

Film Production in Sweden – From Art Policy to Industrial Management

Anna-Maria Blomgren
Roger Blomgren
University of Trollhättan/Uddevalla, Sweden

Paper to be presented at the 7th International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management,
Bocconi University, Milan, Italy 29 June – 2 July 2003.

Contents

Introduction	2
An institutional approach	2
State attitudes and policy towards film	3
The emergence of regional film production centres	5
Film as a cultural industry	7
New regionalism	8
Concluding remarks	10
References	11

Introduction

In Sweden, there is a regional resource- and production centre for film called Film in West. It is located in Trollhättan, which is a small town in the west of the country. It is a joint-stock company owned by the regional council, and it was established in 1992 for the implementation of the region's public policy for film and media. Today, it has become a powerful actor in national film politics. There was a breakthrough in 1998, when as many as eight feature films were co-produced by Film in West and shot in the region. The most well known film that year was *Fucking Åmål* (given the English title 'Show me love' outside Sweden). The film had almost 900 000 visitors in Sweden, (about 10 percent of Sweden's total population), and the film was also a big success in Norway, Finland, Switzerland, Russia and Holland. In 2001, about half of the total number of feature films produced in Sweden are produced in co-operation with Film in West, including international film productions like von Trier's *Dancing in the Dark* and *Dogville*.

There has been a transfer of power and control from Stockholm, with the national Swedish Film Institute and a few dominant film production companies, to a regional centre in western Sweden headed by Film in West. In addition, there are two more regional centres dealing with production of commercial feature films, one in the south of Sweden and one in the north. None of them have reached the same position as Film in West, though.

The aim of this paper is to describe and analyse the political processes behind the emergence of regional film production in Sweden. How has this development been made possible? Has it been a deliberate policy from the state to decentralise film policy to the regional level, or has the state been forced to accept a development initiated and pursued by the regions themselves? Has national policy towards regional film production been active or reactive? What have been the main motives for the regions to take up film production as a legitimate task? How have they acted in relation to the state?

An institutional approach

In analysing this development, we intend to apply institutional theory. Our thesis is that institutions matter. Institutions are to be seen as an intermediate level between state structures and rational choice/actor explanations. Institutions are equivalent to formal rules, compliance procedures and standard operation practices that structure the relationship between individuals in various units of the polity and economy (see Rothstein 1998).

What we have is a policy change, and we shall argue that it can be best understood from an institutional perspective. We will argue that it is the specific institutional conditions of the film policy field that explains regionalisation and the change of Swedish film policy. Political output and the behaviour of single actors are controlled by formal and informal rules. The formal rules are drawn up in an agreement between the state and the film industry.¹ Among informal rules we find for example the predominant conception of quality. The understanding of "quality" has historically been conclusive for which films have been eligible for public economic support in Sweden (see Blomgren 1998).

¹ "Film industry" includes actors in production, distribution and exhibition of films.

There have been attempts to analyse film policy from a structural perspective. In Marxist theory, changes in film policy can be explained by the ruling economic conditions in a society. The power of capital owners signifies a conclusive influence on political decisions and their implementation (see Bächlin 1977, Miliband 1969, Taylor 1995). Today, policy changes are more often explained in terms of other structures, such as globalisation, the new economy or the new regionalism (see Friedmann 2000, Jonung, 2002, Eriksson & Ådahl 2000, Keating 2002). Structural explanations suffer from two major weaknesses, however. The level of abstraction is often very high, which makes these theories hard to falsify. Indications of structural influence can almost always be found. The second weakness is that this kind of theories cannot explain variations in change in different policy fields. For example, the structure of new regionalism cannot explain why film policy in Sweden has changed and, for example, theatre policy has not.

Institutional theory operates on a more tangible level. We can conceive of film policy as a kind of institution. By institution we mean a defined area or field, with its own rules of the game and with a set of players. These players may have different resources with which they can determine the political order (Rothstein 1992, p. 17). The institutional arrangements can in their turn be seen as deliberately created structures that, especially in the long run, have influence on the power and interests of actors, and indirectly on political output (Lindblom 1995, p. 40 f.).

Research indicates that institutions as such determine (a) legitimate actors; (b) the number of actors; (c) the ordering of action; and (d) what information actors have about each other's intentions (Rothstein 1998, p. 146, see also Marsh & Rhodes 1992). The access of alternative actions is strongly influenced by the institutional context. Existing institutions signify that a certain type of capacity of action is at disposal. (Lindblom 1995, p. 47).

An example of the institutional approach in cultural policy is Hillman Chartrands (1989) well known models to describe how states have organised public art policy: the state as a facilitator, a patron, an architect or an engineer. The most common model in Europe has been the architect model, where the state takes an overall responsibility for art policy and give support directly through a Ministry for Art and Cultural Affairs. Support is generally given both to artists and to institutions. The artists are invited to influence the public policy through professional organisations that are regularly consulted by the state. Sweden is a typical example of the architect model.

In this paper we shall analyse the regionalisation of Swedish film production from an institutional perspective. We shall argue that the agreement between the state and the film industry has been an influential institution, defining the legitimate area, the legitimate players and the legitimate rules of the game.

State attitudes and policy towards film

In Sweden, the state's first reaction against film production was censorship, which was installed in 1911. It was the first state controlled censorship in the world. Influential groups in society had argued that some films were dangerous. It was especially working class kids who needed to be protected from such films. The church pointed out that film encouraged profanity (Reinholds 1987, p. 31). Another restraining decision towards film was to introduce an entertainment tax. In those days, film was not acknowledged any cultural or artistic value.

It was conceived of as entertainment, in the same class as circus, jazz music or popular music (Blomgren 1998). One explanation why the state not did support or organised cinema under its control, as it did with broadcastings in the 1920s and 1930s, was that cinema was in the hands of private companies and thereby fell into the category of entertainment (Moran 1996, p. 4).

The Swedish state did nothing to support film between 1909 and 1951. State measures were instead characterised by a policy to restrain film, with censorship and taxes on cinema tickets. It was not until 1951 that a parliamentary decision to subsidise filmmaking was taken. It was decided that the so-called entertainment tax, introduced in 1918, would go back to the film producers. At this time, the state made no quality judgement concerning films. The refund was connected to the number of filmgoers. Thus, it was a kind of industrial support. Film policy was not yet considered to be part of the general cultural or art policy. Film was an industry among other industries – an industry needing public support or abatement to survive.

In the late 1950s there was an increasing critique of the government's refusal to see film production as an art. Eventually, the government took influence and started to make a difference between quality films and commercial films. Public support should be reserved for "good" films, like Ingmar Bergman's productions (Blomgren 1998).

Now, that the state had decided to take an active part and support the production of quality films, the Swedish Film Institute was established in 1963. The institute was organised as a foundation based on a written agreement between the state and the film industry. The foundation form was chosen to guarantee autonomy. This meant that the right to make authoritative decisions in film policy was transferred from the Riksdag (the national parliament in Sweden) to the Film Institute. Among the parties to the agreement were, besides the state, a number of organisations representing the interests of film production companies, film exhibitors and film distributors. The state had four of the eight seats on the first board, and the film industry had four. Equal power was thus institutionalised in the agreement.

The first film agreement prescribed that the entertainment tax on cinema tickets would be abolished. Instead the industry agreed to pay 10 percent of the price for each sold ticket to the Film Institute. The fee would be used to support Swedish film productions. It was regulated in the agreement that 75 percent of the money should go to support production of Swedish "quality" films. The argument for this was that such films should have support since film was now seen as an art on the same terms as traditional fine cultural activities such as theatre etc. The main focus of the film agreement was to regard film as art (Blomgren 1998). The rest of the Institute expenditure was built on a general support to the Swedish film production industry, as a kind of industrial support. It was argued that the film industry would not be able to survive on its own in a small country as Sweden. To maintain a domestic film industry it was necessary to provide public subsidies to the industry itself.

We can see that the film agreement, as an institution, regulated the legitimate area for film policy, the legitimate players and the legitimate rules of the game. This was done in close co-operation with the commercial film industry. The film agreement meant that some actors were excluded from the shaping of film policy. Among the excluded actors we have, for example, the film workers' union and interest organisations representing regions and municipalities. The agreement also meant that film policy issues were effectively transferred away from the elected Riksdag to a corporate body, half populated by the receivers of public film support.

The way the film agreement was drawn up, it is not surprising that film production have been almost in its entirety concentrated to Stockholm and a few commercial film companies. Film activity and especially film production was a matter only for centrally based actors and the state. Regions and municipalities were for a long time excluded from this policy arena.

Policy communities are policy networks characterised by a strictly limited number of members, dominated by economic or professional interests. Other groups are consciously excluded. Membership, values and outcome are stable over time, and there is an equal balance of resources and power. Policy communities are generally associated with policy continuity (see Marsh & Rhodes 1992).

As a description of Swedish film policy, this fits almost perfectly. So how is it that there was a regionalisation of Swedish film production anyway? How is it that it was written into the film agreement of 2000 that the Film Institute should give economic support to three regional centres for film production? How was that possible, given the tight policy community of the parties to the film agreement?

The emergence of regional film production centres

In the 1974, the Swedish parliament came to a decision on a new cultural policy in Sweden. One of the overall objectives was that cultural or art policy should aim at geographic equality. Most of the Swedish theatres and museums were located in Stockholm. To achieve geographical dispersion, regional theatre facilities and regional museums were established by the central government in the Swedish regions (Blomgren & Blomgren 2002). From the 1970s, regionalisation has been an overall objective for all art policy in Sweden.

During the same period, the need decentralise film policy was noticed as well. But it was not decentralisation of the production of films that was discussed, but the distribution and exhibition of film. In 1975 the government started to support film distribution, and gave subsidies to exhibitors. This was done outside the film agreement. The film agreement did not regulate this part of the public film policy. Therefore the government was able to give support to selected exhibitors (Blomgren 1998). It is also important to note that the state did not decentralise these tasks to the regional or local levels. It remained in the hands of the state. The decentralisation of film production was never on the political agenda at this time, though. The regions did not show any interest, and neither did the actors on the central level – the parties of the film agreement.

It was not until the middle of the 1990s that a discussion started about film policy as a concern for regional politics. In the 1993 parliamentary commission to promote a new cultural policy in Sweden, film activity is for the first time mentioned as a concern for the regional and local political level. Regional political actors were demanding state support for film production in the regions in order to reduce the domination of film production in Stockholm. The commission proposed that the Swedish Film Institute should subsidise regional film production funds (SOU 1995:84). The government took impression from the commission and in its governmental proposition from 1996, film activity is pointed out as a concern for the regional political level. However, it was not the government's intention that promotion of regional film centres should result in that these centres produced (commercial) motion

pictures. Instead, the aim was that the regional film centres should encourage children and youth to work with film and to create an interest for film as an art (prop. 1996/97:3, p. 92).

In 1996, very few Swedish films were produced in the regions. Four years later, the greater part of all film productions was located at the regional level, through the three regional production centres Filmpool Nord, Film in West and Film i Skåne. The fact that regional councils are now engaging themselves with the production of feature film is not due to any kind of assistance or interest from the central administration and policy makers. The initiative seems to have come from below – from regional and/or local governments and administrations. In this section we shall analyse the emergence of regional film production centres, and see how this development is dependent on the political institution of the film agreement.

Filmpool Nord and Film in West both started their activity around 1991/1992. In both cases, the initiative came from the regional level. Filmpool Nord was directly established as a film production centre with the outspoken purpose to create new jobs and economic growth in the region. A member of the Riksdag from this region sat on the first board and was proposing motions in the Riksdag to support regional film production. The Swedish Film Institute had a representative on the board as well. Part of the financing came from the municipalities of the region and part from the Swedish Film Institute in Stockholm.

Film in West started out as a branch of the regional administration of cultural affairs in the former region Älvsborgs län, in the west part of the country. The regions and the local municipalities in Sweden had started to engage in cultural affairs in 1974, but they had so far taken no interest in film. There were regional theatres, regional museums, regional orchestras and regional libraries, but no regional film production activities. The regional council of Älvsborgs län now decided, in 1991/92 approximately, to start a regional resource centre for film and video. It was not originally, like Filmpool Nord, established to create jobs and increase economic growth in the region, but in a few years the resource centre had started to engage in co-financing production of commercial feature films.

A formative moment for both Film in West and Filmpool Nord was when Sweden became a member of the European Union in 1995. Among other regions, these two managed to get classified as areas eligible for economic support from the regional development funds of the EU. Part of that support has been used to build up the film production activities. These funds have meant that the regional centres can offer top financing to film producers who are willing to locate a film production to the region. They can attract productions that need the extra top money to make a film. With the EU funds, the region could engage in film production as a cultural industry.

We argue that the regional film production centres were realised through a change in the institutional framework of film policy – through a change of the norms regulating policy in this area. Hitherto, film production had enjoyed state support as valuable art and as support to make the industry able to survive in a small country like Sweden. What happened in the mid- and late 1990s was that film as cultural industry was increasingly regarded as an expedient for regional and local economic development. It was not film as art that primarily interested local and regional actors, but film production as a strategy to create jobs and economic growth in regions with a declining economy. From the regional level, the emphasis was on industrial policy, rather than art policy.

Film as a cultural industry

There are clear parallels between the rise of film as a cultural industry in Sweden and in other west European countries. In the 1980s, it was argued that the state's culture and art policies to some extent had failed in the mission to reach out to the people for whom it was intended. Girard (1982, p. 26) claims that public policies to develop culture have largely failed and the cultural institutions have succeeded only marginally in expanding their audience. The public has preferred industrial/commercially produced cultural work - "popular culture". From a democratic point of view, cultural industries have done better than the state's culture policies in reaching people. Girard's conclusion is that "far more is being done to democratise and decentralise culture with the industrial products available on the market than with the products subsidised by the public authorities." (Girard 1982, p. 25).

This was a new and more positive way to look upon cultural industries than before. Cultural industries could actually promote more democracy than public policy for cultural affairs. Even more important, it started to become obvious that this kind of industries were becoming increasingly important contributors from an economic point of view. Hence, the views of cultural industries as a concept therefore reappeared in a new shape on the political-economic agenda.

A good example is Great Britain, where the argument to support the development of cultural industries in cities and regions suffering from economic decline became common in the mid-1980s. The main problem was not that there was too little culture and arts in these cities and regions. Rather, the problem was a serious decline in traditional manufacturing industries and thereby increasing unemployment figures. The solution was to change the structure of the local/regional economy. It is in this view that the support of culture industries becomes an important tool for local and regional growth. This thinking was influenced by a number of local authorities (see Lewis 1990, p. 135). Initially, these ideas were connected to activities in Greater London Council between 1981-1986, as culture industries became a part of the London Industrial Strategy (see McIntyre 1996, p. 223 f.). According to Lewis (1990 p. 135), the strategy demonstrated the importance of culture as an crucial industry for developing the city.

Sheffield is another example of a city in Britain that has transformed some of its economic activities towards cultural industries. In 1983, Sheffield City Council, associated with other local actors, started to develop the idea of a cultural industry area. As noted by Lewis (1990, p. 136), Sheffield has gradually become a commercial success with a growing economic cluster of cultural industry including production of film, video, music etc. Their goal has been to develop the city into a national base for cultural production. Also in other places in Great Britain, a substantial number of media related economic activities emerged in the end of the 1980ies, including Birmingham, Nottingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol and Lester. According to McIntyre (1996, p. 126), "the most striking thing about this ... is the emphasis on small production companies as the driving force of both industrial development and cultural empowerment".

In the British example, McIntyre (1996) argues that it was in the mid-1980s that most of the elements were in place to make a fairly radical shift in the debate about regional/cultural industries. Local authorities searched for mechanisms and strategies for reinvigorating their local economies, including different commercial and cultural oriented actors. There was also a

change in that (traditional) industrial rhetoric for economic growth became used to secure new private and public funding for cultural development. It is important to note that the initiatives to create or boost a cultural industry in Britain were rarely taken by the central government. Instead, this was largely a process initiated by local authorities in association with local commercial cultural actors combining efforts to gain economic development.

This trend of mixing cultural and industrial policy in Sweden seems almost identical with the process that started in Britain some fifteen years ahead. In Sweden, the first signs of this change from cultural to industrial or economic rhetoric relating to film policy and film production appeared in an article in the leading regional newspaper in 1996 (Göteborgs-Posten 1996-08-14). It was written by the coming Managing Director for Film in West, Mr Tomas Eskilsson. Under a headline claiming that regional film production is a good investment, he argued that the film industry is also the most important tool to develop media industry (cluster) in the region. To invest in film production is thereby also an important component to create new jobs. Hence, instead of using a cultural foundation for the argument, the economic rationale was placed up front to explain why investment in Film in West was essential for the region and the municipalities involved.

But it is not sufficient to show a change in rhetoric. To change a policy, you need to change the institutional framework. It is clear that the Swedish regions are trying to play a more active role in the film policy field. In fact, regions are acting more independently of the state in many areas. We shall now turn to the concept of new regionalism, and see what it can offer for the understanding of the regionalisation of film policy.

New regionalism

Political scientists have for some time been discussing the emergence of a new politics and its consequences for the traditionally strong nation-states. These political challenges for states are largely related to changes in the world economy. At the same time, the new political arena enhances a trend of regionalisation. As noted by Heywood (2002, p. 3f), the European nation-states' integration into the European Union (EU) is one such example, which sets new demands, limitations and possibilities for the member nations. Furthermore, Keating (2001, p. 201), argues that these changes are also strongly influenced by regional, local and minority nationalist movements, and by the advance of the market and civil society, within as well as between nation-states. As noted by Pierre (2000, p. 1), these new trends in politics tend to erode the traditional bases of political power.

There seems to be a new territorial dimension of politics, represented by regions as a new system of social regulation and collective action below the traditional nation-state. This new politics is also known as new regionalism. According to Keating (2002, p. 202), new regionalism is a complex set of processes and influences, since the interplay of function, identity, political mobilisation, systems of representation and government vary across the states of Europe and increasingly within them.

The economic restructuring is characterised by the change from a top-down policy by the national-state trying to integrate regions into the national economy, to a more autonomous role for the regions. This is a trend in Europe where regions today are emerging as a key level of economic change (Keating 2002, p. 206) Sweden has a long and strong historic political tradition to regard the regions as an instrument for the state's political-economic policies. The

Swedish County Administrative Board (Länsstyrelse) has been, and still is, the state organ in the regions with the aim to implement and control that national policy intention is fulfilled at the regional level. However, the conventional top-down policy has experienced increasing difficulties in handling the changes in the new globalised economy in Sweden. Hence, the focus has changed towards the local and regional level. Swedish regional and local governments are today more involved in economic policy, especially in questions regarding sub-national economic development and active labour market policy.

This new trend has made it possible for the regions to be more “self-governing” in some areas. The regions have strengthened their position, both as a political actor and as an arena for politics. The Swedish membership in the EU has naturally enhanced this development. Since the entrance, Swedish regions have been able to apply for support from the European Council Regional Development Fund, Objective 2. This is an important explanation of the success for film production in western Sweden. Here, local municipality councils managed to get the region classified as an Objective 2-area, by reference to decline in traditional manufacturing industries (mainly car production). One idea was to go for film production, as a means to enhance economic growth and employment. The cultural arguments to do this investment were quite weak. At the same time, the small regional public centre for film production, Film in West, was looking for a dynamic environment in which it could grow. The officials at Film in West had plans to expand the activities towards co-financing commercial film productions. The result was that the organisation was able to expand with EU-money and attract large film productions to the region. A rapidly increasing part of Swedish films began to get shot in this region.

This new institutional framework made it legitimate for the regions to take active part in film policy. A new institutional field for film policy had been constructed: and it was a successful marriage between cultural industry and new regionalism. The regional production centres could on the one hand use the traditional institutions for film support, i.e. the film agreement, and on the other hand offer money of their own to film production companies. The possibility to offer this additional money on top of the state subsidies for film productions has given them a competitive advantage.

Central actors, like the official committee on a new film agreement in 1998, could only witness what happened. Gradually there was an adaptation of the national film policy to the regional development that had taken place (SOU 1998, p.142). In 1997, the parliament decided to introduce a state subsidy to regional film activities (Svenska Filminstitutet 2001). For the first time, the state’s support to regional film activity was written into the film agreement (prop. 1998/99). The state had, in co-operation with the film industry, given legitimacy to regional film productions centres.

There are two possible interpretations of this adaptation. On the one hand, the state might have been forced to accept the development, however unwillingly. On the other hand, state and the parties to the film agreement might have been acting very strategically. By including the regional centres for film production in the agreement, the issue was effectively lifted away from the Riksdag. By specifying that only three regional centres for film production would be eligible for support from the Film Institute, the parties to the film agreement could put a lid on further development. They have also been able to keep the new film actors outside the policy community, by refusing to include them as partners in the film agreement.

Concluding remarks

In this paper we have analysed the change in Swedish film policy that took place in the late 1990s from an institutional perspective. We have argued that the establishment of regional film production centres can be explained by reference to the way Swedish film policy is institutionalised.

The film agreement has been an important institutional factor, by which a tight policy network consisting of the state and the film industry in Stockholm has been able to keep new actors out. The Swedish membership in the European Union in 1995 opened up an opportunity, however, for regions to engage in the production of commercial feature films as a strategy for regional economic development. The regions have become autonomous actors in this field, as well as in many other policy fields.

We mean that there are two parallel institutional frameworks in the film policy area today. On the national level the Swedish Film Institute is responsible for the implementation of film policy. On the regional and local level we have regional authorities and regionally based film production companies working together with film production. These new actors have challenged the predominant film policy community and strengthened their position. The regions that have succeeded to build up a regional film production activity have taken advantage of opportunity to use film production to enhance regional development, with funds from the EU. The state has not had the power to stop this, but it has arguably acted to reduce the scope for further regionalisation.

The success of regional film production is probably to a great extent dependent on the fact that they can offer top financing to the film production companies. But what will happen with the regional film production centres in the future? For Film in West, the EU-funding will stop in 2006. Critics have predicted that this will be the end of the regional film production saga in Sweden. The film production centres themselves are optimistic, and believe that EU-money can be replaced by more funding from the local and regional political system. This will be a test of how deeply rooted the regional film production centres are. Do they have legitimacy in the region for attracting commercial film productions with tax money? If they are successful in this they will probably survive. If they are not, the power over Swedish film policy will be returned to the Swedish Film Institute.

References

- Blomgren, A-M & R. Blomgren (2002), *Det ostyrbara pastoratet. Teaterpolitikens nätverk*. Högskolan i Trollhättan/Uddevalla, forskningsrapport 02:03.
- Blomgren, R. (1998), *Staten och filmen*. Hedemora: Gidlunds.
- Bächlin, P. (1977), *Filmen som vara*. Stockholm: Bo Cavefors.
- Eriksson, K. and M. Ådahl (2000), *Finns det en ny ekonomi och kommer den till Europa?* Penning och valutapolitik No 1. Sveriges Riksbank. Stockholm.
- Friedmann, T. (2000), *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. Anchor Books. New York.
- Girard, A. (1982), "Cultural Industries: A Handicap or a New Opportunity for Cultural Development?" in *Cultural Industries: A Challenge for the Future of Culture*, Paris: UNESCO, p. 24-39.
- Göteborgs-Posten 1996-08-14.
- Heywood, P., E. Jones and M. Rhodes (eds.) (2002), *Developments in West European Politics*. London: Palgrave.
- Hillman Chartrand, H. (1989), "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perspective – Past, Present and Future", in M. C. Cummings Jr. And J. M. Davidson Schuster (eds.): *Who's to Pay for the Arts?* New York: ACA Books.
- Jonung, L. (2000), *Den nya ekonomin i ett historiskt perspektiv*. Ekonomisk Debatt årg 28 nr 6. (pp. 561-566).
- Keating, M. (2002) "Territorial Politics and the New Regionalism", in Heywood et al. (eds.) *Developments in West European Politics*. London: Palgrave.
- Lewis, J. (1990), *Art, Culture, and Enterprise – The Politics of Art and Cultural Industries*. London: Routledge.
- Lindblom, A. (1995), *Medborgarskapet i välfärdsstaten*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- McIntyre, S. (1996), Art and Industry: Regional Film and Video Policy in the UK. In A. Moran (ed.) *Film Policy. International, National and Regional Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Marsh, D. & R.A.W. Rhodes (eds.) (1992), *Policy Networks in British Government*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miliband, R. (1973), *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Quartet books.
- Moran, A. (1996), *Film Policy. International, National and Regional Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Pierre, J. (ed.) (2000.) *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prop. 1996/97:3.

Prop. 1998/99:131.

Reinholds, J. (1987), *Filmindustri 1900-1975*. Lerum: Reinholds text & förlag.

Rothstein, B. (1998), "Political Institutions: An Overview" i R. E. Goodin & H-D. Klingemann(eds.), *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rothstein, B. (1992), *Den korporativa staten*, Stockholm: Norstedts.

SOU (1995:84) *Kulturpolitikens inriktning*.

SOU (1998:142) *Ny svensk filmpolitik*.

Svenska Filminstitutet (2001) *Regionerna i centrum*. Stockholm: SFI.

Taylor, G. (1995), "Marxism" in D. Marsh. & G. Stoker (eds.), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. London: MacMillan.