

Ministers' Dossier

The items of the proposed agenda were put together upon consultation with the interested parties. In addition to the questions that have been formulated with regard to the respective items (see below), the present dossiers shall provide additional information for the discussion.

- Inclusive Europe?

How can culture contribute to the cohesion of European societies? To what extent are the social functions of culture different in the various regions of Europe, e.g. between the 15 of Europe, the new members and those (still) outside of the Union? What concrete results do we expect from the actual conference? Are there lessons for ministers of culture from recent phenomena that point at the imperfections of inclusion in Europe?

-
The Role of Culture in the European Integration

What role should culture play in overcoming the current stalemate in the integration process? Had there been a chance to prevent or lessen the European crisis if cultural values and cultural co-operation had been given a greater role? What role should culture get in the integration process, and more specifically in the renewed Lisbon strategy, aiming at increasing the competitiveness of our continent?

-
2008
- European Year of Intercultural Dialogue

How can individual countries contribute to the realisation of the objectives proposed by the European Commission? Where can additional resources be mobilised? How could national cultural policies be adapted to these objectives? How will this initiative affect the non-member states of the European Union, which are their reflections regarding this main European initiative?

- UNESCO
Convention on Cultural Diversity

What is the significance of the approval of this Convention for the cultures of European societies? How does this affect the new member states and the accession countries, characterised by an increased vulnerability of their cultural

markets? How do we judge the role of the European Union and the Presidencies in the preparation of the Convention?

- Widening
Access to Cultural Products

How do we assess the proposals aimed to constitute a European response to the American cultural challenge? How should we tackle the financial and technical obstacles to this cultural competition? How should we divide tasks between the States and the international community? Is it not time to reconsider the copyright regimes and discuss the possibility of introducing a multiplicity of legal techniques (such as outlined in the Creative Commons proposals) aiming at easier (or even free) access to cultural products?

- European
Linguistic Diversity

How do the previous two issues affect the cause of linguistic diversity? What other existing and emerging national and international initiatives would give equal opportunities for the flourishing of less spoken languages? How can we broaden the scope and improve the efficiency of the translation support schemes?

- The
Role of Ministerial Conferences

What should be the future role of the ministerial conferences? What forms of collaboration can be conceived in addition to bilateral co-operation and the joint actions within the confines of international organisations? What specific aims and new kinds of structures can be established? What should be the general themes of future ministerial conferences?

{mospagebreak title=Inclusive Europe?
The Role of Culture in the European Integration}

Inclusive Europe?

The Role of Culture in the European Integration

By András Bozóki for the
Reader of the conference

The European Union almost doubled its membership from 15 to 25 countries just over a year ago. Two more countries are set to join in 2007 and discussions are ongoing about the

possible accession of still more. While the sheer size and numbers would suggest inclusiveness and an unprecedented success of the European project, the political trends and the social mood within Europe as a whole and in individual countries prove otherwise. The refusal of the European Constitution by the majority of voters in France and the Netherlands stopped (or at least seriously halted) the attempt to help consolidate the enlarged Europe through the deepening of integration. This might foreshadow a long-term European stalemate and the weakening of the European vision. Can culture contribute to resolving this political crisis?

Enlargement to include

the ten new countries increased diversity within the EU. Differences in economic development between the richest and the poorest regions in Europe are manifold. This intensified fears in the Western European societies concerning the growth of unemployment through the "invasion of guest workers" from new member states. Inclusiveness of societies could not keep pace with the sudden increase in the number of member-states. The structural problems of the Western European social model result in the understandable insecurity of societies that perceive the threats to their job security to come not from the competitiveness pressures on Europe as a whole, but from the presence of immigrants. The lack of political consensus concerning the future shape of the EU further increases this feeling of insecurity and results in a refusal to come to terms with growing diversity.

What role can culture

play in discovering the worth of this increased diversity? And what are the common values shared by the growing number of countries and societies? Could the values of solidarity, tolerance and equality of opportunity be extended to include the newcomers? Could culture create an integration across this diversity? Could a common European identity be detected in 25 or more societies? Could we conceptualise cultural policies at national and European levels in a way that contributes to the strengthening of European identity and the deepening of the integration process?

The lack of enthusiasm

and political discontent with both national and European politics as well as growing hostility towards migrants do not only characterise "old" European states. European societies alike have to come to terms with the following questions: What are the ways for immigrants to become European? Could they become European while keeping their own culture or only through rejecting it and embracing the culture of the host country? While several political actors, who feed and thrive on anti-immigrant feelings in their society readily use cultural arguments about migrants posing a threat to the home culture, mainstream pro- Europeans still have to come up with a convincing definition of what Europeaness means in a cultural sense. How can we become more appreciative of our differences? How can solidarity and tolerance be reinforced? How can we build a multi-layered European identity?

Short-term calculative

thinking seems to dominate the approach of societies and elites to integration. Old member states fear the loss of transfers or the rise of their payments, while the new members define benefits largely in terms of Euros received from the EU budget. What else Europe is about seems to be forgotten. Culture should

play an important role in the much needed rediscovery, re-evaluation and reinforcement of the shared values of an enlarged Europe. Writers, theorists, politicians, social scientists, artists, cultural activists and community leaders should all play a role in this process.

If we assume that culture plays a role in reviving the European vision, policy-oriented questions may come to sight. Should we consider making and nurturing culture an explicit priority in European policies? Should we think of strengthening multilateral collaborative cultural projects, and introducing new ones? Should we foster trans-national cultural programs? Should we aim to create and promote a truly pan-European culture? If so, what could be the content of such a project? If not, what are the reasons for such a refusal?

On the other hand, can we aspire to create a pan-European culture before cultural and social integration is realised on the national level, as long as access to culture-conceived in a narrow or a broad sense-shows huge inequalities? Who owns culture, who has access to it, who profits from culture and who takes part in shaping it?

In Hungary, for example, if we divide society into fifths, we find a difference of 1 to 220 between the cultural activity of the bottom and top 20 percent! (Data are taken from a national survey, and activity is measured by attending cultural institutions from the cinema to libraries, and reading books.)

Division of Cultural Activity in Hungary

Instances of cultural activity
per person, per year

Top fifth

65.8

2nd

21.2

3rd

10.1

4th

3.9

Bottom fifth

0.3

Ratio between top and bottom

219.3

Average by person

20.4

If we divide the society into three strata, the ratio between bottom and top is still 1 to 34; and taking the bottom and top 50 percent, the more active half of Hungarians still "consume" nearly 90 percent of institutional culture than the other half-what is the minister of culture, what am I to do with and for the other half?

Cultural consumption in and out of cultural institutions-that is, attending theatres, museums, concerts, cinemas and cultural centres, as well as reading books-is closely related to the level of schooling. Those with the longest time spent in education and highest income perform the highest cultural activeness. In terms of cultural habits, about 15-16 percent of Hungarians constitute the active upper layer. It is they who regularly attend cultural events, participate in other leisure activities, read, do sports, take part in various socio-cultural

and civic actions, nurture live social contacts, belong to groups of friends, speak foreign languages, use new technologies. Moreover, it is they who go to restaurants, pubs and cafés in the greatest proportion. The next roughly one quarter of our society limit their cultural activity to smaller scales, but still are regular clients and consumers of institutional culture, and not excluded from community activities.

Further down the scale, 40-45 percent of our society lives a life of reduced interactions. They do not engage in cultural consumption and take no part in recreational or other self-enriching individual or community actions. Their social contacts hardly go beyond the closest family and neighbourhood. They remain excluded from the social life of the town or village, either because of lack of will or lack of activity to join. Most of their free time is spent watching television. The core of this huge group is elderly, unemployed, uneducated people in small settlements, often living alone with poor health conditions. But also painfully high is the proportion of young among them, for whom creating and showing the possibilities in our society is one of the most important challenges for the future.

The causes of such a situation are obviously largely historical, going back to centuries and also to the failure of state socialism, further aggravated by the hardships of the political transition and economic transformation. Have more fortunate societies developed successful, effective programmes for the integration of the culturally excluded? Where can we find such models? Which of these can be exported to other countries? Or do we assume that the increase of cultural interaction between nations, and the promotion of trans-national cultural and community activities will have a favourable affect on the social cohesion of cultural "outcasts" in each nation of Europe?

During the recent months, all Member States have been preparing their individual National Development Plans for the 2007-13 period, and plan to submit them to the European Commission soon. How can we use European funds in these existing frameworks for developing and sponsoring cultural projects? What are the best national strategies and the best practices in planning for culture that helps maintaining diversity and inclusiveness?

I would like to welcome all of our esteemed guests in Budapest, sincerely hoping that our meeting may offer an opportunity to exchange views about all of these questions and dilemmas. And hopefully, we will reach a consensus about at least some of them.

{mospagebreak title=2008 - European Year of Intercultural Dialogue}

2008 - European Year of Intercultural Dialogue

The Commission adopted on the 5th of October a proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council to declare 2008 "European Year of Intercultural Dialogue".

With an overall budget of €10 million, the European Year will draw on the wealth and diversity of a series of specific projects to be implemented during 2008 through programmes and other Community actions. Culture, education, youth, sport and citizenship will be the main areas concerned.

Generally speaking, the European Year is expected to:

- promote intercultural dialogue as an instrument to assist European citizens, and all those living in the European Union, in acquiring the knowledge and aptitudes to enable them to deal with a more open and more complex environment;
- raise the awareness of European citizens, and all those living in the European Union, of the importance of developing active European citizenship which is open to the world, respectful of cultural diversity and based on common values.

The European Year of Intercultural Dialogue shall make possible to promote a consistent image of the multiplicity of Community actions contributing to the intercultural dialogue while developing synergies between programmes, particularly those geared towards neighbouring countries and third countries. The Year shall also involve close co-operation between the Member States to concentrate efforts on awareness-raising and communication activities.

The Commission proposes to fund three types of activity, which will constitute the operational objectives:

- an information campaign promoting the objectives of the European Year - to be identified by a logo - which could account for half of the budget;
- grants for actions at Community level, geared towards a limited number of emblematic actions on a Community scale (e.g. major festivals or sporting events) intended to raise awareness, especially among young people, of the objectives of the European Year;

- co-financing of actions at national level with a strong European dimension.

The preparation for the Year will need to be closely co-ordinated with the preparations for and implementation of the "European Year of Equal Opportunities for All" in 2007 in order to maximise synergies and complementarity between these two initiatives.

Excerpts

from the propositions to the European Commission on an EU Year of Intercultural Dialogue, prepared by the European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH)

The term "intercultural dialogue" is used in many different and sometimes confusing ways. This creates a vague area of reflection, often making the development of concrete programmes difficult. For the sake of clarity, we wish to distinguish between three fruitful and parallel areas of endeavour:

- Inter-continental dialogue as a response to globalisation and the need for serious cultural bridging.
- Trans-national dialogue as a response to a wider Europe and as an integrated part of a strategy towards neighbouring countries
- Inter-ethnic dialogue as a response to the increased heterogeneity in all our towns and cities due to migration and mobility.

The three areas are inter-related. The skills necessary to respond to them are similar and transferable. The key to a successful strategy for Intercultural Dialogue is to create synergies between them. The necessary synergies between the three areas above will have to be sought against a background of the following key contemporary developments and/or requirements, on the road from immigration to cultural fusion and multiple identities.

First point:

Millions of people are on the move in today's world, hence migration has become a major cultural and political force. Mobility - and therefore 'interculturalism' in practice - is constantly increasing. Mixed couples and their children, second and third generation immigrants with one foot in each culture, are common expressions of mobility in all European societies. This is a phenomenon that enriches. It may well lead to a reduction of the importance of ethnicity, whether by blood or imagination and tradition.

Our world is changing constantly - and we need to exercise our capacity for change. Confrontation and negotiation with other realities is excellent preparation for confronting an unknown future. When the legendary theatre maker Peter Brook put together his first intercultural company years ago, he dreamed of "making culture in the sense that yoghurt is culture". He initiated a transformation, an ongoing fermentation of ideas and perspectives, changing not only the participants (micro-cosmos) but also the context in which they worked (macro-cosmos).

Second point:

We should not focus simply on so-called "immigrant artists" reproducing classic forms of European art. Although it seems to be an organic impulse among some artists to gain acceptance in their new countries by re-inventing the wheel and rejecting their "otherness", artistic assimilation misses the point.

Instead - we need hybrid forms that concretely reflect a culture in the making; a plural society built on exchange and dialogue. This can be called fusional art. It increases the oxygen level in a society.

Third point:

We must be motivated by curiosity, a desire to be surprised. Intercultural dialogue is not about giving jobs and opportunities to "underprivileged groups". It is about creating an entirely new context where we are all transformed in the meeting, leading potentially to a relationship of common engagement and focused citizenship.

Fourth point:

We must never, never forget the audience. They will affect speed and rhythm. The audience could be inspired, cultivated and - above all - listened to. We need to develop allies in the radical transformation of culture that is required as a response to migration and globalization. Not in the form of "the crowds" but rather culture as meeting points for debate and reflection. The Arts can take a central position: citizenship and participation are only stimulated within an inclusive society, created by common values that are being developed, not enforced or taught.

Fifth point:

Another challenge we face in a globalised world is the cultivation of multiple identities. Each of us has an ethnic background but also personal identities as a parent, as a religious believer, as a man or woman. We have professional identities and cultural identities. We have a class identity. We share hobbies and interests in sub-cultural groups.

These different identities are in continuous negotiation and transformation. None of them alone are sufficient to define a person at any given moment. We weave our way through this complicated map and we relate to one another from various positions, none of them fixed.

Sixth point:

Practicing trans-national collaboration is an important exercise in a globalised world. However, the standard import-export of national art products fills a very limited function. Audiences see, consume and applaud. Artists travel, perform and depart. The contact surface takes place only within the theatre, concert hall or museum for a limited time. It borders on exoticism, regardless of the quality or the country of origin. How can we avoid this superficial "internationalism"? By turning superficial contacts into collaborative relationships, working/creating together, discussing our experiences and aspirations at length and learning from each other.

Seventh point:

Intercultural dialogue in daily life is seldom stimulated by massive mainstream events which often unintentionally lead to counter-productive results for the image of the

European Union. Any future programme for intercultural dialogue should support an environment in which a diversity of artistic expressions flourish and where discordance is not only tolerated but encouraged.

Eighth point:

Heritage is awareness of the many layers of history and human endeavour that make up a community or a nation. We must always ask ourselves when we consider research and preservation just whose heritage we are talking about? Migration and economic globalisation have opened to a diversity of cultural heritages co-existing in the same geographical space. This requires a conscious and innovative approach to make informed decisions balancing between re-invention, diversity and national traditions.

Summary:

We must cultivate the necessary intercultural competence to negotiate differences inclusively and with parallel strategies, whether on the local/national level or on the trans-national level. At all levels, it is a question of cultural democracy.

{mospagebreak title=UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity}

UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity

One hundred and forty eight countries voted in favour of UNESCO's Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions on 20 October. Only the US and Israel opposed it, with four countries (Australia, Nicaragua, Honduras and Liberia) abstaining. It now requires 30 countries to ratify the convention for it to take effect.

The Convention is the first of its kind in international relations, as it enshrines a consensus that the international community has never before reached on a variety of guiding principles and concepts related to cultural diversity and forms the basis of a new pillar of world governance in cultural matters. The

Convention recognises the dual nature of cultural goods and services, which have both an economic and social value. It emphasizes the right of states to take measures in support of diverse cultural expressions. It will be on an equal footing with other international treaties.

According

to the Commission, "the UNESCO Convention makes it possible to fill a legal vacuum in world governance by establishing a series of rights and obligations, at both national and international level, aimed at protecting and promoting cultural diversity", adding that "there is no objective nor effect to remove or exclude cultural goods and services from the WTO agreements".

As Jean

Musitelli, a member of the international group of experts that drafted the convention, has stated, "a country will have the right to refuse to open its audiovisual and cinematographic market in the framework of international commercial negotiations. For the first time, vulnerable countries will have a mechanism to resist".

The

US fears that the UNESCO convention on cultural diversity may be used by some member states to curb the flow of goods, services and ideas. However, countries such as Japan, India, Brazil, and Mexico, which are all strong in exports of their own national film, music, radio, books, television programming and other cultural goods, approved the convention's core notion, that these global 'products' are not simply merchandise, but expressions of cultural identity.

* *
*

For the uninitiated it is not clear at first sight, not even at first reading, that this agreement is closely related to what was earlier known as l'exception culturelle, the special status given to cultural goods and services in international trade negotiations. The text of the Convention does not suggest the formidable content that made world powers (mainly multinational corporations) try to prevent it from completion for years. It does not even contain the word "trade" or such indecencies as "quota". "Promote" occurs more often than "protect" (37 to 29). It will take long before one learns about the exact impact of the Convention, because of the lengthy process of ratification.

* *
*

Selected

Questions

* How

does the Community uphold the principle of cultural diversity?

Preserving

and promoting cultural diversity are among the Community's founding principles. They are enshrined in the Treaty, under Article 151, and in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, under Article 22.3.

Within

the Union, Article 151 of the Treaty, which has enabled the development of cultural activities, notably through the Culture 2000 Programme, also requires the cultural dimension to be taken into consideration in other Community policies, such as industrial policy in the case of the MEDIA Plus Programme and the internal market policy (free movement of services) in the case of the "Television Without Frontiers" Directive.

This

principle can also be applied to the external dimension of Community action. Article 151 calls upon the EC and its Member States to promote this model in their international relations, as a contribution to a world order based on sustainable development, peaceful coexistence and intercultural dialogue.

* Who

negotiated the Convention on behalf of the European Union?

The

European Community, through the European Commission and as per the mandate conferred by the Council in November 2004, negotiated alongside the Member States at UNESCO, with the incumbent Council Presidency (the three successive Presidencies being the Netherlands, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom) at the helm throughout the process.

This classic modus operandi is used whenever the competences at stake in given international negotiations are shared between the Community and the Member States. The common positions expressed by either the Commission or the Presidency, depending on the subject under discussion, were fully coordinated throughout the negotiations.

The European Union was able to participate for the first time and speak with a single voice as a key player in the UNESCO negotiations.

* In what way is the text a new pillar of world governance?

The UNESCO Convention makes it possible to fill a legal vacuum in world governance by establishing a series of rights and obligations, at both national and international level, aimed at protecting and promoting cultural diversity.

The UNESCO Convention is a platform for debates and exchanges on cultural diversity at international level: it will allow the reality of cultural diversity in the world to be observed and closely monitored, and opinions, information and best practices to be exchanged between the parties. It will also be possible for the parties to coordinate and consult each other to promote the Convention's objectives in the other international bodies and to strengthen international cooperation.

* Does this Convention call into question the Community's and Member States' commitments to the World Trade Organisation?

The Convention does not call WTO commitments into question. There is no objective nor effect to remove or exclude cultural goods and services from the WTO agreements. The Convention recognises the specificity of cultural goods and services and legitimises domestic and international cultural policies.

The UNESCO Convention will not alter the WTO agreements (which is not possible anyway - only the Organisation's members can do this by following established procedures) but will require parties to consider the objectives of cultural diversity and the terms of the Convention when applying and interpreting their trade obligations, as well as negotiating their trade commitments. The Convention is therefore a considerable step forward in protecting and promoting cultural diversity at international level, including in trade negotiations.

* What are the next steps?

As regards ratification by the Community - which may become a contracting party, according to the text - the Commission envisages the adoption of a proposal for a Council decision as of this autumn, with a view to approval.

{mospagebreak title=Widening Access to Cultural Products}

Widening Access to Cultural Products

The proliferation of cultural products offers enormous and ever-growing possibilities for all citizens in Europe. This is especially true for the rapid growth of electronic cultural content. The recent technological innovations and advances have profoundly changed the ways cultural goods are distributed, reproduced and consumed. But in order to realize the full potential of the Internet, and for each citizen to realize their own potential, the full range of online content needs to be made available to all - quickly, easily and in a form appropriate to the individuals' needs.

Cultural institutions and organisations are making significant amounts of online content available to their respective communities - in education, museums, archives, research, public libraries, and so on. However, as the Common Information Environment, a group of public sector stakeholders observes, "the barriers between [cultural] sectors mean that not all this content is accessible to all who might need it or want it. Too much remains hidden amongst the low-quality information that clutters the web and behind technical, commercial and administrative barriers."

In order to achieve a more inclusive Europe, and a true cultural democracy in Europe, it is crucial that the barriers to the free flow of ideas and knowledge between different communities and cultural sectors are dismantled. For the individual citizens, inclusion means creating equal opportunities, chances for all to participate in the global exchange of cultural goods and content. For the communities, inclusion means enjoying, without barriers, and actively recreating their own cultural heritage.

On various levels and in various fields of cultural production, different civic organizations, communities and stakeholders have already contributed to the dismantling of these barriers and the widening of access to cultural goods and works of art: the BBC has opened its Creative Archive ; the various free software and "copyleft" movements have initiated the introduction of new, non-commercial licenses for the distribution of documents, software, and works of art; the Creative Commons initiative has established a range of copyright techniques for the authors and producers of cultural goods from which they can select the licensing option best suiting their artistic and economic interests; and so on. The governments are lagging behind in this process; it is their turn now to take initiative.

The Adelphi Charter on Creativity, Innovation and Intellectual Property - prepared by international experts from the arts, creative industries, human rights, law, economics, science, R&D, technology, the public sector and education, including Gilberto Gil, Brazilian Minister of Culture - responds to one of the most profound challenges of the 21st century: How to ensure that everyone has access to ideas and knowledge, and that intellectual property laws do not become too restrictive?

The Charter states that "The expansion in the law's breadth, scope and term over the last 30 years has resulted in an intellectual property regime which is radically out of line with modern technological, economic and social trends. This threatens the chain of creativity and innovation on which we and future generations depend."

In order to overcome this trend and to promote a new, fair, user-friendly and efficient way of handing out intellectual property rights in the 21st century, the Charter sets out new principles for copyrights and patents (see the Document below). The Charter emphasizes the crucial role of governments in initiating policies to stimulate creativity, innovation, and access - especially for those underprivileged citizens who currently have lesser opportunities to encounter with the wide range of cultural products.

Besides action on the side of the governments, it is important that a common European strategy is developed to reform the existing intellectual property regulation. The European IP regime of the 21st century should focus on the dual aims to improve productivity and competitiveness in the global economic arena and to provide the European citizens with a wider access to cultural goods as a source of their creativity.

* *
*

Document

Adelphi
Charter on Creativity, Innovation and Intellectual Property

Humanity's capacity to generate new ideas and knowledge is its greatest asset. It is the source of art, science, innovation and economic development. Without it, individuals and societies stagnate.

This creative imagination requires access to the ideas, learning and culture of others, past and present.

Human rights call on us to ensure that everyone can create, access, use and share information and knowledge, enabling individuals, communities and societies to achieve their full potential.

Creativity and investment should be recognised and rewarded. The purpose of intellectual property law (such as copyright and patents) should be, now as it was in the past, to ensure both the sharing of knowledge and the rewarding of innovation.

The expansion in the law's breadth, scope and term over the last 30 years has resulted in an intellectual property regime which is radically out of line with modern technological, economic and social trends. This threatens the chain of creativity and innovation on which we and future generations depend.

We call upon governments and the international community to adopt these principles.

- Laws regulating intellectual property must serve as means of achieving creative, social and economic ends and not as ends in themselves.
- These laws and regulations must serve, and never overturn, the basic human rights to health, education, employment and cultural life.
- The public interest requires a balance between the public domain and private rights. It also requires a balance between the free competition that is essential for economic vitality and the monopoly rights granted by intellectual property laws.
- Intellectual property protection must not be extended to abstract ideas, facts or data.
- Patents must not be extended over mathematical models, scientific theories, computer code, methods for teaching, business processes, and methods of medical diagnosis, therapy or surgery.
- Copyright and patents must be limited in time and their terms must not extend beyond what is proportionate and necessary.

- Government
must facilitate a wide range of policies to stimulate access and innovation, including non-proprietary models such as open source software licensing and open access to scientific literature.

- Intellectual
property laws must take account of developing countries' social and economic circumstances.

- In making
decisions about intellectual property law, governments should adhere to these rules:
 - There
must be an automatic presumption against creating new areas of intellectual property protection, extending existing privileges or extending the duration of rights.

 - The
burden of proof in such cases must lie on the advocates of change.

 - Change
must be allowed only if a rigorous analysis clearly demonstrates that it will promote people's basic rights and economic well-being.

 - Throughout,
there should be wide public consultation and a comprehensive, objective and transparent assessment of public benefits and detriments.

We call upon governments and the international community to adopt these principles.

{mospagebreak title=European Linguistic Diversity}

European Linguistic Diversity

Linguistic
diversity is

considered as a European added value. The protection of Europe's multilingual character is the first step towards the protection and the enhancement of its cultural diversity. In this framework special care should be taken for the promotion of the less spoken languages in

Europe.

The European Union has been doing a great deal for the preservation and promotion of less spoken languages. The efforts concentrate on the languages of minorities, both those with or without a so-called mother country. Cultural minorities being an important issue for most new member states, the language policy activities of the EU will certainly follow and intensify this legacy.

The concept of less spoken languages should also be applied to those languages that are dominant in their own sphere, however, "minoritarian" among the 450 million Europeans. Slovenian, Latvian or Finnish etc. are also worthy and in need of protection, especially by cultural means.

This is also acknowledged by the Union. The Commission gives considerable support to the subtitling of films. The Culture 2000 programme, in its capacity as the successor of the Ariane programme, funds the translation of a few hundred European literary works each year. Both practices are extremely valuable and should be continued after 2007.

To remain in the field of publishing: by the selective method of support by title, a tiny share of the market of translated literature can be covered only. With appropriate selection procedure, the most valuable segment of titles, publishers and translators can be reached and supported. Singling out the best few is not enough to turn the tide, or to slow its advance. The statistics of the book markets in Europe indicate a steady growth of titles translated from the English language. Not denying the services that this lingua franca does for the quick dissemination of thoughts and ideas in our world, the phenomenon works against the ideal of linguistic diversity.

The ideal of linguistic diversity supposes a fair balance by the original language (where the notion of source language applies), on the markets of intellectual, artistic and other creative products. Europe should feel concern for the sustainable share of works that originate from lesser translated source languages. To use a specific approximation: any book that has been translated from a language that represents less than five percent in a given market, deserves protection *eo ipso*, by its nature. The principle can be expressed in various ways, referring to films, theatre pieces, news items, articles in journals, lyrics of songs, items of e-content etc.

principle of giving support to lesser used source languages in culture is primarily a national concern. Member states apply mechanisms to promote translation and dissemination from their own languages. These deserve more systematic community support in the future. In addition, incentives should be devised for segments of cultural industries to diversify their offer by source language. More broadly, the very existence of cultural industries (electronic media, publishing etc.) in small languages justifies structural support. The concept of linguistic diversity calls for the strategic involvement of the cultural industries, both on national and on European level.

{mospagebreak title=The Role of Ministerial Conferences}

The Role of Ministerial Conferences

Minister

Carmen Calvo has indicated the intention to organise the next Conference of European Ministers of Culture in Spain in next spring. This will be the fourth edition of the series started in Berlin (A Soul for Europe, Berlin, 26-27 November 2004).

Besides

common features, each conference follows peculiar objectives, too. The Paris Conference (Rencontres pour l'Europe de la Culture, Paris, Comédie Française, 2-3 May 2005) set the goal of initiating practical co-operation between interested EU member states. With the involvement of expert groups, the following eight themes had been elaborated and presented at the conference.

- Promotion of European films in the Europa Cinemas network. This project, the main element of which would be the organisation of Weeks of European Film, would complement the actions of MEDIA.
- Establishment of a network of bookshops that bear the title of European Bookshop (upon the analogy of Europa Cinemas), and which pledge to keep a previously agreed stock of European works in translation and/or in the original language.
- Creation of the title of European Heritage, an initiative inspired by the World Heritage Programme of UNESCO, and by the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe.
- Support given to subtitling in performing arts (opera, theatre etc.), by setting up a fund and establishing a committee of experts who would elaborate principles and criteria and would manage the fund.
- Compilation of a document that contains information on performing arts in the member states, data on venues, festivals, artists, regulation, resources etc, a European Atlas of the Performing Arts, aiming at the harmonisation of conditions also.

- Annual publication of a European Album of Young Architects and a European Album of Young Landscape Architects, upon the example of the French national equivalent, based on open calls for application.
- Establishment of a joint European promotion platform of European music in the Far East, with the main aim of strengthening the European position on the Japanese and Chinese music markets.
- Creation of a long-term lending scheme of contemporary works of art, in order to enhance the mobility and visibility of works of European visual arts in our days.

Some of the suggested items received especially positive feedback in Paris. Nevertheless, the turbulent period that characterised the time that has passed on the European arena since May, has not favoured the practical follow-up of these initiatives. When the major open issues (such as the 2007-2013 budget, and the future cultural activity of the Union) are settled, these and similar suggestions may again enjoy the necessary attention and support.

During the preparations for Inclusive Europe? Horizon 2020, at least two more themes emerged, that lend themselves to joint execution:

- Exploration of the advantages and adaptability of the intellectual property solutions offered by the Adelphi Charter, the Creative Commons, and the related IP initiatives.
- Promotion of arts for young children, and their parents, with or without specific aims at social and cultural inclusion.

If in the areas where the EU has a mandate, the institution of enhanced co-operation, as specified in the Treaty of Nice, continues to gain recognition, a looser version of voluntary co-operation may find justification in domains that are national competence, as an appropriate way of realising joint actions. Similarly to other cultural actions of the Union, the involvement of future members can also be conceived. It is to be decided whether the Conferences of European Ministers of Culture are instrumental in such a co-operation.