of ACP cultural operators and cultural industries. | The general objective of the programme is to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development through the promotion of an enabling environment for creativity, cooperation and exchanges, independence and viability of the cultural sector in the ACP States, as well as the safeguarding of cultural diversity and fundamental cultural values. | In 2011 ACP supported programmes can be found at [http://www.acpcultures.eu](http://www.acpcultures.eu)  
The response to the 2012 call has still not been published. |
| **UNESCO – IFCD** | The Fund’s purpose is to promote sustainable development and poverty reduction in developing and least-developed countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention | The project supported in Zimbabwe through the Culture Fund: Measuring the Economic Contribution of Zimbabwe’s Cultural Industries. |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ford Foundation</strong></td>
<td>The regional strategy in southern Africa integrates initiatives in the following areas: promoting</td>
<td>No known current support to Zimbabwe – but certainly possible.</td>
<td>No known current support to Zimbabwe – but certainly possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparent, effective and accountable government, reducing HIV/AIDS discrimination and exclusion and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengthening human rights, building economic security over a lifetime, expanding livelihood opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for poor households, enabling educational opportunity and scholarship, youth sexuality, reproductive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health and rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince Claus Fund</strong></td>
<td>Based on the principal that culture is a basic need, the Prince Claus Fund’s mission is to actively</td>
<td>For a while, following 2008, there was a specific objective aimed at promoting freedom of expression</td>
<td>Prince Claus Fund and Commonwealth Foundation launched a Culture and Conflict programme, which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seek cultural collaborations founded on equality and trust, with partners of excellence, in spaces where</td>
<td>and dialogue in Zimbabwe. Currently, Prince Claus’s overall mandate and objectives can apply to</td>
<td>aimed to address the often-neglected support for cultural expression before, during and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources and research are limited and cultural heritage is threatened.</td>
<td>Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>periods of conflict. The joint initiative granted support to projects in Pakistan, Rwanda, Sri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lanka and Zimbabwe. Pamberi Trust was a recipient of support in Zimbabwe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Commonwealth Foundation** | The Mandate of the Commonwealth Foundation is to develop the capacity of Civil Society to act together and learn from each other to engage with the institutions that shape people’s lives. | The Commonwealth Foundation’s strategy for grant making has changed a number of times over the last 10 years – with activity falling into different categories. Currently, grants are made under the following four strategic areas:  
  - Dialogue. Developing dialogue for engagement in participatory governance  
  - Facilitating collaboration in participatory governance  
  - Developing capacities to replicate good practice on participatory governance  
  - Building a culture of learning in participatory governance. | Although Zimbabwe is no longer in the Commonwealth, a special culture and conflict programme was created in 2011, which included Zimbabwe.  
Other programmes directly supporting cultural activity are in the areas of literary arts and film:  
Commonwealth Writers, which inspires writers, storytellers and a range of cultural practitioners to work for social change. It builds communities of less heard and emerging voices to influence, directly and indirectly, the decision-making processes which affect their lives.  
Commonwealth Shorts is a capacity building scheme to give new writer/directors the opportunity to make a film along the theme of relationships. The Commonwealth Short Story Prize acts as catalyst to target and identify talented writers to lead on-the-ground activity across the Commonwealth. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa (OSISA)</strong></td>
<td>OSISA’s vision is to promote and sustain the ideals, values, institutions and practices of open society, with the aim of establishing vibrant and tolerant southern African democracies in which people, free from material and other deprivation, understand their rights and responsibilities and participate actively in all spheres of life.</td>
<td>Economic justice tackling poverty; education which is recognised as a right; HIV AIDS; human rights and democracy aiming to promote open societies, where transparency and accountability are viewed as essential parts of the culture of a working democracy; language rights promoting the use of indigenous languages; the law programme which promotes access to justice and rule of law programmes in the region; the Lusophone programme which will help to overcome the linguistic, political, legal and cultural barriers that hinder the integration of Lusophone countries into southern African policy dialogue; the ICT and media programme.</td>
<td>Grants must be applied for in the following 4 categories: Capacity-Building Grants; Core Grants; Policy and Research Grants. Each grant type has different aims and requirements. OSISA has a Zimbabwe representative, but how cultural activity is classified is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mimeta</strong></td>
<td>Mimeta has been working within culture and development since 2006 and was incorporated as a legal entity by its owners Strømme Foundation and Vest-AgderFylkeskommune in 2008. Mimeta is working from Kristiansand (Norway) and Stockholm (Sweden). Through the Fund Mimeta is involved in culture sector development in more than twenty countries. Mimeta also does the coordination of international co-productions, promoting art and design towards Nordic audiences and runs a gallery in Kristiansand. Mimeta contributes to processes that give artists and organizers an opportunity to influence their framework conditions, and we support our partners on political advocacy, platform development and economic sustainability. There is potential in aligning the strategies of cultural organisations in Zimbabwe and Mimeta. Mimeta supports a range of artistic disciplines across Africa, looking specifically at initiatives that give artists, producers and artistic works better protection against abuse, detention and censorship. Initiatives that contribute to processes and tools that give artists and producers their democratic opportunity to influence the free exercising of their rights, mostly through culture policy processes and other broader advocacy initiatives. Initiatives that strengthen independent platforms (venues, festivals, spaces etc) providing free, artistic expressions.</td>
<td>Mimeta’s mission is to give people access to free artistic expressions created on independent terms, in support of article 27 of the Universal Human Rights Declaration. Mimeta has a similar mandate to Prince Claus Fund (the Netherlands). In 2013 they joined forces and put out a joint call for proposals for activities across Africa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mandate for cultural support in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Strategic guidelines for programming</th>
<th>Classification of programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Moves Africa</strong></td>
<td>AMA facilitates cultural and artistic exchanges within the African continent. AMA offers travel funds to artists, arts professionals and cultural operators living and working in Africa to travel within the African continent in order to engage in the exchange of information, the enhancement of skills, the development of informal networks and the pursuit of cooperation.</td>
<td>AMA supported two mobility projects in 2012 and is currently closed to applications due to global funding shortages. This funder should still be kept on Zimbabwe’s radar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Partner – Annual Expenditure on Cultural Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture Fund</strong></td>
<td>617,244.19</td>
<td>2,640,839.92</td>
<td>1,446,753.80</td>
<td>Grants range from US$3,000.00 to US$20,000.00. Requests for smaller grants as little as US$500.00 can be considered.</td>
<td>Call for applications On-going receipt of proposals There can also be collaborative programme design in partnership with other funding partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro Helvetia Johannesburg</strong></td>
<td>PH: 340,000 SDC: 200,000</td>
<td>PH: 357,000 SDC:200,000</td>
<td>PH: 340,000 SDC :100,000</td>
<td>PH implements projects – it does not give direct support to partners. SDC medium term projects average 340,000 ZAR, average 30,000 USD per project per annum over two years ANT projects up to 50,000 ZAR, average 5000 USD per project</td>
<td>PH projects: This is a curatorial approach (call for proposals for residencies) For medium sized projects: a press release is sent out and then communication/correspondence begins and results in proposal submission. ANT Fund: 4 calls for proposals over 2 years – new cycle to begin 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Funding Partner – Annual Expenditure on Cultural Programming
Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africalia</td>
<td>310,500¹</td>
<td>330,000²</td>
<td>351,000³</td>
<td>The support is structural and based on activity plans and timelines by the three main partners, Nhimbe Trust, Dance Trust of Zimbabwe and Pamberi Trust. Size of grants to third party operators vary accordingly, but all must remain within the logic of the framework and the result-based programme and add to/remain in line with the expected outcomes. Examples of grants to third parties is 2500 to Tumbuka Dance Company to perform at Grahamstown Festival through DFC, 1000 for this research, through Pamberi Trust</td>
<td>The main partners enter 4-monthly call for funds based on updated annual budgets. A small annual budget allocation is available for additional activities, either from the direct partners themselves or from third party cultural operators with activities deemed pertinent and further facilitating the envisioned development outcomes. SCAZIM meets 3 or 4 times a year to offer recommendations and feedback on proposals received through them or Africalia. A number of shows on the HIFA programme 2013 received support (e.g. airfare towards a collaboration with an artist that came up from South Africa, an internship from Intwasa to HIFA/Bushfire, a few theatre productions from Bulawayo and other places, etc.). This approach is beneficial to the sector at large and is under constant review. It also explicitly welcomes and seeks cooperation with other funding organisations active in the sector, always with a view to benefit the local arts scene.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Rough total estimate of operational support to partners and activities in Zimbabwe only.
² ibid
³ ibid
Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIVOS</strong></td>
<td>160,000 (direct HIVOS funds) (HIVOS was handling Norwegian Embassy funds this year)</td>
<td>160,000 HIVOS 7.9 Million Kroner for 2 years from Norwegian Embassy.</td>
<td>160,000 HIVOS</td>
<td>Annual: 80,000 USD Pamberi Trust 80,000 USD National Gallery Bulawayo (ended 2011), 80,000 HIFA The above are rolling contracts Other grants vary from 40,000 – 120,000 USD annually</td>
<td>Hivos identifies partners. There are now specific guidelines. Possibility of considering applications. Hivos wishes to open up its portfolio. The current phase ended in May 2013, Norwegian Embassy is currently doing a review. A new contract will be signed with the Norwegian Embassy in December 2013. HIVOS awaits parliamentary approval in the Netherlands to discover if direct Hivos support to culture will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Union</strong></td>
<td>10,000 Euro (direct through the delegation)</td>
<td>10,000 Euro (direct through the delegation)</td>
<td>450,000 Euro (through EUNIC and Culture Fund and directly through the EU Delegation – part of a 1 million Euro programme over 2 years)</td>
<td>On average from 500 EUR up to 20,000 EUR</td>
<td>Closed process for the majority of funds. Funds disbursed through Culture Fund and EUNIC. Application can be made through EUNIC and Culture Fund and directly through the EU Delegation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE EU-ACP SUPPORT PROGRAMME</strong></td>
<td>Annual budget 14.8 million Euro</td>
<td>Benefit to Zimbabweans through African Synergy – fund granted in South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIDA</strong></td>
<td>1 million Culture Fund Small additional</td>
<td>1 million Culture Fund Small additional</td>
<td>1 million Culture Fund Small additional</td>
<td>Grant system awarded through Culture Fund</td>
<td>Process generally handled by Culture Fund Open door policy for discreitional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Norwegian Embassy</strong></td>
<td>734,557.6 (approx) Of the above: 3.7 million Kroner to Hivos 600,000 HIFA 2 collaboration programmes in addition</td>
<td>1,016,949 (approx) Of the above: 4.2 Million Kroner to Hivos 600,000 HIFA Chitungwiza Choir National Gallery, and CHIPAWO also supported.</td>
<td>1,016,949 (approx) HIVOS paid so far Extra support to partners – when there is special need. National Gallery – funding for roof repairs.</td>
<td>No grant system Generally the Embassy tries not to give small grants, but rather supports national organisations. There can be allowances for small projects.</td>
<td>Generally the Embassy refers all applications to Hivos – so has no strict application process. However, there is an online application form which can easily be used, and it shouldn’t take more than 2 months for a decision to made and contract issued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The British Council</strong></td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td><strong>Not grant giving</strong></td>
<td>Responsive to applications for small projects in line with BC objectives. Two main types of relationship - either matched funding, Bulawayo Schools Music Project local partnering with the British Friends of Zimbabwean Academy of Music who match BC funding and pay it directly to British Council. Or, local delivery partners are engaged in which case support will also cover administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approx 150,000</td>
<td>210,000 BC grant</td>
<td>285,000 GBP</td>
<td>Sponsorship of local productions around festivals in the range of 1-5000 US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270,000 with co-funding</td>
<td>375,000 with co-funding</td>
<td>Small funds for residencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alliance Francaise</strong></td>
<td>120,000 USD(^4)</td>
<td>120,000 USD(^5)</td>
<td>120,000 USD(^6)</td>
<td>Small grants between 1000 and 5000 In kind support (space, equipment) Covering costs of producing cultural events</td>
<td>Open door policy. Regular regional meetings with Alliance Francaise network where touring projects can be proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zimbabwe German Society</strong></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td><strong>Not grant giving</strong></td>
<td>Open door policy Works in partnership for joint funding initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In kind support (space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) 15-20% French government 80-85% locally sourced.  
\(^4\) ibid  
\(^5\) ibid  
\(^6\) ibid
### Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000 USD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown - unclear</td>
<td>Unknown - unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO – IFCD</td>
<td>14.8 Million Euro Annually</td>
<td>100,000 USD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Between 50,00 and 500,000</td>
<td>Consult the local National Commission for UNESCO for the submission deadline at the national level. Download the relevant application form (depending on the type of funding request, the applicant may choose the application form for projects or the one for preparatory assistance). IFCD’s next funding opportunity: the fifth call for proposals is planned for January 2014 with a 15 May deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP Dialogue Financing Facility</td>
<td>250,000 Approx total</td>
<td>Programme value to Culture Fund unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Contract agreement with programme partners</td>
<td>Negotiable process at varying levels – within UNDP, and with programme partners eg. the Culture Fund and service providers whom Culture Fund engage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Healing and reconciliation/ HIV AIDS use the performing arts</td>
<td>Size of grants given unknown</td>
<td>Approx 30,000</td>
<td>Size of grants given unknown</td>
<td>Rooftop Promotions and Blessing Hungwe contracted for national touring, public engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Embassy – Public Affairs</strong></td>
<td>Clearance denied</td>
<td>Clearance denied</td>
<td>Clearance denied</td>
<td>Clearance denied</td>
<td>No specific process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Embassy</strong></td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Between 5 and 7 projects are supported out of the cultural budget.</td>
<td>Periodic calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special projects with development agenda can be supported up to 15,000 USD</td>
<td>Since CIDA is now closed the Embassy has limited scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands Embassy</strong></td>
<td>Euro 30,000</td>
<td>Euro 15,000</td>
<td>Euro 8,000</td>
<td>2000-5000 average but it depends</td>
<td>Ongoing receipt of proposals and selection according to criteria and engaging stakeholders directly, within our public diplomacy framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Embassy</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>It depends</td>
<td>Open process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish Embassy</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>No grants</td>
<td>Open process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Expenditure 2011 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2012 USD</th>
<th>Expenditure 2013 USD</th>
<th>Average sized grants</th>
<th>Application process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Embassy</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>No grants</td>
<td>Works directly with the government of Zimbabwe. Any requests from China for Zimbabwean artists to travel to China is processed through the Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Embassy</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>No grants</td>
<td>Open process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Embassy</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>No grants</td>
<td>Curates events such as the Jazz Festival Open process Open to ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total known funding in the sector for 2012: 4,022,301.000
Estimate from known donor funds into the sector in 2011: 2,777,900.00
Estimate from known donor funds into the sector in 2012: 4,834,788.00
Estimate from known donor funds into the sector in 2013, into 2014: 5,114,702.00

Additional known support of significance:
1 million USD from SIDA to repair the Harare City Library
1 million USD from the Norwegian Embassy to repair the roof of the National Gallery.
## Activities supported from a selection of above mentioned Funders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Fund</td>
<td>Film, Audiovisual and Multimedia Production, Cultural Heritage, Fine Arts and Crafts, Cultural Industries, Literature and Languages, Performing Arts</td>
<td>2011: 67 programmes and projects were allocated a total of US$340,000.00. Grantees seminars and disbursements done. Project monitoring and evaluation done. More than 20 festivals and events supported. Technical support through availing PA system contributing more than 30 events. Enabling access to research and resource centre to more than 50 artists. <strong>Artists’ rights</strong> strengthened through a series of 5 Intellectual Property Rights workshops in Harare and Bulawayo for performing arts, visuals arts, literary arts and film category, empowering more than 150 artists. 30 festival directors trained. National Arts &amp; Culture Indaba.</td>
<td>2013: 468,000.00 budgeted for project grants in 2013. Technical support through strategic, leadership and skills training programmes, access to resource centre for research. Recipient list still to be published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012: 74 projects allocated US$545,501.00 through 2 cycles in 2012. Grantees seminars and disbursements done. Project monitoring and evaluation done. More than 20 festivals and events supported. Technical support through availing PA system contributing more than US$15,000.00. Associations strengthened include <strong>Zimbabwe Applied Art in Craft Association (ZAACA)</strong>, <strong>Zimbabwe Writers Association</strong> and <strong>Zimbabwe Music Rights Association (ZIMURA)</strong>. Leadership training programme trained more than 60 participants; Indaba for the arts and culture sector attended by more than 50 sector leaders. Research on contributions of cultural industries to the economy.</td>
<td><strong>National Associations Festivals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leaders in the sector the main beneficiaries of trainings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Individual artists supported with small grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Projects run by organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 Activities supported from a selection of above mentioned Funders
Table 7.3 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro Helvetia</td>
<td>Impact objectives important on music and dance, other projects, especially residencies, in visual arts</td>
<td>About 30 projects per year in PH programme, 4 projects medium term collaboration between SA and ZIM (Nhimbe Trust, Pamberi and African Synergy, Savanna Trust, Gwanza and Market Photo Workshop) and about 13 ANT funding projects so far, looking at about 13 more in 2013.</td>
<td>Organisational exposure for audiences Award winning showcasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africalia</td>
<td>Impact objectives important on music, Theatre, Associations and Networks, festivals and in visual arts</td>
<td><strong>2011</strong> A structural programme involving the following activities: Pamberi Trust (Book Café, Arts Factory); Nhimbe Trust (Schools Performing Arts Academy, Women in Theatre, Zimbabwe Theatre Association); Dance Trust Zimbabwe (Dance Foundation Course); Festivals : HIFA, Intwasa, Chimanimani, Music Crossroads (musicians training and competitions), Theory X (theatre training)</td>
<td>Organisational development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2012</strong> A structural programme, overseen by SCAZIM, involving the following activities: Pamberi Trust (Bookcafé, Arts Factory), Nhimbe Trust (Schools Performing Arts Academy, Women in Theatre, Zimbabwe Theatre Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2013</strong> A structural programme, overseen by SCAZIM, involving the following activities: Pamberi Trust (Book Café, Arts Factory), Nhimbe Trust (Schools Performing Arts Academy, Women in Theatre, Zimbabwe Theatre Association, and WITlabs with Amakhosi. Arterial Network Cultural Policy conference during HiFA, e.a.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIVOS</strong></td>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>HIFA: core support, 80,000 USD annually</td>
<td>Number of artists employed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Pamberi Trust: supporting the venue – creative space for artistic expression – and Flame Project, 80,000 USD annually</td>
<td>Number of audience reached?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Savanna Trust: community theatre training, theatre productions, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td>Number of productions created and performed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Education</td>
<td>Chipawo: theatre, music and dance in schools, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Rooftop: theatre production, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zim Women Writers: writing and publishing skills for women – centres in rural areas, women are helped to develop writing skills. Paid when their work is published, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dance Trust of Zimbabwe: training, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intwasa: support for the annual festival. Multidisciplinary, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Magamba Trust: Shoko Festival, 40,000 USD annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zim International Book Fair: annual book fair, 40,000 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Gallery: participation in Biennale, 120,000 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa Book Development: study circles in rural areas and book distribution, 120,000 USD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Union</strong></td>
<td>In 2011 and 2012 this was:</td>
<td>Broadly, activity in 2011 and 2012 included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>- Festivals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>- Exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>- Cultural exchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2013 this has been extended to include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Workshops, Seminars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Advocacy work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In 2012 – The Mbira Centre received support plus a couple of other small projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In 2013 – Creative Europe with EUNIC has started which includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A livelihoods and artistic development programme with groups of women basket weavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Film project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German book on visual art in Zimbabwe with National Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Disciplines 2011-2013</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE EU-ACP SUPPORT PROGRAMME</strong></td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>African Synergy music and poetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to Culture Fund Support, SIDA renovated the Harare City Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Norwegian Embassy</strong></td>
<td>As defined by local implementing partners</td>
<td>HIVOS institution support – see above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The British Council**             | Theatre, music, visual arts, creative industries | **Annually**  
500 young people attend the Shoko Hip Hop and Social Activism Festival  
6 young film makers trained by Latimer Creative Media (UK) to make short docudramas telling Zimbabwean stories to be shown at international festivals  
5 young playwrights mentored by Royal Court with showcasing opportunities in the region and UK  
Workshop programmes delivered by UK artists planned around major festivals (HIFA, Intwasa, Shoko) reach 400 aspiring artists.  
Curatorial workshop for 20 young African curators delivered in partnership with Tate Modern.  
One breakthrough UK music/spoken word artist showcased at Shoko each year to an audience of 500 youth.  
One major UK performance piece showcased at HIFA mainstage to an audience of 4,000. Further engagement of 600 through free shows in high density areas.  
3 local works produced through collaboration with BC programmes e.g. Royal Court New Writing, SADC Exchange presented at Intwasa Festival.  
2 works produced in collaboration with BC programmes showcased regionally i.e. Soweto Theatre, Bushfire Festival.  
5 UK arts practitioners deliver Harare/Bulawayo conversations to 200 young creatives. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Francaise</td>
<td>Music 70%</td>
<td>Regular performance</td>
<td>Regular events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Film festivals</td>
<td>Regular audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Visual arts exhibition</td>
<td>Professional platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Play readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing acts in/showcasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special projects – eg. facilitating record production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Jacaranda Muse with VeeMukarati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe German Society</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Acoustic night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lights to Theatre in the Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZIM STATS/CULTURE FUND economic mapping of creative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>industries (100,000 USD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO – IFCD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nhimbe mapping of creative economy (100,000 USD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture Fund: My Zimbabwe Story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rooftop national tour of play for national healing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support to events around the 16 Days of Activism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.3 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Embassy – Public Affairs</strong></td>
<td>Cannot provide</td>
<td>Requires clearance – however it is known that the Embassy has supported a wide variety of cultural activity – including performer training, artist forums, music collaborations, visiting artists to HIFA, play readings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Embassy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Acts to HIFA – eg Pianist Collaborating with Prudence FOR HIFA Art Exhibitions – sculptors Events at Ambassador’s residence Networking Sisters Open Mic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netherlands Embassy</strong></td>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>- Arts and Culture education workshops - Arts festivals music collaborations - Photograph project - Sculpture exhibition</td>
<td>- participated in distinctive festivals (musical collaborations and education workshops) - establishment of social media to create platform for artists and markets. - Mural paintings - Dutch acts participation in distinctive festivals (musical collaborations and education workshops) (2013 budget exhausted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music collaborations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Embassy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>German acts to HIFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance project with youth in Mbare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 continued....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Disciplines 2011-2013</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Main Areas of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Embassy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011/2012&lt;br&gt;Periodic Spanish cultural evenings&lt;br&gt;Spanish cuisine at Book Café&lt;br&gt;Arts directory in partnership with Culture Fund and Arts Council&lt;br&gt;Fashion show and dance performance, National Gallery&lt;br&gt;Music Crossroads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Embassy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tours of Chinese troupes to Zimbabwe&lt;br&gt;Zimbabwean choir to China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Embassy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptation of Czech plays&lt;br&gt;Historical cultural project in Mutare about BATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Embassy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Touring Italian dance company to perform in HARARE&lt;br&gt;Annual Jazz Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspectives and analysis on funding

Operating Frameworks

Culture Fund, Africalia and Pro Helvetia each have very clearly defined operating frameworks, which define who and what is funded. These are also available on request and, for Culture Fund and Pro Helvetia, laid out clearly on their websites. HIVOS, the Norwegian Embassy, SIDA and the British Council have clear overall frameworks, which are easily accessible. With the exception of the Norwegian Embassy and SIDA, European support to Zimbabwe has a dual emphasis between exchange or showcasing work from the partner country and development of Zimbabwean arts and culture.

In other development sectors such as Health or Education donors collaborate more effectively due to shared strategic direction and defined national objectives. In 2011, it was noted that ‘There are no formal donor collaboration mechanisms in the area of culture and sport, but informal ad hoc meetings and consultations. A major constraint for such collaboration is the lack of bilateral cooperation with Government’ With the exception of EUNIC and Culture Fund co-operations, this is still the case in 2013 despite the presence of large scale national events and organisations that are multi-donor funded.

Measurement of Impact

In addition it has been noted that even in the context of clear operating frameworks and objectives, a common weakness amongst donors is the lack of meaningful measurement of impact and
limited indicators ‘You just wouldn’t get away with this in Europe.’ Many funders and embassies are concerned with numbers and reach, which makes buy-in to a broader operating framework, with coordinated goals, challenging.

Audience Reach Matters Most

The way donors rate the value of activity is often by reach. HIFA is held up as being the only event of international quality and as it reaches 50,000 people over 6 days, attracts a large proportion of embassy support, many of whom value this as one of the most important aspect of the festival. This can be seen on various embassy websites where HIFA is presented as the main cultural event supported. However, ‘exposure to large audiences is not the only objective of performers.’

Perception of Donor Policies

Donor policies are not well understood. Many respondents mentioned being unclear about embassies’ and donors’ motivation for supporting culture in Zimbabwe. The Norwegian Embassy and British Council each provide examples of this; despite contributing an average of 5 million Norwegian Kroner to the arts and cultural sector annually, the Norwegian strategy for sports and culture is not well known among partners. Furthermore, NORAD’s independent evaluation found no evidence that the Norwegian strategy has been used in programming. The British Council director explained that the Council is often misunderstood as being a funder, when ‘it is in fact a cultural relations organisation that creates worldwide opportunity and builds trust that helps people in the UK and other countries work together to address global challenges.’

Exchange

Most respondents described this as desirable, but often cited a lack of control over how or when this happens, and what it involves. Individual artists or groups who have built their own relationships and won support to make an exchange happen feel extremely positive about the experience (Vee Mukarati recorded the album Jacaranda Muse with Alliance Francaise support, John Pfumojena travelled to the UK to do an internship with CHICKENSHED with British Council support, CHIPAWO participated in a regional exchange programme with support from the Norwegian Embassy through a relationship with the Ibsen Centre – all were described as extremely positive experiences.)

Various respondents described less positive experiences when foreign artists or practitioners come into the country to lead creative processes. However, if the process is collaborative and jointly owned this results in mutual learning, respect, inspiration, expansion and many other desirable outcomes for cultural exchange and individual artistic development.

Short Term Support

Funding in the sector is largely project based – even if the contract is for two or three years, the focus is on specific projects as opposed to
overall programmes. That said, most of this is channelled through organisations that, in order to survive, ensure that the project also supports the existence of the entity that houses it. This is a bind that could be resolved through longer term support meaning organisations could strategically plan sustainable income streams more easily, as well as spend more time and focus on the development of the artistic product or form.

A large number of respondents in organisations in Zimbabwe expressed that too much time, resources and effort is taken up with fundraising, reporting and generally ‘chasing our tails.’

HIVOS, the Norwegian Embassy and the Swedish Embassy are the only funders who provide multi-year core support to organisations. Recently the EU expanded its support for culture through a two-year fund channelled through CfoZT and EUNIC who will contract partners during this period for specific activities – these may be two year contracts but the funding is strictly linked to activities. It should be noted that HIVOS is currently actively lobbying for a three year contract with the Norwegian Embassy. Even longer term agreements would enable improved planning and sustainability. However it has been cited as a danger that long term funding of a few partners can lead to too much dependency on one donor and can create a monopoly for those who are supported.

**Funds available for Arts and Culture often require Development Objectives**

Whilst the arts play a crucial role in education, in sustainable development, in economic growth, in social development and can have a huge impact in terms of communicating messages, awareness raising and positive change, development goals do not necessarily translate to high quality artistic work. Genuine development of the sector relies upon nurturing talent to create artistic work to a world class level.

For example, the Culture Fund of Zimbabwe holds the largest fund for culture in the country, yet one of the core objectives in the agreement with SIDA is sustainable livelihoods. It is a key question for artists in the country whether this objective indeed supports the growth of the arts.

**Development Agenda not necessarily at Odds**

Research into all UN programme areas would reveal multiple ways in which existing artistic initiatives can be supported, whilst also supporting the programme objectives of the international or ‘external’ organisation. UNDP have a Dialogue Financing Facility that aims to:

1. Increase public participation in decision-making on national issues
2. Strengthen processes that seek to support maintenance of peace, national healing and nation building
3. Strengthen national forums that promote social policy dialogue
4. Make progress towards improved international perceptions of Zimbabwe

The arts play a crucial, powerful and culturally relevant role in opening up dialogue – and this might also be the driving intention of an artist. This fund is supporting Culture Fund in the project My Zimbabwe My Story, so has already recognised the importance of culture. The Culture Fund is also realising sector development aims by developing a space to create, share and develop stories from across Zimbabwe. There should be no reason why artists cannot build individual relationships with UNDP programmes
and conceive of further ways to work together.

The notion of selling out artistic credibility is prevalent, but not necessarily true. There are more mutually cohesive, ideologically matched possibilities between external donors and local artists and groups than currently realised.

Horizontal Institutional Relationships

The UNDP DFF My Zimbabwe Story programme provides a positive example of how two agendas can be equally realised. However it also demonstrates how large scale impactful projects come about as a result of institutional relationships, exclusive decision making processes which see artists as ‘beneficiaries’ as opposed to partners.

Artists as Beneficiaries

Artists are often described as beneficiaries as opposed to project implementers or active project managers/partners. This results in exclusion as well as gate keeping and bottleneck. All too often, from an international donor perspective, the local NGO is also described, or viewed, as the beneficiary. This makes the possibility of mutual goals and aims, and a genuine partnership, challenging.

Bottleneck between Funds available and ‘Beneficiaries’

Leading national organisations such as HIFA, Nhimbe Trust, Pamberi Trust and Savanna Trust are in a position to firstly know about large scale funds available both inside and outside this country and secondly are in a position to apply. Whilst these, and similar organisations, are delivering impactful programmes, an access strategy for artists to be involved requires further consideration and development, by organisations, and by donor and financing partners.

This brings the analysis back full circle to the fact there is:

A Major Gap between Donor Country Agenda for Development, and the Artist

Donors supporting development of the sector, and indeed the uses of arts and culture for development, are often informed by overarching national policies designed at country of origin level. This is often described as a problem, and will remain a problem as long as this perception remains reality. There is room for agendas to converge, be mutually beneficial and at the same time uncompromised. Successful examples of this include projects run by the National Gallery funded by the Norwegian Embassy (infrastructure), Nhimbe Trust funded by UNESCO IFCD (policy development) and Pamberi Trust funded by Africalia (SCAzim music project) – in these, mutually rewarding relationships have been established.

Massively Untapped Resources

- Internationally through trusts and foundations
- Nationally through corporate relationships
- Nationally through partnership with NGOs
- Through performing in high density areas to large audiences at affordable prices
Potential Unexploited Opportunities – International

Co-application by local groups/artists in partnership with institutions or organisations that have international standing and strong track records is a largely unexplored option for many. However, the Director of Alliance Francaise noted the institution could apply for grants, propose touring across the Alliance Francaise network and/or provide links to festivals, funding sources, venues and partners if approached with a high quality product or idea. An example of this happening recently was the link and financial support provided to produce the album Jacaranda Muse in France.

A number of embassies and funders cited links to their countries of origin being untapped.

Another underused route is to create independent links with donor-partner countries and seek support in that way. For example, Vincent Kaseke from the Norwegian Embassy explains how Norwegian Institutions can apply to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Norway on behalf of a project idea in Zimbabwe. This is how CHIPAWO won support for a touring exchange project in Southern Africa – the Ibsen Centre applied on their behalf in Norway and the Norwegian Embassy helped facilitate the project from Zimbabwe.

Very few respondents knew about global funds. For example the EU ACP fund or the EU Investing in People fund. Two further examples of untapped funds:

1. **Wanderlust – Fund for International Theatre Partnerships**

   Wanderlust is the urge to travel and broaden one’s horizons. The German Federal Cultural Foundation is committed to fulfilling this dream for municipal and state theatres in Germany, which would like to establish a partnership with a foreign theatre. “Wanderlust” is an application-based fund that finances theatre partnership and exchange for two to three seasons.

2. **DOEN Foundation based in the Netherlands supports various cultural development and exchange initiatives across Africa.**

   The international culture programme enhances the sustainability of creativity and cultural expression in some specific regions in Africa, where the cultural sector has not reached a mature cycle of development yet. Currently, DOEN focuses on North, East and West Africa with a special focus on Tunisia, Uganda and Mali. These regions/countries are the focal points from where we follow (and possibly finance) patterns of creativity that might go beyond national borders.

   DOEN also finances several international networks and funds that directly contribute to the sustainability of the cultural sector in Africa at large, such as the Arterial Network, African Synergy, Art Moves Africa and the Arab Fund for Arts and Culture. Finally, the international culture programme also has a worldwide programme that contributes directly to social innovation: Arts Collaboratory.

   For example, the Arts Collaboratory stimulates exchange between the initiatives in Africa, Asia and Latin America and visual arts organisations in the Netherlands. DOEN provides financial support, facilitates knowledge sharing, and promotes networking and artistic exchange. The total budget of the DOEN International Culture Programme
in 2013 is EUR 3 million.

African Synergy trust is established by Pamberi Trust and has therefore enabled Zimbabwean musicians and poets to tour South Africa and network in the region (Afro Slam, Alexio Kawara). Whilst the foundation’s focus is Tunisia, Uganda and Mali at the moment, this can change – especially with consistent lobbying.

**Potential Unexploited Opportunities – National**

Partnerships with local and international NGOs in Zimbabwe are sought by a limited number of practitioners and groups. For example, CAFOD has a special small grants scheme where it can support activity that pursues a specific development agenda. CAFOD has supported IIFF, Tumbuka and community arts clubs in the last couple of years.

**Unknowns**

There are still significant unknowns – how much funding there is available in the sector. If this was addressed and made transparent to all key players, funding decisions could be more proportionate, contextual, relevant and effective.

It is still unknown what is funded per sub-sector and what the ratio of spending on international involvement (whether showcasing, training, collaboration, importing) to spending on the local sector is.

Both these represent concerns as there is a perception that certain sectors are marginalised and a prevalent belief that foreign donors or embassies prioritise spending on international acts. This research indicates that a much higher percentage of funds available are spent on Zimbabwean artistic development and product. For example, Alliance Francaise apportions approximately 70% on local artistic product and Culture Fund is only mandated to support Zimbabwean work.

**Major Issues can be summarised as being:**

- The impact of donors’ funding agendas on the purpose of arts activities
- Commonly understood weakness amongst embassies and donors is the lack of comprehensive frameworks or indicators to measure impact
- Understanding that the intrinsic value of the arts is high amongst regular funders of the arts, and has grown in the commercial sector. This understanding appears to be relatively absent from government priorities.
- Lack of transparency and cohesion between donor agencies supporting the arts
- Lack of strategic direction in funding for the sector as a whole
- Where decision-making lies and who has ownership – artists and key stakeholders not able to lead or influence the agenda
- Perceived gap between treatment of black and white run organisations – in terms of donors’ preferred choices
- Perceived lack of relevance to Zimbabwe in large amount of donor/embassy funded arts activity
- Perceived lack of continuity – one off conferences or workshops are viewed as happening too often, and having little impact on developing the cultural sector
- Relationship with commercial partners unexploited by most donors, and artists
- Branding and visibility is a common concern for embassies funding culture
- The amount of funding available in the sector is relatively small compared to donor support to core development sectors such as Health or Education
- Government support is required.
9. Recommendations¹

Artistic Voice

To ensure that the voice and needs of the artist are considered as being of primary importance as Zimbabwe’s strategic national policy for arts and culture evolves

National Policy

That National Policy protects artists’ interests as well as the fulfilment of collectively determined sector-growth objectives

That this strategically guides investment, including donor funding, into the arts and culture sector

Platforms

That strategically positioned platforms for artistic voices in funding/budgeting be heard and information across the sector be shared.

Stronger Recognition of The Value of Culture and Cultural Activity by Donors

Lobbying by culture sector representatives to raise the status of culture as a valuable contributor to development

¹ Note: these are set out in addition to the recommendations collated in section
Further Research

That a comprehensive financial audit of income and expenditure by all financial sources into the sector is carried out

That continued collation of the information made available in this paper is carried out and that the information is made widely available, including being a live online tool
Perspective of a Cultural Practitioner:  
A Strategic View

Paul Brickhill, Book Café

The major strategic advantage determining the culture sector in Zimbabwe today is that ownership and capital employed in the sector, with relatively minor anomalies, is Zimbabwean. This ownership and investment is scattered across mainly small-medium enterprise pockets. Logically, cultural output therefore represents a reasonable cross-section of Zimbabwean cultural identity. The sector, especially performing arts, was arguably the first socio-economic sector to indigenise. It is an immense accomplishment, achieved with little fanfare around the decade 1997-2007, in the face of challenges in the era of globalisation in cultural industries – but sadly not much celebrated. It is a process now being consolidated, but fraught with problems around resources and infra-structure, including the impact of development assistance and future sources of investment in the sector.

Historically speaking, a national cultural hegemony is starting to be exercised by Zimbabweans for Zimbabweans: the cultural destiny of the country in a real sense now lies with its artists, writers and film-makers, its arts service providers and NGOs, its publishers, producers and promoters, its venues, theatres, galleries, bookshops and festivals, and, in variable degrees, cultural expression is being driven by Zimbabwean consumers and audiences, especially in performing arts. The process has been shepherded to date by the National Arts Council of Zimbabwe, with strategic input from the Culture Fund of Zimbabwe. As a result, in most genres of music, spoken word, theatre, comedy and dance, as well in craft, design, graphics, fashion and literature, but perhaps to a slightly less extent in fine arts (because a higher proportion of viable markets tend to be foreign), and in food, output represents diverse strands of Zimbabwean creative expression.

There are exceptions, the most jarring being ‘food-as-culture’. An overwhelming majority of listed or ‘rated’ restaurants (in various food forums) in urban areas and the capital, Harare, reflect cultural influences that are neither Zimbabwean nor African. Although this can imply an element of colonial hangover, it is more accurate to see this as one instance where investment representing cultural exchange in food culture has exposed a local cultural deficit in food as expression of cultural identity.

Because of its massive cultural multiplier effect influencing patterns of consumption, the more serious contradiction lies in production, distribution and consumption of film and TV products. The continental juggernaut DStv maintains a grip on what is watched in many Zimbabwean households. It is totally out of Zimbabwean control, while the beleaguered ZTV lurches from crisis to crisis, unable to fuel local production as the national broadcaster. The few cinemas show almost exclusively foreign films. Local film output collapsed in the mid-90s but a vibrant, notably young group of Zimbabwean film-makers is making some progress in short films and a few TV series. They need assistance to go to
the next level, feature films, documentaries and DVD distribution.

Publishing output (creative rather than school textbook orientated) and particularly the bookselling sub-sector all but collapsed in the period 2004-2009, but an increase in author-published materials has partly filled the void; some of these emergent publishers may grow towards professional publishing; meanwhile publishers that survived are slowly re-building backlists.

Regionally, within Zimbabwe, there are anomalies that demand attention. Matabeleland and Bulawayo in particular is under-represented in the national arts output across all arts disciplines because the region remains under-resourced. Variations on this pattern subsist to some degree in all provincial hubs, acutely in Manicaland and Midlands. Cultural output shows signs of becoming Harare-centric; this is a risk to national cultural hegemony. The question posed is simple: can Harare-centric cultural output represent cultural legacy, diversity and innovation of the whole nation?

Asserting cultural hegemony has meant first overcoming that preposterous but stubborn notion that European and North American culture – deemed to be of higher pedigree by virtue of economic scale, diversity and innovative fluidity, as well as distributive power in the era of globalisation – might therefore sit in artistic judgement over African culture. Simply put, for as long as one cares to remember, too many Zimbabwean artists and decision-makers in the arts, in an acquiescent way, have judged Zimbabwean cultural output by its reception overseas, in a global marketplace. The argument typically used is that this is the ultimate global arbiter of artistic quality in terms of content. Yes, this is one critical yardstick, but must of necessity be subservient to home-grown and regional African marketplaces, or it represents risk to cultural hegemony.

The strategic importance of national cultural hegemony cannot be over-stated. It is a process that one might call ‘liberating the culture within’. It is the only viable start-point for meaningful cultural development in terms of representing and growing diverse national cultural identity and re-gearing a ‘culture sector’, into a ‘creative industry sector’.

The process had begun in a more or less scattered way in 1970s struggle era and the 1980s post-independence honeymoon decade, as individual cultural practitioners, by degrees, started to take responsibility in various disciplines to fashion and re-discover distinctive Zimbabwean cultural identity. There are many positive examples showing the extent to which it was widely appreciated that Zimbabwean identity could not be truly expressed in the framework of cultural validation from abroad. Notably, within the culture sector, this idea transcends political or ethnic divisions. It is a question of ‘national self-interest’, or what one might term ‘Team Zimbabwe, in culture’.

This process is incomplete. Importantly however, from this conceptual bedrock, three decades into independence, an entirely new challenge arises for the arts industry: that is how to both assert Zimbabwean cultural identity in all forms and turn this into tangible socio-economic gain.

Like any formerly colonised nation, Zimbabwe is discovering how tortuous is the final chapter in fulfilling national cultural hegemony over its cultural resources and consumption; the closer we come to attaining the dream, the more we discover that no ‘easy victories’ remain, especially in
the economic sphere. Yes, we have indigenised most arts and culture sub-sectors. Now, how do we reap the rewards? What is required in terms of infrastructure, organisational and regulatory mechanisms, quality and content parameters, distributive patterns? And, most critically, from where does surplus arise to sustain growth?

As far as this ‘dream’ is concerned, there are far-sighted whispers that socio-economic development itself might be partly premised on how far Zimbabwe is capable of fully asserting cultural hegemony in its own territory, and unleashing that hidden economic potential. Ideas are the most powerful instruments of social progress and their dissemination, by and large, falls to the creative sector. Certainly, in large swaths of the global economy, creative industries are understood as the “motor within” of modern post-industrial enterprise in the information age. Zimbabwe is starting to wake up to its vast untapped riches in intellectual and creative resource capacity, its ‘intangible assets’.

A definitive move to re-gearing ‘culture’ in terms of a ‘creative industry’ is gathering momentum. Economic studies are replacing esoteric investigations into the nature of African culture. While answers are elusive, the right questions are being asked: how many are gainfully employed in the creative sector, what is the value of the domestic market, of exports, are exports being repatriated to generate growth, where is value-added taking place (Zimbabwe or abroad), what wealth creation (surplus) is being generated? What is the role of festivals and arts hubs as economic catalysts? What is the role of NGOs as both specialist service providers and development incubators?

On the other hand there can be no denying facts, easily verified from global research vehicles, including UNCTAD and UNESCO and thousands of think-tanks and articles from Asia to Latin America, Europe and North America: the fastest growing and most dynamic creative industries are those in which the state (national, regional and municipal levels) provides coherent subsidy and/or incentive, without state or political patronage systems obstructing progress. There are hundreds of relevant examples, the most appropriate of which – for Africa – might be found in Latin America.

In Zimbabwe, like most of Africa, the state does provide minimal subsidy or incentive to the arts, except in the old-fashioned construct of maintaining annual grants to culture-designated parastatals (effectively ‘strategically placed institutions of state in the arts’ established by and large in the colonial period as the ‘development incubators’ of their day). On the contrary, Zimbabwe increasingly taxes the arts; in other words it removes surplus funds and liquidity from artistic enterprise, rendering it less able to regenerate sufficient surplus to accelerate its own growth. Further, the state has been unable to invest significantly in cultural infra-structure.

This model has meant that a generation of innovators: emerging artists, arts enterprises, NGOs, even new art forms, learned that the route to subsidy and support desperately needed to initiate and sustain growth lies in the corridors of funding agencies, which consequently must wield considerable sway over what is funded, how long, how much and for what purpose. One can hardly blame the agencies concerned: they are primarily accountable to their own tax-payer or other benefactor, and must play by their rules. The role of development assistance, traditionally that of complementing state efforts and capacity has been partly distorted in this instance, to that of supplanting state
responsibilities in this sector. Aid dependency represents another risk to national cultural hegemony. Looking at examples from Latin America, arguably two decades ahead of Africa on the road to harnessing economic power within culture, this can change when two strands enter the equation:-

1. When cultural policy to harness and yield local cultural product is devised and crafted jointly by practitioners and state consensus for such policy, each part claiming mutual authorship and ownership over such policy; the principle applied here is profound in its simplicity – implementation becomes effective when the primary implementer – the cultural practitioner – claims joint ownership of national policy and is of necessity invested in its outcomes.

2. When all Ministries and institutions of state, including local government, modify and then codify their regulatory instruments to suit the imperative of such a cultural policy geared to harnessing growth and resource capacity (as agreed by cultural practitioners), not the other way around. At present, a dozen or more institutions of state as well as statutory bodies define regulatory apparatus towards culture quite independently of each other, without reference to ‘national self-interest’ as expressed in any overarching cultural strategy.

It takes trust and belief in cultural practitioners to delegate this degree of responsibility. It is a partnership built around “national self-interest”, in which the state understands, having indigenised to reflect national interest, the creative sector is historically both capable and duty-bound to jointly craft and agree strategy to unleash its enormous power. The cultural practitioner understands, in turn, a sacred responsibility to safeguard the “intangible assets” of the nation since these are intrinsic and fundamental to national socio-economic goals (currently expressed in ZimAsset). It is a form of social contract, variations of which can be found today from India to Brazil, from South Africa to Sweden. Call it ‘smart partnership’ or ‘win-win’, but whatever term we give it, it works.

Such fine-tuned balance of interests is only ever achievable because of a critical factor called ‘political will’, a term so often applied in cultural and also book policy realisation.

This always entails compromises; realism dictates that divergent views become modified and compromised with the goal of reaching a critical mass of consensus that may then be encompassed into one holistic policy and regulatory apparatus that accurately reflects the critical mass of stakeholders – all institutions of state and all organised practitioner stakeholders.

In sum, once a critical mass of stakeholders achieves cohesion over goals and method, resources (financial and economic, as well as social and political will to see the goals succeed) can be harnessed more effectively; the sector tends to grow at an accelerated pace, and to become more efficient and accountable. It is no longer the case of “beneficiary competition” over scarce resources, including corporate input and development grants, but a matter of national self-interest that, ideally, promotes partnership-building within the sector.

Before turning to the structure of the ‘creative industry’ in Zimbabwe, let us consider one troubling example of the real risks entailed to cultural hegemony, in keeping with our own risks in a globalised economy. Around the turn of the millennium, UNESCO undertook a ground-breaking economic
study of the value of a single art form, Jamaican reggae. The annual global turnover plus net gain in tangible asset value, in all economic forms, hard (CDs) and soft (downloads, concerts and tours, intellectual and distribution rights) was valued at an incredible **US$2 billion per annum**! Take note, this is not a figure to gloss over: one art form in one Caribbean island is comparable to the turnover of diamond output in Zimbabwe! Then, the reality check: the study concluded that 95% of the value-added (not so much profit per se as gross surplus from manufacturing and distribution) was attributed to economic activity **outside Jamaica** – London, Paris, New York and Miami being cited as some major centres. Just 5% remains in Jamaica for regeneration and reinvestment!

I have started my short piece on a ‘cultural practitioner’s view’ of resource allocation in culture purposely; to explain practically and precisely what is meant by a term ‘infant industry’ that applies to the creative sector in Zimbabwe, and what becomes achievable when an infant creative sector upgrades to intermediate stage by means of coherence in policy. The important lessons here apply universally, because if culture is to a large extent specific and local, cultural policy application is not, we do not need to re-invent the wheel, we need only to adapt it to local conditions.

So what is achievable? About 18 years ago I was fortunate to be exposed, through UNESCO and my work in the African Publishers Network, to a fascinating and sweeping cultural process in books and culture in Latin America. Ever since, I have pondered its implications for African culture, and asked “what keeps us in Africa from reaching this destination?”

Cultural practitioners (actually book publishers in this instance) in Latin America had started to report, according to hard data, that their centuries-old legacy of being a net importer of books from the dominant European economies had historically reversed; Latin America, they maintained, had become a **net exporter of books to Europe**, including former colonial powers, Spain and Portugal.

While baseline data on books are easier to collate than other cultural products and disciplines, my Latin American colleagues were adamant that a comparable shift subsisted across the entire creative sector economy: in books, music, fine art, design, fashion, craft, theatre and television and many specialist areas of culture (but not in film and cultural ‘hardware’, equipment), Latin America, continentally, had become a **net exporter of cultural product**. Trade in cultural product between the Latin American states had also reached an all-time high and was growing exponentially. **That is what I call ‘development’**.

**Zimbabwean Creative Economy – Realities**

It has been argued by some that Zimbabwe does not have a Creative Sector Economy. I dispute this, mainly on personal experience. I witness various workings of this largely informal sector economy every day as a practitioner. It is more accurate to make two definitive statements:

- The larger proportion of the Creative Economy currently operates under the statistical radar because it typically comprises informal sector SME and micro-economic activity; as a result it is ignored by economic planners, think-tanks and financial institutions
- Since there is no immediate economic benefit to formal incorporation and registration (and
in such a way as statistics might be captured and instruments devised to do this), the SME operators active in the Creative Sector tend to avoid registration unless compelled: formal, legal registration brings with it taxes, compliance fees and requirements and bureaucratic hurdles that are seen as obstacles to growth since the operators concerned do not yet have capacity to meet these requirements.

The Creative Sector remains in its formative stage and, as an economic sector, we would ascribe to it the typical attributes of a nascent, SME/informal, so-called ‘infantile’ economic sector that generates substantial (but unknown) turnover and employment, but does not (as yet) produce sufficient surplus as a sector to be able to make its next step, from ‘informal/formative’ to ‘mostly formal/intermediate’. It is in this sense we ascribe the term ‘infant industry’.

At the base of the pyramid of a Zimbabwean ‘Creative Sector Economy’ an overwhelming majority of de facto economic formations producing artistic content are small enterprises (1 to 5, up to 10 persons). They are emerging in economic terms, proprietor managed and largely not registered (as companies or any other legal registration, such as partnership, association, cooperative, non-government organisation). From a legal standpoint these ‘arts practitioners’ are self-employed entities or partnerships. Individuals frequently cross-subsidise their passion for arts activities with other sources of income, therefore there is a large segment of ‘part-employed’ arts practitioners. They have little formal interchange with formal sector economy (for example statutory vehicles such as NSSA, employment councils, ZIMRA registration and tax certificates, and others such as medical aid, formal contracts of employment under labour regulations). They have a fluid relationship with the state, depending on use-value of this relationship, and its regulatory mechanisms.

In this category exist well over 90% of bands and musical acts, sound and recording studios, informal art and craft producers and exhibitors, most film makers, theatre groups, dance ensembles, all poets and niche areas like stand-up comedy, self-published authors, fashion designers, as well as most of the service and technical service sub-sector that provide sound, staging, technical, repair, logistic, costume, design, promotion, web technology, and transport services and so on.

While this segment of the Creative Economy looks (and is in a structural sense) chaotic, unregulated and mostly disorganised (in the sense of representative associations able to engage and lobby the state), practically it is effective, productive, flexible and – in respective arts disciplines – skilled, even where self-taught, exhibiting a high degree of business acumen (even where management and accounting functions are weak). While there is zero access to bank loans or venture capital (except private loans) capital is generated, on the whole, through clever business deals, small scale investments, product knowledge, energetic marketing and resilience. Overseas contacts are used effectively. There are individual operators in the parallel service sector, gaining livelihood – technically speaking – as ‘consultants’, offering technical skills on small commissions. It is impossible to quantify the number but it runs to hundreds.

That there is a powerful entrepreneurial spirit at work is abundantly clear – survival in challenging
local circumstances depends solely on this.

Above this exists the ‘top tier’ of formal, regulated structures – registered businesses, NGOs, associations, partnerships and individuals. This segment arguably accounts for no more than a third to a half of gross production and turnover volumes in the entire Creative Economy (depending on sub-sector), but it is in a ‘strategic’ position in terms of relationships with the state (as registered vendors, service providers and so forth), and with grant funders.

Here one will find music recording companies, some, but not all, internationally recognised and touring artists, music schools, arts festivals and big concert organisers, some promoters, galleries, bookshops, most bona fide publishers, theatres and theatre companies, dance schools, performing arts venues, clubs, importers and exporters of hardware, art galleries, as well as established arts NGOs and some of the better organised trade associations.

In this top-tier, there is a significantly high degree of engagement with and access to external development funding and exchange and interaction with overseas contacts, suppliers and customers, including embassies. Understandably, the vast majority of academic and other policy-related papers view arts and culture through the prism of this upper-end of the sector.

To all intents and purposes, the ‘top tier’ of Creative Economy, especially in the absence of viable representative associations, serves to represent the entirety of Creative Sector beneficiaries that produce the bulk of artistic content in terms of engagement with funding streams, and in specific instances, linkages with the state.

It is virtually impossible to aggregate in quantitative terms how the Zimbabwean ‘Creative Economy’ functions in terms of finance, investment, turnover generated and trade, since it differs between disciplines and sub-sectors, and no authoritative means of collating economic statistics exists in the large informal SME micro-economic sub-structure. Some generalisations however are pertinent.

The music sector remains financially fuelled by live music and touring, sometimes outside Zimbabwe’s borders, its turnover is generated largely through audiences and in close, frenetic partnership with clubs, bars, and other venues, and of course music promoters. CD sales, with some exceptions, comprise less than 25% aggregate of typical music income (in stark contrast to South Africa), but this is growing. It is, by and large, an entirely ‘local economy’.

In film, a growing number of low-budget short films are being made, perhaps approaching a hundred annually. Much of the funding appears to arise from small-scale private investment. The digital era of film-making has drastically lowered the economic ‘entry-level’, in terms of financing needs and quality parameters (equipment required). Elsewhere, this is mostly driven by small-scale grant funding, minor investment by overseas benefactors, and otherwise self-financed, a labour of love.

Arts festivals are dependent on small to medium grants from embassies and mainly European cultural agencies (for artists’ fees and travel, staging and sound – that is ‘content’), and increasingly the local corporate sector (branding, marketing). HIFA in particular generates significant volumes of
revenue through gate receipts and food and beverage sales. Major concerts that may approximate in some ways the size and function of festival formations are also largely funded by ticket-sales and corporate sponsorship, initial capital outlay typically provided by private venture capital sources.

Fine arts and crafts obviously manufacture finished goods to be re-sold in the retail sector, and frequently the informal retail sector (flea-markets, street sales) largely to tourists and visitors, and occasionally at the upper end of the market receive more significant inflows towards the exhibitions that, in effect represent a marketing platform. Otherwise fine arts are typically export oriented, and most successful painters and sculptors survive financially from overseas commissions and sales.

Little creative writing or social-sciences publishing makes a profit. Publishing remains financially driven by the education (textbook) sector; previously this was able to cross-subsidise risky areas of children’s books, fiction and social sciences output (geared within a single publishing house). Where this is absent, grant funding is often required and sometimes co-publishing agreements with overseas publishers facilitates this. Small scale, niche publishing seems to survive on ‘the sniff of a rag’ based on proprietor management, zero overheads and a publisher’s passion.

Theatre and dance, as well as spoken word expression, is largely externally funded, since – unlike music, as a performing art – it cannot generate sufficient turnover from audiences. Traditional dance survives within its cultural milieu as an amateur arts expression. Stand-up comedy is an interesting exception and is able to generate income and growth increasingly from ticket-sales.

Cutting across all disciplines are thousands of small, direct social ‘connections’ into Europe, USA, Canada, Australia, Japan, South Africa and elsewhere, bringing all manner of opportunities for sales, touring, help, loans, gifts, exposure, marketing; through Diaspora connections or well-wishers. Africans arts practitioners are exceptionally gifted at networking in this way, and Zimbabwe is no exception.

Throughout this scattered Creative Economy, whether formal in the top-tier, or informal in a vast swathe of entrepreneurship there is zero access to formal loan, investment or bridging capital, (except small, private investments). From an economic angle, development funding may be deemed to be a form of ‘investment capital’ in reality, although ‘pitched’ around development rationale. There is no micro-financing vehicle in existence able to bridge the funding gap, as might take place in some other segments of the SME and micro informal sector.

It is evident everywhere how resilient the largely informal sector Creative Economy has been. Not only has it grown with insignificant capital inflow, it has maintained employment, livelihoods and incomes more robustly than much of the formal economy. This is not at all unusual – it reflects, generally, global growth in Creative Industries, and Africa and Zimbabwe is fully part of this growth.

The major contradiction that must be overcome for the nascent creative sector to grow towards intermediate industry status in a formal economy, and to generate significant surplus to do this is that currently, arts initiatives, in order to survive, operate underneath regulatory mechanisms to avoid taxes and compliances. To do this, they must remain small, invisible. This discourages growth,
economy of scale solutions, joint enterprise, trade (exports and imports), artistic movement, larger scale ventures, and – in effect – economic activities likely to produce surplus and then sustain growth by reinvesting surplus.

As a final comment we must investigate the pros and cons of 75% local content regulations in the broadcast sector, alongside the regulatory obstacles to incoming tours of music and other art forms that generate revenue locally. The policy intentions appear geared towards stimulating local cultural production and consumption, and the principle is correct, ‘national self-interest’. My own view is that, artistically, the trade-off cost (of insulation from artistic trends and innovations, especially African and from ‘the South’) is too high. African cultural expression inside and outside the continent has arisen, historically, from transience, movement, migration, hybridity, adaptation and exchange within Africa. Africans are the supreme innovators in the arts. There are hundreds of examples: techniques and styles subsumed into local cultural and sensibility and ‘made local’.

When we turn off the tap to all ‘foreign’ cultural influence (including African and African-derived) to stimulate local output and expression, we also turn off the tap to rich veins of cultural knowledge. Here I am mostly concerned only about African cultural expressions and those derived ‘from the South’, many of which originated, in part, from Africa: Latin ‘samba’ and rumba, jazz and blues, spirituals and authentic hip hop, some contemporary dance, theatre, poetry, and in another way, cultural and intellectual product emerging from the African Diaspora.

More compelling is the simple economics informed by the African scale of economy. Our artists, like all African artists, need markets to grow. The size of any given market will ultimately and ruthlessly determine and approximate the scale and scope of aggregate cultural product. This is not a question of how good an individual artist is; larger markets create the necessary upstream (technical and production capacity) and downstream (distributive) linkages that compete more effectively and produce a multiplier effect in the sector that produces more top-level artists. It is not by accident that South African and Nigerian artists dominate rankings of ‘arts in Africa’ (for example by sales, visibility, branding and so forth). This applies across the board: music, film, books and literature, theatre and so forth. It is no accident that West African French-speaking musicians dominate globally in African music simply because of access to foreign French markets, namely Brussels and Paris.

Our immediate and natural markets, beyond our territory, lie in Southern, Central and East Africa: specifically the SADC territories. On a reciprocal basis African countries must of necessity overcome barriers to movement of arts and artists for ‘national self-interest’ to establish regional markets that stimulate growth. It is a form of cultural pan-Africanism and African cultural renaissance, entirely in keeping with a vision of Africa’s cultural emancipation. Southern African domestic markets, with the exception of South Africa, are too small to sustain growth and create sufficient surplus. The few exceptions to this only prove the rule. It is worrisome when the similar rationale is applied to neighbouring arts, say Mozambican marrabenta or Zambian theatre, which struggle just as we do to survive and have much to offer in cultural knowledge and exchange, as to corporate juggernauts in the ‘entertainment industry’, big name stars with all advantages of global marketing.
Zimbabwean Creative Economy – Funding Streams

Amongst the pitfalls, problems as well as benefits relating to grant funding streams, and corporate buy-in to arts and culture, four stand out as ‘strategic’ in my estimation as a practitioner.

Firstly, there is an issue of mechanisms and criteria of fund application, we might simply express as ‘how, and in what verifiable ways, does grant funding stimulate local arts production and consumption?’ How does it actually grow the creative sector economy and what are the models that show this? It is tempting and typical for grant funding to take an almost mechanical view limited to how ‘final beneficiaries’ receive immediate tangible input and support. The Creative Sector economy however, above all, requires organised infra-structure that can sustain systemic benefit to ‘many’ artists: in music, by way of example, recording facilities, rehearsal facilities, management and marketing, platforms for exposure and revenue (venues, festivals), equipment, technical support, legal support, distribution channels for recordings (hard and soft), regional and international touring support, transport, and strategically speaking, methods of enhancing career development and employment for emerging artists that in turn regenerate and grow the sector.

The criteria of accountability overlap but are not the same. Too often, in my opinion, ‘soft’ application of grant funding results in support to ‘final beneficiaries’ that does not build or sustain organised infra-structure development (I return here to the theme of ‘national self-interest’), but temporarily alleviates areas of individual acute need applied in small-scale ad hoc fashion.

Secondly, noticeably, the entry-level for major grant funding streams is becoming much more technically demanding overall. I think this will turn out to be a plus, but it seems certain it is happening whether advantageous or not. I think a lot now depends on how our cultural practitioners respond. Governance standards, including finance and audit, legal and contractual terms, and reporting and compliance protocols applied to the culture sector have risen appreciably in a technical sense. The overall number of direct recipients has consequently fallen. Budgets are under obvious pressure. I was told a year ago by a Norwegian funder that this would happen, and that strategically, African practitioners desirous of grant funding needed to re-think their function and position, as ‘this is about to get serious’. The old donor-recipient paradigm is shifting. A simple proposal and budget, followed after activity by a narrative and financial report has been replaced by detailed, continuous (or at least periodic) reporting and quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Funders appear to be seeking African partners with capacity and track-record to take on, or maybe take over the main elements of the administration and compliance (that I imagine previously might have been done at ‘head office’). Project management is the new ‘trendy’ term, and it entails significant administrative bureaucracy. It tends to eat into practical areas of project implementation unless the practitioner is well prepared and careful.

Concurrently, there is a clear trend towards ‘groupings’ and ‘platforms’ and ‘partnerships’ of multiple recipients working together to produce a ‘larger capacity – bigger result’, and to be able
to sustain output. Alongside, a very positive and strategic development in my view, executive decision-making seems to be increasingly delegated to the ‘local partners’ working together.

Thirdly, there is noticeable tangible growth concerning corporate business buy-in to ‘Team Zimbabwe in Culture’. Currently it is still mainly limited to branding and marketing ‘feel-good’ budgets, with some CSR elements: essentially an alternative method (to sports sponsorship for example) for a business or product to obtain public visibility. As welcome as this is, ultimately it represents an a\textit{d hoc} approach and limitation in thinking. Creative Sector Economy stakeholders require linkage with bankers, financiers, accountants, business planners and the full gamut of corporate business skills that begin to understand and unpack the cultural product, the creative method and its vast economic potential. Arts is an area of investment that must be seen to produce reasonable risk and return on investment in the normal way, whether product or purely distribution based, albeit most likely over a longer gestation period.

The decisive step might be some form of ‘culture investment conference’ that invites the captains of industry and creative practitioners to investigate viable forms of investment, ‘bankable’ forms of return on investment and cross-sector linkages that apply, for example culture and tourism (cultural tourism being a developed niche tourist product), or even culture and property development (cultural zones that add value to properties in an area).

My final comment on funding streams is rather simple: in the absence of well-organised functional arts associations (there are a few exceptions), other means must be found to verify and record, and ultimately hold accountable stakeholder recipients of grant funding. Since the development funds are, in principle, applied for the purpose of public – not private – developmental goals, their use and outcomes must necessarily be transparent and ideally publicly accountable. I favour any system that requires stakeholder recipients to formally lodge their annual reports and audited accounts with the National Arts Council in such a way that transparency and public accountability becomes an added ‘check and balance’ over fund application. If we are serious about ‘national self-interest’ and ‘Team Zimbabwe in Culture’, we must be publicly seen to be accountable to the national interest. This is not a form of control; it is rather a method by which we build trusting relationships in our sector.
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Why Should Government Support the Arts, and What is Our Obligation?

If the Zimbabwe International Film Festival made a film based on the local cultural industries what would be the plot? Who would be cast in the lead roles?

If we were to set up a stock market for the local cultural industries, who would be the movers and shakers?

You have just received $500m to invest in local cultural industries in five priority areas of research and development/innovation, training, production, distribution and marketing, which ten cultural organisations would you award $50m each? On the other side, name ten cultural industries that have potential to generate $500m?

What particular accomplishments would cause the local cultural industries to make headlines in an international magazine such as Newsweek or the Economist?

Who will be the next Zimbabwean cultural entrepreneur to make it into the Forbes Magazine?

Who is/are the local cultural entrepreneur/s who will be at the 2015 World Economic Forum?

In the majority of instances, cultural discourses shy away from the above and insist on – why should government support the arts?

Cultural industries care less or do they believe that government is currently grappling with how to ensure long-term productivity and economic competitiveness? What solutions are available for chronic challenges in education, health care, environment and climate change, and employment?

In the economic environment currently obtaining in the country there is more scrutiny than before on areas of government spending. All government tax revenue becomes competitive. In the advent of ZIMASSET, the government economic blueprint, which is devoid of the appreciation and recognition of cultural industries as a critical part of the forgoing national economic agenda, what chance do the cultural industries stand to become a significant benefactor of ZIMASSET and the national budgets that aid it? Through this lens an argument may ensue that cultural is either social or economic and therefore at best it should fall under the two lead government ministries of social services and of economy development! Is the current lack of meaningful government support for cultural industries due to a lack of awareness and appreciation of their value or limited government revenue against many competing priorities?

Experiences elsewhere show that when policymakers understand the benefits of cultural industries to government and to citizens, they find a way to continue support, even during hard financial
times such as these.

While it is a fact that cultural industries create jobs and produce tax revenue, in the absence of supporting credible statistical evidence this argument cannot hold sway with government. While cultural industries have a track record of cultivating young imaginations and facilitating success in school and of enhancing students’ academic achievement in multiple subject areas, the gains made in post independent Zimbabwe are being eroded by government policy that frustrates mainstream arts finding their way into schools. The full potential of cultural industries in promoting democracy, engaging citizens in civic discourse, providing forums for important issues and encouraging collective problem solving has been curtailed by the enactment and enforcement of legislation on partisan political lines. The repatriation of the stone Zimbabwe birds, significance of the Zimbabwean flag and national anthem as cultural legacies that preserve culture and heritage, passing along a our country’s unique character and traditions to future generations of citizens, cannot be overemphasised. How can we afford to support the arts in hard times? Economic downturns, natural disasters and other hardships require public officials to make the most of every asset and to adopt policies that maximize the government recovery potential. Cultural industries are a proven part of that mix.

In the words of the Southern Legislative Conference, “...the growing strength of [the arts] as proven admirably during the most recent downturn, when they continued to create positive economic flows despite depleted budgets, may bring a time when policymakers think twice about substantially cutting funding during the next economic crunch.”

Cultural industries are also central to community resilience: whether the government is facing economic distress, natural disasters or other adversity, cultural industries are a powerful force for recovery and healing, a benefit that few other industries offer. Even with a reasonable increase in budget allocation, cultural industries would comprise a very small portion of government spending, and not supporting the cultural industries, under the guise of tight prioritisation or reducing government expenditure, continues to erode the cultural sector’s ability to provide jobs, goods and services. Furthermore, cultural cutbacks can lead to greater losses, since cultural grantees use the “seal of approval” of government funding to attract funding and financing from other sources. Government funding of cultural industries cannot be substituted by corporate philanthropy as market pressures can narrow cultural experiences by favouring the most popular or commercially successful cultural expressions, thereby jeopardizing cultural preservation. In comparison, government investment in culture is citizen-driven and beholden to the public interest. It supports inclusive experiences and socially conscious civic engagement and ensures that all citizens benefit. Government support also provides fair access to cultural resources, especially among underserved citizens.

It is worth stating that important civic functions of cultural industries are not routinely accomplished through corporate support or the marketplace. These civic functions encourage inclusive dialogue and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, which are vital to a democratic, pluralistic society, and they can be seen as providing a lifelong education of democratic citizenship. While corporate philanthropy may yield some of these benefits, they are market externalities and no
substitute for a government role in educating its citizenry. It is also worth dispelling the myth that government funding to culture causes dependence on public funding as cultural industries rely on a blend of funds, predominantly earned income and private contributions. Although the mix of funds varies among different kinds and sizes of arts organizations, government funding is typically a very modest slice of the pie. Despite its small size, that percentage plays a significant role in providing benefits to citizens. Government support therefore ensures the accessibility of cultural expressions and heritage as well as strengthens education programmes and the public outreach that aligns cultural programming with the needs of citizens.

In the 1990s the local cultural industries diagnosed one of its ‘illnesses’ as the perennial gap between income and expense. Later, ‘remedies’ like audience-building were tried, but to no avail. Now there seems to be growing concern that emphasis on the ‘illness’ the cultural industries face has, perhaps distracted us from a close scrutiny of the achiever cultural industries whose best practices or impact stories should stimulate further innovations and practices. Is there anyone looking closely enough at the healthy cultural industries thriving in our midst? Can we not, as is the medical field, direct our gaze away from curing illness and toward encouraging the practices that define lifelong good health? I believe so and we should. While good health is its own reward in real life, this seems not necessarily the case in the cultural industries. In fact, stable and well-managed cultural industries bemoan being often “penalised” for their forethought or good practice. Some are threatened with reduction or withdrawal of funding, as they do not show substantial or growing annual deficits! We all know of cases where chronically ill non-profits receive major grant after major grant, often profiting financially while their more responsible peers pinch pennies.

The vast majority of cultural industries encountered face no questions about their right to life. They provide valuable work. Instead, the “illness” often observed is one of weak management leading to financial troubles, a sort of malnutrition where cash and expertise cannot sustain an organisation. Nevertheless, why do some cultural industries develop and grow while others are sickly and in near-constant financial pain?

Studying thriving local cultural industries, both for profit and non-profit, may help us redefine and refine our views on healthy cultural industries’ lifestyles. The value of such study is not to discover “cures” for cultural industries’ woes but rather to define health in order to promote it. Let it be clear from the outset that, as in life, good health is a lifetime commitment. No programme that anyone can design will turn years of high risk, low return lifestyle into cultural industry health. It is a challenge to investors in local culture to move away from cures or fixes for cultural industry ills and focus instead on preventive measures.

Over the years, I have worked with both outstandingly successful cultural industries and frighteningly endangered ones. Through it all, seven critical habits emerged as particular indicators of good corporate governance and good stewardship of investor support, management resilience and health. All indicators were largely present in healthy cultural industries and notably absent in their more troubled peers. The seven indicators enabled and often caused a highly desirable effect on financial sustainability and stewardship.
Accountability: Less healthy cultural industries shun accountability, without which they can quickly become ‘about’ politics, popularity, or personalities; paths that typically lead anywhere but to success. Accountability is perhaps the most critical of all the seven habits identified.

Management in Sync: Too often, the quality of cultural industries’ management is far below the quality of their products or services. When this balance is discordant, the industry begins to malfunction and, as most investors know, cultural industries are far more complex to cure than to maintain in good health. In-sync management deploys limited resources where they will do the most short-term good. Unhealthy cultural industries often have difficulty detecting any health problem less dramatic than a “heart attack”! Out-of-sync cultural industries lack the feedback that keeps decision-making in touch with a fast-paced and competitive creative economy.

Being discordant can be costly. Beyond lost-opportunity costs, its most expensive side effect is the likelihood that the artistic or service mission will grow well beyond the capacity of management to support that mission, putting the entire organisation at high risk. Management that is in harmony with its artistic and service activities should become the norm.

Low, inexpensive learning curve: Healthy cultural industries keep their management learning curves low, short, and inexpensive. They refuse to pay the high price of on-the-job learning and instead recruit staff and boards that bring relevant abilities and new outlooks, plus real-world experience into their governance and management functions. Further, healthy cultural industries support their boards and management by investing in their training, motivation and retention.

While on the other hand, less healthy cultural industries are myopic in terms of keeping their thumb on the cost-benefit pulse. Such creative industries prove repeatedly the truth of Derek Bok’s famous remark, ‘If you think education is expensive, try ignorance’.

Cultural industries with outstanding standard cultural expression often exhibit skewed management, board, or both. This can be due in part to their cultural expression being embedded in the personality of their founder or artistic director. When this is the case the resulting learning curve can have a near-fatal effect. Often such cultural industries struggle to retain professional staff, given the style of leadership synonymous with such cultural industries which borders on autocracy. Parochialism can often raise learning curve costs still higher, by continually discouraging or silencing fresh new opinions, particularly from scholars, intellectuals and academics in the cultural field. Intentionally or not, some cultural investors often encourage or perpetuate the practice through a primary emphasis on an organisation’s artistic or programme strength without corresponding due consideration and balance to good corporate governance and management. One common effect of keeping learning curves low is that experienced leadership demands increasing accountability and transparency.

Clarity about competition: When measuring to stay in sync and the need to keep the learning curves low, competition is the horizon line. It is should be on the dashboard, something the organisation scans frequently because it is only partly in its control, yet it drives statistics, opinions and perception in the market place. Unhealthy cultural industries always answer my questions about competition in the same way. ‘Oh, we really don’t have any competition. No one offers exactly what we do’. They
are uncomfortable with competition, view it too narrowly for their own good, and fail to consider it in their day-to-day decision-making. It is exceedingly difficult today to be a successful cultural organisation in the absence of clarity about competition. Lacking this clarity, the decision-making process can be dysfunctional, driven by those three evils: politics, popularity, or personality. Cultural industries that are specific and clear about their competitive goals and positioning tend to invest in policies that foster such.

High responsiveness: Visiting severely ‘sick’ cultural industries, one is often struck by the barricades that management has built to insulate the organisation from its public. Complaint letters and phone calls go unanswered. Internal staff dissent is countered with intimidation, blackmail, threats, avoidance, or at worst, dismissal. A bunker mentality often prevails, pitting demotivated staff against disgruntled stakeholders.

In healthy cultural industries, the Director personally accepts and responds to complaints, reasoning that even the smallest changes must begin at the top. Today’s healthy cultural industries value feedback and gather it constantly and routinely, using such vehicles as questionnaires, email and social media. They seek and create opportunities to meet stakeholders one-to-one. By policy, cultural industries respond to all feedback, good or bad, immediately. Unresponsive cultural industries sooner or later lose touch with reality, becomes insular, and out of touch, often becoming defensive and downright unattractive. The cost of unresponsiveness often manifests in expensive yet preventable poor market or audience retention and disinterest from potential investors, as well as low and often short investor retention. Healthy and responsive cultural industries are in touch with their diverse stakeholders. They constantly match internal needs with outside resources, striving to maintain a healthy balance.

Risk management competency: Healthy cultural industries accept risk as an unpleasant fact and manage it as just one more daily cost-to-benefit ratio. They actually seek limited, managed risks and embrace a test-measure-retest strategy within their plan-measure-re-plan lifestyle. Without risks, there are no rewards and healthy cultural industries actively seek the best rewards.

Less healthy cultural industries are often completely risk averse, viewing even the smallest change as hugely dangerous, even if they have far more to gain than to lose. Unhealthy management is often unaware of testing as an option, and views risks as leading to frightening, all-or-nothing, roll-of-the-dice outcomes. They are often ignorant of how to manage risk, having long used their relative isolation to practice risk avoidance.

The ability to evaluate and manage risk can disappear within cultural industries, just as an unused muscle will atrophy. When this happens, management is rendered virtually colour-blind in a world where red/stop and green/go traffic lights govern every street corner in today’s fast paced and highly competitive cultural industries and marketplace. A risk adverse management tends over time to become more and more conservative, more and more fearful of the unknown in a dangerous downward spiral.

The ability to take and to manage risk enables healthy cultural industries to make investments and
to build a record of accomplishment of return on those investments.

**Investment in relationships:** Despite the fact that their livelihood depends in large measure on individuals, dysfunctional cultural industries often astound me with their inability to make and sustain even the simplest human relationships.

Let us say your Aunt Jane sends you US$100 every year on your birthday. She has done this every year for 30 years, a “cumulative gift” of US$3000. However, Aunt Jane is not your favourite aunt, so you often neglect to phone her. You cannot remember her birthday. Last year her Christmas card was returned because you misaddressed it, and you never got around to resending it. Well, lo and behold, Aunt Jane one day will stop sending you that birthday gift... at a potential cost to you that could have included her bequest.

Dysfunctional cultural industries fail to invest in Aunt Jane, telling her they cannot afford to call or write. ‘Do you know how many “aunts” I have who send me money and gifts?’ an unhealthy management asks; ‘I couldn’t possibly phone each of them! I would go broke!’ A dysfunctional management sees this as yet another item they ‘can’t afford’... one, which of course, costs them more and more in income and goodwill with each passing year.

Healthy cultural industries know they cannot afford not to thank Aunt Jane, because there are just not that many loving and generous aunts in anyone’s life. They call her immediately when they get her card, send a chatty thank you note, and make sure she is remembered at Christmas and on her birthday. The message they deliver is, ‘You are special, you are valuable, and I am honoured by your gift’. Healthy management has many corporate, individual, civic, and foundation Aunt Janes, and invests in getting to know them as explicit agenda items with their own budgets and long-term goals.

The majority of cultural industries are dependent for their health upon annually renewable relationships with prospective donors, grant officers, and audiences. Yet only the healthiest cultural industries actually invest sufficiently in these critical relationships. Strong relationships combined with and enabled by the other six habits most often produces results.

**Financial stability:** A healthy management uses all its habits to achieve financial stability, thus staying in relative possession of its short-term destiny. The seven habits serve as a constant early warning system of when risks or relationships are out of balance and might affect income. An in-control management always registers excess income and becomes a shrewd investor in property. Cultural industries with these seven habits are our true health maintenance organisations, and they benefit from higher morale and markedly lower leadership burnout than our ‘showbiz industry’ norms.

A less healthy management typically focuses on income and sees no need for any early warning devices. It waits for the bank to send the overdraft notice. It tends to be reactive (but not responsive). Moreover, in reacting, it finds its options are limited and its lifestyles deeply frustrating. Low morale and burnout often cycle through it like an annual flu, often causing high turnover of valuable staff and volunteers. Income cannot be sustained and deficits become one symptom in an unhealthy
syndrome.

Fostering Health Awareness: Let us imagine that throughout your life your sole human contact was with patients in a hospital heart attack intensive care unit. You might believe that all humans were greying, weak, slow moving, frightened, and in pain.

Many talented and well-trained cultural managers and creators suffer from a similar fate. They have spent their careers almost entirely inside unhealthy, ineffective cultural industries. One difficulty they face in changing lifestyles is a lack of understanding of what a healthy lifestyle might be.

If arts health is worth pursuing, we need education to raise our health awareness. Cultural professionals need the exposure to see and experience what a healthy cultural organisation looks and feels like.

If I won a grant large enough to enable cultural industries health education, here is what I would do to build health awareness.

- Develop easy-to-use accountability grids, self-tests, and simple case studies providing impact stories, best practices and lessons learned to illustrate real-world examples of a the “seven healthy habits” of cultural industries lifestyle.
- Share the above materials widely with cultural managers, creators and investors.
- Provide ongoing training until a healthy-habits lifestyle is a central value of the local cultural industries.
- Continually refine, update, and refresh the concept by integrating real-life healthy habits impact stories.
- Motivate cultural managers by creating an annual competitive cash prize, similar in content and spirit with the ‘Manager of the Year Award’ given in the corporate sector.

Talented individuals enable healthy cultural organisations to succeed. We cannot legislate or clone good corporate governance or cultural management, much as we would like to, and we know that these individuals foster health wherever they go in the cultural industries. Our most talented cultural managers often perform relative miracles. However, why are we allowing their tactics and secrets to remain untold? A doctor who worked medical miracles would be besieged with requests for his methods and lessons learned. Nevertheless, our most outstanding cultural managers remain unasked!

If we study cultural industries health, we can measure it – we can improve it and in the end our stakeholders, partners and government interest and commitment in cultural investment will be spurred.
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Commentator’s background and context:
I first engaged with the Zimbabwe arts and culture sector and the funding context in 2010, as facilitator in legal and business skills for the British Council/Culture Fund Creative Enterprise Programme, which took me around the country and enabled me to engage with dozens of art professionals/cultural actors from across all segments of the arts and cultural sector. I subsequently moved to Zimbabwe permanently, as Director of Education and International Projects of First Floor Gallery Harare – an independent, artist-led gallery and educational organization, focused on developing emerging visual artists, building international and local audiences for contemporary art and fostering sustainable careers for artists. I hold degrees in Law and Economics (University of Melbourne), a Masters in Curatorship and Modern Art (University of Sydney) and am in the process of completing a doctorate in Art History (Cultural Policy, Contemporary Art and Cultural Economics) (University of Paris 1, Sorbonne) with Zimbabwe as one of the key case studies.

Comments:
By and large I agree with the findings and conclusions in the study, the key issues and concerns in particular, in respect to lack of cohesion or strategic vision in scoping the sector or addressing its needs.

In my view it is unequivocal that, despite the vast (by Zimbabwean economy standards) sums expended by the funders as noted by the study, there is little to indicate that the sector has a viable future and long-term prospects. One of the key indicators for this is the fact that despite immense amounts of support given towards cultural advocacy projects, neither art nor culture feature as a specific category in ZimASSET.
I would like to comment specifically on five aspects:

1. **Sustainability, self-sufficiency and dependency**

   My overall view is that no amount of funding can create sustainability or self-sufficiency outcomes in the sector if sustainability is not a criterion. Moreover, funding in its current form has created conditions, which in fact preclude these objectives from being achieved.

   The report states that arts and culture get a lot less money than other sectors. There is no problem with international funders providing more support to sectors such as health, education, and infrastructure etc. Matters of physical survival require funding priority domestically and externally. The issue is not the amount of funding but how it is conceptualized and implemented.

   Few of the funding objectives prioritize building up the sector towards economic and cultural independence.

   The report correctly notes that there is a dearth of core funding for organizations, which leads to an ongoing need to lie in order to secure survival of the organization by taking administration costs and rent out of project funding. Funders seem oblivious to the idea that having an ongoing presence and being able to keep doors open is a fundamental factor in ensuring effectiveness of an organization, and rent and bare minimum salaries are essential.

   The funding is modelled to never be enough to build sustainability or self-sufficiency. Much funding is administered through fictions, which assume that the recipients have cash reserves, and the funding provides a fraction of the required money to execute the project – retaining the balance to ensure accountability, whereas in fact it ensures the exact opposite.

   Moreover, many organisations in arts and culture work in areas where achieving independent income in the market is not an option and, like their counterparts in the developed world, their sustainability depends on ongoing funding from government, sponsors and philanthropists. This funding is a stable feature of the arts and culture economy worldwide and it is hypocritical to pretend otherwise. Arts organisations are not always amenable to business/profit making models and yet funders want them to operate as such.

   Finally, the report points out, most of the benchmarking is done on the basis of nominal reach. Follow up to enquire, let alone ensure, that the funds have had a meaningful impact is rarely, if ever, carried out, especially in the case of the deluge of “skill and capacity building” workshops.

2. **Clash of Agendas**

   Another fiction that underpins the funding environment in arts and culture is that the funders are here to help. The funders are here to implement programmes in line with directives emanating from their national HQs, in line with their global policies and project models. As mentioned above, their reporting criteria do not require them to be interested or invested in finding out if they have made
any long-term or even short-term impact through their funding.

The report also correctly notes that the artists do not always (frequently) understand the funders’ institutional agendas but goes astray in concluding that better communication could solve the problem.

Artists in Zimbabwe will never (honestly) care about the policy ambitions of the Norwegian or German or French government, nor should they. The phrase “if you want to help, help, if you don’t, get out the way” is very apt in this context. It is a delusion to imagine that people worrying about how they are going to pay (5R) for transport to get back home, will prioritize the nuanced differences between the dollar that comes from the German Embassy to do something and the dollar that comes from the German Society (or Alliance Francaise for that matter). The fact that funders have cultivated a milieu in which some artists are able to mimic the funders’ jargon and agendas back to them in order to survive does not mean there is meaningful communication. The manifest absence of financial sustainability in the arts, despite millions thrown at them, is an indication of lack of communication, but also that there is a community of “professional applicants” and that organizations and individuals that have merit but lack the necessary sycophancy skills miss out.

The non-effectiveness of funding in Zimbabwe aligns closely with that of other developing countries and not just in the arts sector. This indicates that there is a systemic error in the way funding is conceptualized and implemented. In the arts in particular it is evident that funder agendas do not recognize the value of art and do not prioritise sustainability and the capacity of the sector to be self-sufficient in and of itself.

Funding cuts, which have been implemented across the board since the 2008 global financial crisis, have led to a very definitive strategy of multi-tasking funding for culture and the arts with the development goals. This agenda now burdens the artists with the responsibility for solving every social ill from gender violence to HIV/AIDS and even food security. Art is not seen as a valuable part of peoples’ lives. While there is no statistical proof for any effectiveness of these strategies, there is ample proof of deterioration of the quality of art in these circumstances, as artists lose their intellectual and creative autonomy and authenticity in responding to issues that the foreign funders believe are important for Zimbabwe.

Three outcomes follow, which even further undermine the capacity of the sector and the practitioners to become successful and self-sufficient:

1) Artists lose connection with their own grassroots, culture and audiences. Instead of seeking real engagement with feedback from broad local audiences, as well as peers and experts in their field internationally, artists become dependent on funders for cues and feedback on what is relevant and of quality, because that is what will get the ongoing funding.

2) As a result, artists are prevented from excelling artistically and producing work that could see them achieve internationally important and financially successful careers. Funders have become the key audience for the artists. This is particularly evident in the disproportionate number of
expatriates, diplomatic and NGO staff at exhibition openings, theatre premiers etc, as well as in the failure of local audiences to support these events and the lack of growth in the local market for the arts from the emerging middle and upper classes of Zimbabweans.

Inadvertently, this model fosters the creation of:

3) A climate of extreme competition and non-cooperation, with artists strategizing to curry favour and access funding opportunities, which they see as being at the expense of other fellow artists. In this climate, there is no opportunity to optimize and share resources, which would make possible a multitude of projects and initiatives, with economic efficiency, or for artists to organize effectively to lobby the government for their needs and rights.

3. Government engagement

Addressing key issues in the arts requires a holistic understanding of each segment of the sector in the same way one would address any sector of the economy. This means looking at every facet impacting the viability of the sector from audiences to education to resourcing. This can only be done with an understanding of the economy and demographics across the country and engaging with government at policy and regulation at all levels from Ministerial, departmental to local government branches. While cooperation happens in some sectors, when it comes to the arts the failure of comprehensive understanding of arts as industry and a sector of an economy leads to consistently irrelevant and wasted efforts.

For example, teaching workshops on audience engagement through social media is great if one is oblivious to the fact that the vast majority of Zimbabweans (who happen to live outside Harare) have poor access to the internet and find it financially unaffordable. So if the funding does not provide means and access to the internet then the workshop is a waste of time and money.

1. How can we grow audiences for visual art if visual art is not a subject taught in any schools other than Group A and private schools i.e. accessible to a privileged minority? So any long-term vision for the sector would include engagement with the Ministry of Education or initiatives to engage with the school system.

2. How can we support art production if the cost of materials is made prohibitive through lack of exemption or concessions for art materials in regards to import duty?

3. How can artists develop careers and job opportunities if the best visual art school in the country (Harare Polytechnic) fails to deliver an internationally recognised degree programme – the highest qualification at present is a diploma? This is a roadblock to both horizontal and vertical development of the sector with loss of opportunities for job creation and income generation on an ongoing basis at a time when education services are a growing industry internationally.
Creation of infrastructure is fundamental to the long-term success of the arts sector as a whole. This cannot be achieved without engaging with the government and its plan for the economy and the country as a whole. The reluctance of funders to engage with the government and its institutions is the elephant in the funding room. It is an open secret that until recently funder support was allocated along ideological and sometimes political lines.

The lack of adequate budgetary contribution by the government to the sector does not mean that government support cannot be obtained in other ways such as:

1) Facilitation by city councils by providing council owned disused premises towards art projects – for free or in exchange for services;

2) Lobbying the government to provide tax rebates for private sector sponsorship for art related projects in schemes that have been successful in other countries e.g. the film industry in Australia was revived by a government tax rebate scheme, while the visual art market is supported by the ability of some pension funds to buy art as part of their portfolio.

Despite immense funding expended on advocacy projects and programmes, certain simple regulatory amendments, which would have long-term impact and increase sustainability of the sector, have not been achieved. Instead of looking at the welfare of the artists, advocacy projects appear to focus on funder ideological interests and more particularly political agendas.

4. Administrative Obstacles

While funding is treated as an unequivocal good by the funders, it is frequently a burden, which in some cases may force organisations and individuals into deceitful practices. The administrative burden placed by funders on their beneficiaries is enormous in terms of time spent on project proposals/grant applications and then reporting and cost of auditing.

For example:

Given the absence of substantive core funding options, each organization and many artists will rely on applying to numerous funders with numerous funding requirements for each project, numerous times a year, if they are to survive. Each funder has its own application process and forms as well as reporting requirements. This means that artists and organisations are burdened with time-consuming exercises that duplicate effort instead of focusing on their actual work. This is difficult even for native English speakers with tertiary education, but far more so for artists who might not have adequate English language writing skills or accounting acumen.
5. Local and Global

Zimbabwe is a relatively small country. This has several crucial implications for funders and funding:

1) Engagement with the international arts sector, market and industry is not an option for most arts organisations. As a small country, Zimbabwe is not able to provide a market for the works of all its artists, even if the economy were flourishing. Therefore artists need to be aware of and supported in engaging with the international industry and markets, without the need to emigrate.

2) Sustainability or self-sufficiency for most arts organisations is not achievable without producing international best practice art products. As noted above, funder agendas at present make that difficult if not impossible.

3) Funders and many artists locally lack expertise in understanding the rigorous and complex globalized industry and market environment in which artists need to operate.

It has been suggested that consultation with artists can hold the key to finding solutions. This is only part of the story. Consultation with artists is imperative for identifying the needs on the ground. Finding solutions must be done in consultation with industry experts of international significance. If you have a cancer patient, he can tell you some of his symptoms but he cannot identify all of them nor can he prescribe the treatment. The lack of exposure to international best practice and holistic education, which includes understanding of their profession, industry and market, creates a lot of misconceptions among the artists about what is possible and a tunnel vision about their prospects and opportunities.

Funders cannot be expected to be a substitute for deficiencies in the education system but funders can work with the education system to support the creation of robust structures that equip emerging artists with the skills and awareness of the possibilities that their profession holds.

As I have noted above, the current agendas of the funders and funding models make this impossible. Egregiously, some funders overtly preclude support for any project that could have the outcome of supporting the artists’ livelihood. Pro Helvetia, for example, expressly excludes any support for a project that could have a commercial benefit to the recipient. As a result, an artist or an arts manager cannot apply to attend a trade fair that would enable them to engage with peers and network with people relevant to their career development internationally.
10. Conclusions

If the amounts spent on the arts in Zimbabwe to date had been invested with an understanding of the country’s infrastructure and demographics, resourcing, complementing and cooperating with government, this could have brought about a paradigm shift, transforming arts and culture into a vibrant and sustainable sector producing international quality arts products. The fact that this has not been the case points to fundamental problems in the approach to funding rather than symptomatic implementation issues, and this calls for a holistic rethink of the funding approach.

The truth is that the sector needs are at not in line with funder objectives and, unless the funders are prepared to address the sector needs, no real progress is possible, no matter how much money is thrown at the sector or how much communication is enhanced.
Melissa Eveleigh

is a director, writer and trainer who has lived and worked in Southern Africa since 2002. Melissa co-founded the award-winning arts and development organization Nanzikambe Arts in Malawi, and has an extensive repertoire of success in the region training and developing talent, creating and producing touring productions and using the arts for development.

Melissa is a practitioner for the Governance and Justice Group www.governancejustice.org and has recently established Arts for Action, an international group of multidisciplinary practitioners working for positive change through arts projects and activism: www.artsforaction.org.uk Arts for Action is attached to the Centre for Creative Practice which develops best practice in the field, does research, training and events: http://centreforcreativepractice.weebly.com

To contact Melissa please email: melissa.eveleigh@gmail.com