

**International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP)**

**Inventory**

**on**

**Cultural Diversity Challenges and Opportunities**

Prepared by Greg Baeker, PhD  
Principal,  
ACP: Cultural Research and Consulting

May 2000

# Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1.0</b> <b>METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0</b> <b>SURVEY RESULTS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 <b>OVERRIDING CHALLENGES</b> .....	4
2.2 <b>OVERRIDING OPPORTUNITIES</b> .....	4
2.3 <b>KEY CONCERNS IN CULTURAL DIVERSITY</b> .....	5
2.4 <b>KEY CONCERNS IN CULTURAL POLICY</b> .....	6
2.5 <b>CHANGING ROLE OF GOVERNMENT AND KEY SECTORAL CONCERNS</b> .....	7
2.6 <b>POLICY INSTRUMENTS</b> .....	8
<b>3.0</b> <b>RECURRING THEMES</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1 <b>CLARIFYING POLICY ASSUMPTIONS</b> .....	9
3.2 <b>LINKING LOCAL AND GLOBAL</b> .....	11
3.3 <b>INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSIFICATION</b> .....	12
3.4 <b>MAXIMIZING NEW TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES</b> .....	12
3.5 <b>LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY</b> .....	13
3.6 <b>NORTH – SOUTH DIFFERENCES</b> .....	13
<b>4.0</b> <b>NEXT STEPS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
 <b>APPENDIX A – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES</b> .....	 <b>16</b>
 <b>APPENDIX B - INVENTORY OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES</b> .....	 <b>25</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Second Informal Meeting of the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP) in September 1999 in Oaxaca, Mexico Ministers agreed, based on a Canadian proposal, to undertake specialized work on cultural diversity and globalization. The aim is to provide Network members with specific ideas and concrete proposals about how to further their cultural policies both domestically (nationally) and internationally.

The first step of this work involved securing input from Network members on broad challenges and opportunities in their own countries. The intent was not to look exhaustively at any single policy area, but rather to establish a “snapshot” of issues facing each country as a means of identifying priorities for further investigation and action.

A draft survey instrument was developed in consultation with the Network Liaison Bureau. This survey was circulated to members of the Working Group and subsequently reviewed at the meeting of the Group in December 1999 in Ottawa. The final survey is attached as Appendix A. It was distributed to all Network members in January 2000. Eleven (11) countries responded: Canada, Croatia, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, Norway, Saint Lucia, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland.

### *Survey Responses*

The overriding theme in the responses was the impact of cultural diversity and globalization on shifting relationships among local (or subnational), national and international identities and forms of association. Local or subnational association was defined geographically as well as “local” interests based on ethno-racial, cultural or other forms of difference.

The challenge expressed by many countries was one of recognizing diversity and protecting the interests and rights of minorities<sup>1</sup> – linguistic, cultural and fundamental civil and human rights - while at the same time sustaining a basic level of shared identity, social cohesion and national solidarity in a global environment.

These tensions are by no means new in most countries. However, attempts to sustain the necessary balance between the two are being challenged as never before by two fundamental facets of globalization – the increased transnational flow of people, and an integrating global economy with its accompanying global media flows.

Increased immigration has brought unprecedented levels of diversity that countries are struggling to manage in all facets of national life, including cultural development. Set against this increased diversity is the homogenizing impact of new technologies and the

---

<sup>1</sup> In the case of South Africa the concern is not with minority, but with *majority* rights.

influx of foreign cultural products with their widespread appeal, especially to youth. In some countries rapid urbanization is contributing to these homogenizing tendencies.

Cultural diversity and globalization, in other words, are “fracturing” countries from “above” (growing transnational forms of identity and association) and “below” (local or subnational forms of identity). Responses spoke of the need for cultural policies that support and define new forms of identity and belonging in diverse societies and new roles for national governments in mediating the local and the global in more effective ways.

Several countries pointed to the implications of these challenges for rebalancing powers and responsibilities at different levels of governance. Different countries in the Network start from different places in this regard. For example, for Switzerland where power and responsibility is highly decentralized and rest largely with cities and cantons, the challenge is to build from these local strengths but to also find “freedom for action in national cultural policy”.

For Senegal the challenge is the reverse: “to emphasize the importance of asserting the cultural personality of each of the country’s 10 regions, the development of local bonds of solidarity ...”. Canada’s experience and challenge falls somewhere in between Switzerland and Senegal in its efforts to coordinate and share responsibilities across local, provincial and national levels of authority.

Norway spoke of the challenges facing the nation state in the context of technologies and networks “tearing down walls, weaving us together and forcing us all to speed up, downsize, download, integrate and streamline”. While conventional wisdom holds that nation states are declining in influence, Norway suggests that the need for *new global governance systems* may in fact enhance the role of the nation: “(The nation) remains the basic political unit ... Although governments have delegated some powers to international intergovernmental institutions, political accountability is still exercised through national Parliaments and elections – and hardly anyone wants to change that”.

The establishment of the INCP is one effort to shape these new instruments of global governance, while preserving the freedom of nations to implement national policies deemed to be in their best interests.

## 1.0 Methodology

Responses to survey questions were first analyzed by using the basic framework of questions contained in the survey. The results are set out in Chapter 2.0, where prominent themes and priorities have been drawn out. A synthesis of issues from each response including salient excerpts is set out in Appendix A.

Cutting across responses were a number of recurring themes that can serve as an agenda for future work on cultural diversity and globalization. These are set out in Chapter 3.0. They are:

*Clarifying Policy Assumptions*

*Linking Local and Global*

*Institutional Diversification*

*Maximizing New Technology Opportunities*

*Linguistic Diversity*

*North – South Differences*

Chapter 4.0 proposes next steps in the INCP's work on cultural diversity and globalization.

## 2.0 Survey Results

### 2.1 Overriding Challenges

#### *Economic and Technological*

Almost all countries identified the paradox of technology as it relates to cultural diversity and globalization. On the one hand the influx of foreign cultural products and the free flow of information and images globally are threatening indigenous cultural values, traditions and lifestyles, together with the various forms of cultural expression/production that reflect and express these larger social bonds. The erosion of national (or subnational) languages, a basic building block of identity, is the most serious threat for many respondents. On the other hand these same technologies offer tremendous opportunities for expressing and sharing these diverse traditions both at home and abroad (see Opportunities below).

More concretely, respondents expressed fear that concentration of media ownership and the growing power of foreign media in many countries would result in a “packaging” and commodifying of cultural resources and a diverting of benefits – both cultural and economic – outside the country. Other recurring concerns related to technology included the inability to control negative or harmful content on the Internet (acts of sexual brutality and abuse of children) and an undermining of the states’ capacity to protect intellectual property rights.

These challenges are compounded in countries such as Guyana, Saint Lucia, Senegal and South Africa where basic technological infrastructure is still absent or underdeveloped and where levels of technological literacy lag behind countries in the developed North. However, countries in the North also expressed serious concerns about the growing gap between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ in “cyberspace”.

#### *Social and Cultural*

Dramatic demographic change was the overriding theme here. Xenophobia and discrimination resulting from growing ethno-racial diversity was cited by many countries as a pressing concern. Other demographic shifts also pose difficulties and challenges. Declining birthrates and aging populations together with a huge generational divide in values and perspectives were cited as concerns in several countries.

Several countries spoke of concerns related to growing disparities and new social divides between ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ - in income, in access to meaningful employment, in access to technology and technological literacy, among other factors.

## 2.2 Overriding Opportunities

### *Economic and Technological*

The main theme expressed here was the flip side of the threats or challenges of technology.

New technologies such as digital media and the Internet are revolutionary tools for creating and distributing a much wider range of cultural resources to much larger audiences – both domestic and international. Many opportunities were cited: *artistic* – enhanced access to tools of creation for artists and cultural institutions/enterprises at all scales; new channels of distribution capable of reaching diverse (diasporic or “niche markets”) nationally and internationally; *economic* – a source of new employment/wealth creation in an expanding knowledge economy; *cultural* – greater cultural choices for citizens and new vehicles for documenting and sharing cultural heritage, including rich folkloric traditions; and *diplomatic* – vehicles for building the profile (“branding”) of countries abroad.

New technologies also offer opportunities for expanding networks and exchanges among a wide range of culture/media institutions and activity, again both domestically and internationally.

### *Social and Cultural*

Technology was seen as opening up the world: “revolutionary opportunities for creativity and exchange .....in knowledge and science, the arts and human relations across the conventional national borders” (Iceland).

## 2.3 Key Concerns in Cultural Diversity

“Cultural diversity” is described and understood in many different ways in survey responses. It is associated in some countries with the need to acknowledge the importance of diverse *local communities*, whose traditions cannot be overridden by either national or global pressures. In virtually all countries it is associated with growing levels of *ethno-racial diversity* brought about by higher levels of immigration. The protection of *linguistic diversity* was central to the diversity agenda for a number of countries. A range of other “communities of interest”, including *feminist, gay and lesbian and youth cultures* formed yet other forms of diversity.

Norway profiled the significance of *generational diversity*: “(The older generation) is still defining its identity in contrast to all that is different, all that is ‘foreign’. The younger generation on the other hand is more inclined to identify itself in interaction with the ‘others’. The traditional opposites – North-South, East-West, centre-periphery – are being challenged”.

A number of countries picked up on this theme speaking of the importance of policies and policy approaches that recognize and celebrate specific culturally diverse communities (multiculturalism) while also fostering interaction among these communities (*interculturalism*).

## **2.4 Key Concerns in Cultural Policy**

Responses here fell into issues or concerns related to the *ends* of cultural policy in the context of cultural diversity and globalization, and those concerned with the *means* needed to address challenges posed by this new environment.

### *New Ends of Cultural Policy*

Senegal's twin pillars of "deep roots and openness" in their cultural policy symbolize the balancing act most countries are attempting to manage. The tension here is that of linking respect and support for longstanding or deeply rooted local and national cultural traditions, with openness to new cultural groups and traditions from outside the country. Again these are not new themes in cultural policy. The balancing of past (tradition and memory) and future (innovation and creativity), juxtaposed with balancing rootedness or "loyalty to self" and openness to "other", are longstanding themes in cultural policy. Again countries reported that the twin forces of cultural diversity and globalization were making the balancing of these dynamics in cultural policy more difficult to achieve.

### *New Means of Cultural Policy*

There was general consensus that cultural development could not be imposed from above but needed to emerge out of specific local or community circumstances and needs. Almost all countries also described the need for national cultural policy perspectives and instruments (including national institutions), capable of providing support to local efforts as well as protecting and advancing national and international cultural interests. Different members of the Network, with their different balancing of local and national strengths, have concrete advice and experience to offer others in terms of strengthening these local or subnational, national and international linkages and interdependencies..

There was strong support for the proposed New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity that would provide clear ground rules to enable countries to maintain policies that promote their culture and ensure cultural diversity, while respecting the rules governing the international trading system and ensuring markets for cultural exports. This is a concrete example of the new transnational policy instruments needed in an increasingly competitive global environment.

Another key idea in this section of the survey is the challenge of *transformng cultural institutions to better reflect diversity*. Many established cultural institutions were tied to traditional forms of (classical European) cultural expression and heritage that no longer

reflected the population. Respondents expressed the need for changes in existing organizations as well as strategies to support new institutions and enterprises capable of responding to new cultural interests and needs.

Concern was expressed by several countries that cultural policy remains preoccupied with traditional cultural institutions and practices at the expense of new forms of expression such as digital media with much greater potential to respond to diverse cultural interests. Focus and attention was sometimes being diverted by the expectation that private sector interests could support and sustain this activity.

In terms of cultural infrastructure countries in the North and the South face fundamentally different challenges. In the South the issue is the *establishment* of basic cultural and media infrastructure. In the North concern related more to the reform of existing infrastructure to reflect a radically different population and to diversify the support base in the face of reduced government funding and support.

This last point relates to another frequently identified concern in this section, the need for new *private sector partnerships and alliances*. More broadly this represented a search for new policy models and instruments premised on a rebalancing of public-, private- and voluntary sector interests and responsibilities.

Finally, there was a call from several countries to replace traditional discipline-specific cultural policies with policies that adopted more integrated approaches aimed at strengthening linkages and synergies across different types of cultural activity.

## **2.5 Changing Role of Government and Key Sectoral Concerns**

Countries spoke of the challenge of rising expectations and challenges in cultural policy set against recognition of the limits of the “big government paradigm” (South Africa) of spending and regulatory intervention. Norway described “growing awareness of the limits of the public purse resulting in growing privatization in some (cultural) industries”. The capacity of governments to regulate activity and “engineer” change in cultural industries is also being undercut by globalizing technologies and the free flow of information and cultural products.

These limits do not mean that governments no longer have roles to play. Canada argues that in fact they make government’s role even more critical. But it does mean that in all countries there is recognition of the need for government to find more effective ways to tap the resources and energies of both the private sector and civil society in achieving cultural policy objectives.

Sweden spoke of the importance of seeing policy as a forum for debate as well as a mechanism for action and collaborative problem solving. This view of policy is consistent with social learning models of community planning that see policy discussions as

cognitive tools for deepening public judgement as well as means of coming to public decisions.

At the level of issues facing specific parts of the cultural sector – broadcasting, new media, museums and archives, performing arts, etc. - countries reported many similar issues and challenges. Most reflected a concern for both popular and “high culture” traditions and forms of expression.

One area that received attention in many responses was that of work on the part of museums, archives and libraries to work more collaboratively in reforming their collections and programs to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population, and their efforts to harness the power of new information technologies in addressing these needs

## **2.6 Policy Instruments**

Countries listed a range of policy measures or instruments under three categories:

- *subsidies* (programs of support for individual artists/creators and cultural institutions);
- *regulatory measures* (constitutional protection for cultural, linguistic and religious diversity, copyright/intellectual property, media content, cultural heritage protection, tax incentives for private sector initiative); and,
- *other* (international conventions, planned network of regional cultural centres).

## 3.0 Recurring Themes

Cutting across responses were a number of themes that can serve as an agenda for future work.

*Clarifying Policy Assumptions*  
*Linking Local and Global*  
*Institutional Diversification*  
*Maximizing New Technology Opportunities*  
*Linguistic Diversity*  
*North – South Differences*

The current work of the Network on the New Cultural Instrument on Cultural Diversity and Globalization supports many of the themes that follow, but will not be the focus of attention here.

### 3.1 Clarifying Policy Assumptions

A key conclusion emerging from the survey is the complexity of the issues involved, complexity that is conceptual as well as political or instrumental. In seeking to better understand cultural policy options related to “cultural diversity and globalization” there is a need for a more critical “unpacking” of these concepts.

#### *Cultural Diversity*

Cultural diversity has been a prominent theme in cultural policy for several years. *Our Creative Diversity: The Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development* (UNESCO, 1995), *In From the Margins* (Council of Europe, 1997) and *The Power of Culture: The Final Report of the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development* (UNESCO, 1998) are among the influential reports that cite cultural diversity as central to the future of cultural policy and cultural policy formulation.

In general these reports assume a connection between diversity and other positively valued social, cultural and political agendas, and assume that these are mutually achievable and mutually enabling objectives. More concretely diversity is believed to be:

- a means of achieving social cohesion – a means of simultaneously celebrating differentiated identities while simultaneously forging a new sense of belonging in culturally diverse societies;
- a key plank in agendas of cultural democracy;
- a means of enriching cultural resources and cultural capital in the cultural industries and knowledge economy;
- a necessary means of overcoming social exclusion;

- an aid and spur to sustainable cultural development and economic prosperity.

But there is a need to subject these claims to scrutiny – conceptually and empirically - if they are to stand as credible pillars of cultural policy responses to diversity.

At the most basic level it is necessary to distinguish two facets of cultural diversity: *cultural diversity in domestic terms* – different cultures within a country; and *cultural diversity in global terms* – national cultures in the world. Responses from all countries reflected concern with both. But the interplay between the two is not clear or unambiguous. On the one hand recognizing and affirming domestic diversity contributes to diversity in global terms by not forcing people into narrow definitions of nations and national identity. It also opens up potential dialogue and intercultural exchange across cultures. On the other hand (domestic) diversity can raise or exacerbate systemic inequities in societies and act to undermine essential levels of social cohesion. It can also serve and weaken a cohesive national voice and presence in a global environment.

Complicating matters is what analysts of diversity speak increasingly of the idea of “hybridity,” referring to the intersecting of multiple identities. Here, more fluid and borderless “communities” make the administrative categorization of people within fixed or watertight compartments impossible. Some have begun to speak of a “post multicultural” perspective – the emergence of multilayered identities, evolving core cultures, intra- and transnational linkages, use of the information highway to forge new solidarities, and dynamic national communities within a globalized environment.

But these same observers caution against these new perspectives not distracting attention from xenophobia and from systemic structures of discrimination and inequity based on difference. Many of these same analysts are critical of vague commitments of “unity through diversity” that they argue do as much to *disguise* as to address these problems.

### *Globalization*

One of the things that makes globalization so difficult to understand is that it is credited with simultaneously fostering greater homogenization *and* diversity.

All countries expressed concern that the increased global flow of capital combined with the free flow of cultural products posed a homogenizing threat to culture in the broadest sense – shared systems of beliefs and ways of life, as well as culture in the narrower sense – specific forms of creative expression that represent these larger bonds. These same trends were also identified as opportunities for countries to develop and share diverse cultural traditions inside and outside national borders.

It is clear that cultural diversity and globalization do challenge many core tenets of cultural policy, including the claims of nations and nationalism, set against the demands of indigenous and diasporic communities to difference. These tensions are significant and

not easily reconciled. Longstanding historical, territorial and linguistic traditions in nations now have to be reconciled with newer claims on identity and belonging.

It is clear cultural policy in all countries must move away from the narrow nationalism of the past. But the new models are not yet clear.

### **3.2 Linking Local and Global**

The INCP is committed to strengthening linkages and collaboration among nations in addressing shared interests and to generating concrete ideas and proposals about how to further cultural policies both domestically and internationally.

A good deal of the work of the Network to date has focused on international collaboration, in particular due to pressures related to the cultural trade agenda. What emerges from the survey is the strong need for the INCP to also support members in sharing insights and concrete strategies about strengthening local (or subnational) cultural development, strategies consistent with new definitions of identity and belonging. The focus on the local also reinforces the importance of the INCP working closely with the Coalition on Cultural Diversity linking cultural NGO's operating at the local level.

The call for nations to decentralize responsibility in cultural policy through devolution of authority, resources and policy functions is once again evident in survey responses. There are no neat formulas regarding the right balance between centralization and decentralization. Arguments made in favour of decentralization point to greater responsiveness to local diversity and greater capacity to respond to changing needs. More centralized policy models, it is argued, generate neither the plurality of solutions nor the grassroots political will needed to address complex community problems.

But opposing arguments to decentralization can also be raised. Decentralized control can increase inequality between communities, can enhance the power of local elites, and can be more exploitative than central government; it can also result in a loss of much-needed central finance. Centralized control can also deliver more efficient results in areas such as technology where consistent standards are critical.

Countries in the Network have experience to share with one another in their efforts to find this right balance.

On the question of strengthened local approaches to cultural development one possible area for the INCP to explore further is the growing body of experience related to *cultural planning approaches*. Unlike traditional cultural policies that continue to be dominated by "aesthetic" definitions of culture, often drawn from European high culture traditions, cultural planning adopted a broad definition of cultural resources as its basis. One mapping of cultural resources illustrates this broadened perspective. They include:

- the arts, media and heritage;
- the cultures of youth, ethno-racial groups and other communities of interest;
- local traditions, including archaeology, local dialects and rituals;
- local and external perceptions of a place, as expressed in jokes, songs, literature, myths, tourist guides, media coverage and conventional wisdom;
- topography, and the qualities of the natural and built environment, including public spaces;
- the diversity and quality of leisure, cultural, drinking, eating and entertainment facilities; and,
- the repertoire of local products and skills in the crafts, manufacturing and services (Bianchini and Santacatterina, 1997).

Cultural planning does not reject “the arts” or aesthetic definitions of culture, but rather sees these forms of expression as one dimension – an indispensable dimension – in a larger planning and policy domain; the old paradigm is not rejected but enveloped in a larger framework of understanding and action.

The second advantage of cultural planning is its *territorial* focus rather than the sectoral focus that has dominated most arts and cultural policy discourses. Again, cultural planning does not abandon a sectoral approach but integrates sectoral concerns with more holistic strategies of urban development.

Many jurisdictions including Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States have considerable experience to share in this area.

### **3.3 Institutional Diversification**

One of the true challenges of cultural policy responses to diversity may be less about inclusion or of different cultural traditions than about *the ability of old structures to change*. Can the way organizations are run – in programming, employment, marketing - change in response? Can mainstream cultural institutions and management structures respond to the implications of demographic change and serve a more diverse cross-section of the society?

A sharper focus on institutional diversification requires an examination of:

- The form and extent to which members of minorities are part of administrative and decision-making processes (participation in decision-making);
- The mechanisms and the structure of budgets and the equitable distribution of funds; and,
- Stronger analysis of access and participation by ethno-racial groups, including audience reach compared to distribution of public funding.

### **3.4 Maximizing New Technology Opportunities**

Virtually all countries spoke of the potential of new technologies for sharing and disseminating diverse forms of cultural expression in ways that potentially make these cultural resources more financially viable.

This introduces another paradox facing many countries related to cultural diversity and globalization. On the one hand there is a strong desire to avoid the “commodification” of culture by resisting the notion that culture is simply another product or service in the market economy. On the other there is a desire to tap the potential of technology and market forces to sustain viable cultural industries that express diverse cultures.

### **3.5 Linguistic Diversity**

The threat posed to linguistic diversity by globalizing trends and the growing dominance of English (in particular) in electronic communications was a central issue for many countries. Concern ranged from threats to strong national languages (Iceland) to a concern for subnational languages (Switzerland).

There was little desire expressed to shut out information drawn from other cultural and linguistic traditions, but rather a desire to ensure that these did not overwhelm indigenous forms of expression.

Beyond the identification of the problem there was little indication of specific responses to the challenge beyond Iceland’s description of its efforts to work with companies such as Microsoft to translate software programs and applications into Icelandic.

### **3.6 North – South Differences**

While countries in the North and South face many similar issues, they also are starting from fundamentally different places in terms of basic institutional and technological infrastructure.

South Africa spoke of the possibility of “technological leapfrogging”, taking advantage of the lessons and experience of countries in the North to accelerate technological development. But there was also recognition of how far many countries in the developing South have to go in establishing even the most basic technological infrastructure necessary to take advantage of this experience.

In terms of institutional development, as noted earlier, the challenge in the South is less the reform of existing cultural institutions to meet new needs than it is the establishment of basic cultural infrastructure, especially at the local level. Institutional networking and exchanges among member countries in the INCP is one area of potential action.



## 4.0 What Next?

Responses to the survey suggest a wide range of possible next steps. Consistent with the purposes of INCP action must be aimed at providing Network members with specific ideas and concrete proposals about how to further their cultural policies both nationally and internationally.

The INCP is currently exploring existing international instruments related to cultural diversity. There are mechanisms related to fundamental human rights. There are also some trade mechanisms that address diversity. There is a need to more closely link those two, perhaps through a new international instrument on cultural diversity. At the same time, the survey also recognizes the need for governments to consider their domestic and sub-national approaches to cultural diversity. In so doing, efforts should be made to link local and global responses.

Specifically, the following themes could serve as a basis for follow-up action focused on:

- Further research to clarify and make more concrete the challenges represented by these themes;
- Identification and documentation of successful (government) policies and policy instruments used to address these challenges, drawn from the experience of INCP members and other jurisdictions internationally;
- Identification and documentation of “best practices” (success stories) involving cultural institutions/enterprises working in cooperation with private or voluntary sector partnerships.

More specifically the analysis suggests the need for:

- further work “unpacking” policy issues related to cultural diversity and globalization; there are strong links here to the current examination of principles underlying international instruments dealing with cultural diversity; there are also strong potential links to outcomes and next steps in the Council of Europe Study on Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity;
- work on indicators/measures for assessing diversity in cultural production/dissemination, both domestically and internationally; once again there are potential synergies with the Council of Europe study;
- an examination of patterns of “everyday culture”; a number of recent studies have sought a better understanding the *actual* cultural practices and experiences of “ordinary people” in communities (contrasted with those cultural activities prescribed by formal cultural policy categories of activities); the results are providing important insights into differing patterns of cultural activity among different segments of the population;
- an inventory of specific policy instruments and strategies in member countries operating in specific sectors (e.g., museums/archives/libraries, broadcasting)

- responding to cultural diversity and globalization;
- case studies of successful policies/strategies/instruments linking local cultural expression to global distribution networks;
  - case studies of successful institutional change strategies;
  - case studies of successful private sector partnerships/alliances;
  - case studies of successful policies/models supporting cultural diversity at the local level..

Given time and resource limitations a process of priority setting will be necessary to determine the most pressing issues for Network members.

Beyond whatever immediate steps INCP takes in work on cultural diversity and globalization thought also needs to be given to some mechanism which can continually define priorities and support ongoing “intelligence gathering”.

In Canada sectors such as health have established mechanisms for annually defining a series of strategic research priorities, undertaking the research in a timely manner and disseminating the results to the sector.

Such a mechanism responds to the need to build the information and knowledge base needed to make more informed decisions at all levels. This need not – nor should not – be solely a government initiative. Monitors in other sectors are frequently partnerships between various levels of government, sectoral bodies and agencies and key industry/private sector players). In these models each partner contributes a portion of funding in return for the capacity to shape the research priorities.

## Appendix A – Summary of Responses

	Core Policy Perspective	Overriding Challenges	Overriding Opportunities	Understanding of Diversity	Understanding of “Culture” & “Cultural Policy”	Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government & Subsectors of Concern	Policy Instruments or Measures
<b>Canada</b>	<p>“If Canadians are to continue to enjoy a vibrant and expanding culture, we must ensure that we can continue to develop our own cultural instruments, maintain our cultural diversity, and enhance our ability to develop initiatives, programs and policies that ensure distinctive and accessible Canadian choices while remaining open to a broad range of cultural content and services from outside the country.”</p> <p>“The challenge for Canada is to achieve a balance between measures that aim to foster cultural expression and our international trade obligations.”</p> <p>Concern with international image, with “branding” of Canada at home and abroad as a leader in this area and as</p>	<p>“To develop international markets for our industries and our cultural products; to promote the Canadian diversity model by participating in international sport and cultural events; continuing to ensure Canada’s openness to the best the world has to offer; and promoting cultural diversity, multilaterally and bilaterally...”</p> <p>Accelerate the transition to the knowledge-based economy; creation of a skilled workforce; capacity to innovate; Internet and e-commerce</p> <p>“...[new technologies] have made it more difficult for Canadians to find choices that reflect their reality...”</p> <p>“The trend to more</p>	<p>E-commerce; internet and “knowledge infrastructure;”</p> <p>Connection to government via the internet;</p> <p>“To brand Canada, at home and abroad, as a dynamic and skilled knowledge-based economy”</p> <p>Linkages within Canada and across the world</p> <p>digitization and convergence of media provide an opportunity to distribute Canadian content at home and abroad</p> <p>Partnerships with other nations will contribute to success in this environment</p>	<p>“The Government of Canada believes that Canada’s diversity is a great strength, that our capacity to accept, respect, celebrate and value differences have made us one of the most open, resilient, creative and caring societies on earth.”</p> <p>“Diversity is the thread that weaves Canada’s rich culture together. It gives us the necessary foundation to continue to shape a modern country that fosters creativity and excellence.”</p> <p>Need for Canadians to “see themselves reflected”</p> <p>Cultural homogenization as a result of globalization, trade liberalization, industry mergers</p> <p>“In a world of change, it is by</p>	<p>“The Government continues to renew tools for supporting the production of Canadian stories and images in all sectors to ensure that they continue to be relevant and effective.”</p> <p>“Central to the Government’s cultural framework is an unswerving commitment to Canadian content and Canadian choices, to reflecting and celebrating Canada’s diversity, to preserving Canada’s rich cultural and natural heritage.”</p> <p>“Canada’s cultural policies and tools have played an important role in developing a strong cultural infrastructure and achieving its cultural goals. Canada continues to own and control its cultural industries, and produces quantities of cultural products and Canadian content that</p>	<p>Cultural policy faces two challenges: will either become obsolete or even more essential as a result of technological change; policies must take a broader and more integrated approach; there is a need “to achieve a balance between measures that aim to foster cultural expression and our international trade obligations.”</p> <p>International approach to promote Canadian artists abroad, develop markets for export of Canadian products, build bilateral/multilateral connections in the field of culture; partnerships with ngos and with key international orgs</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: New technologies and</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p>Government ownership of cultural industries (broadcasting, etc.)</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p> <p>Trade promotions</p> <p>Regulation of Canadian content</p> <p><b>Other</b></p> <p>New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity (NIICD) to “provide clear ground rules to enable Canada and other countries to maintain policies that promote their culture and ensure cultural diversity internationally, while respecting the rules governing the international trading system and ensuring markets for cultural exports.”</p> <p>Statistics Canada culture and population statistics</p> <p>Participation in other</p>

	knowledge economy Four primary issues: "globalization and increasingly borderless world; new technologies; demographic change; and the increasing public demand and the appetite for scrutiny and accountability"	open markets and a free trading world make it more challenging to negotiate trade agreements that recognize cultural diversity and the unique nature of cultural products." Commodification of cultural products Must first strengthen domestic market		knowing who we are and where we come from, by creating and communicating our stories, by connecting to each other, and by building and strengthening our communities, that we reach out to the world with confidence."	speaks to all Canadians that reinforce our national identity. Without these cultural measures, it would be harder for Canadian artists and cultural organizations to produce and display their creations."	"traditional communications media" Language; Ideas; Books; Paintings; Music; Films; Internet content	organizations: INCP; UNESCO; Council of Europe; La Francophonie Projects to help Canada's cultural community to adapt to new technological challenges  Youth internships in cultural industries overseas
	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of "Culture" &amp; "Cultural Policy"</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Croatia</b>	"The development of particular cultures (such as feminist culture, gay culture, youth culture etc.) is the task of primary importance for Croatia, as it is the best way to set free from the nationalistic culture, and to avoid being overwhelmed by the consumer national culture. The realisation of that aim is the greatest challenge to the cultural institutions in Croatia."	Computerisation & globalisation's combined impact on all spheres of life  "One of the significant problems is the state institutions bias to subsidizing classical forms of expression, often at the expense of the development of new media, that are assigned to the market conditions."	Complete opening to the world, especially to Europe	"Cultural particularity is implied in Croatia first of all within national/regional framework, and often understood as being opposed to global scope." Both national (traditioanl ethno-cultural) and sub-national or particular based on other shared ways of life or belief systems	"Cultural specificity should not be imposed, it must arise from life itself. State institutions should protect cultural policy with consideration, and within that a balance is to be achieved between diversified impacts and interests (first of all between the entertainment industry and those pleading for traditional culture), with a view to make the independent development of culture possible."	Broad social and cultural trends related to transition from socialism to market economy, in combination with globalisation  Subsectors of concern: Contemporary art New artistic forms (as opposed to "classical forms of expression")	<b>Subsidies</b>  <b>Regulatory Measures</b>  <b>Other</b> None mentioned as existing; "... the Government should make creative freedom of expression possible for the artists, as well as for all the citizens, and create such legal conditions in which artists may achieve financial independence... State institutions should project cultural policy with consideration, and

							within that a balance is to be achieved between diversified impacts and interests..."
<b>Greec e</b>	<p>"The permanent goal of Greek governments is to preserve all this cultural wealth and also to promote it all over the world." On immigration: "There is a challenge and an opportunity here: for Greek and other cultures to be known and accepted each other... Would it be possible for heterogeneous cultures to have a fertile cooperation in a democratic and pluralist environment?"</p>	<p>Demographics: Ageing population, declining birth-rate, increasing immigration Uncontrolled urbanization; cities "tend to be melting pots homogenising previously culturally different populations. This is a bigger danger for local and ethnic cultures." Decreasing public confidence in government</p>	<p>New technologies for promotion of cultural diversity; also "very positive effect to the implementation of cultural policies, because they enforce the innovative thinking and methods to the old bureaucratic state apparatus." Using new technologies to enhance citizens' cultural choice</p>	<p>"Cultural diversity is understood in Greece as the wealth of cultural elements of all nations of the world." Is a "Greek" and "non-Greek" dichotomy: Greek culture vs. local/ethnic cultures "The local level is very important. Local cultures are rich and sometimes they have elements that are missing from the national level."</p>	<p>"Usually the cultural heritage of Greece is characterized by the historical periods Ancient, Byzantine, Modern. The contemporary creation includes the nowadays art (performance, plastic etc) and the folk art." "National policies concerned with protecting and fostering distinctive ways of life could help the preservation of cultural identities, but this is difficult in a lone way, without international cooperation."</p>	<p>Central role of state in social activities remains but is shifting with the "rise of civil society" and increased investment in culture by private sector</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: Archaeology and ancient art Contemporary art New technologies</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b> Legislation: preservation of cultural heritage; some protecting local cultural elements and groups "(such as the Gypsies)"</p> <p><b>Other</b> Greek Archaeological service Investment by govt in urban regeneration Signatory to national conventions Cultural statistics – are needed</p>
	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of "Culture" &amp; "Cultural Policy"</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Guyan a</b>	<p>"The specific problematic for Guyana involves the struggle to create national unity in the context of cultural diversity – the creation of 'oneness'</p>	<p>Globalization and Technological Change: country is ill-equipped and ill-prepared as a result of historical conditions to cope</p>	<p>Technology: can assist re-discovery of folkloric traditions and their mainstreaming into society</p>	<p>Struggle to create unity through diversity; "the attempt to create national pride and dignity out of those rich and wonderful differences on the</p>	<p>Rediscovery of folkloric traditions and history "How to find balance between the exciting opportunities posed by the technological changes offered by</p>	<p>Government is at a nascent stage in its democracy "First of all, the actual process of arriving at a cultural policy (in which there has been none since colonial</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p>

	<p>through diversity; the attempt to create national pride and dignity out of those rich and wonderful differences on the basis of mutual respect and tolerance.”</p> <p>28 years of undemocratic government followed by 7 years of democracy during which have struggled to “find the ‘spatial opportunity’ for all the various expressions of cultural and political diversity without exacerbating ethnic insecurities”</p>	<p>require physical infrastructure; Where access to technology exists, is used not to advance own society but rather advance oneself outside the country;</p> <p>Intensifies flow of people and resources outside of the country;</p> <p>“continues to marginalize those who have been unable to access these opportunities”</p> <p>Tension between economic advancement and fall-out</p>		<p>basis of mutual respect and tolerance”</p>	<p>the thrust of globalization whilst retaining a semblance of national dignity grounded in rich historical traditions?”</p>	<p>times) provides the catharsis by which a nation comes to terms with many issues.”</p> <p>“Government [as the only agency equipped to do so] by definition must work at all levels of regional and local authority, private sector, ngos and communities to create ‘spatial’ opportunities and facilitate the encouragement of the growth of their traditions and their expressions of visual arts, crafts, music, theatre, poetry, dance, story telling, etc...”</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: Folklore Historical traditions and means of expression, including visual arts, crafts, music, theatre, poetry, dance, story telling</p>	<p><b>Other</b></p> <p>Developing process as government and society evolve; is an ongoing process</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--	---	---

	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of “Culture” &amp; “Cultural Policy”</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Iceland</b>	<p>“There has been a consensus on the aim of maintaining a fruitful balance between a healthy fresh influence from abroad and a healthy appreciation of our own heritage and creativity.”</p> <p>“Language has traditionally been at the core of the Icelandic cultural identity, since Icelandic, although spoken by few, has changed considerably little through the centuries... Thus, Icelandic can be considered one of the classical languages in Europe and its unique purity has an intrinsic value in itself.”</p>	<p>Rapid expansion of communications technologies as threat to balance between national and foreign content</p> <p>Access to technology; legal and ethical questions relating to new technology</p> <p>Language; preservation and “the human cultural right of using your own language while studying or in your daily work.” – one way of addressing this has been to make agreement with Microsoft to translate programs into Icelandic</p>	<p>Rapid expansion of communications technologies also an opportunity for creativity, for opening up revolutionary opportunities in knowledge and science, the arts and human relations across the conventional national borders</p>	<p>“The Icelandic society has traditionally been described as a homogenous society with a homogenous culture, mainly due to a common cultural heritage and the fact that there are basically no ethnic groups, nor minor languages. This still holds.”</p> <p>“A certain sign of change in the social structure of the country, i.e. a greater urbanization and “a flight from the countryside” will evidently pose some new accents in our cultural diversity, but hardly change the whole picture.”</p>	<p>“It is the policy of the present government of Iceland to enhance the cultural creativity at individual or grass-roots level without interfering so much with or structuring its tendencies. At the same time there is a consensus on the official support of institutions which are considered indispensable as flagships of the cultural identity of a modern sovereign society, e.g. The National Theatre, National Library, Art Gallery of Iceland, The Symphony Orchestra and the National Museum.”</p>	<p>Concern for grass-roots level and for national institutions, both of which continue to be supported by government</p> <p>Recognition that few bi-lateral agreements exist, though “cultural relations with many parts of the world are flourishing and growing.”</p> <p>Subsectors of concern</p> <p>New technologies</p> <p>Range of national institutions</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p>Gov’t support of national institutions (theatre, library, art gallery, symphony, museum)</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p> <p>International conventions (e.g. European Economic Area); though few bi-lateral agreements</p> <p><b>Other</b></p>

	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of “Culture” &amp; “Cultural Policy”</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Norway</b>	<p>Democracy and decentralization</p> <p>“It is a priority to promote participation in cultural life in every part of the country and to make art and culture of high quality accessible to as many as possible.”</p> <p>“What will happen to the rich cultural diversity, when a handful of information, entertainment and telecommunications companies control much of the cultural content that makes up our lives?”</p> <p>“The real issue is how to manage diversity in a world of close contact among cultural identities and ethnic practices that will not melt away.”</p>	<p>New Media Environment: Rapid development and globalization of media; concern for Norwegian language, lifestyle, etc.</p> <p>Need to preserve Norwegian language in face of globalization</p> <p>Access to media</p> <p>Balance between private and commercial aspects of trade (e.g. books)</p> <p>Need to ensure access to information through new media; regulation of internet content; intellectual property</p> <p>Need to match cultural diversity of population in activities of cultural institutions (especially museums)</p> <p>Development of long-term strategies for the equal status of ethnic minorities in cultural life</p> <p>Threat of</p>	<p>Closer cooperation between archives, libraries and museums; in part to ensure a better reflection of cultural diversity in these institutions</p> <p>To overcome national and global geographical divides and disadvantages for small countries</p> <p>For institutions, association, artists to market themselves internationally via new media</p> <p>Global governance – both a challenge and an opportunity – has made policy makers more aware of the increased international implications of their policy actions, particularly as regards sustainability</p>	<p>“The Norwegian culture is made up of an abundance of cultural identities... The culture has been, and will be, undergoing constant development.”</p> <p>Sami population (indigenous)</p> <p>Increased acceleration of diversity in cultural expression, with result that two generations exist side by side: “One is still defining its identity in contrast to all that is different, all that is ‘foreign.’ The younger generation on the other hand is more inclined to identify itself in interaction with the ‘others.’ The traditional opposites – North-South, East-West, centre-periphery – are being challenged.”</p>	<p>Media policy: media should be open channels for cultural impulses, information, exchange of views and public debate</p> <p>Language policy: new principles required</p> <p>Museum policy: has priority to enhance multicultural initiatives – local museums exist in all municipalities in order to represent “the relationship between history and identity”</p> <p>“globalisation has brought to the forefront the extent to which degrees of freedom of national policy actions have shrunk in a wide variety of fields. This can be observed when it comes to media and cultural policies, where international trends increasingly have been implemented on the national level.”</p> <p>Some form of global governance is likely to emerge, but unclear in what form</p>	<p>“Nation states will be the principal agents forging the new institutions required to face [the challenges of globalization]... The future of globalization lies in the cooperative actions that nation states initiate in response to its challenges... The question is whether we shall be able in the coming years to create a multilateral system for global governance with enough credibility and legitimacy to function as a framework for consensus building and decision-making.” Norway and other small countries “need to cooperate closely with other countries with similar policy objectives within the cultural field to sustain cultural diversity and other objectives.”</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p>Financial support for touring of established cultural institutions in each region</p> <p>Purchasing programme for Contemporary Fiction</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p> <p>Media content; internet; intellectual property</p> <p><b>Other</b></p> <p>Secretariat for Language Technology in response to language concerns; is administrative point for language and info tech Programs: Multilingual Library; Special Library for Sami; The Art in a Multicultural Society</p>

		transnational media companies mining of cultural resources and re-packaging them as cultural commodities and entertainments; will widen gap between those who benefit and those for whom access is impossible Segmentation of haves and have-nots in cyberspace Need to assert more strongly cultural identity				Little change in role of government to date, but growing awareness of "limits of the public purse" has resulted in increased privatization of culture in some industries Subsectors of concern: Media/broadcasting Public press; Language; Literature; Libraries; Museums; Artists	
	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of "Culture" &amp; "Cultural Policy"</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Saint Lucia</b>	"The overriding policy perspective relating to cultural diversity and globalization lies in the inherent threat of losing our culture in the face of the inroads being made by acculturation. We have to form a people who are so steeped in their own culture that they can be buffeted by the winds of globalization yet be strong enough to retain a sense of being St. Lucian."	Internet, E-commerce both a challenge and an opportunity: Challenge of educating people in relevant disciplines (science and mathematics) Computer literacy Exposure to negative content on internet Youthful population embraces cultural products from "metropolitan countries" "The challenge is for our cultural policy to	Internet, E-commerce both a challenge and an opportunity: "The internet opens the world to us and we can market our cultural products alongside any competing country."	Diversity is external, in the global village, of which Saint Lucia is a part; Saint Lucians are therefore one aspect of a global diversity "We are not so insular as to ignore the richness of cultural diversity, but we are to be wise enough to choose from the menu provided by cultural imperialism... our traditions, what makes us unique,	Culture as "our traditions, what makes us unique" "Cultural policy should be developed within the framework of democracy, where the Government and artists are caused to enjoy a symbiotic relationship. The government provides the impetus by focusing on a climate that is designed to make art flourish, through training and other tangible support... "	"The current government sees its role as one of galvanizing the artists and the general public into developing a Cultural policy along with it by participating in the consultations where the drafts are ventilated."  Subsectors of concern: New technologies Artists and	<b>Subsidies</b>  <b>Regulatory Measures</b>  <b>Other</b> Cultural policy has been ratified by cabinet (no details provided)

		sell them [the young] on the idea that what we have is just as authentic as what is offered from abroad."		must be kept sacred and inviolate."		individual work	
<b>Senegal</b>	<p>Cultural decentralization "... the plan of action prepared by the Ministry of Culture in 1998 emphasizes the importance of asserting the cultural personality of each of the country's 10 regions, the development of local bonds of solidarity, and the creation of conditions for promoting the expression and growth of all cultures."</p> <p>Access to information and the development of partnerships are key</p>	<p>Action required to provide "greater access to new information and communication technologies and to help instil a greater awareness of importance of our cultural heritage"</p> <p>Need to identify with community, "belonging"</p>	<p>Joint projects and frequent meetings will provide clearer sense of impact of globalization</p>	<p>"...in terms of identity, what is important is to be oneself, of course, but also to be able to change, in certain circumstances, and to be like the "other" in some respects."</p> <p>Ethnic diversity "operates in combination with the unifying force of the dominant language, Wolof."</p>	<p>"Our cultural policy has always been built on two pillars – deep roots and openness. The deep roots are in our basic values of society and in our openness and receptiveness to outside influences."</p> <p>Promotion of local cultural potential and strengthening national unity; through support for creation and creativity; creation of cultural infrastructure; support for cultural events based on inter-ethnic linkages solidifying social cohesion; interest in de-centralized co-operation; development of cultural businesses and industries; partnership with economic sector</p>	<p>"The government's purpose in giving local communities responsibilities for culture was to restore powers that are properly within their jurisdiction. Culture is also a responsibility of the national government: in setting policy and implementation strategies, the government must involve civil society and, to the extent possible, the representatives of the economic sector."</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: Associations; Cultural resource centres, infrastructures, events, heritage protection</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p> <p><b>Other</b> Planned network of regional cultural centres; process to make institutional, legal and financial environment "more conducive to the promotion of private initiative in cultural matters"</p>

	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of “Culture” &amp; “Cultural Policy”</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>South Africa</b>	<p>Predominance of foreign cultural forms; difficult for local cultural products to compete; related to increased influx of foreign products following 1994 transition (U.S., UK, and Australia)</p> <p>“South Africa’s dual challenge is to both encourage cultural diversity and forge a sense of nationhood in a country deeply divided along racial and ethnic lines by apartheid.”</p> <p>“The challenge of properly recognizing and supporting the cultures and languages of the historically disenfranchised majority is primary. Likewise, promoting cultural tolerance in post-apartheid South Africa is an important</p>	<p>Regulation WTO’s potential to limit right to regulate; Technological leapfrogging &amp; appropriate technology; protection; Lack of access to technology Creation of viable cultural sectors Audience development Developing pride in local culture; Combating Xenophobia Maintaining integrity of SA cultures Development of effective mechanisms to rectify inequalities Transforming current institutions Effective partnerships in private and NGO sectors Development of sustainable cultural forms Developing sustainable new institutions</p>	<p>New technology and formats Digital frontier Creation of new market niches</p> <p>“The new economy that drives globalisation constantly seeks new materials. Most developing countries are in an excellent position to provide unique products and information. Culture is one of the few areas in which we are not in deficit: our rich cultural traditions provide raw material for achieving the distinctiveness that can make our economy more competitive.”</p> <p>Learning from experience Creating new art forms Making SA the centre of African arts production Profiling SA abroad Private sector</p>	<p>“The overriding issue at this point is how to develop South Africa’s cultural diversity into a sustainable tool for economic, social and political development.”</p>	<p>Both local and global “Protecting this indigenous knowledge and ensuring that the benefits of protection accrue to the necessary groups will be an important aspect of cultural policy in the future.”</p> <p>“The new political dispensation in South Africa ushered in an era committed to the development of the full range of arts, as opposed to only “Eurocentric” forms such as opera and ballet.”</p>	<p>Three tiers of government: federal, provincial, local Downsizing the public service and moving away from a “big government” paradigm Shifting governance paradigm, from government as patron to government as enabler of the arts</p> <p>Needs: Develop national-provincial-local co-governance strategies Develop effective mechanisms to rectify inequalities Transform current institutions and develop sustainable new ones Partner with private and NGO sector orgs</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: Music Film Communications and new</p>	<p>“We are, as a department of arts and culture, acutely aware that without the appropriate copyright, regulatory and funding environment, our cultural diversity is threatened.”</p> <p><b>Subsidies</b> Lack appropriate funding environment</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b> Copyright legislation (inadequate; falls under Dept of Trade and Industry) Lack of basic protection like “pay for play” in the music industry</p> <p><b>Other</b> Constitution: protects cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity and freedom</p>

	project. These tasks are made more difficult in the context of globalisation.”	Developing national-provincial-local co-governance strategies (semi-federalist) Shifting govt paradigms Shifting the private sector	opportunities			technologies, including access Local culture “South African aesthetic” all art forms, both “Eurocentric” forms such as opera and ballet and fuller range of artistic expression	
--	--	---	---------------	--	--	---	--

	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of “Culture” &amp; “Cultural Policy”</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Sweden</b>	<p>National cultural policy promotes "international cultural exchange and meetings between different cultures within Sweden"</p> <p>The cultural policy goals coincide with the general goals for immigrant policy... namely equality in rights and duties, option to express linguistic and cultural identity and co-existence aiming at mutual tolerance and cooperation between the majority population, national minorities and immigrants. These goals express the political will and the vision of a multi- and also intercultural society."</p>	<p>Social, economic, cultural segregation arising in part from open immigration</p> <p>Risk that sole focus on Europe will marginalize joint ventures with other parts of the world</p> <p>International political conflict: "The symbols of cultural identity and cultural heritage have become targets..."</p> <p>Threat to cultural diversity through media globalization</p> <p>Internet: widespread distribution of illegal information and images</p> <p>Preservation of Swedish language</p>	<p>As a result of joining EU, increased co-operation among different areas of cultural field</p> <p>New technologies provide possibilities to increase public access to the work and knowledge of artists and cultural institutions</p> <p>Spread of networks between institutions on all matters of cultural expression and around events</p> <p>Contacts and exchanges with other countries as key</p>	<p>Multi and intercultural society</p> <p>Active immigration policy</p> <p>"To-day, with persons from all over the world living in Sweden, the challenges are on one hand to cater for the possibilities and arenas for these persons' freedom of speech and expression, but on the other hand also to understand and share several parallel cultures and life-styles, including the Swedish."</p>	<p>Link between cultural policy and immigration policy: equality in rights and duties; option to express linguistic and cultural identity; coexistence aiming at mutual tolerance and cooperation</p> <p>Culture as a dimension of democracy and sustainable society</p> <p>Recognition that global and ethnic conflicts take place in everyday life; therefore important to maintain arms-length principle as means of empowering local communities, giving "freedom of action, where national goals and policies of social welfare still have to be interpreted and applied in real life."</p>	<p>"Contacts and exchanges with other countries have grown in importance... The Swedish government has emphasized the importance of international cultural exchange..." at both government and institutional levels, and for individual artists</p> <p>"More initiatives have been taken on the side of the government in order to promote knowledge, debate and understanding concerning issues of multiethnicism, racism, violence and other forms of segregation."</p> <p>Subsectors of concern: Broadcasting Communications technologies Artists in all media, including emerging and ethnic ones Popular music</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b> Programs to support cultural activity in Sweden around theme of multiculturalism, ethnic encounters and joint projects</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b> International conventions</p> <p><b>Other</b> SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) Ombudsman against ethnic discrimination National Integration Office Statistics re: participation, employment, education of those of "foreign" background</p>

						Language	
--	--	--	--	--	--	----------	--

	<b>Core Policy Perspective</b>	<b>Overriding Challenges</b>	<b>Overriding Opportunities</b>	<b>Understanding of Diversity</b>	<b>Understanding of “Culture” &amp; “Cultural Policy”</b>	<b>Cultural Policy Conditions: Changing Role of Government &amp; Subsectors of Concern</b>	<b>Policy Instruments or Measures</b>
<b>Switzerland</b>	<p>“...one of the main objectives of cultural policy in Switzerland is to ensure that local and regional linguistic diversity is reflected in cultural and artistic life itself by making a variety of products and services available to the general public.”</p> <p>“In a context such as this, it is easy to understand why cultural diversity is not only a key component of federal cultural policy but also, and above all, a constitutive element of the Swiss concept of state and society. It is both necessary and logical for Swiss public authorities... to be able to preserve their cultural support system in order to maintain a balance between the various national languages and cultures and to encourage mutual understanding.”</p>	<p>A lack of professionalism in project mgt and monitoring as a result of localized system</p> <p>“We must keep the following tension uppermost in our minds: never allow the confederal concept to be drowned in local identity, but at the same time refrain from imposing a national view of culture. Practical co-operation and exchange are what is required.”</p>	<p>Positive consequences of the existing system:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>grassroots initiatives and broad participation in cultural life of local communities</li> <li>high density of cultural institutions and industries (foundations, museums, libraries, galleries, exhibitions, films, concert halls, shows, lectures, conferences, etc.)</li> <li>respect for local identities and sensitivities</li> </ol>	<p>“The concept of diversity in Switzerland is based on three key characteristics: quadrilingualism and language territoriality, sovereignty of local and canton communities, and mutual understanding.”</p> <p>Local definition according to linguistic regions, with internal regional diversity respected and maintained, in part as a result of locally administered cultural policy in sovereign local communities</p> <p>Idea of a “cultural mosaic” which is “definitely not based on a homogenous cultural identity”</p> <p>Credo: “Diversity is our common culture!”</p>	<p>Culture is the responsibility of municipalities and cantons</p> <p>“... ‘cultural sovereignty’ at the local and canton level means that all cities and towns (and even villages) and all cantons have total freedom to develop their own cultural policy.”</p> <p>Exchange and dialogue are objectives, locally and nationally; is a dynamic conceptualization of policy</p> <p>Concept of a reservation in support of cultural diversity entails:</p> <p>Maintaining possibility and freedom of choice of cultural products and services;</p> <p>measures are required for this</p> <p>Plurilingualism and the maintenance of</p>	<p>With the exception of federal responsibility for language law and ensuring respect for quadrilingualism, as well as for national institutions, “culture is primarily the responsibility of municipalities and cantons.”</p> <p>“One of the main tasks of federal cultural institutions... is to promote and foster dialogue and exchange in practical ways by ensuring the distribution, circulation and translation of cultural works and productions so that they are available in other linguistic regions.”</p> <p>Subsectors of concern:</p> <p>All sectors in a holistic view: foundations, museums, libraries, galleries,</p>	<p><b>Subsidies</b></p> <p>Existing system of grants, which should be expanded to include those working in audiovisual and “other cultural fields”</p> <p><b>Regulatory Measures</b></p> <p><b>Other</b></p>

					dynamic cultural production Maintaining freedom of action for national cultural policy	exhibitions, films, concert halls, shows, lectures, conferences, publishing	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

## **APPENDIX B**

### **International Network on Cultural Policy**

#### **Inventory of Cultural Diversity Challenges and Opportunities**

## **Preface**

The second annual meeting of the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP) was held in September 1999 in Oaxaca, Mexico. At the meeting, ministers agreed, based on a Canadian proposal, to undertake specialized work on *cultural diversity and globalization*. The overriding goal is to provide Network members with new information and advice for cultural policy development.

This work first involves securing input from Network members regarding the broad challenges and opportunities in their own countries related to cultural diversity and globalization, within the context of the evolving international rules-based environment. The intent is not to look exhaustively at any single policy issue, but rather to provide a “snapshot” of cultural diversity and cultural policy issues in each country. Once broad patterns have been identified, the Network may decide to return to examine specific issues in more detail.

The results of this survey will provide an indication of the scope and range of cultural diversity issues facing countries today.

## 1.0 Core Policy Perspectives or Problematiques

At the preparatory meeting of Network experts on cultural diversity and globalization, held in Ottawa December 6-7, 1999, participants described a wide range of issues related to cultural diversity and globalization. In each case there was an overriding policy perspective or “problematique”.

For example, *South Africa* spoke of the challenges of balancing an acknowledgement of diversity with the need to strengthen national unity, and that challenges were less a matter of the needs of minorities, but of majority rights. *Norway* described efforts to democratize and decentralize cultural policy in order to acknowledge the diversity of local populations, while maintaining language and strengthening communications technology as a unifying force.

***Question:***

***Please describe the overriding policy perspective or problematique facing your country related to cultural diversity and globalization.***

## 2.0 Challenges and Opportunities

At the Ottawa meeting, participants spoke of a series of more specific policy challenges and opportunities facing their countries. Issues fell into the following broad categories: *Economic and Technological Forces*, *Social and Cultural Forces*, and the *Changing Role of Government*.

### ***Economic and Technological Forces***

Liberalized trade and the increased global flow of capital were identified as major factors driving policy in many countries. New communications and information technologies were described by some as a potential threat to indigenous cultures, and as an opportunity to extend the creation and distribution of cultural products and services.

For example, the *Ivory Coast* spoke of the inevitability of liberalization and privatization, but of the need to manage this process and in particular of the need to educate citizens in adjusting to these new realities. *Mexico* described its relatively recent shift from a closed to an open economy, and differing views between the ministries of trade and culture on how this transition should be managed. *Canada* described efforts to utilize new technologies to enhance cultural choice to citizens.

***Question:***

***What are the most significant impacts related to globalizing economic and technological change in your country, and what challenges and opportunities do these changes raise for cultural policies?***

### ***Social and Cultural Forces***

Mass global migration of peoples is resulting in unprecedented levels of cultural diversity in many countries. While this growing diversity brings great riches and benefits it is challenging many traditional structures and assumptions.

The *Ivory Coast* described challenges associated with 30% of residents being foreigners not citizens; diversity fostered by immigration was a positive force for the country, but there was a growing sense among citizens of being “victims of an invasion” that must be managed. *Greece* described rapid urbanization of the population, with accompanying fears of cultural homogenization. *Switzerland* spoke of the growing significance of English in that country, and the undermining of traditional or historic languages.

***Question:***

***What are the most significant social and cultural trends in your country related to cultural diversity and globalization, and what challenges and opportunities do these changes raise for cultural policies?***

### ***Changing Government Roles***

A rebalancing of public-, private-, and not-for-profit or "third sector" roles and responsibilities is underway in many countries, raising both challenges and opportunities.

*Sweden* described efforts to build co-operation across government at the federal level, while continuing to respect the power and authority of different regions. The *Ivory Coast* spoke of the lack of basic infrastructure for social, economic and cultural development driving all policies. *France* described the need for international alliances to protect and sustain cultural diversity.

***Question:***

***In the context of promoting cultural diversity in an era of globalizaiton, what kind of cultural policy conditions do you consider necessary? How would you characterize the changing role of government in your country as it relates to cultural policy?***