Governance & Funding of Religious Heritage

A Legal Perspective on the Case of Denmark & some general Remarks
A Common (European) Challenge:

An essential connection between funding & governance within the overall framework in which heritage is considered, including elements like conservation policy, legal procedures or tourism development.
Misunderstandings and Campaigns

“Belinda Johansen har meldt sig ud af folkekirken, men hun er godt tilfreds med, at hun betaler til kirkernes vedligeholdelse over sin almindelige skat.”

(Politiken, 8. september 2016, 1. sektion, s. 7, billedtekst).

Det er imidlertid ikke en retvisende gengivelse af de faktiske og retlige finansieringsforhold.

“BJ has denoted her membership of folkekirken. She is glad to know, though, that she still contributes economically to the maintenance of the church buildings via her common taxation.”

(Quotation from one of the leading news papers this morning).

That is however not the case. E.g. renovation of Our Saviours Church: 50 Mio dkr from church members in Copenhagen (½ the population), 40 mio from charities. Nothing from taxes.
2.350 Church buildings within *folkekirken* are by law governed to meet two purposes:

- Best possible context for religious use
- Ensure the cultural heritage of the church building

They are governed by local *church wardens*, *congregation councils* (volunteers) *and deans* (employed) with decision competence, advisory supported by the Nationalmuseum. Their maintenance is funded by *church taxes*, solely paid by church members + in few cases payment from tourists + 6 mio d.kr./year from state budget.

They are not covered by legislation on listing of heritage 1683 midddelalderkirker
Concrete examples
All other religious buildings

Including rectories within *folkekirken*, synagogues, mosque’s, catholic church buildings etc are under the legislation of listing.

Their maintenance is funded by the owner/governor, i.e.: for religious communities outside folkekirken by the community; for folkekirken by members via church taxes (not by municipal or state taxes).

Governance decisions follows the money, however based on conditions set by the possible listing.
Thus, to conclude the answers from yesterday:

Funding, maintenance and governance of religious buildings seen as cultural heritage in Denmark is funded privately or via church taxes, paid by members of folkekirken only (+ charities + a minimal budget to be applied for in the state tax).

Museums have an advisory role.
The governance is mainly based on volunteer work.
Questions from Today:

Who will pay for maintenance of the cultural heritage in and with the church buildings in a future scenario with fewer or few church members?

Who will take the governance responsibility?
Mors as an example:

34 churches, 31 of which from 11th-13th century.

21,000 people, 18,000 are church members

22 church councils, 12 priests
Are religious buildings meant to be cultural heritage?
Ways Forward?

What money can buy is:
• Active citizenship governing and maintaining the cultural heritage in the folkekirke church buildings – or at least: that is what the church tax system (which changed the levy of tithes in the early 20th century) bought.

What money cannot buy is:
• private, individual maintenance of religious heritage buildings. History with privately owned churches as well as buildings belonging to religious communities today shows this.
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