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01. Introduction

Culture and development are two words which have not always gone together, or been worked upon within the same context. In recent years however, we come across new elements, instruments and ideas which place increasing emphasis on this pair of concepts.

This publication *Culture and Development. Evolution and Prospects* is set within the growing interest in studying the various aspects which form part of development, promoting a global and integral understanding. The work carried out to analyse the fundamental role that aspects like education or the environment have for example in relation to human development is generally known. Culture, that word which seeks to cover so much ground, has not been left out of those debates. For quite a while now figures from the academic and social arenas as well as different intergovernmental and civil society organisations have been working on the theory behind the role that culture can play in development, and the actions which promote its practical application.

Having said this, despite all this work carried out in the area of culture and development, civil society, cultural organisations and the NGOs, amongst others, have all identified the need to examine further the role of culture in development and cooperation, by studying the historic evolution of culture’s insertion into development and cooperation, both on the theoretical level and in its practical application through development activities and projects: starting with the cultural comprehension of the very concept of development, and then clarifying what is understood by culture in development cooperation, in order to generate tools which favour the application of the theory and the mainstreaming of culture in development practice.

There are many authors who have dealt with the culture/development binomial, and the different aspects that we could stress within this framework (cultural rights, cultural and creative industries, cultural and linguistic diversity, etc.). We could also point out that there is still plenty of work left to be done in this area. This publication seeks to join the numerous current initiatives on culture and development, providing an instrument of rapprochement for those interested in finding out what is behind this binomial.

It was UNESCO which in 1966 indicated in an international document the unavoidable need to consider culture within international cooperation. In subsequent decades it went deeper into the concept of development and with the appearance of human development in 1990, which goes beyond mere economic growth and, under the leadership of the internationally renowned Amartya Sen, promotes development as a process to boost people’s capacities and broaden their options, a reference framework was obtained which included a wide range of development-related issues. Culture –as well as cultural diversity and freedom– has also been the object of investigation and interest as a necessary element for the full development of people and communities.

Culture has however been excluded for years from the development and cooperation programmes. As such we shall first analyse here the historic evolution of culture’s insertion into development and cooperation, by studying
the most relevant international instruments on this issue, highlighting the most significant milestones, moments and documents. In this case, it is essential to refer to the United Nations and in particular UNESCO as this body has the merit of having called attention to the relationship between culture and development. Later on, other agencies in the United Nations system have also worked on related issues like cultural liberty (UNDP), the creative industries (UNCTAD, UNPD and UNESCO) or cultural rights (OHCHR).

As we will show below, even a minimum rapprochement to the relationship between culture and development involves the need to perform an integral exercise given that this relationship includes many approaches and transversalization of many sciences (anthropology, sociology, history, political science, etc.). Due to the characteristics of this publication, it would be impossible to deal with all of the theories or even the most important ones, or the initiatives being performed around the world to promote culture’s insertion into development, but we shall give details of some of the most relevant in this area which will serve as a preliminary study of this issue.

On the other hand, and in relation to that stated about culture’s presence in development, the cultural rights are another aspect which are usually mentioned in the cooperation strategies and projects, but are often treated without being based on the international documents and frameworks which could support real work to clarify the cultural rights. We are currently at a unique time in the clarification of the cultural rights: a few months ago General Comment (No. 21) was passed in Geneva on Article 15.1.a of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which refers us to the ‘right to take part in cultural life’. Also, last September the United Nations Human Rights Council appointed an Independent Expert in the area of Cultural Rights with the mandate to clarify their scope and evaluate the different national legislations on the matter.

Taking into account the increasing presence of the Rights-Based Approach to Development Cooperation –an increasingly essential element in any cooperation action–, the cultural rights must be clarified in order to perform cultural cooperation projects.

This publication mentions some of the debates and instruments with greatest weight in the theoretical conception of culture’s role in the development of people and communities. This publication does not aim to include a systematic and exhaustive study of all of the works, research and documents on the subject, and does not try to be a directory of resources. We do however intend to indicate some of the documents and works which can help an initial study of the current situation of the culture/development binominal. As such, at the end is a list of articles and work in the Further Reading section which seeks to provide a set of documents of interest to be used for further research into the subject, and including, amongst others, easily accessible resources like those available on the internet. It also includes those works which have been consulted in order to prepare this publication.

The publication Culture and Development. Evolution and Prospects on culture and development. This preliminary study performed with the support of the Basque Government’s Department for Development Cooperation aims therefore to provide a useful instrument for those who wish to find out more about the relationship between culture and development.

02. Culture and development

«Culture is the be all and end all of development»
L.S. Senghor, poet (Senegal, 1906-2001)

Over the last few decades there has been greater study into the concept of development, including not only indicators like economic growth or production, but also incorporating factors currently considered essential for full development, a non-linear development, and conceived as a complex process involving different fields and characteristics.

The concept of Human Development, promoted on the international level by the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) and Amartya Sen, includes education and health as key factors in human development, which is defined as increasing the capacities of each person and thereby placing the person at the centre of the development action.

The UNDP promotes reports which complement the vision of development by analysing the issues which have an impact on it, like for example global warming\(^1\), access to water\(^2\), human mobility or migrations\(^3\) and cultural liberty\(^4\), all of which will be mentioned below. In this context culture has also become an interesting factor for those analysing development.

Within this framework, in recent years the idea that the cultural dimension must be included in the development policies and actions has become generally accepted. Due to the prioritisation of sustainable human development over

---

other more econometric development models, culture has been studied as a necessary element for the full development of people and communities. Development, as overcoming poverty, has also increasingly opted for a broader concept of the term poverty: hence a broader approach to poverty includes, amongst others, the cultural sphere.

Indeed, as also shown by the author George Yudice, amongst others, both ‘development’ and ‘culture’ are changing words, and he even states that in the 1960s we saw «development without concern for culture». Even when less econometric concepts of development became popular, like for example those promoted by ecologists and environmentalists which led to what is known as sustainable development, culture continued being sidelined. It should be added that nor did the development action have any real cultural presence. Development was too closely linked to economic growth, and authors like John Hawkes –in his publication ‘The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability’– defended, often without any impact or support in the public policies, that culture should be the 4th pillar of sustainability.

The relationship between culture and development started to be defended by different experts in the 1970s although it was not until the 1980s or even the 1990s when the international bodies and development cooperation agencies started to promote studies and work to analyse how cultural factors could have an impact on the development processes. Alfons Martinell, Director of the UNESCO Chair on Cultural Policies of Girona University, stated that despite the studies promoted by experts, “their contribution has been largely ignored by the political agendas of the international community”5. Numerous Development Cooperation Master Plans from different administrations also support this idea, like the Basque Government’s Cooperation Master Plan (2008-2011) when it states that «for years culture was excluded from the development programmes»6.

The study of the causes which had an impact on this gap between culture and development would cover a wide range of reasons and an analysis of this type would exceed the scope of this work. However, without wishing to go into too much detail into this issue, we would like to point out that the lack of definition of the term culture in our society, as well its overuse, may have also had an impact on its late inclusion within the development policies. Culture, always seen as a complex issue and socially and politically highly sensitive, has nowadays become a cliché, used abundantly in almost all contexts of our reality (political, social, educational, economic, etc.).

The word culture is, according to Anna Geli, an all encompassing word, which together with others, like ‘education’, are «words which can mean everything and not clarify anything». Geli adds that «we often fill our mouths with words like culture without knowing exactly what we are referring to»7. Culture has also been an area in which we often find a source of controversy in the political and social arena.

The word culture is also a word which has been recently incorporated into our language with its current meaning: it is no more than 300 years ago that culture was completely separated from its link to the idea of cultivating the land and took on a new abstract meaning as it would be used subsequently (cultivate the spirit)8. According to Prieto de Pedro «the birth of the word culture is a relatively recent linguistic event». Only three centuries ago, in 1690, the Dictionnaire Universel only took culture in its traditional meaning.

The numerous associated terms which we find surrounding culture (mass culture, cultural heritage, cultural identity, popular culture, cultural diversity, etc.) can in turn be taken as a sample of the use of this word, often without giving it a real content. Furthermore, cultural diversity and its relationship with people’s identity, converts the work on culture into a ‘sensitive’ subject in the eyes of the numerous actors in the cooperation field. The many definitions of the term culture

5 Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); La cultura, estrategia de cooperación al desarrollo, University Document, Girona, 2008.
7 Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); 2008.
8 Prieto de Pedro, Jesús; Cultura, Culturas y Constitución, Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, Madrid, 2006.
means that there are various different approaches surrounding the work which could be done in the cultural arena. The theoretical lack of definition of culture also led to it being excluded from the development policies, given that, as Rubens Bayardo states: «There are many readings and different approaches to the notion of culture, and the problem is what is included and what is excluded from it».

In this work we will use a broad definition of culture, deriving from the definition from Mondiacult (1982) and used by UNESCO, which integrates the cultural expressions, as specific manifestations of the cultures. Hence, «culture is that which offers the context, values, subjectivity, attitudes and skills on which the development process must take place», as also contained in the Basque Government Cooperation Plan. This definition of culture also includes the idea of the complementary nature of the cultures, their dynamism and the generation of culture identities which are not mutually exclusive. Thus, culture is not a static set of values and practices: it is constantly recreated as people question, adapt and redefine their values and practices when faced with changes and the interchange of ideas. Finally, we should emphasise that this work considers cultural diversity to be a natural event inherent to human beings.

Amongst the obstacles to including culture in development, we should mention that until recently the issue of protecting cultures was exclusively a problem of ‘cultural minorities’, of groups therefore with little influence in the State. We also work on this idea in the section dedicated to cultural rights.

Another issue which should be mentioned in the analysis of culture and development is that under the umbrella of cultural cooperation there are all types of different actions and that, together with the unfortunately so common understanding which links culture with fine arts and elitism, the cultural policies have always tended to act in favour of a specific type of culture. As indicated by Yudice: «The conventional policies to support the arts and heritage, which make up the majority of the cultural policies, have marginalised the broader concept of culture». As such, the intangible heritage, languages and customs, amongst others, were not considered as elements to be promoted and protected by the public policies.

This situation does not, as may be expected, only arise in the local field: we must state that the multilateral development bodies do not systematically include the implementation of the cultural dimension in their actions. Amongst the most important international events in recent years, we would have to mention the Millennium Development Goals adopted in 2000. One of the most widespread criticisms of the Millennium Development Goals is precisely that they have left out the cultural dimension. On 21st May 2008, on the celebration of the World Day for Cultural Diversity for Dialogue and Development, Koichiro Matsuura, then Director-General of UNESCO, emphasised that the current situation «invites us to demonstrate that cultural diversity is a driving force behind sustainable development and therefore a decisive instrument in the fight against poverty. It is decisive for the international community as culture, unlike education, is not amongst the Millennium Development Goals, despite the fact that it is essential if they are to be achieved».

On the other hand, nor can we overlook the issue of the ‘economisation of culture’ or implementation of the cultural expressions, which has received so much deserved criticism, as indicated by Rubens Bayardo or the United Nations work on creative economy. We are seeing a commercialisation of new sectors, including cultural ones. It is important to pay attention to the research and proposals in the area of the link between the cultural and creative industries with development, so that the creativity inherent in all culture can be used for the development of each community. On this matter, we should highlight the United Nations ‘2008 Report on the Creative Economy. The challenge of assessing the creative economy towards informed policy-making’ prepared by various agencies under the coordination of the UNDP and UNCTAD (United Nations Trade and Commerce Programme), and supported by UNESCO and WIPO.

Development, as overcoming poverty, must be a broad and holistic concept which must incorporate the concept of cultural development. In turn, one must remember the large potential of the work on cultural wealth as it provides a vision of wealth to communities which are always seen as ‘poor’ from the international cooperation perspective, which normally has a more classic concept of poverty (uncovered basic needs). Cooperation must also always take into account the «cultural approach to society’s problems», as stated by Gonzalo Carámbula, which indicates that it is not only the cultural cooperation projects which should take culture into account, but that every social or technological development action must also consider the specific cultural aspects. The role of cultural management in conflicts is not however taken into account, as indicated by Carámbula: «When the time comes for public policy-making (...) the cultural perspectives are left out or are subject to other rules».

The same author provides us with another of the keys which has also had an impact on the difficulty in including
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10 Prieto de Pedro, Jesús; Cultura, Culturas y Constitución, Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, Madrid, 2006.
culture as a dimension of development, and according to Carámbula it is that «culture has a very different tempo to that of politics or the administration». Development and cooperation actions are intrinsically linked to the funds, resources and times of politics and its administrations, and as such this issue must also be taken into account when it comes to considering the possibilities of dealing with cultural processes in development.

Here we should speak about cultural indications as there are more and more international, regional and local bodies which point out the need to measure the impact of the development processes through quantifiable and comparable indicators. But again Gonzalo Carámbula shows that we must be aware that «it is very difficult to measure the cultural impact on any action merely be taking quantitative and qualitative indicators», but he also affirms that «they could provide clues». UNESCO is currently working intensely in the search for valid cultural indicators for development. We could also mention the important work in relation to indicators being performed by AECID (the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation) in its recent publication: Cómo evaluar proyectos de cultura para el desarrollo: una aproximación metodológica a la construcción de indicadores (How to evaluate cultural projects for development: a methodological approach to the construction of indicators) (AECID, 2009).

In all of this process, the first thing to do would be to make sure that culture forms part of political language. According to Carámbula, «the acceptance of cultural diversity is an enormous challenge which has to be taken and seen as a process. Its episodic evaluation is difficult. Pointing out the importance of transforming cultural diversity into a transversal vector of public policies is to accept the difficulty of measuring in the short term».

Despite everything stated up to now, we can now talk about a process towards the precision of cultural policies as priority actions in development and, according to Alfonso Martínez, «we can state, with certain optimism, that there is a gradual process to consolidate this sector of cooperation».

Various international bodies (amongst others United Nations, with UNESCO as the reference in this area) and public and private organisations (like the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation – AECID, etc) have made significant progress in this area through the reflections, documents and actions described above. This progress provides a basic theoretical corpus and already indicates some of the priority actions within the framework of culture and development, like for example the cultural industries or the special attention to intangible heritage and linguistic diversity, amongst others.

George Yudice indicates that «the recognition of the cultural impact flows through UNESCO, some international networks and in some towns and rhetorically in many national policies. But there are very few cases where public policies have been put into operation on the basis of this vision», supporting one of the issues that we have already mentioned, i.e. that there is a lack of precision in the culture and development actions.

Below we shall therefore describe the most significant milestones and instruments of the international community.

03. UNESCO’s role

Out of United Nation’s specialised bodies, it was UNESCO which has been most decisive on the inevitable relationship between culture and development. As UNESCO is the only United Nations body entrusted with culture in its mandate, UNESCO has from its beginning and continues promoting cultural diversity and understanding between cultures, we could mention that in 2010 the International Year for the Rapprochement of Cultures was celebrated, coordinated by UNESCO. We could also remember the statement by UNESCO’s new Director General, Ms Irina Bokova, during her recent visit to Haiti, that «development and culture are closely linked»14, insisting on the need to include cultural aspects as part of this country’s reconstruction process following the earthquake which devastated part of its territory a few months ago, thereby deploying another focus of attention in the relationship between culture and the recovery processes following disasters or emergencies.

UNESCO has the merit of having called attention to this issue and having promoted actions, including research, which respond to the criteria that culture is an essential part of development.

UNESCO has specialised in cultural heritage protection and restoration processes and international campaigns, like those performed in Abu Simbel or Venice, culminating with the extremely well-known 1972 UNESCO Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Following the numerous and effective actions carried out by UNESCO in relation to cultural heritage and its protection, the organisation went deeper into the role of heritage within social cohesion, and broadening the cultural vision and its link with the development actions. Hence cultural policies started little by little to profile themselves as transversal elements and as an active agent within the development process and not as a mere accessory.

In this journey, UNESCO has indicated four stages in the
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13 Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); La cultura, estrategia de cooperación al desarrollo, Documenta Universitaria, Girona, 2008.
evolution of the term culture during the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st.15

1. In the 1950s and 1960s the concept of culture was extended from a definition more linked with artistic production to the concept of cultural identity. During this period, UNESCO defended the cultures in response to specific situations like decolonisation, recognising that all cultures are equal.

2. In the 1970s and 1980s, awareness started about the vital union between culture and development, which would be taken as the basis for UNESCO’s international cooperation and solidarity with the developing countries.

3. In the 1980s and 1990s, awareness started about the cultural aspirations and bases in the construction of democracies. Work on the exclusion and discrimination of minorities, indigenous peoples and immigrant populations.

4. In the 1990s and 2000, there was a move towards the revaluation of the dialogue of cultures and civilisations in their wealth, designated as common heritage of mankind by UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on cultural diversity. It also indicates the two sides of diversity: the first based on ensuring harmonious interaction between the different, varied and dynamic cultural identities; while the other side advocates the defence of the creative diversity, the diversity of the multiple cultural forms and expressions inherent in the cultures.

At present UNESCO also promotes the understanding of culture as a continuous, malleable and evolving process and indicates cultural diversity as an essential condition for peace and sustainable development.

Along this path, UNESCO held many intergovernmental meetings, and prepared reports and proposals which converted culture into one of the central priority themes in the new development model. We will indicate some of UNESCO’s milestones in relation to culture and development:


The most important contribution from this Declaration was without doubt the defence of the equal dignity of all cultures in its Article One:17

Article I

1. Each culture has a dignity and value which must be respected and preserved.

2. Every people has the right and the duty to develop its culture.

3. In their rich variety and diversity, and in the reciprocal influences they exert on one another, all cultures form part of the common heritage belonging to all mankind.

This Declaration stated ideas which would later have wide repercussions throughout the international work on the issue of culture: ‘development of culture’, ‘cultural diversity’, ‘common heritage of mankind’, etc. It also offers the first definition of international cultural cooperation which is established as «a right and a duty for all peoples and all nations, which should share with one another their knowledge and skills» (Article V). Article XI, which closes the Declaration, states that the application of the entire content of the Declaration must be based on «due regard for human rights and fundamental freedoms», which would be the subject of many debates over the following decades.


The Intergovernmental Conference was held in 1970 in Venice with the aim of «studying the ways of contributing to cultural development», and was according to UNESCO this body’s first intergovernmental conference organised exclusively in relation to culture. The notion of ‘cultural development’ was set out and debated as well as the ‘cultural dimension of development’.
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17 See ‘La posición de la UNESCO’ (p.91-96) in Prieto de Pedro, Jesús; Cultura, Culturas y Constitución, Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, Madrid, 2006.
18 First Intergovernmental Conference on the institutional, administrative and financial aspects of the cultural policies (UNESCO, Venice, 1970).
The Final Report document sets out the conclusions on the inclusion of culture in the public development actions. It starts on the basis that «the public is increasingly aware of the need to protect cultural values and stimulate cultural activities». And it considers that in this work *laissez-faire* is no longer adequate to cope with these needs and indicates that given that «at first glance cultural needs may not appear as evident or pressing as some others, such as health, education or welfare (...) it is necessary that the governments and other public authorities accept a clear responsibility for culture and formulate long-term policies».

It is notable that in 1970 some of the ideas were launched which still today, 40 years later, remain valid, like when it affirms that «international aid must be extended (...) in order to include (...) the promotion of culture and the conservation of both spiritual and tangible cultural heritage». In another of the points in the Final Report we read that «it is increasingly recognised that cultural progress is an essential component of economic and social progress. Establishing national identity through cultural action may even be considered a prior requirement for social and economic progress». This idea of the need for cultural development in order to speak about integral human development transversalizes the work performed in this area in the following decades. Although terms included in this document, like ‘national identity’ or ‘national forms of expression’ are more in line with the language used in the 1970s and the in the historical context of the decolonisation process, and are not used in the present day, it shows the importance of local cultural expressions as development factors.

The Conference also tried to generate a definition of culture, as it saw the need to move away from the elitist visions which had surrounded the term: «it is necessary to stimulate the participation of large layers of the population in the cultural activities and thereby substitute a culture of imported and foreign minorities for a genuinely popular and national culture based on national forms of expression». It reaffirms this idea when it affirms that «culture is not merely an adornment but an integral part of social life».

It also indicated some of the areas which have later been taken as the basis in the inclusion of the cultural perspective, like the role of the media and culture, or the participation of youth in cultural creativity.

After this conference came regional conferences: Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe (Helsinki, 1972); Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Asia (Indonesia, 1973); Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Africa (Accra, 1975); and the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean (Bogotá, 1978), which examined further the dimensions of cooperation.

**3) WORLD CONFERENCE ON CULTURAL POLICIES / MONDIACULT (UNESCO, 1982).**

The World Conference on Cultural Policies – MONDIACULT, took place in Mexico City between 26th July and 6th August 1982, and set down the working bases in relation to cultural policies to govern the various actions of the international bodies and state governments in the following years.

The Mexico Declaration established the irrevocable link between culture and development: «balanced development can only be ensured by making cultural factors an integral part of the strategies designed to achieve it».

---

In its Preamble it tackles the task to establish a definition of culture which as we have already seen was also an issue which had been dealt with at previous conferences. This definition has been broadly accepted and was adopted by UNESCO and is still used today:

A) that in its widest sense, culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs;

B) that it is culture that gives man the ability to reflect upon himself. It is culture that makes us specifically human, rational beings, endowed with a critical judgement and a sense of moral commitment. It is through culture that man expresses himself, becomes aware of himself, recognizes his incompleteness, questions his own achievements, seeks untiringly for new meanings and creates works through which he transcends his limitations.

At this same Conference development was taken as a «complex, global and multidimensional process which transcends simple economic growth and incorporates all of life’s dimensions and all of the energies of the community, whose members are called to contribute towards and share in the benefits». The issue of the collective dimension of culture is therefore emphasized and this issue was worked on later also in the international process to clarify the cultural rights.

The Conference and its Declaration can be considered determining factors in the work in question, as they fixed the pillars in the relationship between culture and development: on the one hand, it presented the aforementioned definition of culture as a comprehensive and broad concept, which includes not only the aspects traditionally linked to it, but also the mankind’s lifestyles and fundamental rights. It established various ideas linked to culture’s inclusion in development, as shown in the Declaration, including the sections indicated below:

- **CULTURAL IDENTITY**: It reaffirms that every culture is «a unique and irreplaceable body of values» and that «cultural identity therefore contributes to the liberation of peoples». It considers cultural identity as wealth which promotes human relations; culture is dialogue and runs out and dies in isolation.

- **CULTURAL DIMENSION OF DEVELOPMENT**: Culture is taken as a fundamental dimension of the development process. Sustainable development can only be ensured by integrating cultural factors into the strategies to achieve it.

- **CULTURE AND DEMOCRACY**: Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that «Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, (...)», to emphasize that culture belongs to everybody in the community, avoiding the elitism which had often defined it and defending the term ‘cultural democracy’. It stresses that in order to guarantee the participation of all individuals in the cultural life the inequalities must be eliminated, whether due to origin, nationality, age, language, gender, belonging to minority groups, etc.

- **CULTURAL HERITAGE**: Its conception of heritage covers both the tangible and the intangible. All peoples have the right and duty to defend and preserve their cultural heritage.

- **INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL COOPERATION**: It defends the need to share cultural knowledge through exchange, to favour the diffusion of the creativity. This cooperation will be based on the respect for the cultural identity and the value of each culture, without the possibility of cultural subordination or assimilation.

4) **WORLD DECADE FOR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (UNESCO, 1988-1997).**

Following the suggestion from the 1982 MONDIACULT World Conference, UNESCO’s General Conference passed the proclamation of the World Decade for Cultural Development (1988-1997). The Action Programme for this Decade reflects a dual concern whose aspects are complementary: «how to promote greater consideration of the cultural dimension in development processes, and how to stimulate creative aptitudes and cultural life in general». This Decade served therefore to call attention on the international level on the need to take cultural aspects of development into account.
account. The four objectives established for the Decade were:

1. Take into account the cultural dimension of development: «the recognition of the cultural dimension of development will come from the recognition of the cultural aspects of all the activities linked to economic, social, scientific and technical development».

2. Affirm and enrich the cultural identities: the aspects of this objective tend towards a protection and appreciation of the heritage, but distancing itself from a purely conservative vision, but rather impacting on revitalising processes of these heritage assets; it also indicates the need to stimulate creativity.

3. Broaden the participation in cultural life: it considers that it is necessary first of all to guarantee access to cultural life, in order to later stimulate participation. Both access and participation are necessary for real cultural development: there must be favourable conditions for the effective exercise of the cultural rights.

4. Promote international cultural cooperation: «culture can perform a determining role in establishing more balanced relations between States», analysing the cultural bases of a new balance in the relations between the world’s different regions.

5) OUR CREATIVE DIVERSITY. REPORT OF THE WORLD COMMISSION ON CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT, presided by Javier Pérez de Cuellar (UNESCO, 1995).21

«Development divorced from its human or cultural context is growth without a soul».

World Commission on Culture and Development

In the World Decade for Cultural Development the World Commission on Culture and Development was set up, promoted by UNESCO and made up of various international experts coordinated by Javier Pérez de Cuellar who observed that development efforts had often failed «because the importance of the human factor –that complex web of relationships and beliefs, values and motivations, which lie at the very heart of a culture– had been underestimated in many development projects».

The development process itself needs to be rethought22, on which the Commission started its work in 1993. With the appearance of the UNDP’s concept of human development, culture surely became implied in the new notion, but was not explicitly incorporated. The next step in the re-conceptualisation of development had to lie in the incorporation of cultural perspectives in the development strategies.

The ‘Our Creative Diversity’ Report provided key elements for the analysis of culture in relation to development: the relationship between culture and gender, creativity, cultural heritage in the service of development, the role of youth and pluralism. We should stress the important work in identifying the inevitable relationship between gender and culture, and the need to be fundamentally aware of women’s rights in the work on culture and development.

The Commission made a big effort to emphasise the importance of public policies in relation to culture. The «cultural policies need to be rethought». «We need to find new ways of keeping a multiethnic and multicultural society united, using the pluralism of new and different forms:

1. It involves new forms of stimulating creativity.

2. It involves new forms of using the media to reduce the digital divide.

3. It involves adopting a gender perspective.

4. It involves giving a greater role to the youth.

5. It involves a better understanding of the cultural dimensions of environmental management.

The Report was also clear when it affirmed the issue of the cultural indicators which, now one decade later, continue being controversial in the international community: «Carefully designed cultural indicators are needed which can be used as standards or references to measure the results of the cultural actions. A new level of indicators must be prepared of the cultural dimension».

Another area mentioned in the Report was the issue of linguistic diversity, classifying languages as knowledge banks. «The disappearance of a language is a drain on our resources, just like the extinction of a plant or animal species. The loss of any language represents an impoverishment of the knowledge banks and the tools for intra- and inter-cultural communication».

It also indicated that the meaning of ‘cultural heritage’ would have to be reformulated, moving away from the elitist approach of preservation and conservation. «In the Western industrialised countries the conservation of the cultural heritage is focused on that which is spectacular and monumental: archaeological sites, architectonic monuments, etc. They are also shown out of context and in glass cabinets, often in private collections. The vision of heritage is biased towards the elite and the masculine: the monumental and not the domestic receives attention and respect, the literary over the oral, the ceremonial over the everyday, the sacred over the secular».

Despite the fact that at present some of the issues in the ‘Our Creative Diversity’ report have been overcome, it is still recognised today that this study was very important in generating knowledge towards culture’s real incorporation into development.

6) UNIVERSAL DECLARATION ON CULTURAL DIVERSITY (UNESCO 2001).23

This international document was pioneering in promoting cultural diversity as world heritage and identified cultural diversity as a development factor under its Article 3: «Cultural diversity widens the range of options open to everyone; it is one of the roots of development, understood not simply in terms of economic growth, but also as a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence». In the words of UNESCO’s current Director-General, Irina Bokova, this text «prolongs the 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights»24.

This Declaration was an important admonishment to the international community and advised the Member States to «go deeper into the international debate on problems relating to cultural diversity, particularly those regarding its links to development». It was not only States who were identified as key actors in cultural diversity, but also urged «achieving that the different sectors of civil society collaborate closely in the definition of public policies to preserve and promote cultural diversity».

Following Bokova, the importance of this text lies, amongst other issues, in that «it proposes that cultural assets and goods are not goods like any others, but are bearers of identity, values and meaning».

We must not however overlook that this Declaration was only a moral political commitment (not legally binding). According to Carámbula, in our opinion, «such massive processes and objectives are not guaranteed only by declarations and conventions»25, however important they may be. This idea is stressed in another work26 by the same author: «a Declaration, like the legal regulations or agreements between persons, does not in itself guarantee the expected results». But he does attribute certain importance to this instrument when he states that «it is not the same having a document signed in relation to principles, as not having one», requesting States to adopt this international document.


25 In Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); La cultura, estrategia de cooperación al desarrollo, University Document, Girona, 2008.

7) CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS (UNESCO, 2005). UNESCO’s Director-General stated that «UNESCO considered it necessary to go beyond the 2001 Declaration and adopt a binding legal text». In 2005 UNESCO took a step forward with the passing of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which entered into force on 18th March after being ratified by 30 Member States. Cultural Expressions are «the different expressions of the creativity of individuals and social groups. These expressions include those transmitted by words (literature, stories, etc.), sound (music, etc.), images (photographs, films, etc.), in any medium (print, audiovisual, digital, etc.), action (dance, theatre, etc.) or object (sculpture, pictures, etc.)».

According to UNESCO, the purpose of this regulatory instrument is to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions. The specific objectives of the text are to:
- Create the conditions which allow the cultures to expand and freely interact so that they can mutually enrich each other.
- Recognise the specific nature of these cultural activities, assets and services as bearers of identity, values and meaning.
- Redefine new models of international cooperation.

According to UNESCO, the Convention does not contain all aspects of cultural diversity (although they are in the Declaration), but focuses more on specific fields, namely, on the one hand, the need to recognise that the cultural assets and services are bearers of identity, value and meaning, and cannot be considered as mere consumer goods like any others; and on the other hand, the need for States to take measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions. And finally the need to redefine international cooperation so as to see it as permanent dialogue.

According to the authors Jesús Prieto de Pedro and Alfonso Martinell, the Convention was ratified and entered into force unusually quickly, which shows the broad consensus through the networks and coalitions and political interest which surrounded this issue. According to the authors, «this leads us to believe that the Convention is a text which will enjoy high historical significance». This text, like the Declaration before it, deserves undeniable political value as it situates diversity amongst the priorities of the worldwide political agenda. It consecrates, for the first time in an international treaty, the protection of cultural diversity as a top-level political principle. As opposed to the 2001 Declaration, which is only a moral political commitment, the Convention involves a stronger commitment; it is an international treaty.

One of the most relevant issues of this convention is the meaning of ‘protection’: for UNESCO up until then ‘protection’ included the measures for the preservation, protection and upgrading measures. But in this case, with the word ‘promotion’ the Convention invites the perpetual regeneration of the cultural expressions with the aim of fighting against museology, folklorisation or being treated as objects. From then on, the protection-promotion binomial, which refers us to the importance of cultural policies, becomes intrinsically linked.

Dealing with the issue of the adaptation of the culture-development binomial to the international cooperation actions, it is significant that the Convention devotes articles 12 to 18 to international cooperation, drafted in great, albeit unequal, detail. This block of articles is one of the Convention novel features, which according to Martinell and Prieto de Pedro is what identifies the importance that international cooperation can have in promoting the relationship between culture and development:
- Article 12 – Promotion of international cooperation.
- Article 13 – Integration of culture in sustainable development.
- Article 14 – Cooperation for development.
- Article 15 – Collaborative arrangements.
- Article 16 – Preferential treatment for developing countries.
- Article 17 – International cooperation in situations of serious threat to cultural expressions.
- Article 18 – International Fund for Cultural Diversity.

At the same time, it deals in detail with definitions by clarifying some concepts, including:
- International Cooperation: all activities performed jointly and in coordination with the aim of promoting cultural diversity by two or more sovereign States and by international organisations and other actors. International cultural cooperation is conceived as a general instrument which can be used by any country.
- Development cooperation: it appears linked to certain values: sustainability, reducing poverty and the Millennium Goals.
- Cooperation in special situations of risk for cultural expressions: obligations of mutual assistance.

In their analysis of the Convention, Prieto de Pedro and Martinell indicate three main insights:

27 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2005:
28 10 keys to the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, UNESCO.
29 UNESCO, ibid.
30 This section contains numerous ideas and contributions from the work of Prieto de Pedro and Martinell en Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); La cultura, estrategia de cooperación al desarrollo, University Document, Girona, 2008.
• The first insight is the cultural diversity’s affirmation as common world heritage; diversity as an ‘essential characteristic of mankind’. Cultural Diversity stops being considered an internal issue exclusive to the states or the groups or communities, to become something of interest to all mankind. It is a universal concept and is expressed as a worldwide public asset which generates rights and obligations which concern the entire human community.

• Second insight: lies in the close link between cultural diversity and the democratic values and fundamental rights (See article 2 and the Preamble).

• Third insight: principle of equal dignity and respect for all cultures (the precedent comes from the 1966 UNESCO Declaration, already mentioned in this work). Where the countries are unequal from a socioeconomic point of view, however cultural cooperation becomes a balancing and facilitating factor in the relations between peoples, indicating cultural cooperation’s enormous comparative advantage in this aspect.

Finally, we must not overlook the fundamental importance of the cultural dimension and cultural diversity and their strategic value for development which is emphasised in various articles of the Convention, by defining it as an «essential requirement for sustainable development» (Art. 2); or when it states in its Preamble that «Culture is a strategic element in national and international development policies» (Preamble) and culture as «mainspring for sustainable development for communities, peoples and nations» (Preamble).

8) OTHER UNESCO MILESTONES AND INSTRUMENTS.

Apart from the aforementioned international conferences, publications and regulations, UNESCO uses and calls many events to continue promoting and further examining the culture-development binomial. Below we will simply indicate some of the most significant actions in recent years:

• 2008 International Year of Languages. Languages Matter! indicated that «Far from being an area reserved for expert analysis, languages are the medulla of social, economic and cultural life».

• 2010 International Year for the Rapprochment of Cultures. This international year is celebrated this year, 2010, and has as its principle goal to emphasis the beneficial effects of cultural diversity, recognising the importance of the loans, transfers and exchanges between cultures thanks to implicit or explicit dialogue.

• ‘Investing in Cultural Dialogue and Intercultural Dialogue’ 2009 Report.11 UNESCO presented this World Report in 2009 which aspires to become a reference in the area of cultural diversity. Too often reduced to merely protecting threatened heritage, cultural diversity is not only intimately related to boosting intellectual competences, the search for an antidote to the ‘identity absorption’, the search for new forms of governance and promotion of the effective exercise of the universally recognised human rights, but also constitutes a means to reduce the inequalities in the global creation trade.

• Symposium Culture and Development: A response to future challenges? (Paris, 10th October 2009)32: UNESCO and AECID (Spanish Agency for Development Cooperation) organised this Symposium to reanimate the intellectual debate on the «culture» component as one of the new keys for a sustainable and equitable development.

• Conference on Funding Culture. Managing the Risks (Paris, 16 and 17 May 2010)33. As part of its commitment to studying and promoting the relationship between culture and development, UNESCO organised a two-day symposium to analyse and tackle the perception of risk when funding cultural and creative sectors in developing economies. Despite the fact that culture has large potential for socioeconomic development and reducing poverty, it continues being left to one side in the development programmes and policies. What’s more, the sector suffers from a lack of access to funding, particularly in the developing countries under the perception, often based on false premises, that these investments are more risk prone.

---

33 Funding Culture. Managing the Risks (Paris, 16 and 17 May 2010)
04. Other United Nations Agencies

As we have already stated, UNESCO was pioneer in this topic, but other United Nations agencies echoed this issue. In 2004, the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) dedicated its annual Human Development Report to ‘Cultural liberty in today’s diverse world’. With the collaboration of international experts, this report took a step forward by including cultural liberty within the development framework. We will also mention one of the reports where UNFPA dealt with this issue.

UNDP, 2004, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT, CULTURAL LIBERTY IN TODAY’S DIVERSE WORLD

«Managing cultural diversity is one of the main challenges of our time».

HDR 2004, PNUD

From the Overview, this report tries to shatter the widespread idea that cultures can even be a hinder to peoples’ development and contains elements to include the cultural perspective in development policies. According to the document «If the world is to reach the Millennium Development Goals and ultimately eradicate poverty, it must first successfully confront the challenge of how to build inclusive, culturally diverse societies. Not just because doing so successfully is a precondition for countries to focus properly on other priorities of economic growth, health and education for all citizens. But because allowing people full cultural expression is an important development end in itself».

In fact, as we have seen, human development is based on widening people’s options, i.e. allowing people to choose the type of life that they want to lead, but also providing them with both the tools and the opportunities in order to take such a decision. Without purporting to substitute the traditional priorities, the UNDP fosters the inclusion of cultural liberty into its development strategies in an attempt to complement and strengthen the basic priorities. «Many people believe that allowing diversity to flourish may be desirable in the abstract but in practice can weaken the state, lead to conflict and retard development». «Being born in a particular cultural milieu is not an exercise of freedom –quite the contrary. It becomes aligned to cultural liberty only if the person chooses to continue to live within the terms of that culture, and does so having had the opportunity of considering other alternatives». The identity issue is therefore one of the issues on which this report works directly. This report also tackles the issue of cultural wealth when it states that «the flip side of the development divide is that developing countries are often able to draw on richer, more diverse cultural traditions –whether captured in language, art, music or other forms– than their wealthier counterparts in the North».

It indicates that we must move away from the conception that the cultural issues only affect minorities or States with numerous and varied identities: «Managing diversity and respecting cultural identities are not just challenges for a few ‘multiethnic states’. Almost no country is entirely homogeneous. Today all countries are multicultural». This issue is also more real with the international migrations, which the UNDP later dealt with in its 2009 Human Development Report ‘Overcoming barriers: mobility and human development’.

The central argument of this Report is that societies must welcome and not repress these multiple and complementary identities. The challenge facing the 21st century legislators is to extend people’s options so that they do not have to renounce aspects of their identity in order to access the complete range of social and economic opportunities, and to boost the elimination of cultural exclusion of minorities.

It therefore breaks three widespread myths:
1. Some cultures have more development possibilities than others.
2. Cultural diversity inevitably leads to clashes in values.
3. Cultural diversity is a hinder to development.

According to the UNDP, «there is no clear relationship between culture and development. The idea that a group’s culture has an impact on its development is very attractive on an intuitive level and allows cultural stereotypes to become explanations for the state of the world», thereby breaking away from the cultural determinism which is so deep-rooted in some sectors.

One of its co-authors, Amartya Sen, works in the Report on the issue of multiple complementary identities: «Not is identity a zero sum game. There is no inevitable need to choose between state unity and recognition of cultural differences. A sense of identity and belonging to a group with shared values and other bonds of culture is important for individuals. But each individual can identify with many different groups. Individuals have identity of citizenship (for example, being French), gender (being a woman), race (being of West African origin), language (being fluent in Thai, Chinese and English), politics (having left-wing views) and religion (being Buddhist)». He is also clear when he states that «Identity is not a square box with a fixed size».

«Identity also has an element of choice: within these memberships individuals can choose what priority to give to one membership over another in different contexts», which was an issue also dealt with in the Fribourg Declaration on Cultural Rights, as well as the United Nations Human Rights Council’s Independent Expert on Cultural Rights, as we will see below.

In the intense debate between tradition and human development (also currently tackled in the international processes to clarify cultural rights), the Report indicates that «taking the extreme position of preserving tradition at all cost can hold back human development. There is much to cherish in traditional values and practices, and much that is consonant with universal values of human rights».

Definitions

But, what is cultural liberty? According to this Report, cultural liberty consists in broadening individual options and not in protecting value or practices as an end in itself with blind loyalty to tradition. Culture is not a static set of values and practices: it is constantly recreated as people question, adapt and redefine their values and practices due to changes in the situation and the interchange of ideas.

It therefore stresses that cultural liberty or respect for diversity must not be confused with defending tradition. Cultural liberty is that people can live and be whatever they want and also be able to choose other alternatives.

This work also rejected those ideological trends which affirm that ethnically diverse countries are less capable of developing themselves, stating that there are no signs of a clear, positive or negative, relationship between cultural diversity and development.

Cultural liberty involves allowing people the freedom to choose their identities—and to lead the life they choose—without being excluded from other alternatives which are important to them (like those corresponding to education, health or job opportunities).

The Report indicates that in order to expand the much needed multicultural policies, the States must recognise the cultural differences in their constitutions, laws and institutions. They also need to formulate policies which guarantee that majority or dominant groups do not ignore or annul the interests of specific groups, whether minorities or historically marginalised majorities.

As regards languages, the Report states that the most frequent source of generalised exclusion, even in established democracies, is the monolingual policy. Recognising a language goes beyond its mere use. It symbolises respect for those people who speak it, their culture and their total inclusion in society.

It also deals with the issue of globalisation and its influence on the cultural sphere, indicating that it could threaten national and local identities. According to this document, the solution does not lie in regressing to conservatism or isolating nationalism, but in designing multicultural policies which promote diversity and pluralism. The States are able to formulate cultural recognition policies using means which do not clash with other human development objectives and strategies.

Cultural freedom and human development

This Report focuses on the importance of cultural liberty and the personal and social losses which can occur in its absence. This broad view of development, which includes
cultural liberty, does not overlook the basic commitments, but recognises that denying cultural liberty can lead to very significant privations and thereby impoverish people’s lives and prevent them from establishing cultural connections to which they could aspire.

Cultural liberty is an important dimension of human liberty as it is decisive so that people can live in accordance with their preferences and have the opportunity of choosing between the options available to them. Promoting cultural liberty must be a priority of human development and requires an impact on social, political and economic opportunities which in themselves do not guarantee cultural liberty.

The fundamental aspect is not the importance of traditional culture, but the transcendental relevance of cultural liberties and options.

On the relationship between cultural diversity and cultural liberty, the Report indicates that although maintaining through conservation the variety of cultures which currently exists could be the simplest way of ensuring cultural diversity, this could collide with the liberty, as it requires people not to abandon their cultural history and not to choose to evolve their cultural expressions, thereby limiting their cultural liberty.

Although it is true that it is very important to give room to diversity in the cultural practices, given that the exercise of cultural liberty depends on that diversity, this is not the same as defending cultural diversity on its own merits. The Report’s approach is that considering cultural diversity as something valuable without worrying how it is achieved would be a serious mistake.

In short, according to the human development approach “the value of cultural diversity rests on its positive connection with cultural liberty”. “Diversity is not an end in itself. It is the result of the freedoms of human beings and their choices and in turn involves the opportunity to assess different alternatives when it comes to making such choices”.

UNFPA – 2008 STATE OF WORLD POPULATION: RESEARCHING COMMON GROUND: CULTURE, GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS

In 2008, the UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund) was concise when it indicated at the beginning of its State of World Population Report that “Culture is and always has been central to development. As a natural and fundamental dimension of people’s lives, culture must be integrated into development policy and programming”. This report also focuses on the issue of the link between gender, culture and development, from the human rights perspective.

After analysing the most significant United Nations documents on culture and development, we would now like to point out some instruments from development cooperation agents which may also be of interest on this issue. We must not forget to analyse the Culture and Development Strategy of the AECID (Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development), the Carta Cultural Iberoamericana (Latin America Cultural Charter) and Agenda 21 of Culture.

**Culture and Development Strategy - AECID**

Following numerous actions, like the UNDP-Spain Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund, which contains a specific Subject Window on Culture and Development – which is also used as an element to make more visible the necessary presence of culture in the Millennium Development Goals – the AECID (Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and Development) presented the ‘Spanish Strategy for Culture and Development Cooperation’ which the Agency itself considers as the ‘inheritance’ of previous Spanish cooperation actions, but which is in turn a document which systemises and provides coherence to the various actions promoted in relation to cultural cooperation.

If we look at its Theoretical Framework, we could point out various points of interest, like the issue of «the culture which is accessed and the culture that one has», hereby identifying the idea that culture is not something which is static, or something which has already been given, already present and unchanging in communities. Another interesting issue of this Strategy is the importance that it gives to the Focus on Rights, by indicating the «need to go further in developing the human rights which have an impact on cultural life».

This Strategy recognises the role that international bodies like UNESCO and the UNDP have had in promoting the cultural perspective in development, but admit that there is still plenty of work still to be done: «in order to facilitate the integration of the cultural dimension in the cooperation actions» it states that various actions must be done, some of them, as the reader can see, are covered by other authors and bodies studied in this work. These points are essentially practical and are above all focused on the cultural cooperation action itself:

- Conduct a thorough analysis of the cultural reality of the context in which intervention is to be carried out. This analysis must then be used in the identification, design and development of development cooperation actions.
- Introduce cultural and social impact indicators.
- Analyse the contribution of culture to the different development cooperation projects and programmes as concerns intangible or symbolic dimensions (political life, social cohesion, co-existence, citizenship, identity, etc.) as well as the more tangible and material sectors (economics, employment, tourism, local development, etc.).
- Encourage respect for and integration of languages and minority cultural manifestations in those places where actions are implemented.
- Integrate the concept of Cultural Diversity.
- Do not allow the defence of cultural identity to generate defensive and exclusive standards which fail to respect co-existence and respect for human rights.

For this work 7 strategic lines were identified, which we summarise below:

**Line 1: Training of human capital for cultural management, prioritising projects which focus attention on culture and development:**

Based on the current situation where there is a clear shortage of agents trained in this area, it proposes that training processes should be facilitated on culture and development.

**Line 2: Political dimension of culture as a factor contributing to development:**

Assessing the different contributions that the cultural policies may provide in contributing towards improving governance and social cohesion.

**Line 3: Economic dimension of culture as a factor contributing to development:**

Seeks to foster culture’s contribution to economic growth through the promotion, creation and production of cultural and creative companies, industries and institutions.

**Line 4: Relationship and complementarity between Educa-**

---


37 http://www.mdgfund.org/content/cultureanddevelopment
Cultural Rights

In this effort to find the relationship between culture and development, we must also recognise the current process affecting cultural rights, as 2009 saw relevant international happenings –described below– which make us think about an advanced clarification process of the cultural rights and their content, which is an essential step forward so that we take start to talk about their effective implementation.

The Rights-based Approach is a perspective which is increasingly integrated into the development actions, and as such we are of the opinion that the international clarification of the content of cultural rights may also be a relevant factor in the inclusion of the Rights-Based Approach from the cultural perspective within development cooperation.

The relationship between cultural rights and development has also been studied by different experts, as we can see in the words of Gonzalo Carámbula: «The reality continues showing the symptoms of severe inequality in the access to cultural rights; it is obvious that the most pressing situations have not been resolved, where marginality and imbalances hinder the cultural development of many communities and threaten to seriously harm the diversity of the cultural ecosystem»41.

**Carta Cultural Iberoamericana (Latin America Cultural Charter)**38

In 2007 the Carta Cultural Iberoamericana (Latin America Cultural Charter) was adopted at the Xth Latin American Conference of Culture Ministers with the objective of developing the internal diversity of each country, and coordinating cultural cooperation actions between the signatory countries. The Charter is considered to be a tool deriving from the UNESCO Convention on Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions39 and, apart from reaffirming culture and its diversity as a fundamental element for social cohesion, this document identifies the importance of protecting cultural rights and participation in cultural life.

**Agenda 21 for Culture**40

Agenda 21 for Culture, passed in 2004, is considered the «first document with worldwide mission that advocates establishing the groundwork of an undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development». This instrument came into being from the joint action of local institutions to introduce policies relating, amongst other issues, to local cultural strategy, cultural rights and duties or assessing the cultural impact. At present over 300 cities have joined Agenda 21 for Culture.

It has 67 articles relating to the following issues: Culture and human rights; Culture and governance; Culture, sustainability and territory; and Culture and social inclusion. The Agenda is therefore closely related to the area identified on the international level by other bodies, and collaborates in the local implementation of these actions.

---

40 Agenda 21 for Culture: www.agenda21culture.net
41 Carbó Ribugent, Gemma (coordinator); La cultura, estrategia de cooperación al desarrollo, University Document, Girona, 2008.
Going back to UNESCO’s Declaration on Cultural Diversity, we see that said document already identified the need to link human rights and cultural diversity, stating that «no one may invoke cultural diversity to infringe upon human rights guaranteed by international law, nor to limit their scope». Amongst others, the Basque Government’s Cooperation Master Plan also includes the idea by stating that «the cultural dimension must take into account the defence of the cultural identity, but always within the human rights’ framework».

Linked to this idea, we find cultural rights in Article 27 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights: «Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits», and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in its Article 15, particularly in 15.1.a.: «every one has the right to participate in cultural life».

A quick look at the work by some of the most representative experts in the area of cultural rights shows us that there is a need to clarify and agree on these rights in order to go on to speak about their real implementation. Amongst others, we could highlight the appeal made by Januzs Symonides, the prestigious Polish author and ex-UNESCO Director of Human Rights, who classified cultural rights as «a neglected category of human rights»42. The Fribourg Group (Switzerland) stated that cultural rights are an ‘underdeveloped category’ of human rights. We remember that this Group of experts in 2007 launched a Declaration of Cultural Rights43 which was one of civil society’s most representative efforts on this road towards the international clarification of cultural rights. Together with this, the Spanish expert Prieto de Pedro refers to cultural rights as the «prodigal son of human rights». The Chairperson of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Jaime Marchán Romero, stated that «cultural rights suffer neglect»44 within the Committee’s action.

All of these statements indicate the current situation of these rights. Neither can we deny that, as most experts agree, one of the problems still facing the cultural rights is that they are still often see as linked to the work on ethnic and cultural minorities.

Right to Culture

Parallel to this, the Right to Culture is slowly becoming a specific and specialized discipline within the branch of Law. However, this evolution and the presence of this discipline in Law studies is still limited as cultural legislation has still not enjoyed great recognition or awareness, and has not benefited from in depth studies by the Philosophy of Law, if compared to other branches of law, like for example the commercial, economic, tax, criminal, etc. areas.

Furthermore, cultural legislation has become a mosaic which has regulated, first of all, specific areas always linked to property issues (intellectual property and royalties) and, on the other hand, promoting cultural legislation and regulations which still maintain a concept of elitist culture linked to fine arts and aesthetics. As Prieto de Pedro said, the three pillars supporting the right to culture is that almost all of the 19th century Western legislation already contained regulations which affected the regulation of cultural heritage and artistic centres, namely museums, archives and libraries. We should not overlook that this cultural heritage legislation is also based on a classical or traditional concept of heritage, i.e. it only covered tangible heritage, and in particular archi-

42 Symonides, Janusz; Cultural Rights: new dimensions and challenges, Off-Print, Thesaurus Acroasium, Vol. XXIX.
43 http://www.unifr.ch/iiedh/assets/files/eng-declaration3.pdf
tectonic and monumental (opposed to this ‘highbrow’ heritage, would be the so-called ‘folkloric’ which contains the intangible expressions of culture and which has not been deserving of interest by jurists). Finally, we should mention that, in the 20th century, the legislations incorporated a new aspect in relation to culture: the cultural industries particularly linked to regulations which established their interest in protecting and promoting the economic aspects of these industries.

Neither must we forget that the we find in wide-ranging legislation found in different national legislations on the ‘freedom of expression’ or ‘academic freedom’ linked to the press, literature or academic activities.

But, are these legislations really representative of such a complex phenomenon which is culture? Are the cultural processes, today accepted as continuously interacting, changing and transforming processes, really protected by these legislations? Or are they really partial legislations which continue fixing their interest in a concept of culture linked to the political and economic elites? Is protecting the right to expression enough to guarantee the protection of the right to participate in cultural life? How are the cultural rights reflected in the cultural minority communities within States?

The legislations do not have an integral vision of culture. The fact that until the 1917 Mexican Constitution no constitutional text contained the word culture also shows how much development there has been of cultural legislation. As Prieto de Pedro stated, the growing presence of the word culture in the recent constitutions is not merely lexical or taken at random, but is actually in response to the steady evolution of the relationship between culture and rights, and reflects law’s acceptance of the increasingly comprehensive concept of culture currently considered by other sciences, like anthropology.

Current international clarification

If, as stated above, the very concept of culture provokes so many debates, the difficulties in its definition and specification is heightened when we talk about cultural rights. So it is not surprising that its theoretical conception has seen such little development. Within this framework, we would like to stress the work done by the Fribourg Group, who in 2007 made the aforementioned Fribourg Declaration on Cultural Rights which established a point of inflection on the awareness of the need to deal with this issue on the international stage.

This declarations states that «cultural diversity cannot be truly protected without the effective implementation of cultural rights». The Declaration was a very important challenge to the civil society and is the most important example of private codification and international clarification of the content and scope of the cultural rights. It reaffirms that they form part of the human rights and that therefore there is no room for cultural relativism. Its articles contain numerous references to different elements of the culture-development binomial: cultural identity, heritage, cultural community, cultural liberty, education and training, cultural cooperation, democratic governance, economy, responsibility of the political players and of the international organisations, etc.

Faced with the situation where cultural rights are underdeveloped or marginalised, we are today in a crucial crossroads for cultural rights. 60 years after the passing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and 40 years after the ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, we now have 2 processes within the United Nations which may perhaps lead to a significant advance in specifying the content of these rights, which is of course a necessary step prior to their enjoyment.

General Comment on the right to participate in cultural life

The first of these is the very recent approval, on 19th November 2009 in Geneva, of General Comment number 21 relating to Article 15.1.a of the United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which talks about ‘Everyone’s right to participate in cultural life’. This Document seeks to bring the meaning of this article ‘down to earth’. This Comment provides governments and administrations with indications on this right, as an element which would collaborate towards the understanding and implementation of the Covenant in the national legislations.

Despite the fact that it is not legally binding, this tool is an interpretation authorised by the institutions designated for such purpose in the Covenant, and has in other cases (like the human right to water) had significant weight in the international clarification of the content of certain more difficulty understood rights. Due to the fact that it was only recently approved we are at present unable to know what the scope of the text is going to be, but the existence of this 20-page Comment, drafted in consultation with different experts and civil society, as well as the members of the CESR, may lead to interesting specification processes of cultural rights; we could mentioned the idea of the Comment’s Rapporteur, Mr Jaime Marchán Romero, current Chairperson of the United Nations ESCR Committee, who said that the approval of the Comment «does not end the work but perhaps leads us into a much longer work». We must not however fail to mention the fact that, although it had previous received the attention of the Committee, it was not until now that a consensus has been reached on the cultural issue within the Covenant.
The General Comment has certain interesting aspects which may be relevant to the work in international cooperation. On the one hand, the Comment makes a big effort to define the words which formulate the right, i.e.: ‘everyone’, ‘participate’ and ‘cultural life’.

Marchán stresses that: «The Committee points out to State parties that article 15 contains an anthropological approach, given that no other article in the Covenant uses the word ‘life’, i.e. to participate in cultural life. It is in the Covenant itself, i.e. that culture involves a life-supporting element, and as such a dynamic element, an element of evolution, historic, which has a present and a future (...). Culture is therefore defined as a vital life-supporting process». In these words we see that the Covenant itself emphasises the particular nature of the culture-related work, as it is the only element which includes the word ‘life’ in its articles.

The Committee also spoke about cultural liberty in this Comment: «The right to take part in cultural life can be characterized as a freedom. In order for this right to be ensured, it requires from the State party both abstention (i.e., non-interference with the exercise of cultural practices and with access to cultural goods and services) and positive action (ensuring preconditions for participation, facilitation and promotion of cultural life, and access to and preservation of cultural goods)». We also see the role of the policies, which we have dealt with in depth throughout this work.

The issue of the individual and collective dimension of culture is also studied in the General Comment, when its Rapporteur states that: «Perhaps the most revolutionary or progressive element of the General Comment is the interpretation of the word ‘everyone’. Here the explanation in the General Comment is agreed following an extensive and intense debate, and it was that the term everyone refers to both individuals and groups».

Another issue to stress about the possible application of the General Comment on the right to participate in cultural life in development cooperation actions, is the identification of certain groups in the Comment, which would be groups at greatest risk of seeing their right reduced, like women, children, the elderly, disabled persons, minorities, migrants, indigenous peoples and people living in poverty. Here we can see therefore the close link between cultural rights and development.

The Comment’s 76 paragraphs can be studied in great detail as all of the references have wide ranging and highly applicable issues in development and cooperation projects, but this would be clearly beyond the scope of the this document.

In order to disseminate this Comment and bring it to the local context, UNESCO, supported by other organisations like UNESCO Etxea, is presently starting an adaptation and research process into the particular features relating to the implementation of the right to participate in cultural life in different regions throughout the world, starting with its possible implementation in Latin America.

Mandate of the Independent Expert in the field of Cultural Rights

We have mentioned that 2009 was a year with significant international milestones on cultural rights. The first, as mentioned, was the passing of the General Comment of the ESCR Committee, and the second process was the appointment last October of Farida Shaheed as United Nations Human Rights Council’s Independent Expert in the field of Cultural Rights. The creation of this Mandate48 for the Expert shows us therefore the interest that the issue of cultural
rights is arousing in the United Nations Human Rights bodies. As the appointment is very recent we are still not able to perform any analysis of her performance, but we can however indicate the importance because this 3-year mandate requires «identifying possible obstacles to the promotion and protection of cultural rights». It is also significant that the mandate talks about obstacles to cultural rights. The Expert is also entrusted with «studying how to better clarify the content and scope of cultural rights».

It is easy therefore to identify the possible nexus between the ESCR Committee’s General Comment and the Mandate of the United Nations Human Rights Council’s Expert. Both processes must be mutually beneficial and collaborate in order to identify the international challenges facing the effective implementation of legislations which respect cultural rights and public policies which promote their implementation.

The Independent Expert made her first presentation to the Human Rights Council at its 14th Session, on 31st May 2010. In this recent Report14 the Expert analyses the relationship between human rights and cultural diversity, which was also studied by the Declaration by various United Nations experts on the occasion of the World Day for Cultural Diversity (21st May 2010)36, affirming that human rights are tools for the promotion of cultural diversity, and indicating the union between cultural diversity and human dignity, which was also tackled by the Expert’s Report. The Expert also launched to the international community various points which would be dealt with during her 3-year Mandate, requesting support and collaboration from other organisations, like UNESCO, and civil society organisations.

The Future of Cultural Rights

Together with those two international processes, we can also point to the cultural rights’ interest shown last October in Paris at the UNESCO General Conference, the body’s maximum governing body, which included in its action plans for the next two-year period some express references to the work on cultural rights, like the aforementioned regional studies on the right to participate in cultural life. Some civil society institutions, including UNESCO Etxea, have joined their voice to this process for the local clarification of the right to participate in cultural life through regional studies, in close relation with UNESCO. We could also again mention other instruments, like the AECID Culture and Development Strategy, or the Latin American Cultural Charter, which also form part of this effort towards the international clarification of cultural rights.

Hence, faced with the current situation of lack of clarification of cultural rights, these initiatives lead us to believe that perhaps in a few years we could find ourselves in a completely different scenario as regards the content, scope and effective implementation of the cultural rights, which would help us to incorporate them into our development projects and to the projects to extend liberties, both locally and globally.

We must therefore closely monitor and actively participate in the international processes to clarify cultural rights, and the possible regional and country specific applications and studies, paying attention to the possible applications of these instruments in development cooperation with a cultural perspective, in order to promote, exercise and enjoy the cultural rights.

07. Conclusion

Throughout this work we have identified the most significant international instruments relating to the theoretical link between culture and development, focusing on the UN instruments which justify the inclusion of the cultural perspective into public policies and international development cooperation projects.

Others have been indicated relating to cooperation and development, and the progress being made in the clarification of the content of cultural rights in the international arena. Thus, we have identified inherent and necessary elements to enable us to talk about culture’s incorporation into development, and we have seen that there is still a long, and in some cases complicated, way still to go in order to truly be able to talk about the real inclusion of the cultural perspective into development and cooperation theory and practice. Unfortunately we also note that the inclusion of culture into the development projects and social policies is not systematic, and in some cases culture is still being identified as an obstacle to development.

We have also realised that approaches to the concept of culture and cultural liberty are used which contribute towards creating confusion and insecurity in the management of cultural diversity. In the international cultural cooperation actions we see that culture, as a holistic concept, is confused with the specific cultural expressions. Culture continues in our time being a complex, and difficult to tackle, subject; there is not even any consensus on the definition of culture, thereby contributing towards making it often invisible within development.

Together with this, we see that instruments and materials are needed specifically aimed at the practice in relation to culture and development, so that they can be used as tools

50 Statement on World day for Cultural Diversity, 2010: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/cultural_rights/docs/statements/Statement_cultural_diversity21052010.doc
for the development agents and organisations’ technical personnel who wish to work in practice from a cultural approach. Due to the late incorporation of the cultural perspective into development projects, the agents who work in development cooperation and awareness or in the promotion of human rights, do not have either theoretical or practical tools to facilitate the inclusion of cultural diversity and its management when considering their work actions and methodologies.

We consider however that, in recent years, there are actions and initiatives which collaborate in the gradual inclusion of the cultural perspective into development. As culture is the framework in which human beings fully develop their personality, we must be aware of the need to promote cultural diversity and cultural liberty, as a key and an essential element for the full realisation of cultural identity. Cultural diversity also contributes to facilitating the identification of each community’s development guidelines by its members, where development ceases to be a theory imposed from outside.

These premises (liberty, cultural diversity and respect for cultural identity) will be necessary in order to consolidate a proper basis and a suitable context for inter-culturality, understood as a process of participation and dynamic and permanently evolving interrelation between multiple, complementary and non-exclusive cultural identities, in open communication and multidirectional.

Hence, although we are aware of the long process needed for this panorama to change, we do however consider that progress has been made which will lead to gradual changes and collaborate towards the implementation and inclusion of the cultural perspective in development and, therefore, in the international cooperation projects.

Here we are going to set out some future reflections on culture and development and its inclusion within international cooperation.

**Definition of Culture**

The first step would be to make an effort toward conception clarification. As shown in this work, it is not the same thing to talk about cultural diversity as cultural liberty, just like multicultural is not the same as intercultural. As such, every international cooperation action which aims to have an impact on culture, must first perform an exercise to specify and define, which clarifies the approach to be taken in the project or action. Although this definition does not in itself mean including culture in the action, the terminological definition and specification will inevitably collaborate towards positioning the action.

**Culture’s double dimension**

As we mentioned above, there is a relationship between economy and culture, and in the contributions that the cultural sector can generate in increasing revenue and generating employment in a country. The economic dimension of culture, and the on cultural industries and creative economy, must form part of the culture and development actions.

But this work, in the specific area of culture and development, must not overlook the other dimension of culture: Its identity dimension and its presence as an element of social cohesion and generator of ideas and feelings. Culture is inherent to human beings who need a cultural context in which to develop their personality. As such, we must not limit the work on culture and development to the economic dimension of culture, but rather we must make a special effort to make the identity dimension of culture more visible, paying attention to the social and community effects of the cultural expressions, intangible heritage, language, etc.

**Diverse Culture**

Apart from the work on cultural diversity, in order for culture to have its full impact, we must start with concepts which take culture as a diverse entity in itself, an element in a continuous process, product of meetings between people and communities and changing as a result of said interaction. As indicated by different bodies and institutions, we promote the work with an open culture concept linked to the multiplicity of identities and moving away from the concept of culture as a closed entity only connected to tradition.

**Folklorisation – objectification**

Linked to the previous proposal, and to the holistic definition of culture, we have to separate ourselves from the proposals which irremediably tend towards the ‘folklorisation’ of cultural expressions, using cultural heritage as elements to be shown, even out of context, and as identifying minority cultural communities only with these expressions of their heritage and not with other cultural areas, like feelings, ideology, etc.

**Cultural Communities**

As explained above, although there are some risk groups and communities whose cultural rights of access and participation in cultural life are particularly vulnerable, we must not link the action on culture and development only to these communities. An integral approach to culture in development will also take into account the community as a whole, avoiding falling into the error of making invisible the predominant culture of society’s most favoured groups, as well as avoiding the promotion of ‘folklorisation’ processes of the cultures of these minority communities or those communities without access to participation, transforming action or to power. We should remember at this point that the culture and development actions must have the community's participation in all stages of the action.

**Changing and correcting mistakes and bad practices**

Throughout these decades there have been many development actions which have gone against cultural promotion. In other areas, like that linked to the environment, some of the mistakes have already been identified and some have already been corrected. The identification of errors in itself
generates a very useful tool towards their eradication.

As such, we recommend that an effort be made in order make the errors and bad practices in development actions more visible as the first step towards finding effective mechanisms in order to overcome these errors. Although there are unfortunately many, in order to show what we mean by errors here we give by way of example the «linguistic substitution» processes which occurred in different communities when carrying out educations polices which for example did not take the student’s mother tongue into account.

**Human rights and cultural liberty**

Voices are often heard which say that more integral work focused on culture in development could lead to the acceptance of «cultural relativism in the development processes». However, we consider that we need to go beyond the dichotomy between ‘cultural tradition’ and the ‘historically assigned role’. As indicated in UNESCO’s 2001 Declaration nobody can advocate defending cultural diversity in order to approve practices which go against human rights and a person’s physical integrity. The General Comment on the right to participate in cultural life also mentioned this issue, which is why we consider that the cooperation projects, which naturally derive from the rights-approach, can not fall into the trap of protecting traditions which violate human rights, or each person’s life or health. We can also stress the Declaration of 21st May 2010 by United Nations experts in relation to human rights as a tool for cultural diversity. We must also recall the limits which cultural liberty may generate around ways for protecting cultural diversity, as affirmed in the UNDP Report.

**Culture as transversal factor of development and cooperation action**

We must accept that culture is present throughout all areas of international development and cooperation. Apart from the area directly linked to cultural projects, we must emphasise that the cultural perspective must be made more visible in all development policies.

We cannot think that culture is only taken into consideration in projects which have a direct impact on the cultural sector, but rather it has been shown that all cooperation projects must have a perspective which allows us to see the cultural aspects of all human action.

On this matter, work must be done by the cooperation agencies in order to make it a transversal factor of the projects, like currently given, or should be given, to gender equality, the environment and human rights.

**Gender and Culture**

As commented by several of the bodies and documents dealt with in this publication, in the area of culture and development, just like in order fields of development action, we must pay attention to gender specificities and the possible differences in access to cultural life and the enjoyment of cultural rights by women and men. We consider that every action which wishes to include the cultural perspective into development, the analysis of how the gender differences may affect women’s participation in culture is a priority issue which must be covered both in relation to development and in the clarification of cultural rights.

**Linguistic Diversity**

Within culture, language is one of the most determining and significant expressions although it does not however receive the attention due. Faced with the accelerated process whereby languages are disappearing throughout the world, the development actions also need to analyse the role of languages in human development and how international cooperation can both positively (promotion of diversity) and negatively (linguistic substitution) influence. International cooperation is generally given in the ‘international’ languages (English, French, Spanish, etc.) or the home language of the cooperation organisations, which calls for more detailed analysis of the language issue in the link between culture and development.

**Cultural Indicators**

Although at present there are still no universally accepted cultural indicators, steps are being made towards generating mechanisms to identify them, both qualitative and quantitative. These indicators, which are already being put into use by organisations like UNESCO and AECID, must also take into account culture’s identity dimension, referred to above, and be wary of falling into the temptation of the economisation of culture.

**Rights-approach**

As stated in the previous sections, the contribution to development actions being made by the Rights-approach to development actions is undeniable. On this matter, we must support the international clarification of the cultural rights and in turn back the adaptation by region, country and community of these rights, generating useful material for the generation of protective legislation and public policies.

**Coordination of actors**

As there are few organisations, institutions and actors which today in the world and also in Spain work with a real and integral approach to culture and development, we can see that coordination is essential: NGDO, decentralised cooperation agencies, universities, etc. Networks must be created and joint awareness actions, with the synergies and processes for sharing information and collaborating in the coordination of actions.

**Collecting experiences**

Linked to the previous point, and in order to identify positive and successful actions in relation to culture and development, there has to be systematisation of experiences which show the real possibilities of actions to other development and cooperation organisations and actors.
Training and generation of knowledge

Today the technical personnel and actors working on development and cooperation demand training for culture’s real inclusion in development. On this matter, a special effort must be made on culture’s inclusion in the training (courses, masters, postgrad, etc.) currently being given on human rights and international cooperation. It would also be a good idea to look more at the theory of culture and development and generate knowledge in the area, as essays, articles and other publications, and we hope that this work will be a good example of this.

08. Further reading

To complete this publication, in this chapter we include a brief list of articles and works of interest in the further study of culture and development. This list does not include all of the publications and articles on this issue of culture and development, but rather aims to provide some basic reading on the subject. We have tried to indicate, amongst others, those resources which are easiest to obtain, for example those available on the Internet. We also include those works consulted in order to prepare this publication.

DOCUMENTS FROM INTERNATIONAL AND COOPERATION BODIES


2. First Intergovernmental Conference on the institutional, administrative and financial aspects of cultural policies (UNESCO, 1970)


http://www.aecid.es/export/sites/default/web/galerias/cooperacion/Cultural/descargas/Estrategia_CxD.pdf

http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/docs/gc/E-C-12-GC-21.doc


http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001876/187629e.pdf

15. ‘Funding Culture, Managing the Risk’ (Paris, 16th and 17th May 2010).

http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/cultural_rights/docs/statements/Statement_cultural_diversity21052010_sp.pdf

17. Carta Cultural Iberoamericana (Latin America Cultural Charter).
http://www.oei.es/cultura/Montevideo-ing.pdf

18. Agenda 21 for Culture.
www.agenda21culture.net

19. Declaration of the Culture and Development Inter-
http://www.culturaydesarrollo2010.es/

CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT

Publications:


5. AECID’s Cultural and Development Monographs: A collection with different titles in culture and development: http://www.aecid.es/web/es/publicaciones/Documentos/monografias/


CULTURAL RIGHTS

Publications:

1. Prieto de Pedro, Jesús; Cultura, Culturas y Constitución, Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales, Madrid, 2006.


Articles:

1. Symonides, Janusz; Cultural Rights: new dimensions and challenges, Off-Print, Thesaurus Acroasium, Vol. XXIX.


3. Prieto de Pedro, Jesús; ‘Cultura, economía y derecho, tres conceptos implicados’, en Pensar Iberoamérica num.1, OEI. http://www.oei.es/pensariberoamerica/ric01a04.htm


INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND CULTURE

Publications:


3. ‘Euroamerican Campus for Cultural Cooperation’ publications, OEI. http://www.oei.es/campusEuroamericano.htm

Articles:


ECONOMY, CULTURE AND CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Articles:


MISCELLANEOUS

Publications:


09. Links

International Cooperation Organisations:

UNESCO
www.unesco.org

UNDP
www.undp.org

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
www.ohchr.org

AECID
www.aecid.es

OEI – Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos // Cultura y Desarrollo
http://www.oei.es/cultura/cultura_desarrollo.htm

Civil Society:

UNESCO Etxea – UNESCO Centre in the Basque Country (Spain)
www.unescoetxea.org

UNESCO Chair for Cultural Policies, Girona University
Girona
http://www.catedraunesco.com/

Observatory for Diversity and Cultural Rights
www.droitsculturels.org

Interarts Fundación
www.interarts.net

Development and Culture Network
http://www.desarrolloycultura.net/inicio/

Creative Exchange
http://www.creativexchange.org/

AIETI
http://www.aieti.es/cultura/

O’dam ONGD
http://www.odamongd.org/node/43