

Expanding Cultures

Arts and Local Government Conference

July 24-27 2007

Chapel off Chapel, Prahran, Victoria, Australia

CULTURAL POLICIES, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATION: OR WHY WE NEED AN AGENDA 21 FOR CULTURE

Jordi Pascual

Coordinator, United Cities and Local Governments' Group on Culture

Barcelona City Council – Institute for Culture

Abstract

The Global Community and Local Government: Agenda 21 for Culture

The Agenda 21 for culture was agreed by cities and local governments from all over the world “committed to human rights, cultural diversity, sustainability, participatory democracy and creating conditions for peace”. It was approved in Barcelona on 8 May 2004 at the first Universal Forum of Cultures. After its approval, the cities presented the document to United Nations – Habitat and UNESCO.

The Agenda 21 for culture is the first document with worldwide mission for an undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development. At a local level, it is being used to reinforce and renew local cultural policies, and to include a solid fourth pillar in sustainable development. At a global level, it is the main (original and multilateral) contribution of cities to global cultural governance, when culture (and its constitutive element, diversity) is becoming one of the crucial elements of globalisation: UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity (2005), plans for an Alliance of Civilisations (2006), European Year for Intercultural Dialogue (2008)...

The world organisation United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) adopted the Agenda 21 for culture as a reference document for its programmes on culture (October 2004) and assumed the role of coordinator of the process subsequent to its approval and created the “Working Group on Culture” (June 2005) as an international platform to connect existing initiatives, promote new alliances and advocate for cities to play a growing role in cultural policy debates.

The process has raised the interest of international organisations, national governments and civil society. The website (<http://www.agenda21culture.net>) hosts all the resources related, including translations of the document into several languages, articles, publications, news and events.

Introduction

I am grateful for this extraordinary opportunity to address these words at the conference 'Expanding Cultures'. It is a real honour, and a privilege, to be here with you today, and to share with you this conference. I am grateful to the organisers of the conference, the Cultural Development Network of Victoria and the municipalities of Stonnington and Yarra. A special gratitude goes to my friend Jon Hawkes for his continued inspiration.

1. Culture and 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'.

This is Article 27 (1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)¹.

What does 'cultural life' mean? And what is 'participation'? Which 'community' is the Declaration referring to? How are the nation-states implementing this fundamental right? And how are cities implementing this right? Are there obstacles for its implementation? These questions, sadly, are not raised very often and, therefore, neither are they answered.

The concept '**culture**' is extremely complex to define and its semantic field of meaning is so broad, that it inevitably leads to misinterpretations or misunderstandings.

It could mean:

- a number of activities related to the arts and the heritage
- the way of life of a community
- a dynamic process of cultivation

The contemporary definitions of culture, such as those made by UNESCO (in 2001 and 2005) or by *Agenda 21 for Culture* (in 2004) illustrate that the understanding of 'culture' may be heading, or perhaps should I better say, 'returning' to its original meaning of a 'dynamic process that creates freedom to individuals and communities'. A process of cultivation.

We are living in an age in which cultivation is not popular. It is quite the opposite. Our age sees rising fundamentalism and relativism that often neglect freedoms and infringe upon the respect for the human dignity. 'Our culture', someone can say, does not allow contact with women. 'Our culture' does not allow freedom of speech. 'Our culture' permits torture.

This is why culture, today, needs to emphasise its association with **human rights**. It is the only way to prevent anyone from using culture, or cultural diversity, to justify oppression or exclusion, or commit outrages to human dignity.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), and the International Covenants, on Civil and Political Rights (1966)², and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (also 1966)³ form the foundation of the relationship between culture and human rights. But it has been more recently that UNESCO, in the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001), and the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions

¹ <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

² <http://www.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>

³ http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cescr.htm

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

(2005)⁴, has offered the clearest link between culture and human rights, as far its capacity for implementation is concerned. Article 2.1 of the 2005 Convention says:

'Cultural diversity can be protected and promoted only if human rights and fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, information and communication, as well as the ability of individuals to choose cultural expressions, are guaranteed. No one may invoke the provisions of this Convention in order to infringe human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or guaranteed by international law, or to limit the scope thereof.'

But not only fundamentalism and relativism are a danger for cultural freedom. In western countries, the 'passage' from fordism to post-fordism, from modernity to post-modernity, has been accompanied by a new role for culture, as a 'last resource' or a 'regulatory element' in society. Culture is expected to create jobs, to improve the image of the city, to regenerate neighbourhoods...

Many people, many artists and cultural actors, fear that culture and cultural actors might lose its autonomy. They fear, we fear, culture might become just a commodity, and the critical content that constitutes its very essence blurs or melts. There are worldwide fears that culture is just used just to *amuse ourselves to death* (Neil Postman), in an overwhelming *société du spectacle* (Guy Debord).

My opinion is that the perspective of human rights gives a strength and a legitimacy to reflections on cultural policies that are not obtained if culture is justified solely as a resource or an instrument at the service of other ends. But the relation between culture and human rights is rarely considered in the elaboration of a cultural policy. I will come back to this fact later on.

2. Culture and human development

Let me introduce another concept: **human development**.

Amartya Sen won the Nobel Prize of Economics, partly for his work in conceptualising human development, and in linking human development to freedom.

For Amartya Sen, human development means 'enhancing the lives we lead and the freedoms we enjoy,' in other words, 'expanding the freedoms we have reason to value'. The aim is that our lives are 'richer and more unfettered' and that we will be able to become 'fuller social persons, exercising our own volitions, that is the capacities for deliberate choice, and interacting with –and influencing– the world in which we live'⁵.

Human development is a project which is individual to each person. Today, in the 21st century, this project remains incomplete without contributions from the field of culture. In its dynamic diversity, culture broadens the possibilities of choice and allows each individual greater freedom. Article 3 of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity⁶ is clear in this purpose:

⁴ http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

⁵ Garrett, Jan; 2003; 'Amartya Sen's Ethics of Substantial Freedom', <http://www.wku.edu/~jan.garrett/ethics/senethic.htm>, consulted 1 December 2006.

⁶ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

'Cultural diversity widens the range of options open to everyone (...) as a means of access to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence'.

Amartya Sen influenced the work of the United Nations Development Programme and the calculations of the Human Development Index. Mark Malloch Brown, UNDP administrator for several years, has recently said: 'Human development is first and foremost about allowing people to lead the kind of life they choose - and providing them with the tools and opportunities to make those choices' (UNDP, 2004)⁷.

There is an individual responsibility. Conquering the spaces of freedom is an individual aim. But, as Amartya Sen explains, there are bridges to overcome between 'raw capacity', 'capability' and 'activity'. Public **policies** are needed to fill the space between 'raw capacity' and 'capability', as well as between 'capability' and 'activity'.

This is why, today, **cultural policies** have become important for human development.

3. From rights to policies

More than ever, contemporary phenomena require a personal analysis that can only be provided by access to, and practice with, cultural activities. If freedom and human development involve culture, therefore, the public institutions need to find the laws and the policies, and later on the programmes and the projects, to guarantee that all citizens / inhabitants can attain, with and through culture, his or her full human development.

Cultural policies create the opportunities that no other public sphere provides. Cultural policies are built on the so-called intrinsic values of culture, which include concepts such as memory, creativity, critical knowledge, rituality, excellence, beauty, diversity (and maybe others).

Another way to express the need for cultural policies based on rights and associated with human development. It has been set out by John Holden,⁸ a British researcher of the think-tank 'Demos':

'Throughout the twentieth century we – the public – were defined by two things: our nationality and our work. (...) In the twenty-first century all that has changed. Our nation states are far from homogenous; every individual citizen is now part of a minority; and we no longer define ourselves by our work – most of us will have different jobs, take career breaks, get re-educated, adjust our roles when children come along, and so on. In these circumstances we, the public, need culture more and more to make sense of our lives, and to construct our individual and collective identities.'

Let me add a complement. Culture and human rights, even though they both have the individual as their central subject, also show the importance of the social sphere, the community, or the communities.

⁷ UNDP – United National Development Programme; 2004; *Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World - Human Development Report 2004*; New York, United Nations.

⁸ Holden, John; 2006; *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy. Why culture needs a democratic mandate*, Demos; March 2006, <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Culturalvalueweb.pdf>, consulted 29 November 2006.

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

It is interesting to quote now Article 29 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which is all too often forgotten:

'Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible'.

This article has been controversial, among other issues, because of the usage and reach, of the concept 'community'. If this article was to be agreed today, writers may wish to consider turning the singular '**community**' into the plural '**communities**', reflecting the reality of contemporary cultures, especially plural in our cities, but also the reality of cultural history, always shaped by plural societies, even when many national narratives have pretended to mask or neglect this fact.

4. Culture, the fourth pillar of sustainability

We need cultural policies. But how do we advocate for culture in public policy making, if policies are just built on three pillars, and none of them is culture? The development of societies rests on three pillars: the economic pillar has to do with creating wealth (XIX century); the social pillar redistributes this wealth (XXth century), whilst the third pillar, the ecological (second half of XXth century), watches over responsibility for the environment.

They make the 'virtuous triangle' of sustainable development. It was developed in the second half of the 1980s (Brundtland's⁹ report being its key document. It was successfully consolidated in the 1990s and is used today in local, national and global strategies as a pattern for analysis and public action. For example, the Lisbon strategy¹⁰, the foundation of the European Union for its policies until 2010, is based on this virtuous triangle.

The Australian researcher Jon Hawkes has formulated the need to structure a new 'pillar' for sustainability. His document *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*¹¹ is recognised as a masterpiece for local policy making in many European cities. We, the cultural actors and agents, know better than anybody that the circle of development cannot be squared without the **fourth pillar**: culture. The framework proposed by Jon Hawkes is extremely powerful. Cultural actors and agents, we, need strong metaphors and images to raise awareness on the cultural dimension of human development, and to secure a solid role for culture in public action. It is difficult for anyone to advocate for culture without creating bridges with the other spheres of governance.

The fourth pillar allows us to advocate for culture to be at same level of significance for the development of a society than the economy, the social and the environmental. It does neglect neither a certain degree of overlap nor the complementarity with each one of the other pillars.

⁹ See UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs [Division for Sustainable Development] <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/>

¹⁰ See http://ec.europa.eu/growthandjobs/index_en.htm

¹¹ Hawkes, Jon; 2001; *The fourth pillar of sustainability. Culture's essential role in public planning*, Cultural Development Network, Melbourne, 69 pp. www.cultureandheritage.govt.nz/cwb/pdfs/Jon%20Hawke%20-%20Fourth%20Pillar%20of%20Sustainability consulted 26 November 2006.

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

The fourth pillar offers a strong metaphor and creates solid bridges.




Figure 1. The old triangle of sustainable development




Figure 2. The new square of sustainable development

In a society with a growing diversity (not only ethnical diversity),
in a society that needs to value knowledge and life-long learning,
in a society that is connected (at least potentially) to all the societies of the world
...

you, we, need to build a **cultural pillar** that helps us understanding the world,

by discovering that our roots, our traditions, our cultures, are not self-evident

by building on our human development through the access to, and practice with, cultural activities.

5. Globalisation and cultural policies

Culture has assumed a very crucial role in the recent **globalisation** process.

- Some people say there is a clash of civilisations, some other say we need an Alliance of Civilisations, but we know that population movements push the challenges of dialogue between cultures or civilisations to be dealt at a local level every single day.
- The technological revolution demands reconsidering the mechanisms of production and access to cultural goods and services
- The processes of economic integration provoke a debate on the role that culture plays in world trade, and the need to protect the diversity, and especially the expression of traditional cultures.

The crucial role of culture in the globalisation process concerns us all, public and private sectors, and civil society, and leads us to reconsider our ideas, both on a worldwide and local scale.

Since the mid nineties, various initiatives have been debated to provide world governance with a more solid public cultural competence. The member states of the International Network of Cultural Policies,¹² and, at the same time, cultural society civil, grouped in two associations, the International Network for Cultural Diversity,¹³ and the Coalition for Cultural Diversity, have urged the organisation of United Nations for Culture, (and Education, and Science), that is, UNESCO, to become the centre of these debates and to take over this emerging space.

The approval of UNESCO's Declaration (2001)¹⁴ and Convention (2005)¹⁵ on Cultural Diversity created the current **cultural diversity momentum**. In November 2001, the 31st General Conference of UNESCO unanimously adopted the 'Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity', a text without legislative value but with an enormous symbolic force for promoting and deepening these debates.

In 2005, by an absolute majority of 148 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 4 abstentions, the 33rd General Conference of UNESCO adopted the 'Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions', a cornerstone in the process. The Convention explicitly connects the relationship between human rights and cultural diversity, an absolute necessity to avoid the risk of fundamentalists using diversity as a subterfuge for oppression.

The Convention defines the long claimed double nature of cultural goods and services (economic but also cultural, 'as vehicles of identity, values and meaning'). This double nature enables securing the right of states (and regions, and cities) to establish cultural policies understood as public policies. The Convention is a text with legal value that recognises its complementarity with other international legal instruments such as the World Intellectual Property Organisation or the World Trade Organisation.

The Convention does not forget solidarity, and establishes an International Fund for Cultural Diversity which could potentially be a formidable impulse to international cooperation in culture. The Convention entered into force on 19th March 2007, three months after it had been ratified by 30 member states of UNESCO. The number is about to reach now 60. Never before a Convention had been ratified so rapidly, and this speed illustrates the hunger for international processes on culture and development. The parties of the Convention met in Paris a month ago (18-20 June 2007).

Besides the Convention of UNESCO, there are other processes, at an international level, that I will not refer to now, such as the European Year for Intercultural Dialogue (2008), or the Alliance of Civilisations. Cities and the local governments cannot be absent from the debate on the role of culture in globalisation.

¹² <http://www.incp-rip.org>, consulted 2 December 2006.

¹³ <http://www.incd.net>, consulted 2 December 2006.

¹⁴ UNESCO, 2001, 'Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity', <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>, consulted 2 December 2006.

¹⁵ UNESCO, 2005, 'Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions', http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, consulted 2 December 2006.

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

Today, local policies are indirectly conditioned by international agreements on cultural goods and services. The vitality of the cultural offer in a city is partly conditioned by the possibility of implementing public cultural policies: without international regulatory frameworks which legitimise public action (as does the recently approved Convention), public cultural facilities and programs (an independent cinema production, a theatre venue or a cultural centre) could be challenged as unfair competition or distortion of the market. And, most importantly, cities and local governments cannot be absent from the international debates because citizens exercise their cultural rights at a local level.

Today's cities are the spaces where globalisation becomes clearly and immediately obvious. Creative processes take place in local communities. New shared imaginaries are originated in local communities.

6. Globalisation, cities and culture

Raj Isar,¹⁶ president of EFAH, the most important federation of European arts and heritage associations, recently argued the need to make the cultural diversity of each territory explicit, so that the policies foster knowledge of otherness with a critical explanation. He says: 'Cultures overlap. Basic ideas may, and do, recur in several cultures because cultures have partly common roots, build on similar human experiences and have, in the course of history, often learned and borrowed a great deal from each other. In other words, cultures do not have sharply delineated boundaries. Nor do cultures speak with one voice on religious, ethical, social or political matters and other aspects of people's lives.' The challenge, Raj Isar argues, is to understand 'our' culture, 'in fluid and open, rather than in fixed and essentialised terms'.

Cities feel comfortable with these arguments. States and nations somewhat less. The local sphere demands and requests a distance from the standardising or identitarian impulse that has characterised most modern states.

Let us hear another voice. Colin Mercer, a British that has lived and worked in Australia, a leading expert in cultural policies. He has written¹⁷ that it is crucial to acknowledge that 'diversity is actively *constitutive* of culture, not an element of 'additionality' to it. In spite of the homogenising tendencies of national cultures in the modern period, especially since the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Europe and elsewhere, it is clear from the historical evidence and reality, that all cultures are diverse and hybrid in their formation – if not in the ways in which they are *retrospectively* constructed and imagined by nation states and their citizens'.

The task of deconstructing / **reconstructing collective identities** is not easier for local governments (but certainly it is more difficult for some nation states). Cities cannot defend teleological discourses on the 'cultural identity' of their citizens. Cities have always been the point of destination of immigrants, who, after a few years, become inhabitants and citizens. The identity of cities is obviously dynamic: it has always balanced the expression of traditional cultures with the creation of new cultural forms.

¹⁶ Isar, Y Raj; 2005; 'Cultural learning: some issues and horizons', Catalyst Conference, Liverpool-Manchester, 14-17 septiembre 2005, <http://www.catalystconference.co.uk/cultural-selfhood-and-othernes/>, consulted 1st December 2006.

¹⁷ Mercer, Colin; 2006; 'Local policies for cultural diversity: systems, citizenship, and governance. With an emphasis on the UK and Australia', in UCLG's WG on Culture and Barcelona City Council, *Local policies for cultural diversity*, report for the Division of Cultural Policies and Intercultural Dialogue of UNESCO. See <http://www.agenda21culture.net>.

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

The essential cartographies of cities look very much alike. Citizens request democracy at a local level, services delivered with efficiency, processes that are transparent, a local government that facilitates, a city as an open-ended system, a city that creates new meaning with its inhabitants. The growing relevance of **cities and local governments** has a strong political consequence.

At a national level, local governments are not always acknowledged as important agents in national governance. For example, cities are not always consulted in the drafting of new state or national legislation that directly concerns their competences. Or cities are not always provided with the resources that the implementation of new legislation often implies for their budgets.

Or even worse, in some countries, still today, there is not any political decentralisation, municipal councils do not exist and Mayors are not elected. Democracy is incomplete when all the political power is concentrated in the national capital. Cities and local governments are becoming active agents of national governance, and the national associations of municipalities have a growing role to play.

At an international level, local governments were assimilated to non-governmental organisations. And they are not. They are active in peace and reconciliation initiatives (local diplomacy) where states often fail. They are active in international cooperation for development (also known as ‘decentralised cooperation’) because they have an expertise that no other tiers of government have, for example, housing, risk prevention, public transportation... or cultural development.

In recent years, there has been ‘a gradual acceptance of the legitimacy and right of the cities, especially their democratic governments, to act in international political, economic and cultural life. The acknowledgement of that right today is a factor for the democratisation of international relations and indispensable for agreements and programmes of the international organisations to have a real impact’¹⁸.

A number of recent **United Nations** reports have repeatedly revealed the need for states, international and inter-governmental bodies to listen to the voice of cities and to work with them on the implementation of their strategies. For example, the report on the relations between the United Nations and civil society, known as the Cardoso Report [2004]¹⁹, or the more recent report elaborated by Jeffrey Sachs [2005] on the Millennium Development Goals²⁰ and the world struggle against poverty. These reports recognise that cities and local governments have a priority role as elements of democratisation and efficiency.

At the end of the 20th century, cities had won a place on the international scene. The unification of world municipalism in **United Cities and Local Governments** (May 2004)²¹, has undoubtedly been a milestone.

United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) was founded in May 2004. The first congress, the founding congress, was held in Paris. UCLG acts as the united voice and world advocate of democratic local self-government. UCLG forms the largest association of local governments in the world and has a decentralized structure with regional sections in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe, Euro-Asia, Middle East – West Asia, Latin America and North

¹⁸ Borja, Jordi; Castells, Manuel; 1997; *Local y global. La gestión de las ciudades en la era de la información*, Taurus, Madrid, 418 p

¹⁹ www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/cardoso.html

²⁰ www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

²¹ <http://www.cities-localgovernments.org>

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

America. The cities and their associated members are located in more than 120 UN Member States. Among the direct members of United Cities and Local Governments we find over a thousand municipalities and 112 national associations.

Many among you might wonder why an international association of cities and local governments is so young (May 2004). You are right to raise this question. In fact, there were two international associations of local governments: the International Union of Local Authorities (created after the 1st World War) and the World Federation of United Cities (created after the 2nd World War). They decided to merge in 1996, after the growing convergence of objectives and the repeated claims of UN agencies and programmes to have one single voice for cities and local governments.

United Cities and Local Governments adopted Agenda 21 for culture as a reference document for its cultural programmes and assumed the role of coordinator of the process subsequent to its approval. (But I will come back to this fact immediately).

7. The Agenda 21 for culture

The presence of cities in debates on cultural policies and cultural diversity at a global level is needed. The challenges of our societies are expressed in very acute terms in the cities. Concerns of cities associated with coexistence, conviviality, image, creativity, rituality, knowledge... are intrinsically cultural. A large part of the future of democracy and welfare is dependent on the existence of public spaces and spheres to discuss and implement policies and programmes either 'cultural' or with a strong 'cultural dimension'.

Our society needs a cultural pillar because our challenges are cultural.

Local governments have an essential role to play in the articulation of a new paradigm for cultural policies. Colin Mercer has expressed this assumption in these terms: 'Any response both to the potential and the threat of the reality of globalisation (in economic, social and ethical terms) has to be firmly grounded not in negative gestures of dismay but in the development of indigenous and endogenous capacity to make places, to make (...) narratives, stories and images [;] which assert *this is where, who and what we are and how we distinguish and know ourselves* (...). Local Government and local policies are both the 'engines' and the drivers for effective participation in this field'.

Franco Bianchini, the author, with Jude Bloomfield, of 'the intercultural city', suggests moving towards a new notion of citizenship²². This new notion should not have a communitarian approach, 'which assumes that a preconstituted consensus exists', but 'an open-ended system constructed through the organisation of actors in civil society with the city offering training, facilitation and intermediation ...actively soliciting projects and ideas in all areas of urban policy.'

One of the main challenges of our societies is to give visibility to and to legitimise the processes of construction and reconstruction of citizens' *imagineries*, or narratives. The origination of new cultural forms. Cities are ready to act in the world today both with the

²² Bianchini, Franco; 2006; 'Reflections on urban cultural policies, the development of citizenship and the setting of minimum local cultural standards and entitlements', *Active citizens, local cultures, European politics* project; ECF, Ecumest, Interarts and South East Europe TV Exchanges. www.policiesforculture.org

Proceedings of the 'Expanding Cultures' conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

universalistic formula ‘**think global, act local**’, and also with its diversalist complement ‘**think local, act global**’.

The *Agenda 21 for culture* is a commitment of the local government with the citizenry to elaborate and implement cultural policies and programmes. It can also be considered as a declaration of cities for cultural rights. It is also an example of the political innovation needed to link culture to human development. The *Agenda 21 for culture* aims to reinforce the cultural pillar of our cities.

A group of cities and local governments that felt ‘committed to human rights, cultural diversity, sustainability, participatory democracy and creating conditions for peace’ decided to write a guiding document for local cultural policies. From September 2002 until May 2004, preliminary drafts of this document were discussed in various meetings and conferences organised by international networks like Eurocities, Interlocal, Mercociudades or les Rencontres.

The document was approved by the 4th Forum of Local Authorities for Social Inclusion of Porto Alegre, held in Barcelona on 8 May 2004. The name given to this document was *Agenda 21 for culture*²³. After its approval, the cities presented *Agenda 21 for culture* to United Nations – Habitat and UNESCO. In October 2004, the world association of cities, United Cities and Local Governments – UCLG, adopted *Agenda 21 for culture* as a reference document for its programmes on culture and assumed the role of coordinator of the process subsequent to its approval.

The *Agenda 21 for culture* was not created in a vacuum. Without the experience of many cities in cultural planning during the last decade it could not have been written. Without the inspiration of many researchers in cultural policies, and organisations on cultural development, such as the Cultural Development Network of Victoria, it would not exist.

This was the first time that the local governments the world over worked together to agree upon a guiding document for local cultural policies. A Working Group on Culture was created within UCLG in June 2005 in order ‘To promote the role of culture as a central dimension of local policies through the dissemination and implementation of the Agenda 21 for culture’. The Working Group will finish its mandate in October 2007.

The *Agenda 21 for culture* has 67 articles, divided over three large sections: principles (16 articles), undertakings (29 articles) and recommendations (22 articles).

The ‘principles’ section describes the relationship between culture and human rights, diversity, sustainability, participative democracy and peace.

The ‘undertakings’ section focuses on the scope of local government responsibilities, and requests a solid centrality of cultural policies.

The ‘recommendations’ section advocates for the renewed importance of culture, and demands that this importance be recognised in the programmes, budgets and organisational charts of the various levels of government (local / regional / national) and by international organisations.

²³ *Agenda 21 for culture. An undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development*, Barcelona, 2004. In French, English, Spanish, Catalan, Galician, German, Italian, Portuguese and Turkish. <http://www.agenda21culture.net>, consulted 12 April 2007.

Proceedings of the ‘Expanding Cultures’ conference, Melbourne, July 2007

Hosted by the City of Stonnington, supported by the Cities of Yarra, Melbourne, Moreland, Maribyrnong, Moonee Valley, Boroondara and Port Phillip and the Cultural Development Network www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/expandingcultures

The Agenda 21 for culture is available at present in 9 languages: English, French, Spanish, Catalan, Galician, German, Italian, Portuguese and Turkish. All documents are available at the website <http://www.agenda21culture.net>.

The contents of Agenda 21 for culture can also be summarised thematically, as follows.

Culture and human rights

- Culture and human development. Cultural diversity as 'a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence.'
- Cultural rights are an integral part of human rights. 'No one may invoke cultural diversity to infringe upon the human rights guaranteed by international law, nor to limit their scope.'
- Mechanisms, instruments and resources for guaranteeing freedom of speech
- Invitation to artists to commit themselves with the city, improving coexistence and quality of life, increasing the creative and critical capacity of all citizens

Culture and governance

- New central role of culture in society. Legitimacy of cultural policies
- Quality of local development depends on the interweaving of cultural policies and other public policies
- Local governance: a joint responsibility of citizens, civil society and governments
- Improvement of assessment mechanisms in culture. System of cultural indicators
- Participation of local governments in national cultural policies and programmes
- Importance of networks and international cooperation
- International recognition of local governments in policy-making in the cultural field

Culture, sustainability and territory

- Cultural diversity, as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature
- Diversity of cultural expressions brings wealth. Importance of a wide cultural ecosystem, with diversity of origins, actors and content
- Dialogue, coexistence and interculturality as basic principles for the dynamics of citizen relationships
- Public spaces as cultural spaces

Culture and social inclusion

- Access to culture at all stages of life
- Expressiveness as a basic dimension of human dignity and social inclusion without any prejudice to gender, origin, poverty or any other kind of discrimination.
- Building audiences and encouraging cultural participation as vital elements of citizenship

Culture and economy

- Recognition of the economic dimension of culture. Importance of culture as a factor in the creation of wealth and economic development
- Funding culture with various sources, such as subsidies, venture capital funds, micro-credits or tax incentives.
- Strategic role of the cultural industries and the local media for their contribution to local identity, creative continuity and job creation
- Relations between cultural facilities and the organisations of the knowledge economy
- Respect and guarantee rights of authors and artists and ensure their fair remuneration

On 30 June 2007, UCLG had registered that 225 cities, local governments and organisations from all over the world are linked to *Agenda 21 for culture* (there are probably many more, but it is impossible to trace).

Cities are using Agenda 21 for culture in different ways.

- Today cities are using *Agenda 21 for culture*, on the one hand, to advocate for the importance of culture in local development to international organizations: UN-Habitat, UNESCO, United Nations Development Programme, the European Union, etc. The Working Group on Culture of UCLG coordinates the cities that wish to advocate for the importance of culture in local development.
- On the other hand, cities are using *Agenda 21 for culture* to reinforce local cultural policies. Adopting *Agenda 21 for culture* does not guarantee more resources, but it holds great symbolic importance: it expresses a city's commitment to make culture a key part of urban policies, and a commitment of the local government to elaborate and implement cultural policies and programmes with the community.
- Last, but not least, it is also a sign of solidarity and cooperation with cities and local governments worldwide, a sign which is not a minor thing in our days.

Agenda 21 for culture provides an opportunity for every city to create a long-term vision of culture as a basic pillar in its development. In 2006 UCLG's Working Group on Culture adopted the document 'Advice on local implementation of Agenda 21 for culture'. This document draws up general concepts and considerations. Conditions to develop a cultural policy vary: history, geography, characteristics of the population and vitality of civil society, among other factors, differ from one city to another. Furthermore, cities have different levels of legal competencies, that is, national and/or regional juridical frameworks. The founding conception of the nation-state (unitary state, decentralised state, federal state), as well as the definition of national policies (laws and regulations that recognise, protect or promote cultural diversity, for example) are of paramount importance for local cultural policies to be elaborated and implemented.

On 24 October 2006, UCLG's Working Group on Culture approved two new specific documents (or 'policy papers'), on 'Advice on local implementation of Agenda 21 for culture' and 'Cultural indicators and Agenda 21 for culture'.

Let me briefly refer to the document 'Advice on local implementation of the Agenda 21 for culture'. This document mainly deals with the **governance of culture** at a local level.

This document provides general recommendations that may be useful to any local government worldwide that wishes to develop the *Agenda 21 for culture*; it encourages each city or local government 'to consider the value of the issues raised in the following paragraphs to their policymaking processes'. I will only quote a few:

- a) Political leadership at the highest level of local government.
- c) Local government as a catalyst of cultural processes: reinforcing civil society, fostering consensus and establishing mutual responsibilities.
- d) The encouragement and stimulation of the democratic participation of citizens in the formulation, exercise and evaluation of public policies on culture.
- e) The transparency of information, and the communication to citizens through various channels.

k) The coordination between the process of cultural planning and the strategic plans of the city or any other integrated local planning process (such as Local Agenda 21, Local Area Agreement, Integrated Local Area Planning...).

n) The establishment of application and monitoring procedures for the commitments agreed upon.

r) The participation of the city in multilateral networks and associations dedicated to cultural cooperation, exchanging good practices and advocating the importance of culture in national and international programmes.

The document 'Advice on local implementation of the Agenda 21 for culture' suggests four specific tools as examples:

1. Local cultural strategy
2. Charter of cultural rights and responsibilities
3. Culture council
4. Cultural impact assessment

Let me now reproduce what this document says about each one of these tools.

1. Local cultural strategy.

The development of a local cultural strategy involves the debate, drawing up and approval of a document that describes the cultural priorities of a city. The most effective process would be one that engages all the cultural agents in a territory along with the citizenry and the public administration. The process usually begins with an audit and assessment of the cultural resources of a city and the economic, social and territorial trends. The local cultural strategy can then be formed into a document, debated and approved by the municipal plenary or by authorities such as councils or commissions with the participation of the citizenry. The document normally consists of a mission statement, various objectives and several actions. The document establishes mutual responsibilities between local government, cultural agents and civil society. A local cultural strategy normally includes an implementation timetable, follow-up and evaluation indicators for each objective and action, as well as monitoring procedures.

2. Charter of cultural rights and responsibilities.

A local charter of cultural rights is a document that specifically defines the cultural rights and responsibilities of the inhabitants of a territory. Such a document would be based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other recognised international texts that cover human rights and culture. The effective development of a local charter of cultural rights relies on active participation by the cultural agents of a territory, the citizenry, the administration and experts in human rights. The document would normally be approved by the municipal plenary and implies the creation of a person or organization to guarantee the fulfilment of the Charter and to be the mediator in the often complex situations related to cultural rights and responsibilities.

3. Culture council.

A culture council is a public body that addresses the cultural issues of a city. Such a council would normally reflect the diversity of cultural agents: different sectors (heritage, arts libraries...), different dimensions (large agents to small initiatives), different structures (public, private, associative...) and other variables. Normally, the council would debate, and issue opinions on the most relevant cultural themes of the city. The authority of such councils is variable: there are strictly consultative councils, through to councils with the capacity to take executive decisions.

4. *Cultural impact assessment.*

Local development projects often have their economic, social and environmental impacts assessed and evaluated, but their cultural impacts are rarely analysed. *Agenda 21 for culture*, in article 25, promotes the implementation of forms of 'cultural impact assessment' of initiatives 'that involve significant changes in the cultural life of cities'. A cultural impact assessment is a document developed in consultation with the citizenry and cultural agents that analyses the contributions (both positive and negative) that a local development project could generate in the cultural life of a city. Given the effect that all projects can have on cultural life, it is likely that 'cultural impact assessment' could be considered as a process to be applied to all policy and programme making.

The number of cities that are developing a 'local cultural strategy' and / or a 'culture council' is growing; and many of them use the Agenda 21 for culture for inspiration. There are not examples of cities (or, at least, they are not documented) that are developing a local 'charter of cultural rights and responsibilities' or 'cultural impact assessment', but these are tools that cities might use in the upcoming years.

The Agenda 21 for culture provides an opportunity for every city to create a long-term vision of culture as a basic pillar in its development. It promotes culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable development. And it needs to be locally developed with new alliances between the cultural spheres and the citizenry.

At the same time, the *Agenda 21 for culture* connects cities worldwide. It is a learning hub, a place to exchange information on the governance of culture, and a place for cities to advocate, together, for the role of culture in local development. Agenda 21 for culture is the main (original and multilateral) contribution of cities to global cultural governance.

Today, the Working Group on Culture is chaired by Jordi Marti, Councillor for Culture of Barcelona, and has two vice-presidencies, in the cities of Stockholm and Buenos Aires. The Working Group on Culture is made of cities such as Amman, Brazzaville, Córdoba, Diyarbakir, Essaouira, Kazan, Porto Alegre, Quito, Rio de Janeiro, Roma, Torino, Toronto and Venice, as well as several associations of municipalities.

In October 2007, in Jeju, in South Korea, UCLG will hold its second World Congress and the activities of the all Commissions and Working Groups will be evaluated. The report of our activities in 2005-2007 is already available. The member cities wish to continue the work, and to create a Commission for culture, whose mandate would reach from 2008 to 2010.

We are just beginning. We think the united voice of local governments is needed to place the relation between culture, development and democracy at the centre of our societies. We need the involvement of cities from all over the world. Your involvement is welcome.

***Jordi Pascual** is the Coordinator of the Working Group on Culture (WGC) of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) for the Institut de Cultura (Barcelona City Council). The main aim of the WGC is the progress of the 'Agenda 21 for culture - an undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development' (agenda21culture.net). Jordi is a researcher in cultural policies and local development who has a BA Geography (1992) and MA, European Cultural Policies and International Cultural Relations (1997). He has previously worked as a Researcher at the Autònoma University of Barcelona (1992-1996), then at the Interarts Foundation (1996-2000) and Institut de Cultura - Barcelona City Council (2000-2003) and as URBACT researcher on culture and urban regeneration.*

Ph: + 34 933 161 262 agenda21cultura@bcn.cat

www.agenda21culture.net www.cities-localgovernments.org

Copyright: All text, except where otherwise attributed, is copyright of the author and may not be reproduced without written permission.