

# Into Great Silence

By Emily Munro

My skin changed colour this week. Out in Kelvingrove park, somewhere between the Andy Murrays and the bowling beauties, the *click-clack* and the *whack!*, two shoulders turned out an angry, freckled pink without me noticing the transformation.

That is, until the heat rash struck. I should really have been more

careful. Skin. We wear it and it wears us. Stretching and wrinkling, renewing, aging, seen and felt every day, yet we are infrequently aware of its modifications. It's hard to keep track on something so quiet. Thus I regretfully record the irony that the damage was caused while I was busy with silence.

*Die Grosse Stille* (*Into Great Silence*, dir. Philip Gröning, 2005) documents daily life in the ascetic Grande Chartreuse monastery, nestled in the French Alps north of Grenoble. The monastery is of the Carthusian order, inhabited by men living largely in silence, cultivating serenity; their motto: *Stat crux dum volvitur orbis* – *The Cross is steady while the world is turning*. It reputedly took 16 years for the order to accede to the German filmmaker Philip Gröning's request to film their activities and the result is profound.

In Scotland, a different kind of silence has been cultivated over a lesser period of time. There is no holy order involved; in truth, faith and belief appear to be lacking. This silence preoccupies me, not because it has a clear, meditative purpose but because it indicates a frustrating and troubling vacancy and suggests apathy amongst people who should be associated with action. The ordained? The Scottish film milieu. Before you groan and flick over the page, let me give you a few reasons to stay a while: vagueness, under-confidence, a seemingly interminable yet indeliberate provincialism. Hooked yet? Well, how about patience, determination and vision, then? We can have a play with these more provocative darlings later.

My intention here is not to be polemical, although we could do with a bit more of that. I want simply to provide an honest expression of my sheer bafflement at the current situation which should amount to fair comment. I also have a small, vain hope that after publishing this someone who knows better



might approach me to lift me from my cloud of ignorance and explain, in their own considered words, why I am incorrect in my judgement. At this moment, I have no reason to believe I am.

I have, after all, taken to reading screenwriting manuals. These step-by-step guides to moulding

the well-made drama are of comfort to their readers in their clear exposition of what you actually already knew (dramatic technique learned by instinct and observation), usually backed by some hand-down misinterpretation of Aristotle's *Poetics*. I genuinely like them. Effective dramatic action, the how-tos tell us, is accomplished by conveying what the characters want. It is want which drives the characters toward activity – wanting is, therefore, action.

Outside stage and screen, we seldom associate the positive qualities assigned to action with want. Action is productive whereas 'I want' doesn't get. When something is wanting, it is lacking. The monks of Chartreuse do not want. However, while in some circumstances to outwardly express needs and desires is understood to be selfish or a sign of immaturity (in other words human), elsewhere the articulation of want is imperative for survival and progress.

A discussion on what is wanted is missing in the Scottish film milieu, and film culture in Scotland suffers for it. At times one imagines there could be a motto in support of the hush, perhaps along the lines of *the world is turning and we are too busy to comment*. At least the quiet is consistent.

Before we slide deeper into the absence, I should describe its habitat. A milieu is a setting. In this case, one might envisage it as a stage upon which a number of banners are hung out on show. The most prominent of these hangings has been for some time 'the Scottish film industry', the skin of 'national cinema' in Scotland. While not showy, the need for such display remains of central importance and it is not, as some have said, entirely without substance ('viability'), for behind it things are quietly happening.

The skins worn and displayed by the film milieu in Scotland amount to a rood screen, behind which



sanctuary is taken and rituals carried out. It is onto such a tapestry that the public gaze, catching sight of a candle lit for 'inclusion' or 'access' through the chinks and observing the odd exoteric confirmation of pride, recently *Red Road* (dir. Andrea Arnold, 2006) and the televised Scottish BAFTAs. I am not knocking these moments of exposure which serve as momentary reminders that film producers, artists, programmers and educators continue to work their skins under a Scottish sun. But these activities do not to me express action. They do not speak of need and want but rather substitute critical discussion with self-satisfaction and reassurance. Few feel confident enough to break their work patterns to step in front of the modest display they have become accustomed to holding up from behind and to take dramatic action in the way I have described it.

It's not that nothing is going on with film in Scotland; it's just that the things that do happen occur discretely. It can often seem as though achievements are made in isolation from other developments. There is no domino effect, no structured chain of events in place. And no one wants to bang a drum for the failures – those films made in Scotland which don't get seen, or the creative 'talent' which has had to and will continue to leave the country, not because they want to break free from parochialism but for lack of opportunity.



Then again, what do I know? People from film environments in other countries have asked me what's happening in Scotland and my answer has always been 'I'm sorry but I haven't a clue'. Nostrodamus, I'm certain, would have come up with something more lyrical but, after all, the film business is always keen to demonstrate that the future is something one cannot predict. Up until May 3<sup>rd</sup> this generous outsider's query came with the appendage 'is everyone waiting for the election?' From whence has this expectation that film in Scotland will launch itself once the colours of the political spectrum have stabilised appeared? One suspects like all games of whispers it has come from a local rumour, in this case Creative Scotland.

Of course, Creative Scotland, the proposed national development body for the creative sectors which would merge the Arts Council and Scottish Screen, has become far more than a whisper. There is little likelihood that it will be quashed now if it hasn't been already. Creative Scotland will be responsible for shaping and delivering Scotland's cultural policies, for

developing Scotland's visual and performing arts and screen industries for at least x years, x being more or less than 10, which is the length of time Scottish Screen survived.

Given the implications of this administrative turnaround, and the upheavals yet to be experienced in its implementation, it will be a disgrace if the new body cannot justify its existence in this form long-term. This kind of change should be regarded as seismic, if not in its transformative aims then certainly in its stand for permanence. Surely, then, we should be hearing more about it from the people whom it will effect most directly? Were not the key cultural spokespeople, scholars, practitioners, facilitators and administrators clamouring to have their voices heard in the fall out of the announcement of the Creative

Scotland proposal? Are they not debating their hopes and aspirations right now? No, they were not and they are not.

Creative Scotland was announced in 'Scotland's Culture', the Scottish Executive response to the Cultural Review. The Cultural Review (2005) was a Scottish Executive-commissioned study which advised

that the Scottish cultural sectors be transformed to make them fit for a devolved Scotland. Changes in the administration of arts and culture, it was reported, would fundamentally have to address the lack of strategic coherence in the delivery of cultural policy in Scotland to date.

Scotland's Culture (2006) reflects on the Cultural Review as a consultation document which had uncovered a number of serious shortcomings in the Scottish cultural sector: 'Scotland has a confusing cultural infrastructure; there is a lack of clarity in funding responsibilities, leading to inconsistent levels of commitment by key stakeholders; and frequent financial crises at major arts organisations; there is no clear pathway to success for talented young people; and limited sharing of 'national' provision across Scotland' (Scotland's Culture, Part 2: Our Approach, available online). The aim of the Review was, the Executive said, to help 'to redefine the institutional infrastructure and governance of Scotland's cultural sector, so that it would be equipped to help accomplish the Executive's long-term vision for the sector' (Scotland's Culture, Part 2: Our Approach. My emphasis), a significant statement of intention which I will return to.



Rather than supporting the model proposed by the Commission conducting the Review, the Executive devised its own recommendations for a new infrastructure which might support their outlook for the future of creative activity in Scotland. The plan was to reduce bureaucracy by replacing the current systems of administration with 'a less cluttered, more transparent and efficient institutional landscape' (Scotland's Culture, Part 6: The New Cultural Infrastructure). The establishment of a single agency incorporating key activities currently performed by Scottish Screen and the Arts Council was to be a core feature in this transformation and new cultural legislation for Scotland was required to allow the reformation to take place.

The substantive gains to be achieved by amalgamating Scottish Screen and the Arts Council are not clear. No strong recommendations have emerged from within the cultural sectors as to how such a body will function and where its priorities will lie with regard to fulfilling the somewhat indistinct conditions set forth in the new legislation. The few official responses I have read to the Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill express anxiety as to the exact remit of Creative Scotland.

The Highlands and Islands independent arts organisation HI~Arts has conveyed doubts as to Creative Scotland's status as a 'national' agency, wholly based as it will be in the Central Belt (quite possibly in Edinburgh if Edinburgh City Council and its prominent supporters get their way, though Glasgow-based Scottish Screen doesn't appear to be paying much heed to this campaign), and its capacity to deliver a comprehensive cultural strategy given that heritage is not within its mandate (HI~Arts Response to Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill Consultation Questions, 2007, available online). This latter point was also made by the Museums Association and the National Trust for Scotland who both feel that the description of Creative Scotland as 'a single national cultural development body' is inaccurate and misleading.

UNISON has expressed stark disappointment with the draft Bill, saying that even while they support the broad aims of the Executive with respect to generating strategic national cultural policy, the legislation does not come close to living up to expectations and the commitments made by Jack McConnell's Executive in earlier statements on culture. They say Creative Scotland's role is 'confused and unclear' and, most damningly, in reply to the consultation question 'Do you agree with the remit proposed for Creative Scotland? Has it the right powers and functions?', UNISON frankly state, 'The remit and its powers call into question its existence' (A Missed Opportunity to Enhance Scotland's Culture. UNISON Scotland's response to the Consultation on the Culture (Scotland) Bill, March 2007, available online).

Less fiery is the joint response devised by Scottish Screen and the Arts Council (Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen. Response to the Consultation on the Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill 2006, 31 March 2007, available online). It begins – Appeasingly? By means of reminder? – with a five-line Jack McConnell quotation. The compliment paid in the opening is indicative of the general approach taken in this particular; and one suspects influential, response. It is a diplomatically-worded document, appealingly written, treading ever-so-softly through the matters at hand. It subtly addresses the issue of the 'c' word (culture) through substitution by describing Creative Scotland as 'the national development agency for the *creative* sector' (my emphasis), an inspirational body which will create a national impact by developing partnerships and nurturing ambition.

Meaty, emotive words are chosen for the response. In the introduction we encounter 'the dawn of a new enlightenment', 'enriching lives ... creating confidence, jobs and a new prosperity', 'leadership and facilitation', 'risk and innovation', 'the mystery of the creative process' and 'our creative life blood'. Within the liturgy we are also instructed that 'As a grown-up democracy we must acknowledge the value of arts and culture, for the beauty, excitement and happiness they bring.' Thinking and challenging, I suppose, doesn't really come too much into it – the value of arts and culture, that is.

To be fair, the response should not be blasted for its enthusiasm and it is clear that attempts have been made to tease out and name some of the general functions of Creative Scotland, a requisite procedure. Unfortunately Scottish Screen and the Arts Council do this in their response by direct and largely unquestioning reference to the Culture Bill, in effect endorsing the draft legislation despite its shortcomings and vagaries. They rightly point out that if Creative Scotland is to succeed (if it is to have a right to exist), it needs to be bolder and more instrumental in developing a strategy for the production and consumption of creativity than current instructions allow. It needs, furthermore, not only a national perspective but an international one. These points I support. However, it is alarming to see the agencies comment correctly on the lack of clarity in several areas of the Culture Bill only to allow their own points to be lost in unhelpful rhetoric – an obscure reference to 'capacity issues for both the local authorities and Creative Scotland', for example, and the barely forgivable remark that 'blue sky thinking' should inform Creative Scotland's approach.

I find myself considering whether the careful wording of *questions* to the Executive in the Scottish Screen/ Arts Council response isn't in fact a reflection of a



wider problem in arts and screen establishments. I have in mind a Jeeves and Wooster scenario where Stephen Fry smugly remarks to Hugh Laurie while polishing up a silver tea spoon, 'Perhaps, sir, it might be better if one were to ...?', concealing his superior knowledge in subtle suggestion so that his master might then be convinced to act on the idea as if it were his very own. An ironic twist on the certainty that whoever pays the piper calls the tune. But, in truth, it is the people who pay for the c-word – it is to them/ourselves we are accountable, and this goes for the Scottish Executive too.

The silence in the film milieu relates precisely to the apparent reluctance of people working in and with the sector to make demands. If Creative Scotland is going ahead, then those who will be affected by it shouldn't be politely suggesting that they could maybe 'play a lead role' in the development and implementation of strategy for cultural activities in Scotland, they should be insisting upon it. It is not enough that the Executive consults on policy, the policy must be directed by those who will carry responsibility for delivering it otherwise it will fail. As we have seen, Executives come and go.

Part of the old 'Executive's long-term vision' for creativity in Scotland, now naturally subject to change, was to enhance the cultural contribution of local authorities by developing a policy of 'cultural entitlements'. This policy would operate according to a principle of 'citizens' rights' to culture and it refers to the provision of core cultural services such as libraries and museums as well as selected activities such as video workshops, community festivals and art therapy. In taking this approach, local authorities would be obliged to provide cultural services in a manner which demonstrates 'cultural planning'; that is, services would be chosen with a view to how they might assist the authorities to deliver their other, broader objectives.

Now, there are a number of incidental benefits one might experience as a result of access to arts and creativity. However, it's difficult to prescribe and predict these in advance. Arts and culture will not solve problems of social and economic inequality. Creative Scotland is expected to guide Ministers and local authorities in their cultural planning activities, including, presumably, their understanding of what constitutes an 'entitlement'. How they might do this, and where the line will be drawn between entitlement and privilege, has not been



precisely pronounced from any quarter.

The draft Culture Bill contains vague directions for cultural entitlements provision by stating that Creative Scotland should promote access to arts and culture. The emphasis on cultural entitlements makes sense in terms of a broader contemporary political focus on human rights and equality but no one appears to be discussing how an unbalanced concentration on this approach could transform the rights of artists and practitioners into obligations (more funding for 'community' projects, less for other kinds of professional development and creative practices). Surely what should be aimed for is substance and quality of delivery across the board? Of course, evaluation of these things is only possible if a healthy critical culture exists, something which has not proven an especially strong feature of the Scottish arts scene of late.

Film culture, to get back to the topic in hand, could have something to do with cultural entitlement. Already community and outreach work goes on in the areas of cinema exhibition and video production and the contributions of local authorities are crucial for the continuance of such activities. Yet the draft legislation states Creative Scotland should also have the function 'of realising ... the value and benefits (*in particular, the economic value and benefits*) of the arts and culture' (Culture (Scotland) Bill [draft] Part 2: 8.1.(c). My emphasis.). A contradiction? Some organisations (the Visual Arts and Galleries Association, HI~Arts) have expressed concern about the particular wording and suggest the stress placed on commercial considerations is at odds with the policy of cultural entitlements.

What is this section of the Bill about? One could identify some allusion to social gain or benefits here, at a push given the parenthesis. But I am guessing what is being referred to more directly is the potential profit to be made by hosting large-scale cultural events – for example, the Edinburgh International Festival, Edinburgh Fringe Festival and Edinburgh International Film Festival. Film production, too, might be considered in this paragraph as giving rise to

economic rewards for the country, although this is perhaps less about belief than it is about needing to come up with economic justifications for making films.

Well-known, economically-centred arguments in favour of a national film production sector include the notion



that national cinema allows the nation to reflect upon itself, generating a sense of recognition with respect to the national environment and encouraging civic awareness, even pride. Self-contentment is good for the economy. Coupled to this is the idea that films made about or set amongst the nation help to promote the country abroad and attract tourism, now more than ever regarded as a 'cultural industry' in itself. More predictably, the presence of a national production sector is seen to contribute financially by sustaining a skilled workforce at home and attracting investment from overseas.

Now, ask yourself, if we're working from this page – does Scotland have a national cinema? If 'national cinema' means the integrated provision of indigenous production, distribution and exhibition of films, and audience recognition of 'national' produce, then one would have to say it does not. So, when the draft Culture Bill speaks of Creative Scotland's function being to realise the economic benefits of arts and culture, are its authors implying we're missing a trick with respect to film which we need to do something about to merit funding (in which case, a system of reward is lacking) or are they simply being disingenuous?



To support the development of a national film and television infrastructure which would support indigenous production, promotion and training as well as preservation of the national film heritage, Scottish Screen was established by merging various national screen agencies in 1997. Now that the organisation is to be amalgamated with the Arts Council, we should want to know whether a comprehensive strategy for film in Scotland will be assured. Already the Archive, with its rich holdings of innovative amateur film footage, has transferred to the National Library of Scotland, so it won't be lead by the Creative Scotland screen package. Responsibility for training has been delegated to Skillset, a UK-wide council for developing skills and careers in the audiovisual industries. These are not in themselves negative moves and no doubt there are good economic reasons for them. But it is perhaps an appropriate time to come up with some answers for how a film production infrastructure can be properly fostered by a body dedicated to serving all the arts.

Somehow things keep going. Through the determination of a few, a small number of (non-Hollywood) films get made in Scotland and are funded from public sources. The Cannes Jury Prize-winning,

Scottish-Danish co-production *Red Road* (2006), set in Glasgow, is one of such films. Initiated as the result of a relationship between Denmark's Zentropa and Scotland's Sigma Films production companies, *Red Road* is a creative collaboration as well as a co-production in the sense of mixing finance and production expertise. Writing credits go to English director Andrea Arnold alongside Danes Anders Thomas Jensen and Lone Scherfig (who made prior connection to Glasgow with *Wilbur Wants to Kill Himself* (2002), also supported by Sigma and Scottish Screen).

Sigma is a small company in terms of personnel but its ambition and achievements to date are astonishing given the variable outlook for independent film production in Scotland. Sigma proposed, planned and have a majority interest in Film City Glasgow, a modern production facility based on a model created by Zentropa in Copenhagen and housed in the former Govan town hall. The project is being supported by Glasgow City Council, Scottish Enterprise Glasgow and the European Regional Development Fund but Sigma were the initiators.

The Danish comparison is a potent one. The success over the last decade of Denmark's film industry has made it a beacon for nations of comparative size and wealth who have not yet succeeded in their ambition to build a sustainable indigenous film production environment. Public financing for film culture in Denmark is administered through the Danish Film Institute which has been in its present form for a little less time than Scottish Screen has been in existence. Since 1998, the Danish Film Institute has been directed by Henning Camre, a trained cinematographer and former head of both the Danish Film School and the National Film and Television School in England. He will be replaced this year when he leaves his post to pursue other interests.

The impact of Henning Camre's vision on the Danish film milieu has been fundamental to the prosperity of Danish cinema in recent years, so much so that a Danish broadsheet recently described him as 'Danish film's Godfather' (Politiken: Kultur 8 April 2007, p.5). In the 70s and 80s, Camre revolutionised the Danish Film School, which was to produce countless well-known figures working in Danish film today. He later set in motion a system of long-term strategic planning for the Danish Film Institute, thus establishing what he refers to as the 'foodchain' – a holistic structure for state support of film culture



in Denmark which embraces education, production, distribution, exhibition and film preservation. Camre has described the success of Danish cinema during his time at the Film Institute as 'the unpredictable result of a conscious strategy'. Nothing in the film industry is ever absolutely guaranteed save for the likelihood that without thoughtful and imaginative planning the right conditions for growth will probably never be realised.

It is important to remember, though, that the flourishing of Danish cinema is not simply the consequence of one person's actions but reflects strategic efforts across the sector to plan for the future and set goals. This includes the development of a national film school over 40 years and the devising of inventive practices both in the administering of state finance and amongst producers themselves. Danish people are going into cinemas to see Danish films. Okay, so they might have a linguistic 'advantage' (who else will make Danish language films?) but that 25% of the cinema tickets sold in Denmark were for Danish films last year was by no means assured. Then again, 21 Danish films were released in 2006, giving audiences some choice and variety – and surely that must have helped (figures supplied by the Danish Film Institute).

I don't want to advocate a 'Danish model' because no one system of this sort of complexity works everywhere. I will suggest, though, that a strong film culture will feature film labour (both professional and amateur) as visible, structuring pillars and have public support as its foundation. To maintain this structure, three things are required: provision for a certain number of films to be made professionally (volume), quality (and a developed critical understanding of what that means and where), and policy in support of innovation and artistic ambition.

Duncan Petrie has said that Scottish cinema has the status of 'a devolved British cinema rather than fully independent entity' (Screening Scotland, 2000, p.186). Some self-determination is possible but nothing of much significance can be achieved without the support

of a central agency located down South: the UK Film Council. Creative Scotland will not change this but a persuasive, long-term, overarching strategy for Scottish film culture could improve the fortunes of those working with film in Scotland and enhance the prospects for films made here.

This is not only a matter of investing more in the development of film exhibition culture in Scotland so that audiences might be more interested in a wider range of films and will want to pay to see the latest Scottish movie. It is centrally a matter of the films themselves, their standard and the interest they can generate. Feature films, because of the amount of public financing that must go into them, need to have public value. If they are not being seen and talked about, no matter how well-intentioned the project, they have lost this value and have weakened the argument for subsidising film. I am not talking about deliberately setting out to make 'popular' films. If a film's appeal is limited, fine – but an *audience* (other than the families of those involved in making the thing) must want to see it, otherwise what's the purpose of producing it?

Patience, vision and determination. These are worth returning to. It seems that while the film milieu in Scotland possesses plenty of the first thing, allegiance to the other two is faltering. At risk of replicating the form of the Scottish Screen/Arts Council response to the draft Culture Bill, I say in all seriousness that where there is no spark there is no light. If people involved in film in Scotland want to ensure the best conditions for their creative futures, they must be active in expressing their desires and making demands for what is missing. There is no point to proudly holding up a match in a darkened room if you've nothing to strike it on, unless, that is, you want to disappear into the gloom altogether.

Undoubtedly all demands must be realistic and considered, and work does need to be done 'in concert with' politicians in order to ensure that the criteria and reasons for funding are agreed upon.



But this should not mean replacing boldness and imagination with false diplomacy – that’s an insult to ourselves as well as to the Executive. It is crucial that the right objectives are set and these should naturally be largely designed by the people who know the field and its potholes best. The assumption of greater responsibility will be the consequence of such activity, for those who guide and implement the new policies will have to recognise that if goals are missed or if the decisions taken do not connect to broader, long-term aims, progress will not be made and dissatisfaction and mistrust will emerge from both the funders and the public. Until that stage is met, there needs to be more analysis coming from the creative sectors.

Right now I simply cannot see the bigger picture – is it in anyone’s line of sight? Critically, neither the benefits nor the negative implications of Creative Scotland are being addressed by the people whom it will most directly affect and it may already be too late. I would like for someone to prove to me that a film community exists in Scotland. Just imagine how different the skin of national cinema will look when we come out from behind it, pull it down off the rafters and throw it over something shapely and substantial. It will be hard to do this without making some noise.

#### **Selected references:**

Scottish Executive. January 2006. *Scotland’s culture: Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/01/18091052/0>

Edinburgh City Council. 19 February 2007. *Three Good Reasons Why Creative Scotland must be based in Edinburgh*  
[http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/internet/internet\\_homepage/Council\\_news/Three%20Good%20Reasons%20why%20Creative%20Scotland%20must%20be%20based%20in%20Edinburgh%20-%2019%20February%202007](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/internet/internet_homepage/Council_news/Three%20Good%20Reasons%20why%20Creative%20Scotland%20must%20be%20based%20in%20Edinburgh%20-%2019%20February%202007)

HI-Arts. 2007. *Response to the Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill Consultation Questions*  
<http://www.hi-arts.co.uk/draft-culture-scotland-bill.html>

Scottish Museums Council. March 2007. *Response to Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill and Guidance Consultation* <http://194.200.63.26/news/2007/SMCresponsetoDraftCulture.asp>

National Trust for Scotland. March 2007. *Response to Draft Culture Bill*  
[http://www.nts.org.uk/Conserve/policy\\_work.php](http://www.nts.org.uk/Conserve/policy_work.php)

UNISON Scotland. March 2007. *A missed opportunity to enhance Scottish culture. UNISON Scotland’s response to the Consultation on the Culture (Scotland) Bill*  
<http://www.unison-scotland.org.uk/response/culturebill.html>

Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen. March 2007. *Response to the Consultation on the Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill 2006*  
[http://www.scottishscreen.com/news/news\\_story\\_quick.php?news\\_id=132&page\\_id=32](http://www.scottishscreen.com/news/news_story_quick.php?news_id=132&page_id=32)

Visual Arts and Galleries Association. April 2007. *Response to Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill*  
[http://www.vaga.co.uk/index.php?main\\_section=16&textentryid=397](http://www.vaga.co.uk/index.php?main_section=16&textentryid=397)

Scottish Executive. December 2006. *Draft Culture (Scotland) Bill*  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/ArtsCulture/CulturalPolicy/CultureBill>

