The aim of this article is to discuss the conflict in the financing of culture. The conflict stands between what is desired for artistic reasons and what is realistic regarding market demands. Connected to this is the discussion of the difference between artistic production and other types of production. The article ends with a discussion of the relation between the artistic producer and the market. The market is considered to consist of everyone in control of resources that could be turned into an income for the art producer.

The conflict between art and the market is studied in the author's doctoral thesis which includes four case studies concerning the performing arts. In this article, these case studies are presented in a condensed war. The cases were mainly based on interviews but documents, e.g. accounting material, have also been used when appropriate.

Nothing in the cases indicated that someone besides the art producer had a direct influence over the artistic considerations. Some sort of indirect influence could, however, have taken place.

None of the cases have given any indication that art producers have a realistic knowledge of what the market wants. The consensus seemed to be that audience satisfaction was the most important aim. The distributor's satisfaction did not seem to be of equal importance. Theatres sometimes seemed to target an audience that had no desire to go to the theatre—and were subsequently surprised when few people showed up for the performances.

The art producers seemed to have no idea about the degree of artistic freedom in relation to different levels of public (government) funding, or even what public sponsors wanted in return for their grants. Most of the producers were not at all interested in corporate sponsoring. They felt, at least partly, that their product was of no interest to the private sector. There seems to have been some antipathy towards discussing matters of exchange.

In away, viewing the staff as part of the marker was problematic, as they also had a direct influence over artistic decisions. The objectives of the staff and artistic objectives sometimes coincided, though this was not always the case; e.g., higher wages or a better touring car was sometimes a higher priority than an artistically interesting arrangement. As long as the marker supplied the performing art producer with the necessary resources, no major problem seemed to exist. But quite likely, this producer must have adjusted his artistic ambition to realistic expectations. Apparently, producers have realised that they have a limited room to manoeuvre. If audiences were too small, there was a risk that neither distributors nor government or sponsors would want to participate in the financing of the proposed production. Perhaps not even the staff would wish to participate under such circumstances. Without an audience of the planned size, the artist's interest in performing diminishes and the situation becomes devoid of pleasure. Art must bring joy to the performer.

Some evidence showed that producers have tried to influence different parts of the market in order to receive more resources. Another war has been to decrease the costs. Decreases in costs that left the artistic production intact seemed to be preferred to those resulting in lower artistic quality.

Furthermore, various ways of handling a remaining conflict were identified:
. Lower artistic ambitions and adjusting to the market (*homo economicus*).
. Simply continuing as before and hoping that someone will eventually par the bills- or face the consequences.
. Stop producing (only possible when fixed costs are moderate).
. Combine artistic work with work in other arenas as a war of financing the artistic production.
. Handle the conflict intuitively, based on experience of what had earlier been successful or at least acceptable regarding e.g. audience preferences.
. If the producer wants to do what he is actually able to do, the potential conflict is eliminated (internalisation).
. A collective denial of commercial interest combined with at least the pretence that nothing besides artistic considerations are at issue. The important thing is that other people will not perceive that any conflict is being handled. Actually, no conflict should even be perceived in the art producer's own mind.

Finally, there is a discussion as to whether artistic production actually, differs from other types of production. The answer is that there are differences; the most important of which probably have to do with artistic freedom and that art, for many people, has a value besides the economic value. For art producers, a rational *homo economicus* is not enough: good art presupposes a *homo ludens* (the playful human being) as well. Perhaps this may be true for traditional commercially oriented companies as well as for performing arts companies. But art is not totally free; normally there is some sort of influence from those who pay for it.