

MADRID 1992

1. AIMS AND OPERATIONAL FEATURES

1.1 Background

With some three million residents, Madrid is the largest population centre as well as the capital of Spain. Despite the recent policy of decentralisation in Spain, the role of the Ministry of Culture remains extensive in Madrid affairs, not only in the operation of major museums and galleries but also in the direct management of the principal concert hall, key theatres and other national cultural institutions in the city. The City operates three theatres and five museums, co-funds a symphony orchestra, and directly manages three arts centres (apart from 52 local arts centres). Current responsibilities of the Region (which extends to five million people) include two theatres and three museums.

1.2 Designation procedures and rationale

The Council of Ministers designated Madrid as European Cultural Capital 1992 on 27 May, 1988. The Spanish Government had nominated Madrid after considering rival candidacies from Salamanca and Granada. One factor in the minds of both the Spanish national authorities and the City of Madrid was to find a role for the capital city in 1992, the year of the Barcelona Olympics, the Seville Expo and the 500th anniversary of the arrival in America of Christopher Columbus. Madrid as European Cultural Capital would complete the picture for 1992 which could be presented as a "Year of Spain". As it was expressed in the Madrid 92 Commemorative Volume, "culture, sport, technology and history had a rendezvous in Spain on a symbolic date".

1.3 Objectives and broad approach

The objective of Madrid 92 was summarised in the strapline used in the event's promotional campaign: "Madrid Culture is Capital". This was interpreted to us as seeking to establish "newly-democratic" Madrid's credentials in Europe as a cultural capital. Initially, the Ministry was minded to take the responsibility itself for the year. After a tussle with the City and then the Region, organisation was vested in a consortium of the three authorities.

At the outset, membership of the Consortium was carefully constructed in line with the socialist majority on the City Council. Subsequently, the state of the political parties changed as a result of local elections which had the effect of creating a political stalemate in the Consortium, and conflicts of personality became a regular feature of the management of the event. The problems involved in managing the Consortium were at first kept under control by the Lord Mayor, but when he died in office, it became an unwieldy machine.

In the initial concept of the Madrid programme, the Consortium took note of the approaches that had been adopted by previous cultural capitals and set itself the task of re-discovering and reflecting on Madrid's own cultural heritage and creative traditions. It did this neither with a "self advertising festival" nor by means of one "distinctive artistic project". Rather, the Consortium added its own programming ideas to the mix of the city whilst seeking to complement and co-ordinate the activities of existing institutions. The balance of regular and new activities in the Consortium programme was roughly 35/65, according to one of those involved.

At an early point in the proceedings, some consideration was given in the Consortium to a programme of infrastructure development linked to the year. Time was never sufficient for this to be followed through, though the City Council was able to target the completion of a number of projects on the year.

1.4 Arrangement of the event

The Consortium was charged with "the promotion, development and co-ordination of activities and programmes carried out by Consortium members, together with the accomplishment of activities and programmes agreed through government bodies". The members comprised political appointees representing the City, the Autonomous Region and the Ministry of Culture, presided over by the Mayor of Madrid. It operated as an independently-constituted government Board through an executive committee with a paid Director and professional staff.

The Consortium was established in 1988. The Director, Father Pablo Lopez de Osaba, was appointed in February 1989 and his deputy two months' later. The appointment of other staff began in June and was completed by about March 1990. During the planning stage, the staff numbered some 20. At the peak, it expanded to 63, with four departments: programme; international relations; promotion/communications; and administration/personnel. Whilst the Consortium was an autonomous organisation, it worked under municipal terms and conditions of employment. The core administration, including the finance section, was staffed with secondees from the Municipality.

The programming team was established during 1990. Senor Alfredo Aracil (now Director of the Granada Festival) was appointed to plan the music programme early in 1990 but was asked by the Consortium in July to take over general responsibility for all strands of artistic programming. Music, which started first, remained the principal strength of the Consortium's programme and the other art forms never really caught up with the months lost in the early part of 1990.

Programming was planned by the Madrid 92 professional team which commissioned companies and contracted artists. Implementation quite often involved members of the Consortium, especially the City and the Ministry, which had control of most of the venues. In other cases, independent managements were contracted to implement Madrid 92 projects. All costs incurred (including, for example, those of the City's own theatres) were met by the Consortium which generally took a share of the ticket sales. The "consortium model" of joint working applies to three regular

events in the Madrid calendar: the International Theatre Festival, Madrid Dancing (international dance programme) and IMAGFIC (a festival of fantastic cinema). The first two of these festivals were incorporated into Madrid 92, as was the regular visiting orchestra series, but with a professional input over programming from the Madrid 92 team. The Consortium also funded additional programming in some other regular festivals: the Region's Autumn Festival, the Mozart Opera and Music Festival, and the Independent Festival of Cinema.

1.5 Framework of relationships

The framework of political relationships was contained within the membership of the Consortium. Conflicts between the various elements appeared to dominate the planning process. The Region (which serves a population of five million, the City of 3.2 million and a wider area) complained that the poor districts were being neglected and tended to turn its back on the event. It developed its own outreach programme as a contribution to Madrid 92. A much greater funding commitment from the Region could have been possible, according to one informant, if the politics had been better handled.

The Consortium's structure should have brought the great resources of the three tiers of government to bear on implementing the project. And this, to some extent, was the case in relation to the programme. We were told that the established institutions were not predisposed officially to collaborate with Madrid 92. But it proved possible at a professional level to influence their programming for the year and to engineer their participation. But the Consortium proved an unwieldy instrument for addressing wider targets in relation to 1992. Partly, this reflected the Director's focus on artistic and philosophical matters, but in relation to tourism, for example, communication between the Consortium and the City's tourist office was clearly inadequate and the travel trade, which had no formal link to the Consortium, found it difficult to identify a marketable product.

The cultural institutes were "invited to celebrate their presence in Madrid" and an early plan was to offer El Deposito del Canal de Isabel II, a disused watertower, to previous Cities of Culture to mount cultural programmes. These ideas initially attracted a very positive reaction, but they were not fully pursued. The Consortium expressed the wish to communicate an important message internationally and "make Madrid a reference point for the previous programmes of European Cities of Culture", but it failed to breathe much life into the idea and the outcome was somewhat disappointing. There was little direct input from foreign institutes into the year. The French Institute was re-built and re-opened during the year, but something of the impetus was lost. By the same token, the Director of the Italian Institute was replaced during 1992 which weakened its role. The British Council supported 20 suitable projects in Madrid during 1992 but only three appear to have featured in the Consortium programme.

International artistic collaboration was little in evidence. There were two co-productions, one with the Polka Theatre in London (Castles in the Air) and a Madrid/London visual arts collaboration (Edge 92). Germany contributed a Caspar David Friedrich show and an exhibition of nine German artists, the Portuguese an

exhibition of medieval Portuguese art and the Greeks supplied an exhibition on Mycenae.

International companies were included in the programme, for example, 14 orchestras from abroad. Several prestige visits to Madrid were part of Spanish tours linked to events in Seville and Barcelona. A number of these did not feature in the Madrid 92 programme. There appears to have been no effective co-ordination of the special cultural initiatives in the three cities during the "Year of Spain", for example on the part of the Ministry of Culture.

2. FUNDING

2.1 Available resources and income sources

The Consortium reported its expenditure during the year at Ptas 7.2 billion. Whilst this budget might be regarded as very generous, it was described in Madrid as "modest in relation to the sums committed to cultural programmes in Seville (Ptas 55 billion) and Barcelona". Nonetheless, it represents roughly double the regular expenditure by the City Council on culture of all forms (Ptas 3.54 billion in 1992).

The largest contribution, 42 per cent of the total, came from two special lotteries. The City of Madrid provided approximately a quarter of the necessary finance. The Region, the Ministry of Culture and the European Community made relatively minor contributions. Sponsorship and donations amounted to some 23 per cent of the total.

2.2 Expenditure

Little detail is available on the expenditure of the Consortium. Ptas 5.1 billion, or 73 per cent of the total were committed to the programme. Overheads represented 11 per cent of the total and some 14 per cent (Ptas 943 million) were spent on promotion.

2.3 Sponsorship

As an incentive to sponsors, a special law was passed giving 15 per cent tax exemption to corporate sponsors of Madrid 92 and ten per cent to individuals. Sponsors numbered 15 of which four gave support in kind and the remainder made cash contributions. By far the largest contribution came from the Caja de Madrid, one of the regional banks required by law to contribute a percentage of profits to cultural purposes.

The Mayor was active in raising sponsorship and for certain purposes a sponsorship agency was also engaged. Most of the companies concerned were established

sponsors of cultural projects and Iberia's contribution came in the context of a regular arrangement with the City of Madrid. The business community may have given a little more than usual in 1992, but the general conclusion on this topic was that Madrid 92 made no particular impact on the development of sponsorship in Spain.

2.4 Role of the voluntary sector

There is no evidence of any voluntary input, even to the programme of Extension promoted in the villages of the surrounding Region, where it might have been expected to occur.

2.5 Infrastructure and know-how initiatives

Madrid 92 coincided with the completion of several substantial capital infrastructure projects in the City, including the King Juan Carlos I Park, the Teatro de Madrid, the Casa de America, the Prado extension and the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, the City Museum, and the (continuing) restoration of the Teatro Real as an opera house. It would indeed be surprising if Madrid's designation as City of Culture 1992 did not influence at least the timing of decisions during a period of optimism and growth in the City's cultural facilities and institutions in general. The opening of the Teatro de Madrid was delayed to coincide with the Year. It was suggested that Madrid's designation as European Cultural Capital helped "force the issue" in the case of the Prado extension and the creation of the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum.

3. PROGRAMMING

3.1 Timing and content

The programme of Madrid 92 covered the entire 12-month period and appears to have generated an exceptional volume of events. We were told that 2,250 were included, but the analysis of the programme in the Commemorative Volume suggests some 1,200 performances during the year, together with 15 visual art exhibitions and five exhibitions on other themes. The music programme would appear to have mounted 414 performances and theatre performances were estimated at 670, with the dance programme a further 105. The many conferences and seminars included seven on science and technology, five on culture and art and four each on politics and economics, Europe and Spain and the world.

At its best, Madrid 92 represented a deeply serious exploration of historical achievements within the Spanish tradition, especially in music. This included popular Spanish artforms such as flamenco and Zarzuela. New things were defined to cover both new commissions and "new discoveries", work from earlier eras, some of its based on new scholarly research. The focus of the year was to be found, above all, in a new search for Madrid's own creative traditions and in a local re-assessment of Spain as a European nation of the first rank. This was partly a response to the

"danger in post Franco-Spain, when the doors were opened to anything from abroad, of considering that culture comes only from the airport".

The ambitious music programme included concerts by every regional orchestra in Spain, 62 performances in a Zarzuela season, 38 concerts in the Madrid Villa y Corte programmes of music composed in Madrid, 22 concerts in Academia Armonica. The linking theme was a systematic exploration of Madrid's distinctive contribution to European musical culture.

The aim of the drama programme was to support and complement Madrid's regular theatrical activity. An international drama programme has become a feature of Madrid in recent years. Celebrated Spanish authors were a focus of 1992, including Calderon, Lope de Vega and Cervantes. Seven first performances of new work included Gomez de la Serna, Alvaro del Amo, Bob Wilson and Manuel Gutierrez Aragon, whose *La Vida dura* compared the Picaresque tradition of Spain's Golden Age with that of today. *Precipitados*, a trilogy with a Madrid background by three young authors, was also presented. The "Theatre Gallery" gave young theatre companies a chance to showcase their work.

The visual arts programme was rather more heterogenous. European elements were shows on Rodchenko and Stepanova (a symbol of the opening up of the East), and exhibitions on German art of the 70s and 80s and Italian creativity at the end of the previous century. There were exhibitions of illuminated manuscripts and medieval works of art from Portugal, a major display of 19th century Spanish painting, including newly-conserved items, and a Caspar David Friedrich show at the Prado. Two exhibitions were devoted to current movements in the visual arts involving Spanish and European artists.

A distinctive feature of Madrid 92 was the extensive publishing programme undertaken by the Consortium. This covered 46 catalogues, reports, 4 books by authors with a recognised Madrid vocation, 12 monthly editions of an ambitious promotional periodical - *La Capital*, 1 video, 6 CDs (*Historia Musical de Madrid*) and 9 further special publications, 78 items in all.

Contemporary commercial culture was not included in the Consortium's programme, though the recording project included sampler disks for Madrid rock groups. The audio-visual programme sought to familiarise the public with the most important films produced in Madrid since the beginning of the cinema and, at the same time, to deal with the problems facing the audio-visual sector in Europe, concluding with a "declaration of Madrid". By the same token, the extensive conference programme was intended to focus on "fundamental topics of our time" under the generic title "Conversations of Madrid".

A spectacular popular success was an open-air production in the streets of central Madrid by the National Theatre of a "Baroque mystery play". The Consortium made efforts to diffuse events through local cultural centres at the district level. They were characterised as "exploring the living culture of the city".

Musica barrio a barrio: young artists scheme of 144 concerts (34 programmes) taken to five centres;

Opera de Bolsillo (Zarzuela recitals): 99 concerts (18 programmes) taken to 15 centres;

Tribuna de Teatro/Historias de Madrid: 15 productions toured variously to 24 centres (1 show played 13 venues)

Un Nuevo Publico para la Danza: dance experience in 6 centres offered to students from 102 colleges;

Tribuna de Poesia: 5 reading programmes in student residencies.

The Region's Department of Education and Culture co-ordinates and promotes an annual programme of Extension by means of which tours of concerts and theatre performances are promoted, mainly free of charge, in village squares and churches during the summer months. In 1992, the Region's May Festival, and the Estencion programme, received additional funding from the Consortium and this was used to enhance the quality of the events promoted. The programme included 59 of the region's 183 villages, and reached an estimated audience of more than 110,000 people. The programme of Estencion is serviced by about ten central staff and by one contact (also a paid official) in each village.

3.2 Parallel programme

A number of associated events made use of the Madrid 92 logo. These included tennis and golf tournaments and some football matches.

3.3 European theme and cultural development

The Consortium gave early consideration to developing an active dialogue with the international community but this does not seem to have been pursued with any consistency (see above), and we were informed that some offers from other countries were simply not followed up. Despite elements of cooperation, and the expressed wish of the Consortium to communicate an important message internationally, Madrid 92 had an inward-looking flavour which avoid the allure of superficial cosmopolitanism.

4. **IMPACT OF THE EVENT**

4.1 Promotion

The marketing budget for Madrid 92 was substantial, at Pts 943 million roughly 14 per cent of total expenditure. The majority of the budget (70 per cent) was

reportedly spent on press advertising and some 90 per cent of the budget was committed to the Madrid market. The advertising campaign was confined to 1992 itself and there would not appear to have been a concerted public relations campaign within Spain or abroad. A difficulty faced by the marketing campaign was the lack of a media sponsor which was compounded by pervasive sniping in the press. There were other problems. The direct mailing undertaken at the start of the year covered only a generic brochure and contained no programme. Attempts made to establish a central ticketing system failed "for financial and technical reasons" and the event, which was criticised for "overloading the Madrid market", had to run with the existing antiquated system.

4.2 Media reactions

No analysis of the media reaction is available. The international press was said to have spoken well of Madrid 92. Reactions to the event in the Spanish press were colder - for political reasons - but the art critics were positive. Madrid 92 was submerged in the plethora of stories coming from Spain during the year. But even amongst cultural specialists, the key messages about Madrid 92 do not appear to have registered very strongly.

4.3 Attendance

Before the City of Culture (in 1991), the cultural market in Madrid was reported at six million, with 3.8 million for museums and galleries and 2.2 million for the performed arts, which includes 1.7 million for theatres and 487,000 for the National Auditorium. The trend in theatre attendance had been negative during the 1980s (down 32 per cent since 1987/88), with theatre closures and average attendance falling.

The impact of the European City of Culture on the Madrid public is difficult to judge. Figures on attendance at consortium events remain confidential. The event was said to have attracted a public of roughly one million. Attendance at the state-operated performed arts institutions showed a small rise of two per cent in 1992 from 724,167 to 740,270. These venues were home to some of the Madrid 92 programme. The National Auditorium actually presented rather fewer concerts in 1992, 338 compared with 343 in 1991, but attendance rose by five per cent, showing the impact of the upgraded programme made possible during the year. The Zarzuela Theatre suffered a drop in attendances because the Consortium's ambitious Zarzuela project went to another theatre in the city. On the other hand, the opera did rather well in 1992 (up nine per cent) as did the Teatro de la Comedia (up 19 per cent), though attendance at the National Theatre fell by four per cent.

Attendance at the museums and galleries in the city increased by ten per cent in 1992. The rise was mainly attributable to the opening of the Museo Thyssen. The Reina Sofia achieved a 15 per cent increase in 1992. The figures were dragged down by the removal of Guernica from the Cason del Buen Retiro. Despite this, the higher overall level achieved in 1992 was maintained during 1993, but this was much influenced by the new facilities, with the Museo de la Ciudad attracting over

100,000 visitors and the Thyssen reaching 625,000 in the first full year of its opening.

Attendance at Madrid 92 events (on the basis of the reported one million attendance) represented a 17 per cent advance on the City's cultural market in 1991. But the event included a number of festivals/seasons (e.g. the International Theatre Festival, Madrid Dancing and the visiting orchestra programme) which were a standard part of the city programme. Major exhibitions are a growing feature of the Madrid cultural agenda e.g. Velazquez in 1991. The ratio of regular events to additional activity in the programme was said to be roughly 35/65. There was also most probably some displacement of attendance from other established activity. Accordingly, it is difficult to imagine that the net "extra" attendance generated by Madrid 92 amounted to much more than 500,000, or an eight per cent boost to the market.

4.4 Social impact

According to market research evidence collected during the year (as reported to the research team), most residents were fully aware of the event. Some 60 per cent had had contact with it, although this ranged from seeing a television relay to attending a free event or passing by a Madrid 92 project. It would appear only five to ten per cent specifically bought tickets for a Madrid 92 performance or project. This would be consistent with the reputed one million attendance and the view expressed to us that those attending generally averaged four visits. It was suggested that young people responded best, with the professional educated classes largely indifferent and older people scarcely involved at all.

It was suggested that events in general failed to make sufficient impact on the ordinary citizen. This may be attributed to the nature of the programme, with its lack of strong thematic identity, its deliberate emphasis on classical concerts and international orchestras, which has been described as elitist, and its relative lack of popular events. Measures adopted, such as daily advertising in the press, and a limited form of promotion through agents in outlying districts of the city, could not cope with the magnitude of the event. The monthly magazine "Capital" was a beautifully produced publication but it was criticised as a marketing instrument. Madrid residents may have been distracted during the year by Seville and Barcelona with the rival attractions of the Expo and the Olympics. Whilst Madrid 92 made its presence felt in the city, a common reaction was to disregard it as "yet another 1992 fiesta".

4.5 Tourism

Responsibility for tourism in Spain is divided between the Ministry of Tourism and the Regional and Municipal authorities. The primary function of the national bodies is to promote Spain as a tourism destination worldwide, and the regional tier is responsible for organising and promoting tourism within its territorial boundaries. All regulatory functions in tourism are delegated to the Autonomous Regions. The Madrid City Tourism Office now concentrates its activities on promoting conferences and business tourism.

The City Tourism Office was active with the Ministry in promoting Madrid City of Culture at several international trade fairs (Berlin, Brussels and London) and also cooperated as far as possible with the Region. It included Madrid 92 in its Congress guide and brochures and in its monthly events guide. Press trips handled by the tourist office (January to September) fell from 357 in 1991 to 266 in 1992. Travel agents visits rose from 430 to 458. These figures were affected by the more selective approach adopted by the Tourist Office as a result of financial restrictions. Of the press trips, only seven per cent were specifically concerned with Madrid 92.

Tourists staying in Madrid hotels during 1992 numbered 3.78 million, which represented an increase of three per cent on the previous year. The domestic traffic was less than in the previous year, part of a fall of 12 per cent from 1990 to 1993. In contrast, foreign traffic increased substantially during 1992 by 22 per cent, with marked gains in the UK, French, USA and "rest of Europe" markets. The figures dipped again in 1993 and the trend is negative for the entire 1989/1993 period.

A comparison between Barcelona, Seville and Madrid shows that in the foreign markets Madrid performed as well as Seville during 1992 with a 23/24 per cent increase in trips in both cities. Barcelona, however, showed a ten per cent fall in traffic during the year, but this was restored in 1993. Seville, like Madrid, dropped back in 1993 below the 1991 level. In this respect, Seville and Madrid appear to have been roughly equal beneficiaries of the impact of the "Year of Spain", but how much of Madrid's gain was specifically attributable to the City of Culture is impossible to say.

4.6 Protocol

A committee of honour was appointed under the presidency of HM Queen Sofia and a brief opening ceremony was attended by the Ministers of Culture and the Mayors of the other designated cities of culture, the Cultural Commissioner of the European Union, ambassadors, representatives of the Spanish Government and Madrid local authority. The ceremony was followed by a reception and lunch at the Palace. The opening was also marked by an evening concert, which included a specially-commissioned work, and by a dinner for the visiting Mayors.

During the year, there was no protocol event involving the European Union, nor was there a closing ceremony. However, on 13 January 1993, the Queen received the Mayors of Madrid and Antwerp in order to accept the report on 1992, which was published as a Commemorative volume and to mark the beginning of Antwerp's year of European City of Culture 1993.

4.7 Lasting effects

There were plans to continue some 1992 development activities into the future. Little appears to have been realised. Since 1992, the Ministries of Culture and Tourism have established a joint committee in order to further collaboration between

them, and both Ministries are currently working with the City and the Region and with three Madrid museums on a joint pilot publishing project to promote cultural tourism in the City. These initiatives may be attributed, at least in part, to the experience gained and the needs identified in 1992.

5. CONCLUSION

Considerable resources were made available to Madrid 92. Whilst small in relation to the money spent on cultural programmes in Seville and Barcelona during the "Year of Spain", they represented a doubling of the normal cultural budget (all fields) for the City of Madrid and constituted the largest sum devoted to main arts programme areas within the ECCM programme up to that point.

The funds were used to expand, upgrade and promote the cultural programme in Madrid for one year in a way that complemented existing activity. A strength of the year was the detailed interest and serious intent of the substantial programme, especially in the music field, which addressed Madrid's own creative tradition, including achievements from previous eras (backed by research) when it had been a cultural capital of Europe. There were also important intellectual exchanges in other areas including the programme of "Madrid Conversations". Some regarded Madrid 92 as part of the reassertion of the City's essential status as a cultural centre, counterbalancing what might be regarded as a recent over-reliance on "culture from the airport". In post-Franco Spain, the reaction had been to open the doors to everything from abroad. Financial restrictions now mean less opportunities for artists and events from abroad than previously.

The cultural system in Spain and Madrid enjoyed the major financial injection provided by Madrid 92, especially executive artists and programmers. Newly-commissioned musical works numbered about 15, which together with the "re-discovered" works and the new production in drama and dance constitute an artistic legacy.

The international elements in the Madrid 92 programme, e.g. the visiting orchestras and ensembles, drama and dance companies, represented a strengthening of an established diet rather than a novel experience. In other respects, we were struck by the inward-looking flavour of the event, despite an expressed will to communicate an important message internationally and to find a role in Europe for Madrid. It would seem that the message was not relayed very effectively outside Spain and that little in the way of artistic collaboration or viable European platforms for Madrid artists was established. One observation was that "the event was put in the hands of the wrong generation", and in this Madrid 92 may have made a significant contribution to the evolution of cultural attitudes in the City of Madrid.

The impact of the year on the cultural market in Madrid appears to have been relatively limited, perhaps an eight per cent boost and must be regarded as disappointing in relation to the level of investment. The Region's outreach concerts etc. touched the lives of some 100,000 residences. The City's cultural programmes taken to the outer districts represented a positive initiative, if not always directed at

well-prepared ground. But the broader problem has been attributed to a number of factors:

- the Year of Spain saturating the domestic market;
- poor marketing within Madrid;
- over-academic programming and a relative lack of "popular" events.

The foreign tourist traffic to Madrid rose by 277,000 visits in the year, a 23 per cent increase, with strong growth in the UK, rest of Europe and French markets. How much of this is attributable to Madrid 92 within the general effect of the Year of Spain is difficult to say. As a comparison, during the same year foreign trips to Seville grew by 24 whilst to Barcelona they fell.

At the outset, the year was seen by the organisers as an opportunity to place cultural policy firmly on the City's political agenda, to demonstrate its social and economic potential, to develop a carefully planned and co-ordinated infrastructure, and to provide a major bridgehead to the rest of Europe. In the event, the Consortium was finally not able to establish all of these connections convincingly and amongst the babble of messages coming from Spain in 1992 it was difficult for Madrid 92 to get through.

The political impact of the year appears to have been at best neutral; it is evident that cultural policies have not gained a higher priority than before, nor have they become more closely integrated in the City's strategic thinking, or in the delivery of specific social and economic policy objectives. It is regrettable that some felt able to caricature it as an extravagant, inflationary and openly elitist manifestation unrelated to the realities of the City's social and economic problems or to the interests of a majority of its citizens, and isolated from the rest of Europe. Perhaps the event should have been used more strategically for structural development or educational purposes. Public spending on culture was already being cut back in 1992 and the year did nothing to reverse this trend.

Animosities between the different tiers of government, and between personalities, appear to have undermined the effectiveness of the Consortium and limited the sense of common ownership and pride in the event. In the end, Madrid 92 experienced difficulty in rising above its political context to achieve an artistic imperative greater than the sum of its not inconsiderable parts and become more than one other major event in a major European capital city that is already richly endowed with events and cultural institutions. The positive outcome is that relations have been more harmonious subsequently. The benefits of effective collaboration have been understood and are being addressed in a number of areas, not least an important cultural tourism initiative involving all the parties.

Madrid 92, income and expenditure

	Ptas million
Income	
City of Madrid	1,726
Madrid region	250
Ministry of Culture	150
Special lottery	3,047
EC	30
Sponsorship, donations	1,658
Sales ^a	93
Interest	189
Other	<u>30</u>
	7,221
Expenditure	
Overheads	775
Promotion	943
Programme	5,052
Publications	<u>176</u>
	6,948

Source: Madrid 92.

^a Ticket income, sale of stamps, publications, logo rights.

Madrid 92, projects, by responsible authority

	Music	Visual arts	Theatre	Audio/V	Dance	Science/ literature conferences
City	6	4	2 ^a	5 ^a	e ^a	11
Ministry	3	4	3	2	2	2
Region	-	-	-	1	1	-
Joint	1	-	3	-	2	1
Other	<u>8^b</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>
Total projects	19	15	9	9	10	23 ^c
Performances	414	n.a.	e670	..	105 ^d	..

Source: Madrid 92.

^a Includes 1 exhibition.^b Includes 3 recording projects.^c Includes 5 exhibitions.^d Excludes 2 competitions and series of classes.

Madrid 92, selected programme details

	Events
Audio visual programme	
Showings	3
TV programmes	3
Prizes	3
Exhibition	1
Science, conferences, literature	
Exhibitions	5
Conferences	21
Readings	5
Open days	9
Courses	1
Other	2
Conferences, by subject	
Science, technology	7
Culture, art	5
Politics and economics	4
Academies	1
Europe, Spain, World	4

Source: Madrid 92.

Madrid, theatre activity

	1987/88	1988/89	1989/90	1991/92
Theatres open	34	33	28	27
Performances	8,885	7,546	7,859	7,488
Attendance (million)	2.52	2.33	2.11	1.71

Source: Anuario Estadístico 1991 CAM.

Madrid, cultural market

	Thousand	
	1991 ^a	1992 ^a
Museums, galleries ^b , exhibitions		
State ^b	3,524	3,341
City	132 ^c	482 ^d
Theatres	1,713	..
National Auditorium	<u>487</u>	<u>512</u>
	5,856	..

Source: Patronato Turismo Madrid; Ministry of Culture; Ayuntamiento de Madrid.

^a Calendar year or season 1990/91.^b Key institutions attracting 100,000-plus visitors.^c Excludes Centro Cultural de la Villa.^d Excludes Museo de la Ciudad.

Madrid state performed arts institutions, attendance

	1991	1992	1993
National Auditorium			
Attendance	486,925	512,553	-
Zarzuela Theatre			
Opera	43,015	47,005	-
Recitals/concerts	9,284	8,409	-
Ballet	22,686	19,631	-
Zarzuela	26,088	5,936	-
Teatro de la Comedia ^a	66,955	80,317	-
Maria Guerrero ^b	<u>69,514</u>	<u>66,419</u>	-
	724,167	740,270	-

Source: Ministry of Culture.

^a Classic Theatre.^b National Theatre.**Madrid museums and galleries^a, attendance**

	1991	1992	1993
Museo Prado	1,516	1,627	1,500
Cason del Buen Retiro	528	200	66
Reina Sofia	686	790	635
Museo Thyssen	n/a	325	625
Museo Arqueologico	234	278	238
Museo de la Ciudad	n/a	n/a	118
Palacio Real	<u>560</u>	<u>639</u>	<u>635</u>
	3,524	3,859	3,817

Source: Patronato de Turismo.

^a Key institutions attracting 100,000-plus visitors.**Madrid 92, Region's outreach programme^a**

	Activity		Attendance
	Production	Perfs.	
Theatre	21	225	31,505
Music	14	262	74,757
Dance	7	66	7,684
Exhibitions	<u>7</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>---</u>
	45	574	113,946

Source: Madrid Region.

^a 59 municipalities.

Madrid tourist market (tourists staying in hotels)

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Visitors (thousand)					
Spanish	2,326	2,520	2,462	2,272	2,226
Foreign	<u>1,524</u>	<u>1,456</u>	<u>1,222</u>	<u>1,488</u>	<u>1,396</u>
Total	3,850	3,976	3,684	3,760	3,622
Index (1989 = 100)					
Spanish	100	108	106	98	96
Foreign	<u>100</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	100	103	96	98	94

Source: Patronato de Turismo.

Madrid foreign tourist market

	1992 (thousands)	Change 1991-1992 (percentages)
USA	220	+ 21
South America	233	+ 14
UK	160	+ 69
Italy	135	+ 9
France	117	+ 23
Rest Europe	290	+ 52
Japan	121	- 9
Other	<u>214</u>	<u>+ 8</u>
	1,490	+ 22

Source: Patronato de Turismo.

Spain, tourist arrivals

	Million				
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Domestic	19.9	20.7	21.5	19.4	19.1
Foreign	<u>13.2</u>	<u>11.6</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>12.9</u>
Total	33.1	32.3	33.4	31.9	32.0

Source: Turespana.

Madrid tourist market (tourists staying in hotels)

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Visitors (thousand)					
Spanish	2,326	2,520	2,462	2,272	2,226
Foreign	<u>1,524</u>	<u>1,456</u>	<u>1,222</u>	<u>1,488</u>	<u>1,396</u>
Total	3,850	3,976	3,684	3,760	3,622
Index (1989 = 100)					
Spanish	100	108	106	98	96
Foreign	<u>100</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>93</u>
Total	100	103	96	98	94

Source: Patronato de Turismo.

Madrid foreign tourist market

	1992 (thousands)	Change 1991-1992 (percentages)
USA	220	+ 21
South America	233	+ 14
UK	160	+ 69
Italy	135	+ 9
France	117	+ 23
Rest Europe	290	+ 52
Japan	121	- 9
Other	<u>214</u>	<u>+ 8</u>
	1,490	+ 22

Source: Patronato de Turismo.

Spain, tourist arrivals

	Million				
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Domestic	19.9	20.7	21.5	19.4	19.1
Foreign	<u>13.2</u>	<u>11.6</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>12.9</u>
Total	33.1	32.3	33.4	31.9	32.0

Source: Turespana.

Foreign tourist trips, Barcelona, Seville, Madrid

	1991	1992	1993
Trips (million)			
Barcelona	1.43	1.28	1.30
Seville	0.33	0.42	0.37
Madrid	1.22	1.49	1.40
Trips (1991 = 100)			
Barcelona	100	90	101
Seville	100	123	91
Madrid	100	122	94

Source: Turespana.