

# **Opening Conference for the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention**

Ossolineum National Institute, Wrocław, Poland  
9-10 December 2004

*Proceedings*



# Contents

<b>Official Opening of the Conference</b> .....	5
<b>Welcome addresses by</b>	
1) <i>Mr Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe</i> .....	5
2) <i>Mr Waldemar DABROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland</i> .....	8
3) <i>Mr Miroslav SAWICKI, Minister of Education and Sport of Poland</i> .....	10
<b>Plenary Session 1:</b> <b>“Stocktaking of the achievements over 50 years of the European Cultural Convention”</b> .....	13
Introduction by Mr Simon MUNDY .....	13
<b>General discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport:</b>	
1) <i>Mr Henri INGBERG</i> .....	16
2) <i>Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE</i> .....	21
3) <i>Mr César BIRZEA</i> .....	24
4) <i>Ms Krisztina GONTER</i> .....	26
5) <i>Mr Peter LAURITZEN</i> .....	29
<b>Plenary Session 2:</b> <b>“From stocktaking to new challenges for cultural exchange and cooperation in present-day Europe”</b> .....	35
Introduction by Mr Miroslav SAWICKI, Minister of Education and Sport of Poland .....	35
<b>General discussion with :</b>	
1) <i>Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE</i> .....	36
2) <i>Mr Renaldas VAISBRODAS</i> .....	39
3) <i>Professor Mykola RYABCHUK</i> .....	41
Summary by Professor Kazimierz KRZYSZTOFEK .....	44



<b>Plenary Session 3: "The future of cultural cooperation in Greater Europe – a new role for the European Cultural Convention"</b> .....	47
Introduction by Ms Vesna KILIBARDA.....	47
<b>General discussion with :</b>	
1) Mr Benoît PAUMIER, .....	48
2) Mr Robert PALMER, .....	51
3) Ms Vera STASTNA, .....	54
4) Mr Michael RAPHAEL.....	56
<b>Closing session of the Conference</b> .....	61
1) Mr José Amaral LOPES.....	61
2) Baroness HOOPER.....	63
3) Mr Christian TER STEPANIAN.....	66
4) Professor Jerzy WIATR.....	68
<b>Wrocław Declaration on Fifty Years of European Cultural Cooperation</b> .....	85
<b>Appendices</b> .....	93
1. Kiev achievements of 50 years of the European Cultural Convention.....	95
2. Programme of the Conference.....	99
3. List of Participants of the Conference.....	103
4. The New Dimensions of Europe – Background Document prepared by the Polish Authorities .....	115
Professor Kasimierz Krzysztofek	
5. European Cultural Convention .....	121

# Official Opening of the Conference

*Welcome addresses by*

## 1 – Mr Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

*Ministers,*

*Ladies and gentlemen,*

Let me recall the wisdom of the people who founded the Council of Europe, who recognised in the Statute of our Organisation that, if the Council of Europe was going to achieve a greater unity between its members, it had to encourage cooperation not only in economic, social and legal matters but in culture as well. Their wish was realised through the European Cultural Convention which provided the framework not only for the Council of Europe's work in culture but also in education, heritage, youth and sport.

Culture is at the heart of relations between people and between nations, the foundation of individual and collective identities, the cement that keeps society together. It cannot be taken lightly or for granted. As we know from the history of Europe, if cooperation is only based on political interests, rather than on a strong and genuine desire for mutual understanding and peaceful collaboration, it is short-lived.

The dynamic interaction between politics and culture provides the rationale for an intergovernmental organisation such as the Council of Europe to deal with cultural matters in a systematic, comprehensive and forward-looking way.

Fifty years down the road, the time has come for a stocktaking of our achievements under the Convention and a reflection on the challenges lying ahead. Let me at this point thank warmly the Polish Authorities for providing us with these excellent conditions for work and with so many opportunities to enjoy their culture, our culture, over these two days.

Conscious of its role as the only pan-European organisation for cultural cooperation, the Council of Europe has invested relatively little in this cooperation in financial terms but invested enormously in terms of energy, innovation and commitment.

The Convention's aim has not been to improve Europe's cultural reputation and even less to attempt to illustrate some form of superiority; rather it has been to help governments provide the conditions which are necessary to enable cultural life to flourish.

The vision of the Cultural Convention was one of an undivided Europe. Drawn up in the early stages of the Cold War, the Convention was from the outset open to all



European States willing to adhere to it. It became a sort of passage through the Iron Curtain, a stepping-stone for full membership in the Council of Europe. The Convention projected a vision of a Europe strong with the diversity of its cultures and its common heritage; a Europe of understanding and dialogue between peoples.

Along with democracy and human rights, these values have been the pillars of our Organisation and remain an essential basis for the identity of a united Europe. Indeed, I cannot imagine that the legal and institutional safeguards of democracy and human rights in our member States could be as solid as they are today if they were not embedded in a cultural foundation of tolerance, freedom, equality and respect for human dignity.

**We have worked for 50 years to build this cultural foundation.**

We have fostered creativity, cultural freedom and diversity; we have created standards and mechanisms for policy coordination in order to ensure equal access for all to education and culture. We have worked with youth in order to bring up new generations in the spirit of common values and active citizenship. We have treated sport not only as a source of physical and psychological well-being but also as a means of promoting tolerance, fairness and social cohesion. We have developed the concept of lifelong learning. We have promoted language teaching and unbiased history teaching as essential dimensions of intercultural education.

The list is long. I hope to be forgiven for not mentioning all of the accomplishments which the Cultural Convention has nourished over the years. I should emphasise, however, that they have all had as a common denominator : the concept of cultural democracy and the right to cultural expression, which are closely linked to the Council of Europe's evolving principles of human rights. Without our work over the past 50 years, the concepts of cultural rights, educational rights and linguistic rights would never have gained such prominence across Europe.

The European Cultural Convention has not only been a source of inspiration for the building of Europe's social and cultural capital, it has also been an extraordinary driving force of innovation in thought and practice.

For instance, over the years, our engagement in heritage has led us well beyond the conservation of old stones into a broader concept of heritage. Another example is "*Eurimages*", our unique fund for film co-production which stimulates the continued development of a European film industry and engenders works of outstanding value in one of the most popular of the arts.

*Ladies and gentlemen,*

Today, we face a new resurgence of the tension between diversity and identity. Cultural and religious identity is sometimes used as a justification of inter-ethnic tension, racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic acts and even armed conflict within Europe. Cultural rhetoric fuels terrorism and violence.

It is crucial to realise that, as the Council of Europe mobilises to meet these challenges, our work in the area of culture remains fundamental. Building inclusive, stable and peaceful societies based on shared values means that these values need to be reborn in the minds and hearts of every generation.

The Council of Europe, together with its many partners, exists to help member States in the development of comprehensive policies for managing cultural diversity and fostering intercultural and inter-religious dialogue through art and through the sharing of heritage. We are developing educational models which transmit the values of the Council of Europe and strengthen citizenship and social cohesion. We are creating new ways of passing on to the young generations the value of democratic citizenship and motivating them to continue the struggle against discrimination, racism and intolerance.

The European Cultural Convention is a formidable instrument for cooperation with Europe's neighbours, particularly those to the South of the Mediterranean. The Convention offers to neighbouring countries a framework for partnership based on common principles, as well as the knowledge, experience and practical instruments developed over five decades of pan-European cooperation.

For this partnership to become a reality, however, the Convention needs to be opened up to non-European countries. We need, therefore, to explore ways and means to make this possible through an appropriate instrument, such as a new protocol to the Convention. Such an instrument would provide a basis for a focused dialogue and joint action in areas such as cultural exchange and teamwork which could in turn lead not only to conflict prevention but also a richer life.

I believe that the celebration of the 50th Anniversary must be the occasion for creating a new impetus in our cultural cooperation. In the past decade, we have concentrated on building the institutional and legal framework for democracy and the rule of law throughout Europe.

Now, we must find a new balance among the core areas of action. We must recognise that it is essential for democratic institutions to be embedded in a democratic culture, or they will be unsustainable and short-lived. We must also provide the resources which are necessary for investment in human capital and the building of stable and inclusive multi cultural democratic societies.

Today, we are not only celebrating the achievement of the past but also, and more importantly, we are beginning a debate on the future, which will culminate in, but not end with, the Third Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Government next May. We must clarify the links between the cultural mission of the Council of Europe and the other core elements of our mandate: democracy, human rights and the rule of law.

Culture is a concept similar to freedom and democracy: difficult to define with any precision. But we know what they are when they are missing. And, just as freedom and democracy cannot be simply handed over like a fairy godmother's gift, but



must be created and maintained by daily efforts and vigilance, culture too relies on the joint efforts of organisations and individuals, each making their contributions to form a harmonious living whole called civilisation.

Thank you very much.

## 2 – Mr Waldemar DABROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland

*Ladies and Gentlemen,*

It would have been difficult to find a better venue for our meeting, which is an important link in the construction of our European community on the threshold of the new challenges facing us at the start of the 21st Century. Wrocław is an exceptional city. Two outstanding historians, Norman Davies and Roger Moorhouse, entitled their great work, a monograph devoted to this city, MICROCOSM. What constituted that microcosm?

Permit me, Ladies and Gentlemen, to select a few essential "signs" - phenomena and personalities symbolising Wrocław's specificity.

It has always been a city of art. The Middle Ages, when Polish-Bohemian Wrocław created a certain kind of Silesian Gothic - splendid Gothic churches and religious sculptures brimming with spiritual expression. Then there was Silesian Baroque, an example of resplendent richness. This evening, you will have the opportunity to admire this richness at the Aula Leopoldina of the University of Wrocław. It was in that period that, thanks to the University, Breslau - Wrocław became a city that radiated learning. Later, many Nobel laureates worked and lectured there. The place where we now are is the edifice, taken over by one of the most magnificent cultural institutions of Lwów - the OSSOLINEUM Institute, which history shifted hundreds of kilometres to the west.

Among the many outstanding individuals linked to this city from its creation, allow me to say a few words about three of them:

Edyta Stein - a Carmelite nun and a Jewess - who shared the tragic fate of millions of European Jews, a great European intellectual, a student of Husserl, who called this city her home and studied here.

A member of the Polish landed gentry and an art historian, a citizen of the German Empire, Erick Klosowski, married to the daughter of a Wrocław Jewish community's cantor. In 1902, they met in the Aula Leopoldina. They were soon to leave for Paris, where their two sons were born: the outstanding French philosopher and writer, Pierre Klosowski, and the painter Balthus, a great personality of 20th Century painting. Six years ago, the then 90-year-old Balthus came to Wrocław to receive an honorary doctor's degree from the university.

Jerzy Grotowski, who died a decade ago, a great theatre reformer, a man whose reflection on the limits of art and life, on the sources of artistic creativity and the

search for spirituality, became an inspiration for artists in every corner of the globe. He was one of the great reformers of 20th Century theatre.

This city has had an exceptionally tragic and unusual history as its legacy of the Second World War. Festung Breslau was Nazi Germany's last stronghold defending itself to the bitter end.

The insane, totalitarian regime, that had an entire central quarter razed to make way for a military airport, drove its inhabitants to disaster by forcing them to flee or be resettled on the basis of the Yalta Agreements. And the ruins of Wrocław were subsequently to receive other displaced people, those from the East, trying to save themselves from the cruelty of another totalitarianism, a communist one this time, which they had already sampled in the East in the pre-war period.

The legacy of this city is complicated. It is a microcosm of Central Europe – a variety born of dramatic, often tragic circumstances which has now become a splendid leavening for culture, for its spiritual and intellectual substance.

*Ladies and Gentlemen,*

I have allowed myself this brief introduction, because I believe the specific nature of this space is important. For two days, we shall deliberate and be in places bearing a clear imprint of history. And, through this conference, the Council of Europe will write itself into the history of this city, just as this city will inscribe itself into the history of that greatly merited Organisation. I note with distinct satisfaction that it is Wrocław which will be linking up with the cultural renaissance of the Council of Europe, because that is how the goals we have set ourselves should be regarded.

The Wrocław Declaration should mark the start of a policy change on the part of the member States of the Council of Europe and various international organisations towards culture, education and sport. This, on the one hand, is so that they may become essential tools consolidating and expanding areas of democracy. On the other hand, it should enable democratic mechanisms to create, in those areas, opportunities for the widest possible participation in culture in the broadest sense of the word, with particular emphasis on youth activities.

By means of its legislative tools, the Council of Europe can define the fields and determine the terms of international cooperation in culture, education and sport. Above all, it can propagate programmes strengthening the Organisation's policies and defend culture, as well as sport and education, against the commercial aggression of the market's invisible hand.

The signing of the Wrocław Declaration also means our mutual obligation to protect cultural diversity, work towards eliminating divisions, promote human rights and make use of sport to benefit the health of all of society. Perhaps, most importantly, the Declaration clearly states that culture, education and sport should be tools providing equal development opportunities and relieving tensions so that Europe may become a safe and friendly place giving the possibility of a creative,



successful and dignified life for everyone, so that it might become a better Europe than that in which historical insanity and cruelty were possible.

I welcome you to Wrocław most cordially and I hope you will experience a feeling of the great sense of this Conference in the course of its deliberations.

### **3 – Mr Miroslav SAWICKI, Minister of National Education and Sport of Poland**

*Secretary General, Ladies and Gentlemen,*

It gives me great pleasure to be one of the hosts of such an important event as the European Conference organised to mark the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the European Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe, which is, at the same time, one of the key features of the programme of the Chairmanship of the Republic of Poland in the Council of Europe.

I am convinced that the discussions of the ministers of both culture and education will contribute to the tightening of our co-operation in the future.

Fifty years ago, it was difficult to predict how great the significance of the *European Cultural Convention* (signed in Paris on 19 December 1954 by 14 Member States) would be for co-operation in the field of education, culture, heritage, youth and the development of sport.

Reference in the Convention to the common cultural heritage of Europe turned out to be a valuable basis for the gradually developing co-operation in the fields of education, youth and sport. This also formed the basis for close co-operation with the cultural area.

The goals set by the European Cultural Convention almost 50 years ago still remain valid if we take into consideration the challenges that our societies are facing: the saving of European culture, the preservation of our own identity while respecting dissimilarity, the promotion of education and studies on languages, history, civilisation, which still remains the best response to nationalism and lack of tolerance. The articles of the Convention are flexible and may be applied to many different initiatives. Although, in principle, this is a document signed by different governments, it remains entirely open for the activities of other institutions: NGOs, universities or sports organisations. From the moment it entered into force, the European Cultural Convention constitutes the foundation for the creation of many other international instruments such as the European Youth Centres or the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz (Austria). It seems justified to reconsider the possibility of the creation of the European Centre of Citizenship through Education.

Although it is convened to mark the 50th Anniversary, our meeting is primarily a starting point for further initiatives aimed at the co-operation in the field of culture, education, youth and sport in Europe. Today, this co-operation concerns 48 governments, but it is also conducted through the Parliamentary Assembly, the

Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and a considerable number of NGOs. It is important that the Council of Europe is a tool of integration and supports all these forms of co-operation.

In education, the role of the Council of Europe consisting in integrating formal and informal education is particularly important. The subjects in which the Council is interested and the initiatives undertaken cover both the operation of school systems and youth organisations and support for various exchange and co-operation programmes.

The success in the promotion of citizenship through education and education for human rights is a major achievement of the Council of Europe. The declaration by the Council of Europe of 2005 as the European Year of Citizenship through Education gives rise to new challenges and opens up new prospects in order to highlight the key role of education in promoting human rights, creating civic attitudes and building democratic societies. Member States of the Council of Europe have actively participated in the organization of the European Year of Citizenship through Education through the formation of National Committees which will be responsible for the organisation and preparation of the programmes to celebrate the Year as well as for initiating appropriate actions at the national level. It is with great pleasure that I inform you that I have set up such a committee in Poland.

Much was done to improve teacher training systems. As part of the In-Service Training Programme for Educational Staff, the Council of Europe organises annually several dozen seminars and training sessions devoted to selected topics attended by European educators. The seminars introduce their participants to the achievements of the Council of Europe in education, the educational policy pursued, they enable the exchange of experience, educational materials as well as help the dissemination of the knowledge gained in member States.

The Council of Europe did a lot to solve difficult problems related to researching and teaching the history of 20th century Europe. As for Poland, the programme entitled "The Reconstitution of the Memory of Poland" conducted under the aegis of the Council of Europe and aimed at collecting information about the sources for Polish history stored in foreign archives in a situation where a substantial part of the information in Poland was destroyed or stolen, is of particular importance.

Also the project "Teaching remembrance – Education for the prevention of crimes against humanity" started in 2001 is crucial. It originated in response to the text of the Declaration adopted during the 20th session of the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education (Kraków, 2000), in which European Education Ministers undertook to introduce a Holocaust Remembrance Day and which is also a day of prevention of the crimes against humanity. The selection of the day is made taking account of the history of each of the member States. In Poland, given the events from the history of the Second World War, 19 April, the date of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, was chosen as the date for commemorating the Remembrance Day in schools in our country.



Moreover, within the framework of the Programme of the Chairmanship of the Republic of Poland in the Council of Europe, the Ministry of National Education and Sport will organise in Poland in May 2005 a seminar for European Ministers of Education of the Council of Europe devoted to "Teaching Remembrance through Cultural Heritage" in co-operation with the Council of Europe (as part of the above-mentioned project). The participation by European Ministers of Education in the March of the Living organised in Auschwitz on 5 May 2005 will be a key event in the programme of the seminar.

The Council of Europe attaches special attention to the development of language policy stressing the varied nature and language diversity in member States as well to the promotion of the idea of multilingualism. One should underline the achievements of the European Year of Languages (2001), the European Language Portfolio which is being realised at present and the Common European Framework of Reference.

Of paramount importance for building European awareness in pupils, teachers and parents, and thus in whole societies, is a European school contest – "Europe at School", which has been organised for more than 50 years under the aegis of the Council of Europe. The contestants, children and teenagers from almost all European countries, prepare and make works of art and literary works on a subject related to European issues.

The role of the Council of Europe in the shaping of co-operation in higher education in Europe has to be highlighted. The recognition of the autonomy of universities with the retention of the influence by the state on the scientific and educational policy best illustrate the actions undertaken by the Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research of the Council of Europe bringing together representatives of ministries and academic circles with equal rights. The system of co-operation in the recognition of diplomas and the programme supporting university management reforms completed recently were a real achievement. The European Cultural Convention was considered as the basis for the definition of the framework for the European Higher Education Area (under the Bologna Process) in the work undertaken to create this area by 2010.

*Ladies and Gentlemen,*

We have before us several months of discussions as to how to proceed further. Preparations are under way for the Third Summit of the Council of Europe which will be held in May 2005 in Warsaw. It is to be hoped that the heads of state and government will stress the significance of our co-operation for the future of Europe. I am convinced that, when we meet at the closing conference of the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention, we will be in a position to undertake with satisfaction a large number of new tasks.

Thank you very much for your attention.

## Plenary Session 1

### "Stocktaking of the Achievements over 50 years of the European Cultural Convention"

*Introduction by Mr Simon MUNDY, Director of the Centre for the Cultural Environment, King's College, London*

There were two events in 1954 of importance to some of us here today. I was born and the European Cultural Convention was signed. The two were not related but I mention the fact because I am truly the first generation to have spent all my life in a Europe where respect for language, history and civilisation was a matter not just of enlightened behaviour but of international treaty.

There have been moments in those 50 years when several Council of Europe States have fallen short of these obligations - but nothing like as short as they had in the previous 50. The Europe in which I have lived has had to adjust to competing ideologies, shifting borders, the plague and eventual elimination of totalitarian regimes, and economic reinvention on a scale that was often daunting. However, the fact that it has been dealt with in a spirit of increasing consensus and without recourse to general territorial war is, in a large part, thanks to the conventions of the Council of Europe with which the continent armed itself in the decade after the Second World War.

Where there has been more strife than peace, it has often been in those places where people have felt that precisely the values of respect for language, history and civilisation have been threatened - either by their own state authorities or by those of neighbouring countries. Europe has shifted from a continent that fought over dynastic control of territory, national machismo or trade to one where the most inflammatory issues have become attempts that are perceived to curb cultural expression and people's sense of belonging to a society in which they feel at home.

Whether it has been in Ireland, Spain, the Balkans, Eastern Europe and now the Caucasus, it has been the failure of agreement over whose version of history deserves respect, whose language is heard most, and who held the keys to civilisation that has become the cause for turmoil. Culture is not the stuff of entertainment. It has the power to ferment societies to irrational fury. Yet, without a collective view of culture, it is very hard for societies or nations to retain the loyalty and engagement of citizens.

The Cultural Convention has not been, in truth, the most highly visible of the Council of Europe's conventions. It has, after all, only five substantive articles. Yet these few sentences give scope for a huge range of activities and initiatives. They



ask member States to safeguard and develop their own national cultural life – not as a matter of national self-congratulation but as a “contribution to the common cultural heritage of Europe”.

This is as effective a way as any of saying that all cultures in Europe – the diversity which we now stress so strongly – are of fundamental value to the whole. Belittle one region or nation’s ability to maintain its cultural momentum and you diminish the quality as well as the quantity of European culture. Equally, attempts to play the national interest off against the European miss the point entirely. National cultures will not be served in the long term by taking away the European dimension. Instead, it is the international recognition and connection that adds value to a national resource. Nobody wants to belong to a backwater culture. Every country and community wants to see its heritage, language and artistry as globally relevant.

The Convention also expects States to protect and provide access to the cultural heritage of Europe under their national control. Adherence to this has often been less than perfect, which is a pity because it gives countries a perfect excuse to raise the standards of their heritage conservation and presentation to the highest levels.

The Convention asks for the study of other people’s languages and requires States to grant facilities to others to study on their territory. Studying is a theme that is far stronger in the Convention than one might have expected from a 1950s document on culture. However, it is from here that much of the Council of Europe’s subsequent work in education stems; the advice on curriculum design, balanced history teaching, teacher training and standards.

There is, crucially, a call on States to “promote cultural activity of European interest”. This, I would suggest, does not mean some form of Euroculture that a number of ministers seem to be frightened will swamp them if any finance is put into backing the provisions for cultural engagement. Rather, it enjoins Council of Europe members to view their own culture as automatically of interest to others in Europe and to support it accordingly. It assumes that the national cultural operators will want to circulate and cooperate and that such intercultural competence is by its nature worthy of support from national governments.

Article 4 calls on States to make this possible by facilitating the movement of persons as well as objects. In other words, there are no good reasons for refusing visas to people who are legitimately of cultural interest from performing in other Council of Europe States; a commitment that many countries conveniently forgot during the years of the Cold War and have not always been over eager to honour since. It also validates the schemes for encouraging the mobility of artists and of their work.

The European Cultural Convention, in truth, pre-empts many of the Treaty of Maastricht provisions of the European Union by nearly 40 years. It is strange, therefore, that so many countries have felt so wary of committing resources of any significance to fulfilling the spirit of their obligations.

However, there have been many positive results too. It is doubtful whether the European Broadcasting Union's public service radio stations would now be swapping up to 25,000 hours of music each year if they did not have the philosophical backing of the Convention.

Nor would the massive growth of festivals - clearly one of the most effective tools for demonstrating cultural vitality that is of European as well as national interest - have been so explosive if organisations such as the European Festivals Association had not been encouraged in their early years.

Indeed, the Council of Europe was closely engaged in encouraging the start and sustainability of cultural networks in Europe long before the European Parliament ever became involved. This support has dried up in recent years, though, as money has become less available. The result has been that the Council of Europe itself has been less visible to (and less regarded by) those active as cultural professionals and entrepreneurs. It is an issue, particularly with regard to strengthening the civil society base of cultural life in the east and in the Mediterranean, that the ministers might like to reconsider in the coming years.

In this context, it is worth taking a moment to ask how the Convention could be strengthened or updated, particularly since some ministers are now calling for a European Union Cultural Charter. This reflects the evolution of debates about cultural rights as an extension of general human rights, an issue that is both controversial and complicated since cultural rights, if defined too broadly, could clash with the individual basis of human rights. There are good reasons, though, for asserting the rights to freedom of expression, non-discrimination and education in a specifically cultural context. In a continent where alienation is seen as one of the greatest barriers both to security and to economic achievement, formally recognising such freedoms could increase people's sense of value.

The right to an education in which culture is central would do much to underpin the efforts of those who look for history to be taught with an open and unjingoistic curriculum. Music, poetry and the other arts, so essential to Europe's creative competitiveness, would be given the backing of a stronger legal instrument for guaranteeing their place in schools. This could be expressed as the right of people in Europe to have an education that prepares them effectively for the cultural opportunities which they are offered in the rest of their life.

Because cultural issues are deep-seated but long-term and do not often emerge as socially threatening until there is some other catalyst, there is a danger that they are seen as secondary to economic or welfare issues. As a consequence, Ministers of Culture often have a lowly position in the political food chain, and those who are engaged in the business of culture are regarded as ephemeral or elitist. In fact, the proper management of culture in its widest sense has an impact on every sphere of governance. Culture is not just for Culture Ministers. It underpins national, local and personal self-confidence, it defines us to the rest of the world, it secures the social memory, it creates economic dynamism, it removes the excuses



for conflict, and it enhances the ability to go beyond tolerance to a position of generous engagement with other people.

In 1954, Europe was struggling to rebuild itself physically and psychologically. If a Cultural Convention was seen as one of the essential building blocks of that process then, surely the Convention has to be regarded with more than affection now. It must give us the argument for treating our cultures seriously, investing in their future as well as the record of their past. It is actually a matter of social health. A society with no regard for its culture will be sick in many ways. Just as music can improve people's chances of leaving hospital quickly, so a strong cultural policy for Council of Europe States can improve our chances of surviving the next 50 years with a degree of pride. There is no reason to suppose that the Baroque or the Renaissance, or the classical period were the only high points of European culture. There is no reason why the first half of the 21st Century, by using the inevitable tensions creatively, cannot have just as much to say to the future, and say it just as well.

### **General discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport**

#### **1) Mr. Henry Ingberg, Secretary General of the Ministry of the French Community of Belgium**

The European Cultural Convention was a foretaste of the greater Europe to come. It opened people's minds to European cultures and to co-operation long before economic and commercial forces smoothed away the borders; long before the great political wall that divided Europe was broken down, paving the way for democracy.

The Council of Europe simultaneously illustrated the vital role of both culture and Human Rights as fundamental ingredients of a European vision.

To fully appreciate the Cultural Convention's contribution, one must look at it from a triple perspective, appreciating its current achievements in the light of past events and future expectations.

The Council of Europe is an intergovernmental, non-supranational authority, except – and the exception is significant and decisive – where human rights are concerned. Its intergovernmental status is an asset but also a weakness.

A weakness because the Organisation cannot impose binding rules on states. A weakness also because of the small size of its own budgetary resources.

An asset too, however, because co-operation inevitably breeds respect for the identities that make up the fabric of cultural diversity. And also because the progress made is the result of determined commitment.

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

The work done in the framework of the European Cultural Convention has been based mainly on the emergence of new ideas and concepts. Innovation has always been a springboard for initiatives and projects.

Throughout the history of the Cultural Convention, a new vocabulary has emerged, and the resulting terminological advances have helped to turn a series of ill-defined trends into lines of force.

Thanks to the Council of Europe, new cultural phenomena have been described, often in pairs, with energy flowing between the poles to produce rapid developments:

- cultural animation / continuing education;
- cultural democratisation / cultural democracy;
- cultural industries / artistic creation;
- communication / culture.

I would like to dwell on the last two themes, comparing the creative and artistic dimension with the phenomenon of mass culture represented by the cultural industries and the new communication technologies. A lot of work and thought was put into these topics from the beginning of the 1980's to 1995.

What is fascinating about these approaches is that they hover on the fringes of culture, economics and politics. This forces us to open our eyes to developments in these other sectors. Culture is not chemically pure. It is combined with other areas of organisation of life in society. This also sheds a new light on the traditional relationship between public authorities and culture.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

For this reflection to be productive, it is essential to pool the opinions of all those who are directly involved. This is why projects on the subject depended on bringing together the different categories of participants:

- public authority representatives (the Council of Europe's usual method);
- representatives of the arts;
- representatives of cultural businesses and industries;
- representatives of the various audiences (a more "active" term than consumers).

This four-way dialogue has led to new thoughts and avenues to be explored. It is a method worth using again and again. Even the European Union is using it more and more. Various organisations, including Eurovisioni, for example, have informally based their organisational structure and *modus operandi* on it.

"The development of the cultural industries is clearly leading to increasing overlapping of the different sectors. State intervention in a particular sector can therefore have repercussions – positive or negative – on other areas as the cultural industries function as a global whole."...



"... However, in order to foster the development of creativity in Europe, action by the public authorities alone is insufficient. It is advisable, moreover, to encourage direct cooperation between radio and television companies and cultural industries... and provide for collaboration with live performance entertainment businesses."...

"The emphasis ["is placed"] on new means of public authority participation which make it possible to act on the economy and culture at the same time (legislative and fiscal measures, economic support... in aid of creativity, the safeguarding of identities and diversity of expression)."

These highly pertinent texts are 20 years old. They are extracts from the final report of the conference in the Hague in October 1986, concluding the four-year project on "Promoting creativity in the face of the development of the cultural industries", from 1982-1986. It was preceded by an exploratory conference on the role of the state vis-à-vis the cultural industries, organised by the Council of Europe in 1980.

The research done in this framework made it possible to go beyond the traditional boundaries of public intervention in the cultural field and take the sweeping changes brought about by the mass dissemination of culture and its effects on mass consumption into consideration.

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

The other symbolic project on the interference between economics, politics and culture was the one on "Culture and Communication", carried out from 1993-1995. Here, the focus was on the development of the media and their growing influence on cultural models and conceptions, particularly in the youth field.

Once again, the four-way "public authorities / artists / media / audiences" interaction was brought into play.

It highlighted such phenomena as:

- the new media;
- free radio and television, paving the way for private radio and television and ending the public service broadcasting monopoly
- television and radio broadcasting companies' cultural policies (these are extraordinary instruments of acculturation, where turnover or audience ratings are not the only considerations. For the first time, a list of qualitative assessment criteria was drawn up);
- the role of regional press and television companies, in conjunction with the development of Europe's regions, was one of the themes of a symposium held in Krakow in 1993. All too often, we have a tendency to forget the press and give all our attention to broadcasting. Yet newspapers are vital vectors of cultural identity;
- the media and minority cultural expression ... when you add them all together, minority groups can outnumber the majority.

Today, this work should continue with the analysis of modern phenomena such as reality television and its ambiguous juggling between surveillance and fiction...

\*  
\*   \*   \*

The Council of Europe has been instrumental in all these advances. They have provided so many openings, so many possibilities of setting up ideas and action networks, and so many ideas for innovative public authority action in the cultural field. If all these efforts are to bear fruit, the achievements of the past must not be wasted. The Council of Europe has built up a real cultural capital which must be reviewed and updated regularly. Practical projects and actions have also been implemented, guaranteeing a positive long-term approach. One example is the *Eurimages Fund*, which supports co-production in all its member States. In another register, the Convention on Transfrontier Television preceded the European Union Directive, which incorporated many of its provisions directly.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

Current thinking about cultural diversity must take into account the interaction between culture and the economy. This comparison is the key to the whole debate on the future of European culture. It is present in UNESCO's draft Convention on cultural diversity. The Council of Europe has made its position on this subject clear for a number of years. The idea is not to be bound hand and foot by the World Trade Organisation's general rules, which govern market mechanisms only, with the risk that cultural goods and services will be swallowed up along with the rest. If that is allowed to happen, all the ethical and symbolic dimension of culture would be eclipsed by purely commercial concerns. This is where it is important to remember that Culture and Human Rights are two of the fundamental concerns of the Council of Europe, which has laid the foundations of a Europe turned resolutely towards the future.

Contradictions between economic rules and cultural rules also exist in the European Union. Admittedly, the Union advocated excluding culture and the audiovisual sector from the World Trade Organisation's sphere of action. But the same difficulties and tensions are found in European Union law. Freedom of competition is clearly embodied in the texts and remains an essential feature of European market and European Union organisation.

On the other hand, culture is mentioned in the texts – including the new European Constitution – but only in a minor and incidental manner.

Article 151 of the current Treaty, for example, still provides for the possibility for Europe to interfere in cultural affairs provided that culture is considered in a non-commercial light. This constantly hinders the taking of any initiatives that combine cultural and economic measures to foster the role of the cultural industries.

Furthermore, all the public subsidies granted to culture or broadcasting are open to criticism at any time for being contrary to the laws governing competition. Even



though the European Union adopted a protocol in Amsterdam to provide a framework for public service broadcasting, the legitimacy of the public funds involved is regularly challenged. The same applies to the film sector.

To date, it has been possible to moderate or suspend the application of these rules, but without reducing the weight of commercial rules and regulations on the cultural sector.

Needless to say, culture and, in particular, broadcasting also occupy a major place on the international export market, so it is not hard to understand the importance of this sector among others in global trade balances. Having said this, however, we must not forget the collective expression and artistic creation dimension which the draft UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity aims to defend.

The telecommunications sector, on the other hand, has been fully integrated into the rules of international trade. Public service telecommunications providers have been eliminated one after the other. Public subsidies are proscribed.

Now, however, digital broadcasting techniques are encouraging the use of the same networks for carrying messages, programmes and creative works. Clearly, therefore, there is a logical temptation to lump everything together and apply the same rules to communication in general as are applied to telecommunications, so that the same rules govern the whole market.

The new "Telecomvision" business, however, must maintain the distinction between interpersonal communication, where confidentiality is called for, and programmes available to all or part of the general public, which fall into the broadcasting category and consequently under the specific rules that govern it. Once again, technical, legal and economic considerations must not be allowed to eclipse the cultural dimension of broadcasting.

This is an area where the Council of Europe could open up new horizons reflecting the philosophy behind the European Cultural Convention and the ethical dimension of human rights.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

It is our conviction that the Council of Europe's Cultural Convention, which could soon lead to the UNESCO Convention on cultural diversity, represents a major advance. First and foremost, however, it was a reaction to the threat of public cultural policies being flattened by the steamroller of economic and trade regulations.

Defending the status quo is not enough, however. Culture is in a perpetual state of flux. This is why increasing exchanges, defending freedom of expression and creation and setting up overlapping networks for exchanging and pooling cultural projects can and must open up a new horizon for action in this field.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

The introductory document to this Conference rightly highlights *"the need to balance the known failures of the market mechanisms, ensuring equity between citizens and social groups and access by all to the cultural resources required for personal freedom and human development. This requires the responsibility of European governments in legislation and co-financing of major initiatives in the four sectors, as well as strengthening their role in standard-setting and policy cooperation on regulatory functions to secure the public sphere, equal rights and equal conditions for participatory citizenship"*.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

In conclusion, the next 10 years of the European Cultural Convention will be able to develop "Cultural Convergence". Culture must assume its responsibilities, not as something marginal, or confined to its own enclosed space, but as something that touches on other sectors of development in our societies.

We must literally proceed by "cultural contagion". Defend a "cultural infusion" that pervades public policies but also the operators and the public themselves. An "infusion" rather than a "perfusion", which would imply that Europe's culture was sick.

With cultural diversity, cultural co-operation makes it possible for us to invent and imagine together the cultures of the future. Not to take over from national or regional cultures, but to work on new projects based on them.

## 2) Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE,

I. When, as a young member of the Bundestag, I became a member of the Consultative Assembly (later the Parliamentary Assembly) of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg in 1973, I knew a little about cultural policy in my country but was not yet aware that there had long been something like a framework agreement on European culture and cultural policy, namely the European Cultural Convention. At that time, this convention was much less well-known among West Europeans than the European Convention on Human Rights, which was four years older. I soon discovered that that was unreasonable. It had the potential, even in the 1970s, to become the leitmotif and repository of ideas for a common European cultural policy. More than that, together with other Council of Europe texts, it provided an impetus for changes in national cultural policy, especially in the Federal Republic. Soon we were speaking of a "New Cultural Policy" in Germany.

II. At that time, the Council of Europe was the most important cultural-policy body both in and for Europe. The Council's Statute itself sounded full of promise as regards European policy, especially in connection with the safeguarding of human rights, but also as regards culture and cultural policy, which became my special subject in Europe. The Council's Statute states that "(the) devotion to the spiritual and moral values which are the common heritage of (the European) peoples (necessitates) the further realisation of these ideals (among the countries of Europe by setting up) a Council of Europe". This is more than a mere declaration of intent.



This aim should ultimately be achieved by "common action in economic, social, cultural (and) scientific matters". We are all aware that this economic and social goal was soon (with the 1957 Treaty of Rome) to become the main task of the EEC. In Strasbourg, "culture" thus developed as a central task alongside the safeguarding of human rights.

III. The Council of Europe became an organisation that had a considerable influence on the development of cultural policy in Western Europe (and had some impact in Central and Eastern Europe too). However, cultural policy did not become a priority until the signing of the European Cultural Convention in 1954.

In order to safeguard and promote the "common heritage", this Convention was established as an instrument of cultural and cultural policy co-operation, thus initiating a unique European success story of cultural co-operation: just as the Council of Europe's Convention on Human Rights of 1950 became more and more widely established in the minds of Europeans, so the European Cultural Convention became for decades the authoritative text for common European thinking and cultural action for creative artists and overall cultural policy.

Without culture as a link between Eastern and Western Europe, it would be hard to imagine the political reunification of the two parts of Europe after 1989. Indeed, the substance of the Convention on Human Rights and the European Cultural Convention was incorporated into the conclusions of the CSCE's symposium on the cultural heritage held in Cracow in 1991, an event to which the Council of Europe's contribution was crucial.

The document refers to the participating states' "deeply held conviction that they share common values forged by history and based, *inter alia*, on respect for the individual, freedom of conscience, religion or belief, freedom of expression, recognition of the importance of spiritual and cultural values ... and openness to dialogue with other cultures". It is the spirit of the Council of Europe, as expressed by both conventions, that should stand here as an example for the new, greater Europe.

I have moved quite a way forward in detailing the history of the impact of the Convention – it could also be mentioned that the reference in the 1992 Treaty of Maastricht to the "preservation of the diversity of cultures and Europe's common heritage" was ultimately inspired by the Council of Europe, but I should now like to take stock by looking back.

IV. Many critics point out that the European Cultural Convention, with its conservative concept of culture based on the heritage of an advanced civilisation, was already no longer sufficient in the 1960s to respond to the cultural reality. There is probably some truth in this but it does not reflect the overall trend. In the 1970s, the Council of Europe was certainly able to become something like Europe's intellectual workshop for looking to the future – both in spite of and thanks to the European Cultural Convention !

Finally, in the Committee of Cultural Experts (to use the term used in the European Cultural Convention – its name has repeatedly been changed right up to the present day), a permanent rethinking and redefining process has taken place. I would

remind you, for example, of the (famous) meeting of experts held in the French town of Arc-et-Senans in 1972 on "The Future of Cultural Development", to which the Council of Europe invited a group of experts from various disciplines. There, for the first time, and based on sound arguments, the traditional concept of culture was extended and brought into line with the new social task of cultural policy: "The underlying purpose of any cultural policy is to bring all possible means to bear to develop ways and means of expression and to ensure complete freedom in their use". This document went on to make a decisive statement and proclaim programmatic principles that are valid today more than ever before: "The aim of cultural action, then, is to permit the re-thinking of society along different lines and to promote in each individual a sense of responsibility for its possible development (and) enable him to face up to the crisis"; "Any cultural policy implies an ethical dimension".

These are core sentences in a socially oriented cultural policy matching the spirit – but not exactly the precise wording – of the European Cultural Convention and marking a historic move towards a forward-looking European cultural policy of the kind which was given exemplary confirmation by the Ministers of Culture of the Council of Europe's then member States four years later in Oslo, and embodied in many later resolutions, especially those on Europe's cultural heritage. Concerning "principles for cultural policy", the culture ministers stated in 1976: "Policy for society as a whole should have a cultural dimension stressing the development of human values, equality, democracy and the improvement of the human condition ..." and "Cultural policy can no longer limit itself exclusively to taking measures for the development, promotion and popularisation of the arts; an additional dimension is now needed which, by recognising the plurality of our societies, reinforces respect for individual dignity, spiritual values and the rights of minority groups and their cultural expressions".

V. An attempt was made in the late 1970s to take account of this realisation (new proposal for the extended cultural concept of "cultural democracy") by revising the European Cultural Convention of 1954 but was then rejected by the ministers, in particular because of the sensitivities arising from the German federal system. Thirty years after the adoption of the European Cultural Convention in Paris, culture ministers contented themselves with the European Declaration on Cultural Objectives (Berlin, 1984), in which – entirely in keeping with the western position – they stated that "the significant role of culture and those values which give purpose to the existence and actions of mankind" are based on the "dedication (of the European cultures) to freedom and human rights and that the "very diversity (of ways of life) provides the cultural richness which is the basis of progress towards European unity". Today, the "Greater Europe" needs, more urgently than ever in the last few decades, common basic principles and criteria for European cultural policy. This is also, and especially, necessary in the context of a self-confident European Union that has in the meantime been given a cultural policy mandate.

To be sure, the Council of Europe is collaborating on drawing up a UNESCO Convention on the protection of the diversity of cultural content and artistic expression. This is a good thing, and we are all working as best we can on this in our national bodies.



We are concerned to ensure the rejection of neo-liberal economic interests, as represented in particular by the USA, which has rejoined UNESCO. Even if we succeed in this endeavour, this will not absolve the Council of Europe from the task of drawing up its own "Charter" of common cultural principles for the "Greater Europe" of its more than 900 million citizens.

I am sure that the principle set out in the 1972 Arc-et-Senans Declaration will then apply: "Any cultural policy implies an ethical dimension".

**3) Mr César BIRZEA, Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee  
for Education and Director of of the Institute of Education, Bucharest**

*The Cultural Convention and co-operation in education*

For half a century, the European Cultural Convention has provided a versatile policy framework enabling the Council of Europe to take an interest in all fields of activity except defence.

As far as education is concerned, the Council of Europe's activities have evolved with Europe and the societies that form it. Briefly, they can be broken down into four phases:

- The reconciliation of the 1950s and 60s, when cultural co-operation was relaunched based on the Organisation's three fundamental values: human rights, pluralist democracy and the rule of law;
- The extension of human rights to include cultural and social rights;
- The gradual enlargement of the 1990s, with the result that, for the first time in its history, Europe adopted the same political system, ie pluralist democracy (a fact officially acknowledged at the First Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe, Vienna, October 1993);
- Opening up to the world, in the context of globalisation (from the turn of the century).

Whatever their priorities and content, the activities carried out during these four phases were organised around five main themes:

- education policies and reforms;
- education for democratic citizenship;
- modern languages;
- history teaching;
- intercultural education.

At present, the Council of Europe is a major player on the European education scene. Compared with other European institutions and organisations, the Council of Europe has its own educational identity, which stems from its political mission and takes its inspiration from the European Cultural Convention. This educational identity is based on the following principles:

- a) Considering education, culture and social which could be described in a single term, the culture of democracy. Education is not considered in its own right, but as the foundation of the human condition. In this broader vision, our aim is not only to make teaching more effective, rather, it is a project for society in

which education is the fulcrum. More specifically, our efforts do not focus solely on teaching methods and content but on "empowerment", ie training competent, aware individuals capable of acting as citizens, learners, members of a family, creators and consumers of culture.

- b) "Lifelong learning" is the main paradigm of the educational community. Today, all the European institutions and organisations consider lifelong learning as an essential reference:
- UNESCO has linked lifelong learning to development policy;
  - The OECD has added the idea of equity ("LLL for all");
  - The European Union has included lifelong learning in the grand "knowledge society" project.

However, very few people today remember that it was the Council of Europe that launched the concept of "lifelong learning" in 1964, with the Bernard Schwartz report, and that the concept was subsequently thrown open to the world by UNESCO in 1971 in the Faure report.

- c) Considering the right to education as a generic right. The right to education has its own special status:
- it is a compound right, a right that implies other specific rights (eg the right to basic education, to choice of educational establishment, to quality services, to official recognition of diplomas, to social assistance, etc);
  - it is an "enabling right", opening the way to other fundamental rights, such as the right to work, to identity and to decent living conditions.

As a result, the right to education lies at the heart of the human rights edifice which the Council of Europe defends.

- d) Placing emphasis on education in values. The Council of Europe's political objectives are defined in terms of values, particularly the three fundamental values that mark the Organisation's identity. Accordingly, all its activities in education explicitly support appropriate values and learning situations. They are not neutral from the axiological viewpoint, but strongly committed to a societal project, namely democratic society.

Strengthening the European dimension of education. The progress made in this respect (a "European" touch added to national education systems) exemplifies the Council of Europe's progressive commitment in education. The initial stage, in the 1980s, consisted of education in Europe (based on the idea that we all belong to the same cultural space). This was superseded in the 1990s by education "about" Europe, with curricula including European studies and specialised subjects. The new, more complex challenge consists in providing education "for" Europe. The idea is to build European citizenship, based on a broader sense of identity than the strictly legal approach proposed in Article 8 of the Treaty of Maastricht. It is our conviction that this education for Europe is the key to the implementation of the European Cultural Convention in the new European context.



4) Ms Krisztina GONTER,  
Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee for the Development of Sport

What does sport give to Europe?

First of all, I would like to say that it is a great pleasure for me to be here in Wrocław, and I would like to thank our Polish friends and hosts for their warm hospitality and excellent welcome.

Before going to the point, it is wonderful to be here and to speak about sport in Poland, a country where a minister of sport became President of the Republic. Because I come from Hungary, where, just two months ago, the Hungarian Minister of Sport, Mr Gyurcsány, became Prime Minister, that is what we could call the positive impact of sport.

But turning to more serious issues, I have come here to speak to you on behalf of a very special member of this great and wonderful family of European culture that is to say sport.

Sometimes, when speaking about sport with people working in education or culture in the strictly traditional sense, I have the impression that, as happens in life with special individuals, people frequently do not recognise the full importance and meaning which they represent for the whole community.

Sport is a little bit like that, it is a somewhat special and important element for the world of education, culture, heritage, youth and sport in Europe.

I would like to read to you the words of Ms Maud de Boer-Buquicchio, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe. Here is what she said in Budapest, at the 10th Conference of European Ministers responsible for Sport (14 October 2004):

*"Sport is not on the 'side-lines' in the Council of Europe, but at the very centre of our interest. With its natural values of respect, mutual understanding and fair play, sport is an excellent means to promote the goals of our pan-European Organisation for the better future of our citizens".*

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let me say a few words about the values of Sport for Europe.

We all know that 2004 was the year of the Olympic and Paralympic Games, and both are a spectacular and glorious manifestation of sport. I must say that the Olympic Games are part of the common European cultural heritage: they were born in Ancient Greece and re-born in modern Greece thanks to the efforts of a Frenchman. All the founding members of the International Olympic Committee were Europeans.

In 2004, thanks to the media, we were able to enjoy wonderful images from Athens, showing positive values such as success, competition, and fair play. Success and brilliance at this level of sport are of great interest to the public, and especially

young people who, in our times, badly need role models and positive examples of behaviour. Many researchers agree that sport can help people, particularly young people, fight the feeling of emptiness, lack of identity, which are among the greatest challenges faced by society at the present time. This an undeniable social and cultural value of sport which should never be underestimated.

In 1992, the European Ministers of Sport adopted the European Sports Charter which defines the idea of sport accepted and promoted by the Council of Europe. People working in governmental and non-governmental sports' organisations are aware that sport is much more than what is shown to us by everyday media. Sport is much more than winning medals, more than cases of doping, more than big business, more than violence and racism in the stadia or the millionaire football players seen on television.

Sport is a way to educate young people to learn about rules and governance, and, in this sense, sport can be considered as a school for democracy. Sport helps to transmit positive values and attitudes to people facing such problems as disability, social marginalisation, or the consequences of human or natural catastrophes.

We must not forget that sport is one of the biggest leisure activities in Europe, and it is second only to tourism in generating mobility in Europe.

After these theoretical points, I would now like to turn to some of the activities realised under the auspices of the Council of Europe.

I have previously mentioned the European Sports Charter which is a basic tool for policymakers throughout Europe.

There are also two European Conventions signed by a considerable number of countries:

- the Anti-Doping Convention (ETS135) ;
- the Convention against spectator violence and misbehaviour at sports events and in particular at football matches (ETS120).

Both aim at setting up European standards in the fight against these negative phenomena.

One of the most important roles for the Council of Europe is to safeguard the unity of Europe, to act as a bridge between countries with different economic, political, social backgrounds.

In the area of sport, the Council of Europe supports different forms of training for sports leaders, such as seminars, summers schools, etc. This year, one was held in Moldova and another in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

An interesting element of the Council of Europe's work in sport is the programme "Ballons Rouges" : the organisation of sports camps for children facing the consequences of social or natural catastrophes. Experts have shown for a long time that



physical activity and play are essential in improving the well-being of people who are suffering.

Unfortunately, due to cuts in general financing, the Council of Europe's sports budget is not sufficient to cover the costs of these activities, so a special fund has been set up for voluntary contributions. Let me congratulate once more the governments of Switzerland, Sweden and Cyprus for being the first to offer voluntary extra funds to the "Ballons Rouges" and show us all an example of solidarity.

In 2004, in the framework of this programme, two children's sports camps were held: one in Azerbaijan for internally displaced young people of the Caucasian region and another in Belarus for children suffering from the effects of Chernobyl. These camps hopefully contributed to transmitting a positive message to all the children concerned as well as to all those who were informed about it. Playing a friendly football match or volleyball game based on rules recognised throughout the world: this really makes a bridge between people from different backgrounds.

A bridge between people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds is something that Europe needs more and more. The number and proportion of immigrants is increasing throughout Europe, and we must look at this phenomenon seriously, looking for solutions which allow dialogue and coexistence between different communities. Sport is one of these solutions.

Before finishing, I am convinced that, in Europe's future society, the role of NGOs is more and more important. Sport is an activity which is practised naturally through NGOs. That is why, for a long time, non-governmental sports organisations have been invited to participate in the work of the Steering Committee for the Development of Sport (CDDS), and the main topic of the last Conference of Ministers of Sport was good governance in sport including cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations. In this way, the experience of sport can be an important contribution to the overall work of the Council of Europe.

To conclude, when we look at the objectives of the Council of Europe in the Draft Wrocław Declaration, we can see that sport is in line with more than one of them. We can see the concepts of the common cultural heritage, mobility, cooperation, and, among the new objectives, we can see terms such as participation in democratic life, the European dimension in the standards as well as shared values, or the cooperation between governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope I have been able to give you a short but convincing idea of what sport really means and what it can bring to Europe and Europeans.

On behalf of the thousands of European sports clubs, associations, federations and individuals involved in sport, I would like also to express our hope and our wish that sport will keep and develop its place in the family of the Council of Europe's future activities based on the Wrocław Declaration.

Thank you for your attention.

5) Mr Peter LAURITZEN, Head of the Youth Department, Council of Europe  
30 years of youth work in the Council of Europe

*Introduction*

The youth field of the Council of Europe is composed of the following elements:

- the European Youth Centre, Strasbourg;
- the European Youth Centre, Budapest;
- the European Youth Foundation;
- the Solidarity Fund for young people;
- the Partial Agreement on the European Youth Card;
- Intergovernmental co-operation on youth (the Steering Committee for Youth); secretariat of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for youth;
- Partnership agreement with the European Commission on training, youth research and EUROMED co-operation;
- Young Political Leaders Programme;
- Programme of field activities in member countries;
- Programme of international youth policy reviews and youth policy advisory missions.

Youth is now part of DG IV and belongs to the Directorate of Youth and Sport. Its most important establishments, the Centres in Strasbourg and Budapest, and the Youth Foundation, are co-managed on a parity basis; i.e. their management body is a "Programming Committee" of eight governments and eight NGOs. The larger statutory construction is made up by the CDEJ, with 48 member governments and a 30 person Advisory Council made up exclusively of NGOs. Both meet twice a year as the "Joint Youth Council", a united body of both the CDEJ and the Advisory Council with the mandate to set work priorities and policy guidelines.

This co-management practice has existed since the beginning of operations in 1972 and is probably the longest lasting example of participatory democracy within a European organisation. That it has lasted this long is, maybe, not a strong argument, but it has continuously developed into an efficient system of social co-production between the intergovernmental sector and civil society. It has always been and still is an outstanding example of best practice in international youth work provision and youth policy delivery.

The recommendation to create a European Youth Centre was made as early as 1965 by the Parliamentary Assembly and it took seven years until this Centre, planned within the Committee of Out-Of-School Education, could leave its status as an "Experimental Youth Centre" behind and move into its premises in 1972. The architecture of the building, created by a Norwegian team, reflected the thinking of a "laboratory of experimental learning" (which is what the Centre was meant to be) of its time and was enthusiastically received by its users, mainly participants coming through International Non-governmental Youth Organisations (INGYOs).



The European Cultural Convention has always been a key text within the youth field and its States parties became the reference for membership in the CDEJ, but administratively "Youth" became a sector of its own, reporting directly to the Secretary General; i.e. it did not belong to the then Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport and its committees were not part of the Council for Cultural Cooperation (the CDCC).

This changed only recently with the creation of DG IV – Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, when the lost child returned, together with a 65 person staff highly diversified and a decentralised service.

So, what have we done under the European Cultural Convention over 30 years and how can we now best integrate into a joint approach to work with common objectives and complementary working methods?

(1) The dominating process concerning young people (and society at large) in the last 30 years has been modernisation. However, within the Council of Europe, the pace of modernisation is dramatically different in its member countries. When comparing Germany and Russia, or Armenia and the Netherlands, or Slovakia and Finland – what do such countries have in common with regard to the life situation of young people? Not much at first sight, and thus a coherent statement on young people concerning life trajectories, intergenerational aspects, economic and social status, the sense of belonging to a community, creative potential and access to opportunities can hardly be made throughout the member countries of the Council of Europe. It is not impossible, but it needs thinking about in different modernities and identifying outside common elements of development such as globalisation.

(2) This is different from the situation before 1989, when there were fairly comparable situations in many member countries with the exception of Turkey. At the time, trans-national categories describing the social and cultural situation of young people had emerged together with common youth agendas as well. Of course, national, regional and cultural differences existed and were even strongly underlined by youth councils and youth movements, but the codes of understanding were clear and so was the place of the Strasbourg-based youth institutions – a political forum, a training centre, a financial mechanism to back up youth NGOs in Europe, intergovernmental co-operation focusing particularly on youth mobility, a definition of Europe which was wide and inclusive, based on human rights, democracy, social cohesion and cultural difference.

(3) At that time (we are speaking of the 1980s), the minority issue – one of the permanent issues on the youth agenda from the outset – had not yet been so overshadowed by regional, ethnic and national interpretations as is the case today. Minorities defined themselves for example within gender, religion, physical and mental handicaps, sexual preference, social exclusion, life-styles and youth cultures; a good tradition of a transversal definition, which the field always tried to maintain against the aggressive definition of minorities as ethnic unities only.

(4) Also, until 1989, the concept of multipliers with regard to the participants of EYC and EYF activities remained unquestioned and so did the concept of membership-based association and the national or regional youth councils. These were considered to be the societal transmission belts of the results of individual learning processes within larger meetings, exchanges and field experiences of young people within Council of Europe activities. And this was also the answer to visibility – within the youth and social work "milieu", the Council of Europe was quite visible, with the effect of creating a long-lasting friendly climate around budget decisions in favour of young people.

(5) Achievements in the "before 1989 period" were:

(a) The strengthening of trans-national European youth structures through highly qualified study sessions, language and training courses, symposia and consultative meetings with youth experts (EYC); contributions of the EYF, both in terms of decentralised youth projects and administrative support, and the co-management feature.

(b) The political capital acquired in that period was probably, in the first place, the youth contribution toward overcoming the Cold War and the East/ West division of Europe. Numerous meetings related to the Helsinki Process, the first system of pan-European youth and student co-operation, the early inclusion of participants and youth representatives from Central and Eastern Europe in activities of the youth field, publications and research (Project 121, Joel Kottek's study on youth involvement in the Helsinki process) show the crucial contribution of the youth field to what would become a complete redefinition of Europe soon after. Other examples are the efforts to contribute to democratic youth work in post-fascist countries in the 1970s and the constant work on learning through examples of good practice in the different areas of youth activity. The youth field was an active partner in the North/South Campaign, which was the starting point for a whole series of Third World activities and it became, in the 1990s, the carrier of the Campaign against Racism, Anti-Semitism, Xenophobia and Intolerance (RAXI), an experience which in many ways is still not finished and leads today into the successful Human Rights Education Programme based on COMPASS. Forerunners to the campaign were the two Conferences on Intolerance 1981 and 1989 and the Youth Weeks of Strasbourg (1985) and Bratislava (1992), to be followed by the largest event of this type, European Youth Week in Strasbourg in 1995. It is important to underline that all these activities have been organised in co-operation with other Council of Europe departments, task forces and Directorates, some have even been supervised by the Deputy Secretary General and Private Office directly (RAXI, creation of the Budapest Centre, Intolerance Conferences) and all have been transversal activities, a pronounced policy of the Secretaries General Oreja and Lalumiere during their time in office.

(c) When placing these questions to decades, it could be said that the high time of political movements, and this was in no way restricted to party political movements, was in the 1970s. At that time, even the Christian Democrat and conservative



movements had subscribed to a preamble of the European Co-ordination Bureau of INGYOs, claiming that they would all work for "anti-capitalist and emancipatory" objectives; so this indeed was the decade of the left. This was followed, in the 1980s, by the dominance of social movements over the sector, again to be followed by a more heteroclite picture in the 1990s – educational and exchange movements and agencies, life-style movements, minority organisations, youth worker networks and youth culture organisations. However, throughout the 30 years, organisations such as the Scouts and Guides, 4H Clubs, YMCA and YWCA, EFIL and some other exchange organisations, religious youth and student organisations and party political youth organisations, to mention but a few, have kept a continuum of activity and commitment with regard to the youth field of the Council of Europe. It has not always been fair to call these partners "traditional", it was done to encourage the sector not to become a closed shop and constantly remain open to new members in the club. With hindsight, this has been good, as the area constantly welcomes new members and also loses movements, which have outlived themselves.

(d) The 1980s and 1990s served to build social and educational capital. The Youth field became the focal place for social and intercultural learning and developed highly professional standards for voluntary work, campaigning, training of youth workers, advocacy and lobbying and youth policy development.

(6) With the fall of the Berlin wall – the ultimate symbol for the breakdown of the Soviet empire and its ideology – the world changed dramatically, and not only in the East. The western countries, many of them governed by some form of "caring capitalism" with strong welfare state components and still defending values such as solidarity and equality, turned to a model of aggressive, globally organised neo-liberalism as if the fall of communism had also meant the end of their own social commitments. Meanwhile, this model has become a global reality; it is intolerant to any non-fiscal approach in governance, it promotes management objectives before political and ethical standards and it increasingly annihilates the old distinctions between market, public authority, public sphere and civil society – all is governed by the market, the real winner of the Cold War. For young people, the consequences of this development are known: increased individual competition; flexibility becomes the highest educational ideal; risky behaviour increases; violence, racism, sexism, suicide, idleness and social nihilism become high priority youth issues.

(7) For the youth field of the Council of Europe, united in the conviction "youth is a resource, not a problem", the picture painted above is unacceptable. The values of the Council of Europe such as the principles of equity and fairness, the social embedding of the economy and the democratic process, the obligation of public authority to ensure free education for all, to encourage healthy lifestyles, to build the capacity of civil society and the associative movement, to facilitate the entry into the labour market of young people and to care for children, young people, families and communities, finally to watch over a climate of tolerance and societal dialogue and guarantee the security of minorities remain incompletely intact –

these are achievements of the late 20th Century and late modernity which must not be sacrificed for profits, financial manoeuvres of a few and an economic concept of governance. This means that the youth field is not as politically neutral as many think. It belongs, in the largest sense, to the "counter reformation" (Bourdieu) as expressed in the global NGO movement of Prague, Seattle, Genoa and Porto Allegre. Other than in 1968, this is not a movement of a particular political orientation and it is not revolutionary in its objectives; it unites such different components as for example the Catholic Church and many world religious leaders and movements such as attac, Amnesty International and Greenpeace.

(8) The large event on "globalisation – how big is your world?" (Strasbourg, May 2004) has shown that the youth field is quite clearly positioned within the global discussions about a better distribution of resources, overcoming extreme poverty, combating racism, war, discrimination and violence by working on global education for human rights. The field is a production and knowledge centre of ideas concerning citizenship, identity, social responsibility, participation and educational reform. Its products consist of training, communication, networking, project development, social research and social action. It builds capacities whilst sticking to the values of the Council of Europe. About these, there is nothing old-fashioned; they seem to be the mainstream thinking of many young people today in all our member countries. This is, therefore, one important part of the mission statement of the youth field – it associates young people to Council of Europe values and spreads them effectively. The thinking is European and global at the same time and it is multi-polar, complex and committed.

(9) The links to this field in DGIV are cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and intercultural learning, non-formal education, the message of the European Year of Citizenship through Education, cultural and social cohesion and social interaction.

On the other hand, by its cross-cultural character, the field also deals with welfare and health policies, criminal justice issues, housing, urban spaces, employment and discrimination issues. This often creates a difference in approach; to make this difference recognisable and use it in a constructive manner will influence, whether the youth field is only administratively attached to DGIV or, as it should be, one of its strong pillars.



## Plenary Session 2

### "From Stocktaking to new challenges for Cultural exchange and Cooperation in Present-Day Europe"

*Introduction by Mr Miroslav SAWICKI, Minister of National Education and Sport of Poland*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are aware that over the last 50 years, both the Council of Europe and individual member States have had much success while undertaking actions resulting from the provisions of the European Cultural Convention.

Expressing satisfaction at the democratic changes taking place over the last decade in Central and Eastern Europe as well as the great progress made by Europe towards the enlargement of the common democratic area, human rights, peace and welfare, we know that these achievements are not final and they are exposed to risks. Therefore, education and cultural co-operation should play a key role in defending and reinforcing them.

Our co-operation has to face up to many challenges which we all have:

- the countries of Europe are becoming knowledge societies, while the rising unemployment carries the risk of marginalisation of whole groups in societies;
- new information and communication technologies offer a huge potential for cultural enrichment and lifelong learning while, at the same time, the risk of abuse, the disappearance of personal contacts and social exclusion become apparent;
- the traditions of tolerance and multiculturalism still dominate in Europe but a considerable number of citizens reject this direction of development turning to racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism adopting a strongly nationalistic attitude.

The quickening pace of economic and technological change is a testament to the increasing capabilities of individuals and governments, but the unpredictable direction of these changes is a source of anxiety and confusion constituting a challenge for the traditional role of education and culture.

When considering the new situation in Europe, we must take account of the global context of the changes and the impact of globalisation processes on our future actions.

In such circumstances, the Council of Europe will face new challenges in the coming years.



The harmonious shaping of the *European identity, cultural diversity* and social cohesion will primarily constitute a key challenge.

The European identity of culture and education is already present in many declarations and undertakings of the Council of Europe. However, we devote little attention to the implementation of common principles of democratic societies. Therefore, our continent is not free from conflicts, intolerance and breach of democratic freedoms. Joint action is necessary both in the area of education and culture for the benefit of a civil society. I believe that the ministers of culture and education gathered here should actively support the forthcoming European Year of Citizenship through Education.

Cultural diversity is a permanent value in the European heritage. While strengthening this diversity both in the area of culture and education, we must develop new forms of dialogue, exchange, mutual understanding and tolerance. The lifting of mobility barriers is important to meet this challenge.

Social cohesion is one of the fundamental goals in European politics. Culture and education should contribute to the shaping of social cohesion in a meaningful way.

The knowledge society and the society using new opportunities offered by information technologies skillfully (information society) constitute the next important challenges for culture and education. The acquisition of the skills to learn through one's whole life with particular attention to informal education is one of the most significant actions in this area.

Stable and sustainable development requires new actions in the area of education and culture, with the need for an integral approach to the environment and the cultural environment of a human being gaining more and more appreciation. It is with great interest that we acknowledged the work on the Framework Convention devoted to cultural heritage which will be a subject of this session.

While engaging in discussions about new challenges during the course of this Conference, we should aim at specific conclusions and initiatives addressed to the sphere of European policies (primarily to the participants of the Third Summit of the Council of Europe), European law (new conventions) as well as refer to our co-operation as ministers responsible for culture, education, young people and sport. The speeches by the invited experts and our discussions should aid the formulation of conclusions to be taken into account in the final declaration at the end of the Conference.

**1) Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE,**

*I. What binds Europe together?*

What is it that holds together the "core" of the greater Europe? The element that has reunited the continent since 1989, following a division lasting more than four

decades, is not the "internal market", "Economic and Monetary Union" or any merely geographical link but solely its common cultural heritage.

It is easy to say this and it has the ring of a fine-sounding political speech that is given one day and has little relevance the next when it comes to dealing with everyday life. This is no doubt true, but Europe is a combination of heritage and dynamism; it is a new beginning that keeps on repeating itself, a process that needs its intellectual and cultural players so that this continent – which stretches from Armenia through Poland to Portugal and from Palermo through Ljubljana to Bergen – acquires and maintains its character, importance and profile in the world.

Quite simply, what is required is the Council of Europe, which secures the common European legal and cultural area and does so on the basis of the Human Rights Convention and the Cultural Convention.

### *II. Does Europe need a player common to all in politico-cultural matters?*

In the "diversity of its cultures, languages and religions", Europe needs a common manifestation of its dynamic unity, because this unity does not come about naturally but is an ongoing endeavour, a process, to keep achieving a varied (not "harmonised") unity from diversity.

The bond is the value horizon of its culture, or, to be more precise, "cultural democracy" – to use the term introduced into the debate by the Council of Europe in the 1970s (I spoke about this this morning). This is the element our civil society needs in order to understand itself and so build Europe as "unity in diversity".

In order to organise this and constantly breathe new inspiration into it, what is needed is a set of elements and principles. In the past, which – at least in its best days – was always forward-looking, the Council of Europe pooled its experiences regarding a common cultural policy and proved its worth in its 45 member states. It is from its midst that a new politico-cultural agenda must be developed – and why not a new European Cultural Declaration?

### *III. Invitation to the Council of Europe*

The Council of Europe – what other institution? – must see itself once again as an organisation that embodies a common European cultural policy.

In contrast to the early days, there are enough concrete challenges facing the Council in a globalised and media-fixated world. I shall only mention those that, in my opinion, are the most urgent:

- Art: a new way of dealing with it and with artists in Europe. By this, I mean the promotion of art and, indeed, its interlinkage with cultural policy. The Council of Europe has always been a bastion for the defence of its independence, that is to say the conscious effort not to put art in the service of politics, society or social communities.



- Religion: the new challenge of which we are all aware – and which cannot be met without reference to Europe's common heritage of tolerance, humanism and enlightenment.
- Young people: one of the priorities is to deal with the major issue of their significant absence from European politics – with the exception of a few European programmes of youth meetings (we heard about them this morning).
- Media: political and cultural policy circles must use the new media, which have been changing the world for 50 years, to promote a new European Cultural Convention.

#### *IV. What could the Council of Europe's political priorities be?*

I have referred to the Council of Europe's proven experience in the broad area of common cultural policy. By this I mean, for example:

- The priorities it sets for the preservation of the architectural heritage. Who else can, for example, point to such a successful campaign as European Architectural Heritage Year 1975 – "A Future for our Past" – which was accompanied by a political and social awakening throughout western Europe, and especially in the Federal Republic of Germany? The framework agreement that has now been drawn up for the cultural heritage as a whole should be adopted soon – we need it!
- Its campaign for the old cultural paths, the care and rediscovery of Europe's cultural routes, culminating in the rediscovery of the species *Europaeus* and, finally, *homo viator*, the wayfarer.
- The 50-year-old tradition of the major European exhibitions organised by the Council right up to the present day: from Europe of Humanism (Brussels, 1955) and Trends of the Twenties (Berlin, 1977) to the Leonardo da Vinci exhibition (Florence, London, etc., 2005)

#### *V. Final remarks:*

A strong element of cultural policy in Europe today is monitoring its implementation and the establishment of something like an observatory, such as the one conceived by the European Cultural Foundation in Amsterdam, as well as the assumption of the overall charge of other networks.

The Council of Europe in Strasbourg does not have to organise everything but it should maintain – both vis-à-vis the European Union and the many NGOs – the intellectual leadership of cultural policy and provide cultural impetus for Europe.

This is not easy and it will not fall into our lap, but a framework must be established. I think there is no better framework than a cultural convention of the greater Europe. After all, the thought processes involved in drawing it up could result in giving Europe a soul of its own.

2) Mr Renaldas VAISBRODAS, President of the European Youth Forum

*The European Cultural Convention and the Youth Sector*

The celebration of the 50th anniversary of the European Cultural Convention comes at a time when Europe is defining its future; a Europe that will soon celebrate the 60th Anniversary of the Liberation from Nazism, a future that we want to be based on the shared values promoted by the Council of Europe, a future that we want without dividing walls and lines.

The debate on the future of Europe and the place of the Council of Europe in the European architecture is intensifying with the growing enlargement of the European Union. The European Cultural Convention, as the legal basis for the work of the Council of Europe in the areas of Education, Culture, Youth and Sport is one of the main instruments that led to the achievements of the Council of Europe in enhancing democracy and promoting Human Rights in Europe.

The legal basis, given by the European Cultural Convention to the international cooperation carried out by the Council of Europe's member States in the area of youth policy, led to the adoption of the document which brought together different stakeholders facing a common challenge to develop policies that would respond to the needs and aspirations of young people on the continent. It is important to emphasise that the Council of Europe was the first intergovernmental institution to take up this challenge in its policy areas. Youth policy remains more than ever a priority for international institutions in Europe and the Council of Europe is playing a crucial role in its promotion and effective implementation at all levels.

The key achievements in the youth sector are in line with the political objectives of the European Cultural Convention and the challenges for the future which we are discussing here in Wrocław.

The fact that youth was included as a major sector of cultural cooperation at European level is in itself an achievement, as it constitutes the legal basis for the work of the Council of Europe in the area of Youth.

I will not come back to a thorough description of the developments that took place (cf the presentation given by Peter Lauritzen during Plenary Session 1), but I would like to underline some of the great achievements of the youth sector totally in line with the objectives of cultural cooperation. But there are also areas in which further work needs to be done, to ensure the realisation of the Council of Europe's main objectives of creating a Europe without dividing lines :

- geographically; mobility ;
- no lines between European citizens.

*1. Mobility*

The area of cultural cooperation has enhanced the mobility of young people in Europe:



- 300,000 young people have been able to participate in programmes and meet each other ;
- the Youth Foundation, the Solidarity Fund for Youth Mobility, the Youth Card, the Youth Centres in Budapest and Strasbourg.

Most youth leaders took their first steps and received their first insights of European institutional architecture through their involvement in activities organised by the Youth Directorate in the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg. Meeting and exploring the variety of cultures, experiences and practices of youth work in the continent is an everyday reality for those who join the international youth movements.

The main challenges:

- a barrier-free Europe is one of the real challenges that the work on cultural cooperation needs to address.

Obstacles to mobility, such as the need for visas, contradict the aims for the promotion of mutual understanding through exchanges at the same time as it is contradicting policies of equal rights and non-discrimination. The Youth Sector is committed to fighting for equality, against discrimination and for the free movement of persons. Briefly - all different, all equal - is the principle that the Council of Europe follows and action should therefore be taken to ensure youth participation in international activities and exchanges.

It is necessary to start building a common approach and partnership between the actors who are designing and implementing youth mobility policies. Today, thousands of young people travel daily to other countries because of their involvement in international youth work and contribute to the development of European societies. We have to make sure that the following proposals are considered in the near future:

- The establishment of a (special) visa for young people involved in youth work ;
- The reduction of the level of bureaucracy when getting visas ;
- No fees for visas for youth workers.

1) There is a unique system of participation of youth organisations in the decisions on policies and projects concerning them. The principle "Nothing about us, without us" came into force within the Council of Europe. Due to this, the youth sector and young people are equal partners with governmental representatives when taking decisions on how to shape youth policies in the Council of Europe and how to address the needs of young people in Europe, through actions developed in the European Youth Centres and the European Youth Foundation.

The challenge is to create conditions for the full participation of young people in democratic life.

We have experienced the creation of a unique system for youth participation that has proved to be sustainable and is an excellent tool in bringing citizens closer to

their institutions. The challenge which lies ahead is to make this structure a living reality in Europe for young people at all levels.

2) Towards a Europe without dividing lines

The promotion of a European identity and democratic citizenship is the key to bringing people closer to each other and encouraging cooperation and intercultural dialogue. European identity is a concept based on the shared values that are promoted by the Council of Europe. The youth sector has a particular role in spreading those values and encouraging the active participation of young people in the life of civil society. The Council of Europe should strengthen its role to empower individuals to act as responsible citizens in their communities. International institutions, when addressing these challenges, have to engage in continuous dialogue based on the principles of equal participation and mutual respect.

Policies can be implemented only when they are developed in close cooperation with civil society, in this case with young people. Developing policies for young people, but without involving them in the process, does not comply with the principles we promote and the values we stand for. The Council of Europe, in this regard, is a role model to be followed.

Young people are at the forefront of change. We are living in a Europe full of different nationalities and cultures. The richness and diversity of the continent should remain our greatest asset and not a dividing element in our societies. We should never forget that there are still many young people who suffer from discrimination due to their disability, origin, religion, gender or sexual orientation. Europe is an inclusive project that gives everyone a chance. In this regard, youth NGOs offer continuous commitment and involvement in the work under the European Cultural Convention and in promoting the main principles of youth policy developed in the Council of Europe.

Young people will continue to build Europe. It is therefore important for the tools offered by youth policy to be given appropriate consideration and priority. The European Youth Forum is ready to commit itself to a Youth Pact for the Future, Europe and Young People. A Youth Pact that empowers young people. A Youth Pact that guarantees respect for human rights, cultural diversity and equality. A Youth Pact that calls for broader participation of young people in decision-making. A Youth Pact that ensures the future for Europe and its young citizens.

3) **Professor Mykola RYABCHUK,**  
**European Humanities Research Center, University "Kyiv – Mohyla Academy"**

I was not sure which language I should use because. On the one hand, English is a world language and, I think, the most appropriate language for all of us, but, on the other hand, Polish is the language of our hosts, the language of a country which I love dearly. I believe more and more Ukrainians will love Poland because a friend in need is a friend indeed, and, what is more, it is a friend who used to be a



historical enemy. As you know, there was a lot of hatred and violence between Poland and Ukraine. A dramatic change has occurred over the past decade, one of the greatest miracles wrought by human hands, the result of idealistic vision and tireless work: I mean reconciliation and cooperation between Poland and Ukraine. That is also the triumph of the idea of Europe and of those common values that have shaped our path.

I am from a country that, although it appeared on the map of Europe in 1991, has never really appeared on the mental map which, to most Europeans, is more real than the geographical map. I remember the remarks of western politicians made during the first years of Ukrainian independence ...the best remark was the one about a seasonal, provisional state. I also remember the newspaper reports. One of the most characteristic was written by Abraham Brumberg in the prestigious "New York Review of Books". It was called "Nasty Ukraine". Another American writer said no less openly: Ukraine is the "unwanted step-child of Soviet perestroika". And, not long ago, we all heard about the "Ukraine fatigue" which Ukrainian leaders have spread all over Europe with their unjustified pseudo-European declarations and demands.

Yet, all of a sudden, within a single week, all of this changed. Ukraine appeared firmly on that mental map of Europe, on the front pages of newspapers and in television programmes. It appeared no longer as a kind of Russian back yard, a historical aberration, but as a real country which has to be accepted. Of course, there is still no shortage of gibberish, ignorance, hypocrisy, cynicism and even malice in remarks on the subject of Ukraine today. Timothy Garton Ash wrote an excellent article about this in "The Guardian" recently:

*"For 25 years, I heard the same old arguments against supporting East European opposition movements. It was explained to us that these movements are a threat to 'stabilisation' in Europe. Lurking behind them or even collaborating with them are nasty nationalists and/or the CIA. We have to respect Moscow's justified security interests (this argument was originally used as justification for the continued existence of the Berlin wall). A terrible Pandora's box will be opened by....Poland's 'Solidarity', Charter 77, the demonstrators in Leipzig in 1989, the students in Belgrade demonstrating against Milosevic, the Georgian rose revolution, and now the Ukrainians... Behind all these devious assertions sounds an internal voice saying: 'Why can't all those damned semi-barbaric Eastern Europeans leave us in peace and let us live happily in our neat little Western European paradise?' Sometimes one even hears: 'Why are those damned Americans encouraging them to disturb us?' "*

And yet, as Timothy Garton Ash rightly says, this is not a struggle between the left and the right, America and Russia, the KGB and CIA, or various oligarchic clans as some people have written, or between the eastern and western parts of Ukraine. It is most of all a struggle for certain values, the very values which we are discussing at this Conference today, values on which European culture is founded and which

European culture extols. That is the choice that my country has made, a choice between European values and Soviet values, or rather pseudo-values.

In the space of one or two weeks, the Ukrainians confirmed their European choice more convincingly than the leaders had done, with their years of bickering on the subject of European integration. It seems to me that the Ukrainians have achieved three exceptionally important things: firstly, they have made a civic choice despite the teeth of propaganda, horrible Goebbels-like propaganda. They have made a deliberate, civic choice in a peaceful manner, in other words by ballot. Secondly, they staged a rebellion, a civic protest, against the rigging of the elections. They protested in a peaceful, yet highly organised manner. And thirdly, they have been able to resolve this conflict without force, they have displayed an ability to negotiate and resolve conflicts in a peaceful manner.

There is no doubt that this serves as testimony to the presence of a civic culture, European culture, in a country that seemed to be hopelessly Sovietised. Where does this culture originate? It would take a long time to explain, perhaps too long. I will, therefore, draw attention to three aspects only. First, it appears to me that an important role was played by this country's historical membership of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. After all, until the end of the 18th Century, Ukraine was not part of Russia, or Muscovy as it was then called, but a part of the Polish-Lithuanian *Rzeczpospolita*. Secondly, after this period, this country was probably the most westernised of all the Soviet republics (except of course the Baltic republics), in other words, western influence was biggest and strongest in this country. This influence was also largely conveyed via Poland, which I remember from my childhood; after all, I first read Kafka, Camus and Heidegger in Polish. And the final actor which I consider important is the country's openness to the world which has occurred over the past decade, involving a flow of information, particularly via the Internet; student exchanges; youth exchanges; and foreign travel by people to work, study and for tourism. This too has largely changed the shape of society, especially the younger generation, which has already been brought up outside totalitarianism.

To summarise, Europe has proved to be a magnet that particularly attracts those who are more educated and better informed. I have seen the results of opinion polls recently, and I noted that an overwhelming majority of young people voted for the opposition; in other words, they were more inclined to support the political force that represented democratic values. Also, the more educated people were, the greater was their support for the opposition, that is their support for western values. I realise, of course, that we still have a lot of problems and challenges ahead, our own problems and challenges and all-European ones. At the beginning of the 1980s, the Poles, our hosts today, reminded the whole of Europe that solidarity is, or must be, one of its fundamental values. This message has now been received by the Ukrainians, out of gratitude to the Poles and to all the Europeans who have not forgotten about this value. One of the greatest challenges for today's Europe is its openness, its inclusiveness. That is why I have recalled today



such a fundamental value as solidarity. European culture rests on this pillar, and I hope it will do so forever.

**Summary by Professor Kazimierz KRZYSZTOFEK, Vice-President of the Warsaw Research Institute – Pro Cultura**

During the discussions, little was said about the draft of the Declaration itself. Mr. Norbert Riedl (Austria) stressed that the document is exhaustive and provides many opportunities for cooperation with other partners – UNESCO, the OSCE and the European Union. One of the Croatian proposals concerned the propagation of the cultures and languages of countries that figure less prominently on the European cultural scene. Mr. Riedl suggested the incorporation of long-term strategies during work on an amendment to the Convention itself. It is important to show foresight – the creation of a vision whose joint realisation will shape Europe's future. Regarding opinions about the Convention as the basis for the Council of Europe's programmes of activities in cultural cooperation, it has proved a success. If we compare 1954 to 2004, we see that the Council of Europe has become universal. The whole of Europe belongs to the Council today.

It was generally agreed that the Convention provides a framework for cultural policy. The Italian delegate indicated two paths for Europe – the first of these being a path of universalisation, leading to the same human rights for everyone, regardless of their culture, and the second being a path of building culture and participating in it. This second path leads to diversity. It was also said that, what happened in Poland over 20 years ago and what is happening in Ukraine today, is proof of the liveliness of the ideas enshrined in the European Cultural Convention – this was and remains a struggle for citizenship and for the selection of European values. The presentations we heard focused on the problem of cohesion and diversity, in other words what is described as "unity in diversity." Professor Schwencke referred to this problem – the point is to reach compromise lest we collapse into a variety in which we lose the common denominator of European values, our European cohesion.

That is the ethical minimum that should join us. But, on the other hand, cohesion should not be exaggerated and we should not become obsessed with it at the cost of diversity. While preserving our own cultural idioms, we must try to transpose them to discourse. In other words, idiomatic identity must be transposed to discursive identity. Then we will be able to communicate with each other and build some sort of common future.

The next topic was young people, in other words the change of generations. If we compare the ideas that lay at the roots of the European Cultural Convention 50 years ago and today, with all the changes that have occurred in our lives, including relationships between technology and culture, then we can say that Europe's new generations are living in a new reality. The NGO representative pointed out the obstacles facing young people today, obstacles to mobility throughout Europe. What he meant was that one must not erect a wall on the eastern, external border of the European Union. Yet, such a wall may rise unless a new policy regarding visas

is formulated. Visas are the greatest obstacles to mobility. Even so, there have been some successes – several hundred thousand young people have been involved in various exchange programmes.

And now the penultimate topic – here, let me refer once again to Mr. Riedl, who spoke of the multiplicity of players and of partnerships. The question here is the participation of numerous international organisations in European processes. If we talk of a multiplicity of players on the European stage, we mean those entities that did not exist 50 years ago, when states, or rather governments, were dominant. Today, we have regions, towns, districts, NGOs and the world of business, which is entering areas that are in the Council of Europe's spheres of interest (culture, education and sport). How do we inspire this partnership, how do we attain a synergy for the benefit of Europe?

Finally, the last issue. The Austrian delegate underlined the problem of cultural education. More democratic access to culture has been the subject of the Council of Europe's concern for decades, and remains so. This task remains topical. Without cultural education, there is no participation in culture and society. And this leads to the emergence of cultural ghettos in Europe, which we do not want.



## Plenary Session 3

### "The Future of Cultural Cooperation in greater Europe – New role for the European Cultural Convention"

*Introduction by Ms Vesna KILIBARDA, Minister of Culture and Media of the Republic of Montenegro*

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to chair the third session and briefly introduce the topic we are about to address, which is a real challenge and provides us with an opportunity to come up with a shared vision of the future as we would like it to be. We are about to discuss the way in which we see the future of cultural cooperation in Greater Europe and the new role of the European Cultural Convention.

First of all, I would like to take the opportunity to thank Gabriella Battaini-Dragnoni, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport at the Council of Europe, for inviting me to chair this session. I consider it a personal honour and one that is perhaps symbolic, insofar as I believe that, in assuming this role, I represent the many countries present at this Conference that are not members of the European Union but may be so in the near future.

Yesterday, we were reminded of the progress made in the 50 years since the European Cultural Convention was signed, and there was talk of the new challenges connected with cultural cooperation and exchange in present-day Europe. We recalled the initial policy objectives of the Convention. The first was recognition for Europe's shared cultural heritage - a heritage that bears witness to continuity over time, carries the imprint of the past and reflects the civilisations that succeeded one another through out Europe's history. Another objective was mobility and exchange as a means of fostering mutual understanding, given that information and human contacts are the main, and indeed essential, instruments for bringing about development and human progress. Lastly, there was Europe-wide cultural cooperation based on a multidisciplinary approach through programmes in areas ranging from culture, heritage and education to youth and sport.

Huge progress has clearly been made since 1954, but it has brought in its wake new objectives. The main ones include establishing conditions that make for full democratic participation, a stronger European dimension in standards, policies and practice, cultural diversity and shared values.

We are embarking on the second half-century of the Convention's existence in a context very different from the situation 50 years ago. We have left the Cold War and the Iron Curtain that divided Europe behind us, and, now that we have a Greater Europe, we hope that those countries which do not belong to it will be able



to join the European fold. The most important means of speeding up this integration process is perhaps to try to destroy the imaginary barriers that still separate us at times and produce the opposite of what we want: nationalism, xenophobia and intolerance. I am referring here to the various prejudices and stereotypes that we unfortunately harbour in respect of one another and must make an effort to combat. Culture, education and sport are precisely the areas in which it is easiest to get rid of these prejudices and stereotypes.

I think this celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention is an ideal opportunity to put cultural cooperation on a new footing. We are gathered here this morning to start discussing the possible course of future work under the Convention, the models to be followed for activities, the obstacles we may encounter and means of overcoming them.

I shall now give the floor to Benoît Paumier, the first expert to speak this morning. Thank you.

### **General Discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport**

#### **1) Mr Benoît PAUMIER, Delegate for development and international affairs, French Ministry of Culture and Communication**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very happy to be here with you in this beautiful city of Wrocław, a symbol of our European identity if ever there was one. I am also very happy that Poland is hosting this conference to celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention, which has rapidly become a driving force in the debate about the Europe of culture we wish to build.

As Milan Kundera said in the dark days of the cold war, *"European aspiration is a cultural ambition"*. And this is indeed our conviction: if we want our citizens to adhere to the European political project, we must take another, decisive step towards building a Europe of culture. It is not hard to see that in all the debates around European identity and the limits of Europe today, culture is back with a vengeance. So the challenge is definitely that of a Europe of culture, a Europe of cultural co-operation, a field the Council of Europe pioneered with its European Cultural Convention, the 50th anniversary of which we are here to celebrate today.

As we head towards the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe, in Warsaw in May 2005, we want to strengthen our ties with the Council of Europe, for we are convinced that the Council has a fundamental role to play, particularly outside the borders of the European Union.

Because the European Union should not function as a dividing line, because Europe should be a place of dialogue and "radical openness to others", to use the fine phrase coined by the philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas, the Council of Europe is

essential and the European Cultural Convention as relevant as ever, even if new synergies with the European Union and its member states remain to be found, even if programmes need realigning and geographical priorities redefining.

The Council of Europe's work in culture is important because it is the only organisation with a strong programme on culture and heritage at the wider European level. Its programmes in heritage, cultural policies and intercultural dialogue are unrivalled. The Council of Europe is the only European organisation to develop standard-setting instruments in culture and heritage. I am thinking of the HEREIN network, the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, the Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, the European Landscape Convention and also the future Framework Convention on the value of cultural heritage for society, currently in preparation.

I should also like to mention the Compendium of cultural policies, which is a useful tool for political decision-makers, cultural actors and researchers in these days of concern about the relevance and renewal of cultural policies. It is all the more important in that these policies increasingly serve purposes as varied as attracting business and tourism, social cohesion, integration of foreign communities and education.

It should also be remembered that the Council of Europe's cultural programmes have made a major contribution, in the democratic transition process, to the emergence of the rule of law in the cultural and heritage fields, through legislative assistance with the elaboration of cultural policies, and by lending legitimacy to public policies in the cultural field, setting standards, encouraging the exchange of best practices and so on.

All this thanks to the Convention whose 50th anniversary we are now celebrating.

Finally, we should like to salute the work done in favour of mobility in the context of this European Cultural Convention. The exchange programmes for students, young people and artists initiated by the European Cultural Convention are essential to the building of a common European cultural space. These exchanges of young people will gradually build up the feeling that we all belong to the same community. This is a vital part of the Council of Europe's mission, so that all Europeans come to terms with the fertile contradiction Montesquieu pointed out as early as the 18th Century, namely that *"Europe is but a nation composed of many nations"*.

The theme of our round table is the new directions the European Cultural Convention should take in a Europe which is finding itself again. I have said what activities we consider as relevant as ever in the new configuration of Europe. I should now like to stress the new challenges that await the Council of Europe, which we consider essential: promoting cultural diversity and building a Europe of culture.



More than all the other European institutions, the Council of Europe has addressed cultural issues. In a manner of speaking, it pioneered the Europe of culture we want to build today. Just as it was the Council of Europe that first spoke out, in its declaration in 2000, in favour of respecting and promoting cultural diversity.

Let me assure you of the importance of this notion of cultural diversity in our debate. Do not dismiss it as a disguise for a form of cultural protectionism.

Cultural diversity is a real and precise issue with regard to our ability in the future to continue to offer a wide and varied supply of culture, to share it with the largest number and quite simply to have the right to continue to implement our own cultural policies. It is the ambition to see international law make full provision for the specificity of cultural assets, as it has started to do in the areas of health and the environment.

We still lack indicators to appreciate the cultural uniformity threatening our world. All we have are a few disparate but significant figures: to take the UNESCO figures for 2000, 85% of the cinema tickets sold in the world were for films produced in Hollywood. Just as 50% of the fiction films broadcast on television in Europe came from the United States. All the research shows, however, that it is by consuming these cultural products that people gain access to culture, much more than by more traditional, more "personal" means such as going to museums, exhibitions or performances, or visiting architectural and monumental heritage sites.

What is more, these cultural practices are strongly influenced by what the cultural industries produce. Of course, the consumption of recorded music will influence musical creation; of course, the consumption of the same type of film or book over and over again will influence stage productions and the plastic arts.

In autumn 2005, UNESCO will be examining a draft convention on cultural diversity which will recognise the specificity of cultural goods and guarantee public authorities' right to implement policies to support cultural activities, which is a requisite of intercultural dialogue.

If cultures are to engage in dialogue, to their mutual benefit, they must be able to do so, if not on an equal footing, at least on the basis of mutual respect, and all cultures must have the right to prosper and their artists the possibility to participate in the major trends of contemporary creation.

Pardon my digression, but the Council of Europe must play a role in this debate. Because it has already taken up a strong stance on cultural diversity. Because it is a forum that reaches beyond the confines of the European Union. Because diversity is its daily bread. I am pleased, therefore, that this is confirmed in the Wroclaw Declaration.

And lastly, the Council of Europe has a role to play in building a Europe of culture.

Thinking in terms of Europe means thinking about its values, its memory of its traditions, in a word, its culture. The answer to the confrontation of identities and religions is a matter of culture. The Council of Europe is an irreplaceable think tank on the subject.

In this new context of an expanding European community, it must continue to play its role of inspiration and reflection regarding Europe and the culture it is building. Europe needs the Council of Europe's experience, the fruit of many years of effort during which it has taken the temperature of every country of Greater Europe, brought cultural actors and civil society together and generated the feeling of sharing in a common destiny.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

To conclude, I should like to stress the timely celebration of this 50th anniversary of the European Cultural Convention, just a few months before the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe in Warsaw in May. It was important that we should have this opportunity to exchange views. Once again, I thank the Polish Government. I also salute the gesture of the Portuguese Government in offering to host the closing ceremony of this anniversary year next year. My thanks also to the Secretariat of the Council of Europe.

The French Minister of Culture, Mr Renaud Donnedieu de Vabres, who regrets being unable to be here with us today, will address the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe as soon as the opportunity arises, as several of its members have requested.

What we do not want is a world of uniformity. It is because we know that cultural issues also concern the cohesion of our societies and peace in the world, and that culture is a source of wealth and progress, that we consider that the battle for a Europe of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue needs to mobilise everybody's efforts and in particular those of the Council of Europe.

Thank you.

## 2) Mr Robert PALMER, Independent cultural adviser

I thank the Council of Europe for the opportunity to share some views here this morning. The topic this morning is clearly the future, about the challenges that lie ahead – the new challenges that face each of us – as governments, as transnational bodies, as part of civil society.

I am afraid that such challenges cannot only be met by declarations, but through actions. And so I myself carried out this exercise for this Conference. There are fortune tellers and soothsayers who believe they can see the future. Some do this by gazing into a ball of crystal; others divine the future by looking at the tea leaves at the bottom of your cup; some even look at the lines of your face and hands.

So let us look at the lines on the hands and face of Europe. Judging from where we are now, what do we see? What do I see?

We are witnessing revolutionary new technologies. A communications revolution is increasing the speed, flow, density. This is where each party understands the importance



of the connectivity of our lives. We are instantly connected by our mobile phones and the internet. All this has led to a speed of exchange between people. We now operate on new network models.

50 years ago, we talked about cooperation in a very particular way. Cooperation relied on formal agreements between people and between governments. In cultural terms, governments operated on the basis of bilateral relationships with others, with closely guarded and carefully negotiated sets of rule, and protocols and exchanges.

Now, we have moved into a different age, the age of networks. Networks are about relationships that are based on optimising the benefits of all parties, and the keys to successful networks are reciprocity and trust. Trust is the core of network relationships.

Networks rely more on the informal social ties of the participants than on formal arrangements between parties. These informal connections happen with speed. Three ministers of culture developing trust over the lunch table work faster than 20 civil servants trying to negotiate the details of agreements over three years. Maybe that is common sense, but these new types of fast-tracked negotiations are part of our networked world. A 50-page agreement of 50 years ago is now often replaced by a short e-mail.

So, the future of cultural cooperation cannot really be affected by agreements between governments anymore. I look into my crystal ball and I see an active mix of governmental and non-governmental action. I see governments letting go, and really engaging with cultural organisations that operate as part of civil society. I see governments looking to these organisations, to artists, to citizen groups and professional associations as partners, not just in terms of implementation, but to help set priorities, and help in planning.

In my crystal ball of future cultural cooperation, I see dense connections, the integration of civil society into the political sphere. Cultural cooperation is not about bilateral partnerships anymore; it is a kaleidoscope – that needs more flexibility and more innovation than ever before.

Since it is mainly governments represented here, let me gaze again into my crystal ball. What form will cultural cooperation take in the future?

In the future, intergovernmental cultural cooperation will change. It will change from the notion of what governments do between themselves to a broader more strategic and multilateral level. I see cultural diplomacy becoming a discussed term. It will be replaced by a new logic, a logic based on an understanding of European common space, based on integration, multilateralism and very broad partnerships.

I also see, in the future, national governments recognising an important role for regional and municipal authorities in cooperating more or less freely with other regions and municipalities on cultural projects and exchanges. National

governments may offer a strategic framework and coordination, but the actions will be decentralised.

In the future, I see much, much broader definitions of culture being used in programmes and initiatives. New cultural phenomena will be included – including programmes that fuse different sectors and disciplines, and the focus on art forms and forms of expression that are of particular relevance to young people today – new forms of music, digital arts, the merging of science and art.

And one profound change I see. And that is that culture and cultural cooperation will become an increasingly essential element of the approach to European conflict resolution and peace-keeping. Culture is no longer just about art. Culture now is a profound security issue. There will be a stronger role for culture in our approaches to foreign policy and security. In the future, tools of cultural cooperation will focus on dialogue, on exchange, on new approaches to cultural diversity, on a range of important artistic, scientific and educational programmes that create bridges among people, are bridges to large political, religious and economic differences. Governments can use culture as a means of helping to empower the poor, to spread democracy, to help resolve conflicts. We need to give a new meaning to the term cultural cooperation, and I am now working with the European Cultural Foundation on a study to examine these instruments. What are the cultural components of European foreign cultural policies? This is not just a question for ministries of culture, but also for ministries of foreign affairs, for Europe's approaches to external affairs. I invite you to participate in this important project.

In the long-term, the Council of Europe needs to respond to several cultural challenges: culture and cultural rights; cultural and economic development; culture and peace.

In the short-term, in culture, I suggest the following priorities:

- continuing with the programme of focused national policy reviews ;
- continuing support for the compendium and comparative information
- coordination of all actions with the EU, as well as UNESCO and other transnational bodies ;
- expanding the orbit of interest to include all of Europe and the diaspora of Europe. I am suggesting here the building of alliances with countries in Latin America and other countries that share European values.

New approaches to culture will offer ways of sustaining a new vision for the future. But, in the end, I want to return again to my first point. We need action. It is easy for us to talk, but we need action. Gone are the boundaries, the time zones that once kept us distant and apart from each other. Let us get rid of the notion of geographic distance and cultural distance. If there is a new role for the European Cultural Convention – it is a role based on re-invention, a role based on action.



**3) Ms Vera STASTNA, Chair of the Steering Committee  
for Higher Education and Research**

Your Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Dear colleagues,

First of all let me warmly thank the Polish hosts as well as the colleagues from the Council of Europe for this invitation which enables me to share with you some views for possible future cultural cooperation seen through the prism of education, in particular through the eyes of a representative of the Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research of the Council of Europe.

In all the contributions, it was clearly stated that we all wish to create a prosperous, cultural Europe without dividing lines. Dividing lines among countries caused either by their political or economic situation or between different social or ethnic groups. It is increasingly clear that sustainable development is only possible in a cohesive society. But how can it be managed?

Definitely, an important role is played by education – formal, informal or non formal. Everybody agrees on it, everybody agrees in principle that this is the priority. But in reality? Education is a difficult priority. One of the reasons is that its impact is far in the future – 15-20 years. And allow me a question – can education be attractive for governments with mandates of four or five years?

Moreover, it is expensive, in particular if accompanied with a cohesive social system. And, since the costs are foreseeable, they are less attractive than "trying to get by with what we have", even if this is likely to be more expensive in the long term. As I said, impacts are in the distant future – positive as well as negative impacts.

But a well educated population is also an opportunity. A chance for economic development which makes our efforts easier. A chance for changing mentality and educating children and young people to real intercultural understanding and tolerance.

What are the main roles of education? The first answer is usually : there is employability, career possibilities, or competitiveness on the labour market. However, education also plays an important role in preparation for life as active citizens in a democratic society, in individual development. And, in higher education, it is crucial for development and the maintenance of a broad, advanced knowledge base.

We used to call our society a "knowledge based society". We cannot create a knowledge-based society without knowledge being widespread. This means in reality the prolongation of education to the tertiary/higher sphere on a mass scale. And, from a certain point of view, it could also be perceived as a disadvantage – the "productive life" of most people will be shorter. However, mass higher/tertiary education has become a reality and, in fact, it is the political decision which most European countries have already made. Mass education is also a significant challenge in

terms of social cohesion. Education may well be one of the main factors in dividing societies, since there is less and less room for those without qualifications, and also creates considerable social stigmas. This is one reason why equal opportunities for education are so important. It means in reality not only creating equal bases for access but also working with those groups which usually do not enter higher/tertiary education. They have equal opportunities but they do not use them, possibly because they do not know how to. They have to be guided from the earliest age in this direction. It also means working with them during their studies and thus giving them the possibility to be successful.

As I have mentioned, one of the most important roles of education is preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies. I would like to bring to your attention an important activity which the Council of Europe is just launching - the European Year of Citizenship through Education. Through its programme, we can draw attention to the activities on which we have been working, to concrete contributions, e.g. in higher education to the heritage, universities as sites of citizenship, recognition in Europe, higher education governance with a focus on the democratic participation of students, etc. And it is a challenge not only for the Council of Europe but also for the member States, as well as for all of us working at different levels of the education systems. We should not miss this opportunity to make our efforts more visible.

What should be the role of the Council of Europe in education? In order to be an Organisation which is recognised and interesting for member States, its programme should contribute both to the Council's overall priorities and the concerns of educational policy makers and practitioners. Practical results are the best promotion.

We have been looking for possible future models of cooperation in Europe. Allow me now to turn your attention to one example of unique pan-European cooperation. It is the process which has already been mentioned several times during this Conference. The process of creating the European Higher Education Area which we used to call the Bologna Process. The stress is on the word process. It is a rather forward-looking activity with a deadline of 2010 (it started in 1998 with the Sorbonne Declaration and took on a deciding momentum in Bologna in 1999). For the first time since the Council's foundation in 1949 and the adoption of the European Cultural Convention in 1954, cooperation on a pan-European scale has been developed. It is, at present, cooperation between 40 countries with five more countries expected to apply to become members of the "Bologna family" in Bergen in May 2005. Thus a more or less full range of countries of the European Cultural Convention will be covered. This platform is unique. It gathers countries with different traditions and political backgrounds - "old" and "new" EU member countries, countries of South-East Europe, the Russian Federation. They all cooperate as equal partners, share their experiences and learn from each other. The Process also brings together international institutions and organisations such as the European Union, the Council of Europe and UNESCO - and again all in constructive cooperation. It



is no less important that the Process has brought together ministries, higher education institutions and students – they work together much more closely than used to be the case. The students are important partners. They have been looking at the changes in higher education – indeed they are the most substantial changes since the 1960s – with lots of hope. They are optimistic but also critical participants in the Process.

And what is most interesting – all this has been taking place through work on a voluntary basis. There is no convention behind it; there is only the agreement of the ministers. And it works. The aim is ambitious – nothing less than to establish a framework for European higher education, in which key policies are agreed at European level and implemented nationally as well as within each higher education institution. How is it possible that this cooperation works so successfully ?

It is definitely because the Bologna Process is based on the needs of all European countries. It tries to join together common European values and traditions with national specificities which are an integral part of the practical work in its implementation. We have been looking, and the Council of Europe is contributing significantly in this direction, for a unified solution. We try to agree on shared principles and methodologies. The framework is agreed at European level, solutions have been sought within this given "playground", in line with particular national or regional needs. Thus more than one harmonised solution is usually found.

The changes have started, they will have an impact and it will go far beyond the sector of higher education. We believe it will influence the economic development and we hope also the social cohesiveness of Europe positively. It seems that this could be a possible future model of European cultural cooperation in general.

I would like to stress once more how important it is for an intergovernmental organisation such as the Council of Europe to be an active player in such a Process. It gives the Council of Europe a good opportunity to become a recognised player in the European arena in a given area. This strengthens on one hand its possibility of defending European core values (promoting democracy, social cohesion, the rule of law...), on the other hand, it can participate in practical policies and legislative work, where member countries are usually most interested. Thus, it can contribute significantly to achieving, and has already been contributing to, the shared vision, as I said at the beginning, of the future prosperous, cultural Europe without dividing lines.

Thank you for your attention.

#### **4) Mr Michael RAPHAEL, Independent advisor**

The word for crisis in the Chinese language is made up of two distinct symbols: Danger and Opportunity. This was my motto as I worked among young people in conflict areas over the last 10 years. Cultural and ethnic strife has become a familiar occurrence in post-Cold War Europe. The lifting of the iron curtain, the crumbling of old style regimes, and the fact that many of the countries of Central and

Eastern Europe are joining the European Union has created a sense both of opportunity and of danger, and sometimes actual lethal engagements. Many places in Europe are going through swift political and social changes which are welcomed by some and suspected by others. The vanishing of some traditional cultural reference points as well as the rapid change of fundamental social elements, such as family, religion, and the nation state, can create a sense of uncertainty. The new opportunity for free mobility and economic development is exciting for those who can benefit, and resented by those who cannot. Immigrant communities who were welcomed (invited?) by Western Europeans are now feeling mounting pressure by radical and extreme-right political organisations.

These new developments are an opportunity for young Europeans to take a new look at the old divisions that have separated the East from the West and the North from the South. This transition period can be an opportunity to create a new equal and democratic dialogue based on mutual respect and an equal footing. Each and every community should have the opportunity to learn from one another's cultural perspective. European society must be proactive, and must face those who objectify culture and use it in politically charged, usually nationalistic, racist, or ethnic discourse. This is use of culture in a cynical and negative way. It must be confronted to prevent the intentional exclusion of minorities and immigrants in our societies. It is up to the European institutions to take on this challenge and transform it into a new opportunity for gain and unity and not new dangers.

Multicultural education is one of the main interventions that can help European youth to deal with these new challenges. To foster the intellectual, social and personal development of all the youth to their highest potential, it is necessary to provide each young person with an equal opportunity to learn. This is the purpose of multicultural education and may be achieved through the following four interrelated activities:

1. The first activity is ensuring that the educational opportunities of all young people in Europe are fair and equal so that all students, including minority and economically disadvantaged young people, can achieve their highest potential. Central to this is establishing a collaborative interaction among diverse youth in which conflicts are managed constructively. The cognitive dynamics of prejudice and stereotypes and the dynamics of intergroup hostility must be understood and replaced with processes of acceptance and appreciation.
2. The second activity is reforming curricula so that multicultural and global perspectives are studied and acknowledged. The curricula should present the contributions of major communities around Europe. Curriculum reform is aimed at ensuring that young people develop multiple historical perspectives and that young people learn to consider both minority and majority points of view in interpreting local and national events. From learning multiple historic and cultural perspectives, young people's own cultural consciousness should be strengthened. Cultural consciousness leads one to recognise that one's cultural perspective is



shared only by the members of that culture and that it differs from perspectives of other cultures.

3. The third activity is teaching intercultural skills to young people so that they can interact effectively with members of cultures different from their own. Intercultural skills enable people to behave in such a way when interacting with members of other cultures that the consequences of their behaviour match their intentions. This requires interpreting accurately intentional communications, unconscious cues, and customs from members of cultures different from one's own and presenting intentional communication so individuals receiving the communication can accurately understand it within the frame of reference of their culture.

4. The fourth activity is teaching social action skills needed to combat prejudice, discrimination, and other major problems that threaten the future of a united and free Europe. Multiculturalism requires an end to prejudice and discrimination. Central to these skills are conflict resolution and intergroup cooperation. These activities must be parallel to a process that promotes democratic values, such as commitment to the equal worth of all persons and each person's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Other important values are an appreciation of cultural diversity, respect for human dignity and universal human rights and for the interdependence of all human beings and all aspects of the natural environment.

My presentation would not be complete without mentioning some of the dangers in the multicultural education process. Bringing diverse individuals together does not automatically result in positive outcomes. Proximity is a necessary condition for the positive potential of diversity to be realised, but not sufficient in and of itself. There is a risk that diversity will lead to negative rather than positive results. When diverse individuals interact in destructive ways, or when the interaction takes place in a competitive atmosphere, diversity can create great problems.

The first is that initial contact between diverse individuals is often characterised by interaction strain, where the individuals feel discomfort and uncertainty as to how to behave. Interaction strain inhibits interaction, creates ambivalence and fosters typical behaviour such as overfriendliness followed by withdrawal and avoidance.

The second is that interaction can result in negative relationships that confirm stereotypes and increase prejudice. One of the early findings in interpersonal attraction research is what takes place before interaction. We tend to like those people who are similar to us and dislike those who seem different. Before actual contact, young people may have vague or negative impressions of one another. Not only can contact in the wrong circumstances and without the correct methodology be ineffective, it may even strengthen pre-existing stereotypes.

The third is that interaction among diverse individuals requires more effort than interaction among similar individuals. This can create the impression that the diverse workplace and community is more of a difficulty than a benefit. In order to counter these difficulties, we must follow a course that will create a positive

atmosphere for multicultural dialogue and support those elements in our civil society that promote these values. We must support the values of diversity within the informal and formal education systems. We must agree on a set of interdependent goals that bridge differences through working together on concrete goals that will better the lives of the everyday citizens in our communities. We can cooperate and create a vision of a community based on civil society while promoting the diversity that so many cherish. European societies should emphasise the right of every person to belong to and practise the culture or religion of his or her choice and the responsibility to respect the right of others to do the same.



## Closing Session of the Conference

**Presentation of the Draft Declaration by Mr José Manuel Amaral LOPES, Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture of Portugal**

The text of the Draft Declaration has been prepared by a Drafting Group set up by the Committee of Ministers' Rapporteur Group on Education, Culture, Sport, Youth and Environment on the basis of a paper by the Polish Authorities.

It was also discussed at three meetings of the Rapporteur Group and the text we have in front of us today is the fruit of all these meetings as well as the amendments which we have received from delegations to the text.

I would like to congratulate all involved in the elaboration of the text for their contributions to this important Declaration which aims to take the work of the Council of Europe on cultural cooperation further forward.

It is even more important because it has been prepared with a view to the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe's member States which will take place in Warsaw in May next year.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

The Declaration has been drawn up in three parts:

- the achievements of 50 years of the European Cultural Convention;
- challenges facing European cultural cooperation in today's Europe;
- lines of action for a Europe without dividing lines.

The achievements:

- the European Cultural Convention was drawn up less than 10 years after the end of World War II and provides a framework for cultural cooperation to try to heal old traditions and to prevent new conflicts;
- it was the first text of its kind;
- the Convention was drawn up at a time when Europe was divided;
- the idea of culture was open-ended. It included the arts, learning history and languages and it was readily extended to other aspects of modern civilisation, such as youth and sport;
- the working methods were flexible.

*Original political objectives*

The Convention had three original political objectives which were:

- the recognition by Europeans of their common cultural heritage;
- mobility and exchange for mutual understanding;
- a broad current of pan-European cultural cooperation.



The Convention has provided a framework for dialogue between the Council of Europe's member States and provided the possibility for non-member States to accede to the Convention before becoming full members of the Organisation.

*The challenges facing European cultural cooperation in today's Europe*

The Europe of today – half a century after the adoption of the Convention – is very different from that of 1954.

The Cold War is over, there have been dramatic transformations in Central and Eastern Europe and all European States now take part in the work under the European Cultural Convention.

However, different challenges face Europe:

- exclusion of minorities and the poor;
- social disconnection;
- targeting of the heritage during conflicts;
- the end of ideology but the revival of xenophobia, intolerance, anti-Semitism, racism etc.

*Lines of Action*

This is in fact the most important part of the text for us to discuss today because it looks to the future. It is essential for us to adopt a Declaration which will provide the framework for the next few months during which we will be discussing the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention as well as new thrusts for all our work on cultural cooperation.

As you will see at the end of the Declaration, it will be submitted to:

- the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe;
- other Council of Europe bodies such as the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe;
- other events organised within the framework of the celebrations of the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention whether national or international;
- and, most importantly, we ask the Committee of Ministers to transmit the Declaration to the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe's member States which will take place in Warsaw, on 16-17 May 2005.

The Declaration opens up new perspectives for:

- partnerships with the European Union and UNESCO;
- work with civil society;
- cooperation with the neighbouring countries in particular those around the south bank of the Mediterranean;
- work on intercultural and interreligious dialogue.

These Lines of Action apply equally to all the sectors involved in cultural cooperation:

- school, out-of-school and higher education;
- culture, natural and cultural heritage;
- youth and sport.

The Lines of Action take as their inspiration the Council of Europe's programmes of activities both past and present and look to the future challenges in a changing Europe and world.

I would like to encourage you to adopt this Declaration today at this Opening Conference for the celebrations of the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention.

The challenge will be to see where we go following the other events to be organised within the framework of the celebrations:

- the Colloquy of Intellectuals which will take place in Strasbourg in 2005;
- the closing Conference for the celebrations which will be held in Portugal under the Portuguese chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers thus beginning with the Polish chairmanship and ending with ours;
- and also the importance which the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government should give to the work of the Council of Europe in the area of cultural cooperation.

Thank you.

**Presentation of the Parliamentary Assembly's perspective on cultural cooperation by Baroness HOOPER, Vice-Chair of the Parliamentary Assembly's Committee on Culture, Science and Education**

Mr Chairman,

Ministers,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It has been a great privilege to listen, meet and talk with so many colleagues with similar interests in this Conference in Wroclaw. I must congratulate all those involved in the excellent organisation and thank you, Minister, for the splendid Conference and dinner last night.

It is the view of the Parliamentary Assembly, the democratic voice of the Council of Europe, that the Council of Europe needs to reassert cultural cooperation as one of its strategic priorities. As most speakers here, in speaking of European cultural cooperation, I mean of course culture in the broad sense including education, science, the arts, heritage, media, youth and sport.

I should introduce myself. I represent the Parliamentary Assembly as First Vice-Chairman of its Committee on Culture, Science and Education. I am from the



United Kingdom, a member of the House of Lords and former Education Minister. I was also an MEP after the first direct elections in 1979.

The Assembly has been closely involved in European cultural cooperation in the Council of Europe from the genesis of the European Cultural Convention and throughout its development. In 1949, immediately following the formation of the Council of Europe, the Assembly proposed an eight-point programme of cultural cooperation which led to the Convention of 1954 as the framework for European cultural cooperation. The Assembly has subsequently played an active and interactive role inside the structures set up to administer that cooperation (in particular the Council for Cultural Cooperation and its subordinate bodies) and has regularly defended the place of European cultural cooperation on the basis of the Convention in a series of reports from that Mr Larock in 1949 to most recently that by Mr de Puig in 2002.

The Assembly shares the positive evaluation of European cultural cooperation carried out on the basis of the European Cultural Convention. The achievements have been considerable. First, on the policy level, with the establishment of concepts such as cultural democracy, integrated conservation, youth participation and co-management, and sport for all. Secondly, on raising public awareness, for example in relation to architectural heritage, music, cinema and language learning. Thirdly, on development of the European dimension in history learning, in museums or in education. But also in many more concrete activities such as teacher training, heritage skills, history learning and media education. A number of other more specific instruments have been prepared also open to States party to the European Cultural Convention (education equivalences, archaeology etc). These achievements are fully documented in the appendix to the Declaration.

The Convention has been the primary instrument for this cooperation because it has been the major framework in which it has taken place in the past. But, this has not excluded the development of other Council of Europe intergovernmental activities outside the framework of the Convention, for example specific assistance programmes and activities in the fields of media, of minorities and of minority languages, of young political leaders and of combating racism and intolerance. Moreover, since the suppression of the Cultural and Sports Funds, an increasing number of these activities are being co-financed with the European Union.

A major political contribution of the Convention has been to enable the extension of European cultural cooperation to European non-member countries. At times, the number of countries involved in European cultural cooperation has been considerably greater than the members of the Council of Europe itself, though currently it is only two more. The Convention has enabled useful contacts with countries otherwise prevented from becoming members of the Council of Europe either by totalitarian regimes (as Finland was prevented by the USSR) or which we felt to be unacceptable (as for example Spain from 1957-77 and now Belarus). The Assembly has taken advantage of this wider cooperation in, for example, the youth and museums sectors and in early contacts in former Yugoslavia.

The difference between cultural and political objectives needs to be kept clearly in mind in discussing the origins, application and future of the European Cultural Convention and European cultural cooperation. In the early Assembly debates of 1949, an argument arose between "disinterested" culture and "militant" culture or propaganda. This dichotomy has continued in many of the political debates about European cultural cooperation and is reflected in the different objectives of the specialised ministers on one side and the ministers of foreign affairs on the other as we have witnessed in this Conference today.

To my mind, this accounts for the difference between this Conference of specialised ministers of culture and what is likely to happen at next year's Third Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Government. Both approaches are entirely valid and are not incompatible. But they are different.

A way of expressing what I mean here is to compare :

- the (political) reasons advanced in 1949 for cultural cooperation as a fight against totalitarianism by the (cultural) means of individual freedom of expression or access to culture and so on ;
- with the (political) reasons advanced today for cultural cooperation as a fight against terrorism by (on the cultural level) intercultural dialogue and recognition of cultural diversity.

We should remember the extent to which the political objectives of the Council of Europe support for European cultural cooperation have taken over control of cultural cooperation itself since the Committee of Ministers' Deputies (and, in particular, its Group of Rapporteurs on Culture represented here by its Chairman, the Ambassador of Armenia) took over coordination of this activity from the Council for Cultural Cooperation (or CDCC) in 2001.

The presentation of European cultural cooperation would, I believe, be made more effective if the political and cultural objectives could be more clearly distinguished.

This is not the place, Mr Chairman, for detailed comment on individual activities. But, it is the place for certain strategic decisions. A meeting like this is limited in value unless it also looks forward. The most important conclusions are, therefore, the next steps to be taken in European cultural cooperation. I would, therefore, single out the following from the many discussed in this Conference.

The European Cultural Convention should continue as the basis for European cultural cooperation in the Council of Europe. It would seem unwise and unnecessary to redraft and thereby put in jeopardy the Council of Europe acquis. On the other hand, extension is necessary and this can be achieved by protocols or by other instruments. The Assembly has called for :

- the inclusion of the European Union ;
- the association with neighbouring countries especially those of the South Mediterranean on which we have had a specific report ;
- a more effective coverage of media questions.



The dynamic of ongoing cooperation should be asserted by commitment to concrete activities such as:

- the opening to signature of the Framework Convention on the value of cultural heritage for society (which we hope will take place in Portugal in 2005) ;
- development of education for Europe (on which my Romanian colleague Mr Prisacaru has recently reported and which will be the subject of a campaign in 2005).

It is essential to ensure prominence for cultural cooperation in the discussions at the Third Summit with an assertion of the strategic place for culture in government policy-making (and to have equal priority with foreign, economic, social and environmental policy).

The Council of Europe can, in this way, underline its specific role in European cultural cooperation. Ministers can help by better coordination between representation to governmental institutions and organisations (the European Union, UNESCO, OECD and the Council of Europe). We, in the Parliamentary Assembly, should try to meet with our opposite numbers in the European Parliament. The Council of Europe should continue its partnerships with civil society - that is with non-governmental organisations, with the commercial sector, and especially (since financing is so important) with the various banks to which reference has been made (the World Bank, EBRD and the Council of Europe's own bank).

Much of this should be set in motion immediately. We certainly shall be taking the conclusions of this Conference to the centre of our coming Assembly debate in Strasbourg in January on preparation of the Third Summit.

As a final point, I believe that it is essential that the specialised ministers of culture also manifest their support for the prioritising of cultural action. Despite the considerable number of important personalities who have attended this Conference, the personal absence of many ministers is to be regretted. I would contrast the full attendance of ministers of education, culture, youth and sport in the EU Council meeting in Brussels last month. Three United Kingdom ministers attended that meeting, whereas not one has represented the United Kingdom here in Wroclaw. I would, therefore, end by calling for a more convincing response by ministers of culture at the follow-up meeting in Portugal next year.

**Closing remarks by Mr Christian TER STEPANIAN, Permanent Representative of Armenia to the Council of Europe and representing the Committee of Ministers**

A French politician from the last century, Edouard Herriot (who chaired the very first session of the Parliamentary Assembly in August 1949) described culture as being what remained when everything else had been forgotten.

What will remain from this Conference? What will we retain and what will we forget? As a representative of the Committee of Ministers, I will remember the warm hospitality of the Polish Authorities, the high quality of our discussions and the

magnificence of the history-laden buildings in which our Conference has taken place.

I shall also remember, perhaps above all, the fruit of our labours, the Wroclaw Declaration that we are about to adopt.

As you are aware, this text has probably been drafted in a way that is unprecedented in the history of the Council of Europe, since it has involved in turn:

- a working group comprising representatives of seven steering committees from the field of cultural cooperation and representatives of the Council of Europe Secretariat;
- the relevant Committee of Ministers rapporteur group, which I am honoured to chair;
- and lastly, ourselves, the participants at this Conference, who are now its custodians.

It seems to me that the result we have achieved justifies all the effort that has been exerted. We now have a reference text which:

- reviews 50 years of cultural cooperation,
- identifies a number of challenges to be addressed,
- and sets out – without prejudging our future discussions, since the debate is only just beginning – promising avenues to explore.

Of course, these avenues will need to be looked at in greater depth, since I am sure that no-one here would be happy merely with good intentions. We want to be able to turn these ideas into action. Indeed, much more than want, we need to do this, and the Europe of today needs this.

The Europe I am talking about cannot develop without a continuation of the unwavering work that has been carried out for the last 50 years. This work has borne unquestionable fruit, but it is far from complete. Fifteen years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, our continent is making remarkable – and indeed un hoped for – progress along the path to the democratic ideal. But walls fall more easily than prejudice, and technology develops much more quickly than attitudes.

I am convinced that Europe needs a cultural dimension, even today – perhaps even more so today than ever before. And today, perhaps more than ever before, the Council of Europe has a major role to play in giving life to that dimension, to giving the process of European integration that “added soul” which alone can guarantee its future.

In the introduction to Part III of our Declaration on Lines of Action for a Europe without dividing lines, we assign to European cultural cooperation a general objective which is actually two-fold :

- responding to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of all the States parties to the Convention and, in particular, young people as regards their vision of



Europe as expressed at the Youth Summit to be held in parallel to the Third Council of Europe Summit next May;

- and promoting dialogue and harmony between Europe and the rest of the world, by championing the values of peace and democracy shared today by virtually all European countries, and developing inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue between Europe and its neighbouring regions.

This is the dual message that will be submitted to the Committee of Ministers and it is a message which I shall undertake to defend in accordance with my responsibilities. In this respect, the Third Summit in a few months time will be a crucial stage in rooting the resolutions adopted today firmly into the political reality of tomorrow.

There is no doubt that we will be able to count on the current Polish chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers and the forthcoming Portuguese chairmanship to ensure that our efforts will be successful. I wish only the best for the Cultural Convention over its next half-century.

### **Conclusions and overall recommendations by Professor Jerzy J. WIATR<sup>1</sup>, General Rapporteur**

#### *1. Organisation of the Conference*

To celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the opening to signature in Paris of the European Cultural Convention on 19 December 1954, ministers of culture, education, youth and sport of the States parties to the Convention assembled in Wrocław, Poland, at the invitation of the Government of Poland. It was the first time that the ministers of culture and of education assembled together. The conference was attended by ministerial delegations from all the Council of Europe's member States, the Holy See and Belarus, as well as by Mr Terry Davis, Secretary General of the Council of Europe, Baroness Hooper, Vice-Chair of the Parliamentary Assembly's Committee on Culture, Science and Education, and other personalities. The conference was co-chaired by Mr Waldemar Dabrowski, Minister of Culture of Poland, and by Mr. Mirosław Sawicki, Minister of National Education and Sport of Poland. The Polish authorities presented a background document written on their behalf by Professor Kazimierz Krzysztofek (*The New Dimensions of Europe, Appendix III*).

The Conference was held at the Ossolineum National Institute, one of the oldest cultural institutions of Poland, on 9-10 December 2004. It was organised in three plenary sessions devoted to :

- (1) "Stocktaking of the achievements over 50 years of the European Cultural Convention";

---

1. Professor of sociology; Minister of education of Poland (1996 -1997); since 2002, chairman of the Council of European Education, Ministry of National Education and Sport.

(2) "From stocktaking to new challenges for cultural exchange and cooperation in present-day Europe";

(3) "The future of cultural cooperation in Greater Europe – a new role for the European Cultural Convention".

At the closing session of the Conference, the Wroclaw Declaration on 50 Years of the European Cultural Convention was adopted. It was submitted to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. The Conference asked for the Declaration to be further considered by all relevant Council of Europe bodies and invited the Committee of Ministers to transmit the Declaration to the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe's member States (Warsaw, 16-17 May 2005).

## 2 . The European Cultural Convention – achievements of 50 years

In 1954, Europe was divided. Our continent was then the main battlefield in the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism. The democratic governments signatory of the European Cultural Convention were fully aware of the fact that the future of democracy depended not only on military might but on the force of the spiritual values of democracy as well. In the opening paragraph of the Convention, they stated that the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose, among others, of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles, which are their common heritage. They also stressed the importance of a greater understanding of one another among the peoples of Europe. Cultural cooperation was, therefore, considered as an essential part of the collective efforts to safeguard the European democratic heritage.

In his Report on 50 years of the European Cultural Convention, the Secretary General defined these goals as follows:

*"The Convention's authors had a vision of an undivided Europe, expressed in the openness of the instrument to non-member European States. Europe would recognise the expressions of its civilisation as both common and national heritages, and preserve them not as memorials set in stone, but as sources of creativity in society through study, exchanges, common action and public access. Along with democracy and human rights, these values have been the pillars of the Council of Europe and remain an essential basis for the identity of wider Europe".*

Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the European Cultural Convention, the Wroclaw Declaration stressed in particular:

- the recognition by Europeans of their common cultural heritage;
- the promotion of mobility of persons and the exchange of cultural objects for the mutual learning of the European peoples about each other's culture and heritage;



- undertaking of the open and holistic process of cultural cooperation, which has been extended from culture, heritage and education to youth and sport;
- the need to create conditions for full participation in democratic life.

The importance of these goals for the future of democratic Europe has been fully recognised. So the fact that, in the last 50 years, Europe has fundamentally changed for the better should not make one forget the relevance of these fundamental goals for the future. It has to be remembered that the fate of democracy depends on the strength of the commitment of all citizens to the system of values on which democracy is based. Human rights and individual freedom constitute the core values of democracy. Commitment to these values is essential for the survival of democracy. This commitment cannot be taken for granted. Enemies of democracy have not invaded Europe from outside. Totalitarianism has not been an alien element in the political life of Europe.

Both Nazism and Communism were born in Europe and both, as Hannah Arendt<sup>2</sup> was the first to demonstrate, had their roots in some currents of European political and cultural traditions. They were, each of them in a different way, degenerated products of the European tradition of nationalism and social radicalism. Fascism and Nazism were based on an exaggerated sense of national unity, itself a product of the rise in the 19th Century of the national idea. As the Polish historian of philosophy Andrzej Walicki<sup>3</sup> has demonstrated, the intellectual roots of Communist totalitarianism resided in a specific interpretation of the concept of freedom, deeply rooted in the European cultural heritage. The struggle against totalitarianism has been, therefore, the struggle for the soul of Europe, for its democratic and humanitarian values. It is in this context that the importance of the European Cultural Convention should be seen.

Fifty years after, Europe is united in its commitment to democracy. The peaceful victory of democracy testifies to the strength of moral and cultural values. It is not only a matter of history. At the Wroclaw Conference, the Ukrainian speaker Professor Mykola Ryabchuk, referring to the recent political events in his country, stressed the importance of democratic culture for the future of the newly reborn democracy in post-communist States. Young democracies need time fully to absorb the democratic values and modes of behaviour. But the older democracies have their own problems, resulting from ethnic and religious fanaticism, which has re-emerged in some sections of their societies. Anti-Semitism has not been fully eliminated in spite of the tragic experience of the Holocaust. The recent demonstrations of hostility toward the Muslim minorities in some countries of Europe remind us of the necessity to be on guard against the rebirth of the ghosts of the past. The goals which inspired the European Cultural Convention have not lost their importance for the Europe of the 21st Century. The consolidation of

---

2. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York 1951.

3. *Marxism and the Leap to the Kingdom of Freedom, The Rise and Fall of the Communist Utopia*, Stanford 1995.

democracy is an ongoing process in which cultural cooperation between all European States plays a vital role.

The achievements of the past should not blind us to the enormous challenges facing us at the beginning of the new century. The Wrocław Conference discussed some of them and, in its Declaration, identified the following major unresolved problems:

- not sufficiently wide access to educational and cultural rights, particularly the often continued exclusion of minorities and the under-privileged;
- gender inequality in spite of considerable progress made in the last 50 years;
- the continuance of social disconnection;
- targeting of the cultural heritage and of the environment in the course of armed conflicts;
- uneven and unsustainable economic development;
- the revival of racism, anti-semitism, extreme nationalism, xenophobia, intolerance, exclusion, terrorism and various forms of violence.

Several specific problems directly related to cultural life were also identified in the Wrocław discussions. Simon Mundy spoke about the potential clash between individual human rights and the collective cultural rights of distinctly different communities. Simon Mundy as well as Henri Ingberg also signalled the danger of delegating cultural issues to a secondary place compared to economic issues and called for a strong cultural policy. Olaf Schwencke added that such cultural policy should have strong ethical roots. Cesar Birzea raised the issue of education for democratic citizenship and emphasised the role played by the Council of Europe in promoting such education. Krisztina Gónter drew attention to the role which sport has in educating people in the spirit of fair play and of respect for the rules of the game – both crucially important for democratic culture. Sport has a role to play in promoting European values and principles. "Practised in the proper spirit", wrote the Secretary General – "sport participates in the education process by developing skills and attitudes of value to both the individual and the society as a whole". Peter Lauritzen and Michael Raphael reviewed the activities of the Council in relation to young people and stressed the need to find an answer to the sense of uncertainty felt by many young people as a consequence of the rapid changes of our time. Elaborating youth policy on the European level has become an important task. There has been unanimous support for the idea that culture has a vital role to play in promoting democracy and human rights and that the Council of Europe has an important role in building European civil society, but some discussants expressed their feeling that the role of the Council in the last decade should have been greater. Robert Palmer called for greater cooperation with the European Union and for the promotion of European culture outside Europe.



### 3. Culture as the system of values

In the European Cultural Convention, the original concept of culture referred to the artistic and intellectual heritage, which should be preserved, transmitted to new generations, interpreted in the light of new experience, enriched and enjoyed by as many as possible. With the passing of time, this implicit definition has been broadened to include the fundamental values of human rights and freedom. Such redefinition, shifting the focus to cultural development and the right to cultural expression, linked cultural democracy to the principles of human rights. Consequently, culture has received a specific meaning, consistent with the tradition of those philosophers and sociologists who consider it predominantly as a system of values. "Culture – writes the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman – is unique to man in the sense that only man of all living creatures is able to challenge his reality and to ask for a deeper meaning, justice, freedom, and good – whether individual or collective"<sup>4</sup>. In the discussions held in Wrocław, such a normative concept of culture was accepted as the basis of European identity. The common European heritage consists of such elements of European culture which are consistent with the fundamental values of human rights and individual freedom. The authors of the Convention rightly believed that these values are of a universal nature. They give European culture a distinctly humanistic and democratic character and provide the rationale for human solidarity.

During the Wrocław discussions, it was stressed, particularly by the representative of the Holy See, Archbishop Jozef Zyciński, that democracy should not be considered exclusively in terms of institutions and procedures but also in terms of underlying values. Democracy without values deteriorates. The problem, however, is complicated by the fact that, in all democratic societies, there exist conflicting values and there are various interpretations of some fundamental common values, such as the right to life, the freedom to choose one's lifestyle, obligations to the family, or gender equality. Separating democracy from value systems is not the right answer as it opens the door to the misuse of democratic institutions and procedures for goals, which are inconsistent with the democratic and humanistic heritage of Europe. There has to be a balance between the commitment to universal democratic values and respect for the diversity of cultural traditions, as reflected in the Declaration on Cultural Diversity adopted by the Council of Europe in 2000. "Today", - wrote the Secretary General – "we must resolve the tension between diversity and identity in the Convention's spirit of mutual understanding". Understanding and cooperation between all European nations requires a cultural dialogue in which differences are brought to light and debated freely. Such an approach has become particularly important when the European family of democratic nation States expanded and the Council of Europe became the common organisation for the whole continent. The plurality of cultural traditions, the diversity of religions and the complex mosaic of ethnic relations inherited from the past, dictates the need for multiculturalism.

---

4. Culture as praxis, London 1973:177.

Multiculturalism is closely linked to the concept of *cultural rights* strongly expressed in the Wrocław Declaration. Cultural rights by definition are collective rights in the sense that they cannot be enjoyed by isolated individuals but by culturally distinct communities. The right to use one's language in public life, the right to receive education oriented towards the needs and expectations of a cultural community, the right to cultural institutions run by a cultural community are rights which require the active role of a community with a specific cultural identity. The Wrocław Declaration endorsed the European Cultural Convention's goal of the peaceful harmony of diverse cultures as a key to democratic stability and added its strong support "for the same international recognition for the cultural rights as for civil, political, economic and social rights". It also acknowledged the cultural rights "as integral to the core fundamental rights codified in the Council of Europe's legal instruments".

The cultural and linguistic plurality in Europe constitutes a great challenge. The Europe of the future should be based on a unity of values, but not on cultural homogeneity. It is, and will remain, a family of distinctly different nations, with their traditions, languages and national cultures. The process of cultural unification does not aim at eroding these differences. Rather, it is and should be the process through which the European nations, proud of their respective cultural heritages, come to know each other better, to develop respect for, and understanding of, the cultures of their European neighbours and to value their common democratic values.

For centuries, cultural diversity has been a fundamental fact of European life, but the character of this diversity changed over time. In the first decade after the Second World War, the diversity of distinctly different national cultures was, to some degree, overshadowed by the political and ideological division of Europe. European cultural identity was based first on the system of democratic values shared by Western European States. While these values had strong appeal to large sections of the population of the then Communist States of Eastern Europe, they were not endorsed by the official ideology and policy of these States. The European political division became, therefore, a cultural one as well. With the passing of time, the relaxation of tensions between East and West and the liberalisation in some of the Communist States made this division less sharp than it had originally been. It was, however, the end of the Cold War and the change of regimes in the Eastern part of Europe that fundamentally changed the political framework for the cultural policy of the European States. The common European cultural identity has become a reality, reflected in the accession of new democracies in Eastern and Central Europe to the European Cultural Convention.

The cultural re-unification of Europe does not erase diversity, the roots of which lie in three processes which began in the second half of the 20th Century. The first is globalisation, particularly in audiovisual and telecommunications aspects. It creates a serious challenge for national cultures and traditions. Managing diversity in



the era of globalisation requires both respect for the cultural heritage and openness to new ideas and possibilities in the global world.

The second is growing regionalisation. National identities are now increasingly interconnected with regional ones and some regional identities cut across national borders.

Finally, ethnic diversity has increased, as the result of the dissolution of three union States (the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) and of the massive immigration from within and particularly from outside Europe. Millions of immigrants and their children now live in Europe constituting distinctly separate ethnic and religious communities. They are here to stay. Their assimilation to the dominant national culture is neither a realistic nor a desirable perspective. Rather, Europeans have to learn how to live with ethnic and religious minorities from different continents and cultures.

While the European Cultural Convention deals with the European heritage, there is nothing in it that could be considered exclusive. The core values of European culture constitute a message which is not exclusively directed to the European nations. It has a universal meaning. In the discussions held at the Wrocław Conference, this idea was emphasised. The clash of civilisations is not inevitable. European nations constitute an integral part of global society, in which they face the great challenge of promoting their own cultural values while, at the same time, being responsive to the cultural values of other nations. In the open world society, which is being created now, we must avoid extremes, such as the absorption of national cultures by the global one and the isolation of national culture from foreign influence. Devoted to our common cultural heritage, we are ready to continue and to deepen the dialogue with other nations in the hope that such a dialogue will promote the universal values of democracy and human rights and that, through it both we, the Europeans, and nations belonging to other cultures will be able to learn from each other.

In this context, the issue of transatlantic cultural unity was raised. Europe and the United States of America have been united in the struggle for common goals, both during and after the Second World War. Transatlantic solidarity has a deep meaning. It is based on shared values as well as, or perhaps even more than, on common interests. This basic solidarity cannot obscure the fact that there exist important cultural differences between Europe and America. American individualism and the European sense of community are reflected in what the American political writer Jeremy Rifkin sees as the opposition between the American and European dreams<sup>5</sup>. The difference between these two dreams affects both the domestic and the foreign policies of the United States and of its European allies. Sometimes, as for instance during the war in Iraq, such differences result in mutual recriminations and suspicion. To avoid them, more is needed than the art of diplomacy. There is a

---

5. *The European Dream: How Europe's Vision of the Future is quietly eclipsing the American Dream*, New York 2004.

place for informed cultural dialogue across the Atlantic aimed at strengthening common bonds and at the better understanding of nations united by common heritage but different in their commitment to specific national traditions and ways of behaviour. Such a transatlantic dialogue must reflect not only our lasting commitment to the European tradition but also our respect for the way in which Americans see their role in the world. The European Dream of communal solidarity should be seen as the best answer to the challenges of the new century. Sharing Rifkin's belief that the European Dream has much to offer, we must answer affirmatively his question "whether Europeans' sense of hope is sufficient to the task of sustaining a new vision for the future" (p.384).

#### *4. European education*

The Wrocław Conference follows earlier efforts by the Council of Europe to bring together cultural policy and education. Whilst it was the first joint conference of ministers of culture and of education, it was not the first step in such efforts. Language learning and other actions to support multilingualism have had an important place in the activities of the education sector of the Council.

Recently, special emphasis has been put on intercultural education, as reflected in the Athens Declaration of Ministers of Education of 2003. Teaching, which reflects and respects religious and other cultural diversity, has been set as one of the principles for European education. Heritage education, initiated and promoted by the Council of Europe, is a new concept requiring cross-cultural teaching and based on sharing the cultural heritage of the European nations.

The Council of Europe, in its educational activities, emphasises the importance of guaranteeing equal access to high quality education as the fundamental human right and as the cornerstone of good society, free of social exclusion. "The primary aim of future education programmes in both formal and non-formal learning contexts", writes the Secretary General in his report, "will be the development of education policies, standards and practices for quality life-long learning, with a particular focus on the values, as well as the attitudes, knowledge and skills necessary for socially inclusive, responsible, active citizenship imbued with a democratic culture". These words were echoed in the Wrocław debates and in the Wrocław Declaration, which called for guarantees of the right to education for all, and particularly for the vulnerable groups in danger of being permanently excluded. In taking such a position, the Wrocław Conference responded to the warnings of the social scientists, repeatedly pointing to the negative consequences of educational inequalities on the exercise of citizenship. "Lower educational achievement levels are related to greater political scepticism, to pessimism over an individuals' personal capacity to influence political decisions or events, to a more limited political participation, and to indifference toward or rejection of democratic politics"<sup>6</sup>. Such inequalities also lead to cultural exclusion, particularly from higher culture.

---

6. Adam Przeworski et al., *Sustainable Democracy*, Cambridge 1995: 37.



Higher education was given special attention in the Wrocław discussions. The Chair of the Higher Education and Research Committee of the Council of Europe, Vera Štastná, expressed the view that education in general, and particularly higher education, is the key to sustainable development and to the creation of a cohesive society. Thinking about the future, she said, nothing is more important than education, but education requires thinking and acting in the long perspective of 10–20 years. Such a perspective is too long for politicians, who are used to thinking in terms of a four or five year mandate. It is also expensive, with potential benefits delayed for many years. All these problems make the role of the Council of Europe even greater, since it is the main body capable of maintaining a climate favourable to a long-term policy based on educational priorities.

Higher education is essential not only for the labour market with its fast-growing demands for highly skilled labour, but also for the development of individuals and for their preparation towards the inactive role as citizens of a democratic state. The Bologna Process, the creation of the European Higher Education Area, is a unique effort to meet those challenges by the joint efforts of all European nations. In this sense, the activities of the Council in higher education extended and enriched cultural cooperation. When referring to these activities, the Wrocław Declaration called on the Council of Europe “to build on its work on youth participation and mobility, language learning, recognition of qualifications, and the European Higher Education Area as possible models for creating policy frameworks in other areas in particular mobility across borders”. The Declaration also called for considering “the possibility of launching a major programme for secondary school-based educational and intercultural exchanges” within Europe and with neighbouring countries.

#### *5. Education for democratic citizenship*

At the Wrocław Conference, special attention was paid to the role of education in promoting democratic values.

Education for democratic citizenship has been one of the principal objectives of the Council of Europe, particularly since the Second Summit (Strasbourg, 10–11 October 1997) at which the Heads of State and Government “expressed their desire to develop education for democratic citizenship based on the rights and responsibilities of citizens, and the participation of young people in civil society”.

On 7 May 1999, the Committee of Ministers, at its 104th Session, adopted the Declaration and programme on education for democratic citizenship.

The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Council of Europe at its 20th session (Cracow, Poland, 15–17 October 2000) adopted a resolution in which education for democratic citizenship was defined in its political, legal, cultural, socio-economic, European and global dimensions.

Finally, in March 2004, the Committee of Ministers declared 2005 the European Year of Citizenship through Education and established the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the European Year of Citizenship through Education (CAHCIT).<sup>7</sup>

The decision of the Council of Europe to declare 2005 the European Year of Citizenship through Education was fully endorsed by all the participants of the Wrocław Conference and provided an impetus to discussing various aspects of democratic education. The Wrocław Declaration strongly endorsed the Year: "In this context, we are looking forward to celebrating 2005 as the European Year of Citizenship through Education and we are convinced that it will be a major event in the implementation of our policies for education for democracy".

In his report, the Secretary General pointed to the importance of the Year and expressed his hope that "the development of common European standards might form the basis of a framework convention on education for democratic citizenship in a follow-up to the Year". The Secretary General expressed the opinion that "education programmes under the European Cultural Convention will need to address at least three interrelated domains of action dealing with democratic values and social cohesion, the management of diversity and the European dimension of education". Furthermore, the Secretary General pointed to the close links between education for democratic citizenship and education in human rights. Since at least 1997, when the Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation 1346 on human rights education, the Council of Europe has devoted its attention to promoting education in human rights, including the teacher training programmes, in-service training and other activities. The Wrocław Conference brought together two important aspects of educational policy: promotion of democratic citizenship and of human rights through education on all levels, both formal and non-formal. It also called for sustained efforts to develop life-long learning in democratic citizenship and human rights and for the creation of a centre of excellence for the training of teacher trainers.

Education for democratic citizenship and for human rights must realistically take into account several problems confronting both the older democracies in Western Europe and the new democracies in the Eastern part of the continent. It would be unrealistic to assume that education alone can solve these problems but sustained educational efforts are indispensable if we are to deal with them effectively.

In the older democracies, there has been widespread political apathy and disillusionment with the democratic institutions, particularly among the younger generation. Sociological surveys show that politics has a very low place in the hierarchy of socially accepted values and that interest in politics is declining. Such a trend has also been manifest in the new democracies and is most likely the consequence of the feeling that one's personal involvement in politics does not make any

---

7. The Launching Conference of the European Year of Citizenship through Education took place in Sofia, 13-14 December 2004, at the invitation of the Bulgarian authorities. The conclusions from the Wrocław Conference were presented at the beginning of the meeting.



difference. The concept of *democratic deficit*, to which some speakers referred in this context, has a psychological character. It does not mean that the existing democratic institutions are no longer instruments of the government of the people, by the people and for the people, but rather that they fail to reach the level of public expectations.

One has to guard against too easy generalisations. The massive mobilisation of citizens in defence of the democratic electoral process in Ukraine has demonstrated the importance of the potential for participatory democracy when the people feel that something important depends on their activity. Citizens are not inherently passive. They become passive when the system works in such a way as to rule out any meaningful choice for them.

Education for democratic citizenship can help to overcome the democratic deficit through the promotion of realistic expectations. On the one hand, it should demonstrate the extent to which democratic institutions can make the life of citizens better, and, on the other, it should point to the limitations of public institutions, which cannot serve as answers to all possible problems. Meaningful electoral participation requires not only that the citizen knows techniques of voting but that she or he understands how to influence the process of selecting candidates, how to listen to the electoral messages in an informed way, and how to maximise the impact of one's vote.

Educating citizens in the spirit of civil society is important for the formation of a realistic approach to the political process. Realism requires the understanding of both the potential and the limitation of political institutions. They can do a lot, but not everything, to make life better. If democratic institutions cannot solve all societal problems, it is important for citizens to want and to know how to have a direct impact on realities through voluntary associations of civil society.

Democracy is an art of civilised dispute, in which people differ in their views but do not behave as enemies. Tolerant behaviour, willingness to listen to the arguments of the other side and to seek compromises, are essential for a healthy democratic process. They do not come naturally. They can only be learned. One of the tasks of education for democratic citizenship is to teach people how to disagree in a democratic way and how to build consensus through compromise.

Tolerant attitudes are essential components of democratic political culture. They are now under attack because of the rapid increase of intolerant behaviour, hostility and fanaticism.

Ethnocentrism and xenophobia are old ills in Europe, but recently they became a growing danger. Anti-Semitism, an old phenomenon in much of Europe, is on the rise, including in some of the old democracies where a few decades ago it was on the decline. The special report published on 6 January 2005 by the US Department of State points to the massive demonstrations of anti-Semitism in Russia, but also describes the increased attacks on Jews and Jewish institutions in several older democracies in Europe. No European country is entirely free of this phenomenon.

It is not only, or even mostly, a residual consequence of old prejudices. The growth of anti-Semitism in the Europe of today is caused by the aggressive propaganda of some militant groups hostile to Israel (sometimes also hostile to Western civilisation as a whole) and ready to go beyond criticism of Israel's policies to the generalised attacks on Jewish communities in Europe. While the core of these groups is composed of local citizens, the presence of strong immigrant Muslim communities in Western Europe, some of which are strongly anti-Jewish, contributes to the growth of anti-Semitism.

Simultaneously, in some parts of Europe, there has been a wave of hostile, often violent, acts directed against the Muslim minorities. In the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks, Muslims in Western Europe feel endangered by the militancy of the extremist groups. Similarly, in Russia, the protracted conflict in Chechnya, particularly after a series of terrorist attacks on civilian targets, provoked hostility and acts of discrimination directed against Muslim communities. Irresponsible comments made publicly by some prominent European writers and journalists have contributed to the growth of such attitudes.

Education for democratic citizenship and for human rights must face this challenge. It is not enough to denounce such behaviour as inconsistent with the values of democracy. It is necessary constantly to remind people, and particularly the young generation, of the horrors to which xenophobia in all its forms brought Europe only 60 years ago. The experience of the Holocaust has already become an important part of education. In 2005, the memory of the Holocaust will be brought to European schools in special programmes. It is particularly important to stress that the Holocaust resulted from the long history of anti-Semitism. Whilst German Nazism was the principal culprit, it found willing collaborators among many other nations. Bringing this aspect of the Holocaust to the attention of young Europeans is vitally important.<sup>8</sup>

It is also important to enrich the school curriculum by an informed and balanced presentation of the history and contemporary problems of Islam and of the relations between Europe and the Middle East. Europeans often have problems with understanding why the memory of the crusades, idealised in European literature, has an ominous character for Arabs and other Muslims. In such a context, intercultural education becomes an essential element of democratic education in the sense that it helps overcome our limited and one-sided understanding of history and its impact on contemporary politics.

Intercultural education is also important for promoting solidarity and a feeling of togetherness between the peoples of Europe. The basic requirement for this is that

---

8. In this context, the Polish example may be of some interest. In 2001, under the auspices of President Aleksander Kwasniewski, the 60th anniversary of a massacre of the entire Jewish population by its Polish neighbours in the Polish town Jedwabne was commemorated. The case was discussed publicly and has become part of the teaching about the Holocaust. As could have been expected, such an approach was strongly attacked by those who refuse to acknowledge Polish responsibility for crimes committed during the last war.



they know each other better. In this respect, citizenship education overlaps with multicultural education. A good citizen needs to know his or her neighbours, their history, their culture, their way of life.

But, it is also something more. In Europe, the history of relations between neighbours is full of bad memories. Future closeness between citizens of European States cannot be based on forgetfulness. The past should not be forgotten, but it has to be overcome.

Education plays an important role in reconciliation between former enemies. More than 30 years ago, under the auspices of UNESCO, the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland undertook pioneering work to review school textbooks from the perspective of eliminating material detrimental to the process of German-Polish reconciliation and strengthening the positive image of the other side. Such an educational effort has contributed to the improvement of relations and helped build an atmosphere of friendship between the younger generation of Poles and Germans. Later on, the experience of the German-Polish Commission on Textbooks was replicated in several other countries.

The new democracies in the post-communist States also face some problems related to their experience and resulting from the combination of political and economic change over a short period of time. During this short period of time, "they have to address simultaneously the civil, political, and social requirements of citizenship"<sup>9</sup>. What in the West has emerged in the long process of historical evolution has to be formed in the East in the lifetime of just one generation. It makes education for democratic citizenship particularly important in countries where democracy has been born (or, sometimes reborn), after the fall of the communist regimes.

This task is complicated by the impact of economic change on politics, particularly on the way in which citizens see the political process.

In post-communist States, citizens are often frustrated because of what they perceive as the failure of the market economy. Dismantling the centrally controlled economic system of the communist States was necessary for their recovery and their incorporation into the international economy. In the long run, the transformation of state controlled economies into market economies brings economic improvement to the situation of citizens. In the short run, however, this transformation called for sacrifices. Moreover, the benefits of the economic change are unevenly distributed. The better-off sectors of society improve their situation, while the poorer sectors remain poor or become even poorer in the transformation. What makes things worse is the great expectations in the early moments of transformation. People were told that the principal reason for their economic problems was the communist system of government. It was almost inevitable that they expected rapid change for the better, once the communist government disappeared. All these factors have produced massive frustration. Frustrated societies do

---

9. Adam Przeworski et al., *Sustainable Democracy*: 36.

not form a hospitable environment for democracy. In the post-communist States, political apathy is even more widespread than in the West and voters tend to change their political allegiance from one election to the other.

One of the consequences of frustration is the nostalgic feeling that things were better under the old regime. In surveys conducted in several post-communist States of Central Europe, only a minority of respondents believed that they were better off than they had been under communist rule, while, in Spain, three out of four respondents declared that they were currently better off than under the Franco regime<sup>10</sup>.

There is also a strong authoritarian current in the political attitudes of citizens in post-communist States. While surveys show that most citizens in Central European States favour democracy over any other system of government, there is also a sizeable number of respondents who believe that a government led by a strong man may be preferable. In Russia and in the other former Soviet Republics, this attitude is even more common.

Can education help in overcoming such attitudes? It is important not to overestimate the potential of education, but it is also important not to give up.

Teaching the history of the recent, non-democratic past is one way of educating young people for democratic citizenship. The passing of time makes the former regime somewhat removed from the personal experience of young people in the new democracies. The youngest of them were born after the change of regime and the oldest were children at the time of change. From their parents, they receive a picture of the previous regime coloured by the present attitudes of the older generation. School education should give students the necessary knowledge of the past, which would allow them to form an independent but informed opinion about it. It is essential that such an education avoids simplification and one-sidedness, but it is also important for it to bring home to young people the fundamental difference between democracy, individual freedom, the rule of law, and the protection of human rights on the one hand, and totalitarian control, violation of human rights and the persecution of dissidents on the other. Knowledge of the past is necessary for making the right political choices today.

Another aspect of democracy, important from the point of view of education for democratic citizenship, is the concept and practice of the rule of law. Citizens, old and young, must not only know the most important laws of the land, but also become used to the philosophy of the rule of law. The essence of it is the obligation to honour the law, even if one disagrees with it and wants it changed. As long as a law is legally binding, the rule of law requires that everybody behaves in accordance with it.

Many citizens of contemporary democracies, under the influence of postmodernist political philosophy, tend to adopt a relativistic approach to legal rules. On the

---

10. Samuel H. Barnes & Janos Simon, *The Postcommunist Citizen*, Budapest 1998: 235.



other hand, we have experienced situations in which bad laws became weapons used against fundamental human rights and freedoms. A delicate balance is necessary between an uncritical acceptance of every law and unlimited legal relativism. Such a balance requires legal education to include the philosophy of natural law and its consequences for law making.

Educating people in the rule of law encounters difficulties caused by the way in which the law functions. In many democratic States, there have been flagrant violations of law by high-ranking representatives of state power. When a former prime minister dies in exile, and another head of government is forced to resign because of financial irregularities, citizens tend to adopt a cynical attitude to law enforcement. This is a problem common to all democracies – both old and new. But, in the new democracies, the problem is magnified by the fact that people of these States had little opportunity to learn respect for the law.

Would it be naïve to postulate that, in the programmes of education for democratic citizenship, corruption is given too much attention? In spite of widespread corruption, most of our public servants are honest. Educating young people in the values of democratic citizenship, we should make them aware of the corrupting influence of big money and privilege on the quality of democracy and to show them ways in which citizens can protect their democratic institutions from corrupt practices.

Such broadly defined programmes require national governments, organs of territorial self-government, non-governmental organisations, and concerned individuals to join hands in promoting education for democratic citizenship and human rights. It is also important for efforts to be made to encourage international cooperation and exchange of experience.

The Council of Europe has a crucial role. The Wrocław Declaration calls for the strengthening of the role of the Council of Europe in promoting European identity and democratic citizenship.

*"In order to empower individuals to act as responsible citizens in their daily lives both individually, and collectively, – reads the Declaration – the Council of Europe should strengthen its role as a centre of excellence for policies to equip people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes for life in democratic societies fully respecting human rights and to combat structural obstacles to democratic participation. To this end, consideration should be given to the setting of European standards by means of appropriate conventional mechanisms as well as the expansion of European opportunities for the training of educators through the creation of a centre of excellence for the training of teacher trainers. "*

#### *6. European cooperation for sustainable development*

The Wrocław Conference provided an opportunity to discuss the perspectives of international cooperation "in order to respond to the aspirations of citizens for a higher quality of life, now and for the future" (Wrocław Declaration). Cultural

cooperation has been firmly placed within the broader context of European policies the aim of which is to promote inter-generational equity in access to economic, social, cultural, and natural resources. In particular, the Wrocław Declaration called for the development of programmes of activities emphasising:

- the need for an integrated policies approach and strategy;
- the links between conservation and sustainability of the heritage and of natural and cultural aspects of landscapes and the environment;
- the role of risk prevention and management of natural or technological disasters in sustainable development policies;
- the essential role of formal and non-formal education for sustainable development;
- cultural diversity as part of sustainable development.

In emphasising such goals, the Wrocław Conference put cultural cooperation within the broader context of European cooperation for sustainable development, and redefined the concept of sustainable development to include cultural development along with economic and social development. Strong cultural policy, argued Simon Mundy, is necessary to avoid the danger of delegating cultural issues to a place secondary to the economic ones. He also strongly argued for a policy of investing in culture as the safest way to building a better future for the generations to come.

Various forms of international cooperation to achieve sustainable cultural development were discussed.

Exchanges of teachers and students as well as collaborative work on comparing curricula and textbooks were endorsed.

Wider cooperation between governments and non-governmental institutions of civil society was considered essential for cultural development.

Regional cultural programmes undertaken by neighbouring States were seen as useful.

For the future, the Wrocław Conference emphasised the need for a more active role by the Council of Europe in promoting cultural and educational cooperation. It also called for closer complementary cooperation with the European Union "creating the conditions for real partnership".



# Wrocław declaration on fifty years of European Cultural Cooperation

## (Preamble)

We, MINISTERS responsible for culture, education, youth and sport from the States parties to the European Cultural Convention, assembled in Wrocław, on 9-10 December 2004 :

We CELEBRATE the 50th anniversary of the opening to signature of the Convention in Paris on 19 December 1954 ;

We AFFIRM that the values and principles of the Convention that has brought our countries together in peaceful cooperation under the Council of Europe for 50 years remain as valid as ever, and represent a precious resource for an undivided, democratic Europe in the 21st Century ;

We ADOPT this Declaration and commend it to the Council of Europe and its member States for their future action.

## I. Achievements of 50 years of the European Cultural Convention

Less than 10 years after the end of World War II, the adoption of the European Cultural Convention within the framework of the Council of Europe reflected the hope of future unity and a belief in the power of the humanistic spirit of education and culture to heal old and new divisions, prevent conflicts, and cement the democratic order.

The key achievements of our predecessors and ourselves<sup>11</sup> must be judged by the principles of the Convention itself and of its later developments in *European cultural cooperation*. The three *original political objectives* of the Convention were:

- *The recognition by Europeans of their common cultural heritage*

Our governments undertook in the Convention to treat our national heritages of civilisation as a common patrimony and trust. We have developed a broad range of measures to safeguard the heritage, tangible or intangible, broadened the scope of the concept, and illustrated its sharing imaginatively.

- *Mobility and exchange for mutual understanding*

Our governments undertook in the Convention to promote mobility of persons as well as of cultural objects for the mutual learning of our peoples about each

---

11. Summarised in the appendix to this Declaration.



other's culture and heritage. We have mainly targeted our action for mobility on students and other young people, and our governments have also encouraged it by bilateral and multilateral programmes and general measures for freedom of movement.

- *A broad current of pan-European cultural cooperation*

Our governments undertook in the Convention to join in an open and holistic process of cultural cooperation. We have striven, with the active support of the Parliamentary Assembly, to maintain the Convention's unified vision in its flexible and dynamic implementation. We have built up a broad programme of cooperation at both political and professional levels, and extended it from culture, heritage and education to youth and sport.

We have realised the importance of the contribution which the Convention can make to the basic values defended by the Council of Europe and accordingly we have re-shaped the cooperation carried out under the Convention.

The original commitments were thus joined by three major new objectives:

- *Creating conditions for full participation in democratic life*

Whilst seeking effective implementation of the Council of Europe's core values in European societies, we have worked for the promotion of a model of a democratic culture underpinning law and institutions. In particular, we defined the guidelines for cultural democracy, lifelong learning and sport for all; set up a youth programme as a laboratory for participation; made universities and non-governmental youth and sports organisations full partners in the relevant programmes; and placed education for democratic citizenship and equal opportunity at the heart of our idea of educational quality.

In this context, we are looking forward to celebrating 2005 as the European Year of Citizenship through Education and we are convinced that it will be a major event in the implementation of our policies for education for democracy.

- *A European dimension in standards, policy and practice*

We recognised the need to implement the Convention's broad principles more effectively on the ground. We complemented the sharing of good practice through networks with the intergovernmental setting and monitoring of numerous standards in all the major fields. This policy has strengthened ties to and between national policymakers in each sector, but calls for vigilance to maintain the common vision. We have also acted on our recognition that successful action also relies on partnerships with other international institutions and organisations, in particular the European Union and UNESCO.

- *Promoting cultural diversity and building up shared values*

We understood that the Convention's goal of the peaceful harmony of diverse cultures is a key to democratic stability. Accordingly, we have developed policies to ensure that the diversity of our heritages and artistic creations is not only accepted but actively promoted, as well as ways of fostering dialogue and preventing conflicts both by knowledge and understanding of difference, and by common values.

We have also been active in seeking the same international recognition for cultural rights as for civil, political, economic and social rights, and acknowledgement of cultural rights as integral to the core fundamental rights codified in the Council of Europe's legal instruments. In that connection, we welcome the fact that many cultural rights or rights with a cultural dimension are included in the European Convention on Human Rights, the Revised Social Charter, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

Impressive progress has been made since 1954. However, major challenges still lie ahead. We therefore call on the Council of Europe to further develop its action based on principles, in the same way as 50 years ago the Council and the Convention brought to the forefront values overshadowed by extremism and conflict.

## **II. Challenges facing European cultural cooperation in today's Europe**

The European Cultural Convention enters its second half-century in a Europe transformed by history. These transformations are political as well as economic and technological. The quality of life must be judged by the higher test of the values of the Council of Europe. A lot has been achieved, but similarly a lot remains to be done:

- wider access to education and cultural rights, but too often continued exclusion of minorities and the poor;
- considerable progress in equality between women and men, but important efforts still needed to consolidate recent evolutions and anchor them in people's minds;
- wider personal freedom, but much social disconnection;
- greater protection of the heritage and the environment but their targeting in the course of conflicts, and a realisation of how far our economies are from sustainability;
- access to a flood of information, but scarcely greater wisdom; the end of the tyranny of ideology, but the revival of racism, antisemitism, extreme nationalism, xenophobia, intolerance, exclusion, terrorism, extremism and even warfare.

In the coming years, the Council of Europe will encounter many new challenges for its cultural cooperation. We have begun a debate to identify these to guide our



strategy. This debate should be continued throughout the celebrations of the Convention's 50th anniversary, with contributions from our partners.

At this stage, we therefore formulate our provisional conclusions as *hypotheses* for further consideration in the coming months:

- *European identity and democratic citizenship*<sup>12</sup>

We should deepen a sense of our *shared history and common future* among the peoples of our 48 states, within their diversity, so as to avoid the emergence of a sense of division within greater Europe. We should therefore encourage a balanced vision of the identities which make up "Greater Europe". We should also encourage and preserve links and dialogue with European diasporas throughout the world.

This would call for measures to combat trends towards stratification and a retreat into closed community identities encouraging a balanced concept of multiple identities; to support the emergence of a common European memory based on recognition both of achievements and of the common heritage of suffering; and to ensure greater mobility of young people, students, artists, creators and professionals throughout the continent within the framework of existing legislation.

- *Cultural diversity and cohesion of society*

We should ensure cultural freedom and promote cultural diversity so that each person can develop from his or her own heritage and that of others in respect of common values. In this respect, current initiatives aimed at defending and recognising the specificity of cultural assets and the right of states to carry out national public policies in cultural fields, in particular the draft convention drawn up by UNESCO, deserve our support.

This would call for measures to manage diversity in all its manifestations; to deepen common civic values as the basis for social cohesion; and to foster, the dialogue in and between our peoples.

We should build *intercultural dialogue* – including its inter-religious dimension – into European policy in full respect of the principles on which our societies are founded.

This would call for measures to develop this dialogue as an instrument for the prevention of conflicts and for reconciliation. To reinforce our openness towards neighbouring regions – in particular the southern shore of the Mediterranean – and towards the rest of the world, we should seek for the fuller use of existing instruments and the creation of new ones as appropriate.

---

12. Democratic citizenship implies that all citizens should have full enjoyment of human rights and feel protected by democratic society. It also implies that everyone needs to participate in matters in society and act as active and responsible citizens respectful of the rights of others.

- *A Europe of knowledge and information*

We should affirm *European democratic values and identity* in the transition to a global information society shaped by knowledge, cultural expression and communication.

This would call for measures of educational, cultural, youth and sports policy to ensure further development of cultural industries, access and participation by all, overcoming digital divides and exclusion; creative, discerning and responsible use of information technologies expanding the intellectual horizons of individuals; ensure the active presence of European cultures in global cultural exchanges, while using our cultural and natural heritage for sustainable socio-economic development.

- *Changing actors and partners*

Our cooperation should build on a "network Europe" of multiple organisations and on a vibrant civil society, in the framework of *partnerships* based on the Convention's goals. These partnerships would be based on projects in the field and the development of flexible and efficient ways of working with civil society, broadening and adapting our unique practice which we have established in the areas of youth and sport and in our relations with universities.

We should track the emergence of major new patterns in European societies focusing on the *role of the public authorities* in the fields of culture, education, heritage, youth and sport in ensuring individual rights and maintaining democratic values.

Such prospect would call in particular for reinforced cooperation with the European Union and UNESCO. This would also enable us to reaffirm the importance of national cultural and educational policies in a multilateral context.

### III. Lines of action for a Europe without dividing lines

We propose the following strategic guidelines for the further development by the Council of Europe of its work of cultural cooperation. They apply equally to all its sectors, school, out-of-school and higher education, culture, natural and cultural heritage, youth and sport, and build on their achievements and on-going programmes. The Council of Europe should continue to play an essential role in Europe as a forum for the drawing up of standards and cultural policies.

The general focus should be on responding to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of all the States parties to the Convention and, in particular, young people as regards their vision of Europe<sup>13</sup> and on promoting dialogue and harmony between Europe and its global environment. The Council of Europe and our governments should take action in the following areas:

---

13. As expressed in particular at the Youth Summit to be held in parallel to the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government (Warsaw, May 2005)



- *European identity and democratic citizenship*

In order to empower individuals to act as responsible citizens in their daily lives both individually and collectively, the Council of Europe should strengthen its role as a centre of excellence for policies to equip people with the knowledge, skills and attitudes for life in democratic societies fully respecting human rights and to combat structural obstacles to democratic participation. To this end, consideration should be given to the setting of European standards by means of appropriate conventional mechanisms as well as the expansion of European opportunities for the training of educators through the creation of a centre of excellence for the training of teacher trainers.

- *Cultural diversity and cohesion of society*

Intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, based on the primacy of common values, should be organised and systematically encouraged as a means of promoting awareness and understanding of each other, preventing conflicts, promoting reconciliation and ensuring the cohesion of society. This should be done in particular through formal and non-formal education, the dimensions of remembrance and common heritage, cultural action and participation in the community. To this end, the Council of Europe should continue to develop strategic policy frameworks for the management of cultural diversity and models of good practice based on its fundamental values.

Cultural diversity manifests itself today especially through the exchange and consumption of culturally different goods and services. The Council of Europe should, therefore, continue to implement its measures in favour of cultural industries, in particular "Eurimages" and the Convention on Cinematographic Co-productions, and assess the need for any other appropriate measures.

- *Intercultural and inter-religious dialogue*

Going beyond the action carried out to develop intercultural dialogue in European societies, the Council of Europe should promote an intercultural and inter-religious dialogue between Europe and the neighbouring regions, in particular the southern shore of the Mediterranean, with a view to ensuring stability and cohesion and to enhancing mutual understanding and respect.

In addition to the fuller use of existing instruments for dialogue with Europe's neighbours, the Council of Europe should actively consider the possibility of adopting an instrument which could serve such a purpose.

- *Participation in the knowledge and information society*

Respect for and access to cultural rights – and in particular the right to education – should be promoted to fight exclusion and to build equitable societies, with particular attention being paid to vulnerable groups. A policy for inclusion should be developed for young people to facilitate access to cultural freedom and education. Efforts should also be made to promote knowledge by the Europeans of their

respective cultural works, for example literature, with the aim of promoting cultural diversity.

The Council of Europe, as a pan-European organisation dealing with human rights and the democratic dimension of communication, should emphasise the role and responsibility of the independent media as well as the right of freedom of expression in the knowledge and information society – especially in times of crisis.

- *Mobility*

The Council of Europe should build on its work on youth participation and mobility, language learning, recognition of qualifications, and the European Higher Education Area as possible models for creating policy frameworks in other areas in particular mobility across borders. The possibility of launching a major programme for secondary school-based educational and intercultural exchanges should be pursued both within Europe and with neighbouring countries. Attention should also be paid to developing mobility for artists, cultural professionals and works of art. All these measures should take account of existing legislation.

- *Sustainable development*

In order to respond to the aspirations of citizens for a higher quality of life, now and for the future, the Council of Europe is committed to developing integrated policies for intergenerational equity in access to economic, social, cultural and natural resources under the principle of sustainable development. Policies for the sensitive management of these resources would enhance their contribution to wider economic opportunity, to personal and community development and to the expression of cultural identity and diversity. The Council of Europe should, therefore, develop programmes of activities which demonstrate and emphasise:

- the need for an integrated policies approach and strategy;
- the links between conservation and sustainability of the heritage and of natural and cultural aspects of landscapes and the environment;
- the role of risk prevention and management of natural or technological disasters in sustainable development policies;
- the essential role of formal and non-formal education for sustainable development;
- cultural diversity as a basis of sustainable development.

- *Partnerships*

In the context of the European Union's enlargement and with a view to its new Constitution, the Council of Europe should seek for full and complementary cooperation with the Union, creating the conditions of real partnership.

The level and content of cooperation with UNESCO should also be reinforced in all areas of cultural cooperation.



Cooperation with other international organisations and with organisations from the private sector in furthering cultural cooperation should be reinforced.

The Council of Europe should continue to focus on the contribution of non-governmental organisations and voluntary activities in cultural life and society and should pursue its action in building cultural networks.

- *In conclusion,*

We therefore SUBMIT this Declaration to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe. We ask that the Declaration be further considered by all relevant Council of Europe bodies and submitted to the other events to be organised within the framework of the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the European Cultural Convention.

We also INVITE the Committee of Ministers to transmit the Declaration to the Third Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe's member States (Warsaw, 16-17 May 2005), stressing the vital importance of cultural cooperation in promoting the core values of our Organisation.

# Appendices



# Appendix 1

## Key achievements of 50 years of the European Cultural Convention

### The original political objectives of the Convention:

#### 1. The recognition by Europeans of their common cultural heritage

*(Articles 1 and 5 of the Convention)*

- The illustration of the interdependence of European art by the cooperative organisation of 27 major art exhibitions and 12 cultural routes.
- The development of the concept and standards of integrated conservation of the architectural and archaeological heritage<sup>14</sup>.
- The widening of the protection of the heritage to the audiovisual and landscape domains<sup>15</sup>, to archives, and to the intellectual heritage of European universities.
- Revised textbooks and curricula in history education to remove bias and promote empathy between groups (cf Recommendation Rec(2001)15 on History Teaching in 21st Century Europe of the Committee of Ministers); and the inauguration of a Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust and for the prevention of crimes against humanity.
- Research-based models for safeguarding the European linguistic heritage through the language industries.
- Concepts and practice for intercultural education in formal and non-formal settings.

#### 2. Mobility and exchange for mutual understanding

*(Articles 2 and 4 of the Convention)*

- Standards of fair mutual recognition of qualifications<sup>16</sup> to enable the mobility of students; contributions to pioneering the model of inter-university cooperation, and to the coordination of policy and standards for the establishment of a European Higher Education Area by 2010.
- Over 300,000 young people enabled to come together for their international activities through the European Youth Centres, European Youth Foundation

14. CETS conventions 121, 143. Full titles are given in the Secretary General's report.

15. CETS 66, 143, 176, 183, 184

16. CETS 15, 32, 49, subsumed in the Lisbon Convention 165



and Solidarity Fund, and development of wider policies for youth mobility including the Partial Agreement on the Youth Card<sup>17</sup>.

- Over 10,000 in-service training places shared with teachers from other countries, and a pilot for intercultural school-based exchanges.
- European language learning standards for effective communication (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages and the Language Portfolio).

### 3. A broad current of pan-European cultural cooperation

*(Articles 3 and 6 of the Convention)*

- The inclusion of all European states in the Convention, one by one, for 29 of them as a doorway to the Council of Europe.
- The complementary concepts of cultural democracy and life-long education as strategic guidelines for all the Convention's areas of concern.
- The inclusion of youth and sport as major sectors of cultural cooperation and vectors of its values.
- Pioneer methods of networking for innovatory projects with practitioners and regional and local authorities as well as governments, and a legacy of networks created.
- A unique level of participation by universities, youth organisations, and sports federations in decisions on policies and projects concerning them.
- Wide-ranging practical assistance through thousands of missions to help new member states and conflict regions come up to European standards in our sectors.
- Substantial impacts on policy agendas and measures both nationally and in the European Union achieved with limited resources.

### The major new objectives:

#### 4. Creating conditions for full participation in democratic life

- A shift in the guiding notion of state cultural policy from the democratisation of an élite culture to cultural democracy and the right of all to cultural expression; and the embodiment of these principles in standards for public participation in heritage and landscape policies.
- The youth programme in the two European Youth Centres and the Youth Foundation established as a practical model, not only of non-formal learning, but also of youth participation in public life, providing an effective platform for a contribution by youth to issues of European concern.
- The principles and content of a policy of sport for all.

---

17. CETS 37 and 175

- The concept of permanent (later lifelong) education and learner empowerment, and the working out of its implications for access for all to good education in different contexts.
- Contributions to transversal projects for affirmative action to secure the rights of women, and people belonging to minorities and vulnerable groups.
- The principles and content of a policy of education for democratic citizenship as a key aspect of educational quality, in schools and for young people.

#### 5. A European dimension in standards, policy and practice

- The promulgation of standards of good practice in 19 conventions<sup>18</sup> and numerous recommendations to governments adopted by the Council's Committee of Ministers, and their application through convention monitoring, intergovernmental committees, and technical cooperation and assistance.
- The exposure of many national policies to international comparison and benchmarking, through national policy reviews in culture, youth, sport, and languages; and information networks for mutual reference and policy research such as the Compendium of cultural policies and the European Heritage Network (HEREIN).
- A stronger European dimension in national practice, based on our common standards and goals, through work on school and higher education policies and curricula, and training programmes for teachers, trainers, youth leaders and other key multipliers.
- Partnership through joint projects with the European Union, including the European years of music and languages, the European Heritage Days, the European Cultural Routes and agreements on youth training and research; with UNESCO, such as the Lisbon recognition convention; and with other international structures including the Bologna process and the World Anti-Doping Agency.

#### 6. Respecting cultural diversity and building up shared values

- The launch of the forthcoming instrument on the value of cultural heritage for society, which will complement at pan-European level UNESCO's efforts on cultural diversity.
- Support to diversity in European film-making through the "Eurimages" fund.
- A policy framework for multilingualism, based on the relevant Council of Europe conventions; and work with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on cultural action in regions and communities.
- Theoretical and practical development of inter-cultural education, both in school and out-of-school contexts.

---

<sup>18</sup> The full list of conventions and a selection of recommendations are given in the Secretary General's report.



- A practical scheme of education on human rights as part of citizenship, and joint action against intolerance in cooperation with young people and ECRI, in particular through the "All different, all equal" campaign.
- Instruments to protect the values of sport against abuses, through standards against violence and doping<sup>19</sup> and to develop the positive contribution of sport to healthy, integrated democratic societies.
- The first results of a commitment of all four sectors – culture, education, youth and sport – to help our societies meet the challenge of conflict prevention, reconciliation and dialogue: framework texts for cultural policy for intercultural dialogue and conflict prevention (Opatija Declaration) and for intercultural education (Athens Declaration), youth activities for a culture of peace, and the "ballons rouges" project to bring sport to refugee children.

---

19. CETS 120, 135, 188

## Appendix 2

### Programme of the Conference

#### Wednesday 8 December 2004

Arrival and registration of participants

- 20.00 Art Exhibition of scientific works of Leonardo da Vinci, Former Town Hall  
Dinner for all participants at the invitation of the Mayor of Wrocław,  
Piwnica Świdnicka, (Wrocław, Rynek Ratusz 1)

#### Thursday 9 December 2004

- 08.30 Departure from the hotels by coach

##### 09.00 Official Opening

Ossolineum National Institute (Wrocław, Szewska 37)

Welcome addresses by:

- Mr Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe
- Mr Waldemar DĄBROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland
- Mr Mirosław SAWICKI, Minister of Education and Sport of Poland

##### 09.30 Plenary Session 1: "Stocktaking of the achievements over 50 years of the European Cultural Convention"

Chairmanship by Mr Waldemar DĄBROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland

Introduction to the theme by Mr Simon MUNDY, Director of the Centre for the Cultural Environment, King's College, London

- 10.00 Coffee break

- 10.00 Press Conference with:

- Mr Terry DAVIS, Secretary General of the Council of Europe
- Mr Waldemar DĄBROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland
- Mr Mirosław SAWICKI, Minister of Education and Sport of Poland

- 10.30 General discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport:

- Mr Henri INGBERG
- Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE
- Mr César BIRZEA
- Ms Krisztina GÖNTER
- Mr Peter LAURITZEN



- 11.30 General discussion (continued)  
Summary by Mr Simon MUNDY
- 12.00 **End of Session**  
**Departure to restaurants**
- 12.30 Lunch for the Heads of Delegations hosted by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe (invitation only)  
Museum of Architecture, Kruzganki Room<sup>20</sup> (Wrocław, Bernardyńska 5)  
Lunch for the other participants hosted by the Polish Authorities  
Inspiracja Restaurant (Plac Solny 16)
- 14.30 Opening Ceremony of the Exhibition at the Kolegium Europy Wschodniej Gallery (Wrocław, ul. Kielbaśnicza 5)
- 15.00 **Plenary Session 2: "From stocktaking to new challenges for cultural exchange and cooperation in present-day Europe"**  
Ossolineum National Institute  
Chairmanship and introduction to the topic by Mr Miroslaw SAWICKI, Minister of Education and Sport of Poland
- 15.30 General discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport
- Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE
  - Mr Renaldas VAISBRODAS
  - Professor Mykola RYABCHUK
- 16.30 Coffee break
- 17.00 General discussion (continued)
- 17.30 Summary by Professor Kazimierz KRZYSZTOFEK
- 17.45 End of the session
- \*  
\* \*
- 18.45 Departure from the hotels by coach
- 19.00 Presentation of the Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe at Wrocław University (Wrocław, Plac Uniwersytecki 1) – Awards Ceremony followed by small Reception  
Exhibition of the Posters of the Council of Europe's Art Exhibitions
- 20.00 Concert at Wrocław University, Aula Leopoldina
- 21.00 Dinner hosted by Mr Waldemar DAŹBROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland at Wrocław University, Oratorium Marianum

---

20. Transport to and from the Museum of Architecture by coach will be organised by the Polish Authorities.

## Friday 10 December 2004

- 08.15 Departure from the hotels for the participants in the 8.30 session
- 08.30 Open-ended session to finalise the Declaration**
- 10.00 Plenary Session 3 : "The future of cultural cooperation in Greater Europe – a new role for the European Cultural Convention"**  
Chairmanship and introduction to the topic by Ms Vesna KILIBARDA, Minister of Culture and Media, Montenegro  
General discussion with the participation of personalities from Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport
- Mr Benoît PAUMIER
  - Mr Robert PALMER
  - Ms Vera STASTNA
  - Mr Michael RAPHAEL
- General discussion
- 11.30 Coffee break
- 12.00 Closing session of the Conference**  
Chairmanship by Mr Waldemar DABROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland  
Presentation of the draft Declaration by Mr José Amaral LOPES, Secretary of State, Portugal  
Adoption of the Declaration  
Presentation of the Parliamentary Assembly's perspective on cultural cooperation by Baroness HOOPER, Vice-Chair of the Parliamentary Assembly's Committee on Culture, Science and Education  
Closing remarks by Mr Christian TER STEPANIAN, Permanent Representative of Armenia to the Council of Europe and representing the Committee of Ministers  
Conclusions and overall recommendations by the General Rapporteur, Professor Jerzy WIATR
- 13.00 End of the Conference
- 13.00 Media Briefing
- 13.30 Farewell Lunch – Aula, Ostrów Tumski (Plac Katedralny 1)  
Followed by a short tour of Ostrów Tumski

## Saturday 11 December 2004

Guided tour of Wrocław (by registration only)



## Appendix 3

### List of Participants

#### Albania/Albanie

Mr Edmond DRAGOTI, Vice-Minister of Culture, Sports and Youth, Tirana

Mr Arben KUMBARO, Adviser to the Minister, Ministry of Culture, Sports and Youth, Tirana

#### Andorra/Andorre

Ms Carme SALA-SANSA, Permanent Representative of Andorra to the Council of Europe, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Principality of Andorra

Ms Cristina MARTI-TORRES, Director of Culture, Ministry of Education and Culture, Principality of Andorra

#### Armenia/Arménie

Mr Sergo YERITSYAN, Minister of Education, Yerevan

Mr Artak SAHRADYAN, Vice-Minister of Education, Yerevan

Mrs Lilit ASATRYAN, Vice-Ministre de la Culture et de la Jeunesse, Yerevan

Ms Hasmik GHARAGHAZARYAN, Experte au Département des relations internationales, Ministère de la Culture et de la Jeunesse, Yerevan

Mr Ashot HOVAKIMIAN, Ambassador, Embassy of the Republic of Armenia in Poland, Warszawa

Ms Tamara TOROSYAN, Experte au Département de la politique de jeunesse, Ministère de la Culture et de la Jeunesse, Yerevan

#### Austria/Autriche

Ms Brigitte BÖCK, Director General, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Vienna

Mr Norbert RIEDL, Director of International Cultural Affairs, Federal Chancellery/ Department of the Arts, Vienna

Ms Hilde ZACH, Mayor, President of the Culture and Education Committee, Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, Innsbruck

Mr Egon KORDIK, Desk Officer, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Vienna

Mr Wolfgang STEINBAUER, City of Innsbruck, Innsbruck



### **Azerbaijan/Azerbaïdjan**

Ms Sevda MAMMADALIYEVA, Deputy Minister of Culture, Baku

Mr Nazim SAMADOV, Chief Advisor, Ministry of Culture of Azerbaijan, Baku

### **Belarus**

Mr Leonid GULYAKO, Minister of Culture, Minsk

Professor Yadviga GRIGOROVICH, Rector, University of Culture and Arts, Minsk

Ms Natalya NAGIBINA, Chief Expert of the International Relations Department, Ministry of Culture, Minsk

### **Belgium/Belgique**

Mr Jos AELVOET, Delegate of the Flemish Government, Ministry of the Flemish Community, Paris

### **Bosnia and Herzegovina/Bosnie-Herzégovine**

Mr Zijad PASIC, Minister of Education and Science, Sarajevo

Mr Safet HALILOVIC, Minister of Civil Affairs, Sarajevo

Ms Aida DURIC, Professional advisor, Ministry of Civil Affairs, Sarajevo

### **Bulgaria/Bulgarie**

Mr Bojidar ABRASHEV, Minister of Culture, Sofia

Ms Deiana DANAILOVA, Director of International Policy, Ministry of Culture, Sofia

Ms Svetlana SLAVOVA, Head of Division, Ministry of Culture, Sofia

Mr Jan CHOROSTKOWSKI, Honorary Consul of the Republic of Bulgaria

Ms Silwia Borianka PUNCZEWA, Director of the Bulgarian Institute of Culture

### **Croatia/Croatie**

Mr Bozo BISKUPIC, Minister of Culture, Zagreb

Ms Goranka HORJAN, Assistant Minister of Culture, Zagreb

Ms Alida MATKOVIC, Head of Department for Multilateral Cooperation, Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, Zagreb

Ms Suncana GLAVAK, Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Culture, Zagreb

Ms Nebojsa KOHAROVIC, Ambassadeur, Ambassade de Croatie en Pologne, Varsovie

Mr Mirko VOLAREVIC, Premier Secrétaire, Ambassade de Croatie en Pologne, Varsovie

### **Cyprus/Chypre**

Mr Georgios MOLESKIS, Senior Cultural Officer, Ministry of Education and Culture, Nicosia

### **Czech Republic/République tchèque**

Ms Petra SMOLIKOVA, Deputy Minister of Culture, Prague

Ms Jaromíra MIZEROVA, Director, Department for Foreign Relations, Ministry of Culture, Prague

Mr Zdenek PRIHODA, Expert, Department for Foreign Relations, Ministry of Culture, Prague

### **Denmark/Danemark**

Mr Peter VAN ZAANE, Special Advisor, Ministry of Culture, Copenhagen

### **Estonia/Estonie**

Mr Anton PÄRN, Undersecretary/M.A., Ministry of Culture, Tallinn

### **Finland/Finlande**

Mr Kristian SLOTTE, Director General for International Affairs, Ministry of Education and Culture, Helsinki

Mr Kimmo AULAKE, Special Advisor, Ministry of Education, Helsinki

### **France**

Mr Benoît PAUMIER, Délégué au développement et aux affaires internationales, Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Paris

Ms Clara WAGNER, Chargée de mission pour l'Europe centrale et orientale et le Conseil de l'Europe, Délégation au développement et aux Affaires Internationales, Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Paris

### **Georgia/Georgie**

Apologised for absence/excusé

### **Germany/Allemagne**

Mr Rolf-Dieter SCHNELLE, Director for Culture and Education, German Foreign Office, Berlin

Ms Marja EINIG-HEIDENHOF, Head of Division, Multilateral Cultural Policy Division, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin

### **Greece/Grèce**

Mr Dionysios LELOS, Ambassadeur de Grèce en Pologne, Varsovie

Ms Zoe KAZAZAKI, Chef de la Section des Organisations Internationales, Direction des Relations Internationales, Ministère de la Culture, Athènes

### **Holy See/Saint Siège**

S.E. Mgr Józef Miroslaw ZYCINSKI, Archevêque de Lublin, Membre du Conseil Pontifical de la Culture, Lublin



**Rév. Mgr José Manuel DEL RIO**, Commission Pontificale pour les Biens culturels de l'Eglise, Cité du Vatican

**Rév. Père Pascal IDE**, Congrégation pour l'Education catholique, Rome

### **Hungary/Hongrie**

**Mr Sandor SIMON**, Director General of the State Secretary's Office, Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Budapest

**Mr Zsolt JEKELY**, Deputy Head of Department, Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Budapest

**Ms Beata PETES**, Advisor, Ministry of Youth, Social Issues, Family and Equal Opportunities, Budapest

### **Iceland/Islande**

Apologised for absence/excusé

### **Ireland/Irlande**

Apologised for absence/excusé

### **Italy/Italie**

**Ms Antonia PASQUA RECCHIA**, Director General for Innovation, Technology and Promotion, University of Cultural Heritage and Activities, Roma

**Ms Roberta ALBEROTANZA**, Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Tirana

**Dr Vincenzo MICOCCI**, Inspector General, Ministry of Education – International Relations, Roma

**Ms Rosanna BINACCHI**, Directorate General for Innovation, Technology and Promotion University of Cultural Heritage and Activities, Roma

### **Latvia/Lettonie**

Apologised for absence/excusé

### **Liechtenstein**

Apologised for absence/excusé

### **Lithuania/Lituanie**

**Mr Juozas SIRVINSKAS**, Undersecretary, Ministry of Culture, Vilnius

**Ms Audrone MOLYTE**, Senior Officer of the International Relations and European Affairs Department, Ministry of Culture, Vilnius

**Mr Evaldas STANKEVICIUS**, Cultural Attaché at the Embassy of the Republic of Lithuania in Poland, Warsaw

## **Luxembourg**

Mr Guy DOCKENDORF, First Counsellor to the Government, Director General Ministry of Culture, Higher Education and Research, Luxembourg

Ms Barbara ZECHES, Deputy to the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg to the Council of Europe, Strasbourg

## **Malta/Malte**

Mr Louis Philip NAUDI, Permanent Secretary, Ministry for Tourism and Culture, Valetta

Mr Joseph M. MICALLEF, Director, Tourism and Corporate Services, Ministry for Tourism and Culture, Valetta

## **Moldova**

Mr Veaceslav MADAN, Ministre de la Culture, Chisinău

Mr Eugen CARPOV, Ambassadeur de la République de Moldova en Pologne, Varsovie

Mr Valeriu TUREA, Conseiller de l'Ambassade, Varsovie

## **Monaco**

Mr Rémy MORTIER, Représentant Permanent Adjoint de la Principauté de Monaco auprès du Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg

## **Netherlands/Pays-Bas**

Ms Daphne VAN DER AA-VAN DAALEN, Senior Policy Advisor, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Den Haag

## **Norway/Norvège**

Mr Yngve SLETTIHL, Deputy Minister of Culture and Church Affairs, Oslo

Ms Antoaneta HANSTEEN, Adviser, Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs, Oslo

## **Poland/Pologne**

Mr Waldemar DABROWSKI, Minister of Culture of Poland, Warsaw

Mr Mirosław SAWICKI, Minister of Education, Youth and Sport of Poland, Warsaw

Professor Kazimierz KRZYSZTOFEK, Vice-President of the Warsaw Research Institute – Pro Cultura, Warsaw

Professor Jerzy WIATR, General Rapporteur, Warsaw

## **Portugal**

Mr José Manuel Amaral LOPES, Secrétaire d'Etat aux Biens Culturels, Lisbon

Mrs Margarida ABRUNHOSA, Ministry of Culture, Lisbon



**Mr Joao RODEIA**, President, Portuguese Heritage/Ministry of Culture, Lisbon

**Mr Pedro PESSOA E COSTA**, Représentant Permanent Adjoint du Portugal auprès du Conseil de l'Europe, Strasbourg

### **Romania/Roumanie**

**Mr Ioan OPRIS**, Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs, Bucarest

### **Russian Federation/Fédération de Russie**

**Mr Yuri BUNDIN**, Director of the State Policy Department, Ministry of Culture, Moscow

**Mr Evgeny KUZMIN**, Head of the Section for Archives and Libraries, Ministry of Culture and Mass Media, Moscow

**Ms Tatiana ZANINA**, Senior Expert in the Federal Archives Agency, Ministry of Culture and Mass Communication, Moscow

### **Serbia and Montenegro/Serbie-Monténégro**

#### **Serbia/Serbie**

**Mr Dragan KOJADINOVIC**, Minister of Culture of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade

**Mr Bojana ZORIC**, Head of the Minister's Office, Ministry of Culture, Belgrade

**Mr Borislav SURDIC**, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Culture, Belgrade

#### **Montenegro**

**Ms Vesna KILIBARDA**, Minister of Culture and Media, Podgorica

**Ms Milena FILIPOVIC**, Advisor for International Cultural Relations, Ministry of Culture and Media, Podgorica

### **Slovak Republic/République Slovaque**

**Mr Igor OTCENAS**, Director General, Division of International Relations, Ministry of Culture, Bratislava

### **Slovenia/Slovénie**

**Ms Vesna ČOPIČ**, Ministry of Culture, Ljubljana

### **Spain/Espagne**

**Mr Fernando GOMEZ-RIESCO**, Sous-Directeur Général de la Coopération Internationale Multilatérale, Ministerio de Educacion, Cultura y Deporte, Madrid

## **SWEDEN/SUEDE**

Apologised for absence/excusé

## **SWITZERLAND/SUISSE**

Mr David STREIFF, Directeur de l'Office Fédéral de la Culture, Berne

## **"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"/ "L'Ex-République Yougoslave de Macédoine"**

Ms Melpomeni KORNETI, Deputy Minister of Culture, Skopje

## **Turkey/Turquie**

Mr Sander GÜRBÜZ, Deputy Director General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ankara

Mr Hasan ZONGÜR, Chef du Département des Affaires Extérieures, Ministère de la Culture et du Tourisme, Ankara

Mr Timuçin SAYAR, Director of EU Coordination Division, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ankara

## **Ukraine**

Apologised for absence/excusé

## **United Kingdom/Royaume-Uni**

Ms Emma BAINES, Political Secretary, British Embassy, Warsaw

\*  
\* \*

## **Council of Europe/Conseil de l'Europe**

### **Committee of Ministers/Comité des Ministres**

Mr Christian TER STEPANIAN, Président du Groupe de Rapporteurs des Délégués des Ministres sur l'éducation, la culture, le sport, la jeunesse et l'environnement, Représentant Permanent de l'Arménie auprès du Conseil de l'Europe

*Secretariat of the Committee of Ministers/Secrétariat du Comité des Ministres*

Mr Denis HUBER, Administrateur principal

### **Parliamentary Assembly/Assemblée Parlementaire**

**Committee on Culture, Science and Education/Commission de la Culture, de la Science et de l'Education**

Baroness HOOPER, Vice Chair of the Committee on Culture, Science and Education of the Parliamentary Assembly



*Head of the Secretariat of the Committee on Culture, Science and Education/ Chef du Secrétariat de la Commission de la Culture, de la Science et de l'Éducation*

**Mr Christopher GRAYSON**, Chef du Secrétariat de la culture, de la science et de l'éducation, Assemblée parlementaire

**Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe (CLRAE)/Congrès des Pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe (CPLRE)**

**Ms Hilde ZACH**, Mayor, President of the Culture and Education Committee

*Secretariat of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe/ Secrétariat du Congrès des Pouvoirs Locaux et Régionaux du Conseil de l'Europe*

**Mr Alexander BARTLING**, Administrateur

**Steering Committee for higher Education and Research (CD-ESR)/ Comité Directeur de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche (CD-ESR)**

**Ms Vera STASTNA**, Chair of the Steering Committee for Higher Education and Research

**Steering Committee for Education (CD-ED)/Comité Directeur de l'Éducation (CD-ED)**

Apologised for absence/excusé

**Steering Committee for the Development of Sport (CDDS)/ Comité Directeur pour le Développement du Sport (CDDS)**

**Ms Krisztina GÖNTÉR**, Vice-Chair of the CDDS

**Ad-Hoc Committee of Experts for the European Year of Citizenship through Education (CAHCIT)/Comité Ad Hoc d'Experts pour l'Année Européenne de la Citoyenneté par l'Éducation (CAHCIT)**

**Mr Krzysztof OSTROWSKI**, Chair of the CAHCIT

**Steering Committee for Culture (CDCULT)/Comité Directeur de la Culture (CDCULT)**

**Ms Roberta ALBEROTANZA**, Chair of the CD-CULT

**Steering Committee for Youth (CDEJ)/Comité Directeur pour la Jeunesse (CDEJ)**

Apologised for absence/excusé

**Steering Committee for Heritage (CDPAT)/Comité Directeur du Patrimoine Culturel (CDPAT)**

Apologised for absence/excusé

**Steering Committee for the Activities of the Council of Europe in the Field of Biological and Landscape Diversity (CO-DBP)/Comité Directeur des Activités du Conseil de l'Europe en matière de Diversité Biologique et des Paysages (CO-DBP)**

Apologised for absence/excuse

**Liaison Committee of International NGOs enjoying Participatory status with the Council of Europe/Commission de Liaison des Organisations Internationales Non-Gouvernementales**

**Mr Alain MOUCHOUX**, Président du Regroupement des ONG «Education et Culture»,

### **European Commission/Commission Européenne**

Apologised for absence/excuse

### **Observer State/Etats Observateurs**

**Canada**

Apologised for absence/excuse

**Israel**

**Mrs Silvia BERLADSKI**, First Secretary of the Embassy of Israel, Athens

**Japan/Japon**

Apologised for absence/excuse

**Mexico**

**Mr Francisco José CRUZ- GONZALEZ**, Ambassadeur du Mexique en Pologne, Varsovie

**USA**

Apologised for absence/excuse

### **International Organisations/Organisations Internationales**

**Arab League Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization/L'Organisation arabe pour l'Education, la Culture et la Science – ALECSO**

Apologised for absence/excuse

**European Cultural Foundation**

**Ms Kathinka DITTRICH VAN WERINGH**, Chair of the European Cultural Foundation, Köln

**Mr Gottfried WAGNER**, Secretary General of the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam



#### **European Youth Forum**

**Mr Renaldas VAISBRODAS**, President of the European Youth Forum, Vilnius

#### **ISESCO**

Apologised for absence/excusé

#### **OECD/OCDE**

Apologised for absence/excusé

#### **UNESCO**

Apologised for absence/excusé

#### **Experts**

**Mr Simon MUNDY**, Director of the Centre for the Cultural Environment, King's College, London

**Mr Henry INGBERG**, Secrétaire Général du Ministère de la Communauté Française de Belgique, Bruxelles

**Professor Olaf SCHWENCKE**, Berlin

**Mr César BIRZEA**, Institut de Science de l'Education, Bucarest

**Ms Krisztina GÖNTÉR**, Vice-Chair of the CDDS, Budapest

**Mr Renaldas VAISBRODAS**, President of the European Youth Forum, Vilnius

**Professor Mykola RYABCHUK**, Kiev

**Professor Kazimierz KRZYSZTOFEK**, Vice President of the Warsaw Research Institute – Pro Cultura, Warsaw

**Mr Benoît PAUMIER**, Délégué au développement et aux affaires internationales, Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Paris

**Mr Robert PALMER**, Brussels

**Ms Vera STASTNA**, Chair of the CDESR, Prague

**Mr Michael RAPHAEL**, Tel Aviv

#### **Secretariat General of the Council of Europe/ Secrétariat Général du Conseil de l'Europe**

**Mr Terry DAVIS**, Secretary General/Secrétaire Général

**Private Office of the Secretary General/Cabinet du Secrétaire Général**

**Ms Irena GUIDIKOVA**, Administrator/Administratrice

**Directorate General IV – Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport/Direction Générale IV – Education, Culture et Patrimoine, Jeunesse et Sport**

Ms Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General DGIV/Directrice Générale DGIV

Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education/Direction de l'Education scolaire, extra-scolaire et de l'Enseignement supérieur

Mr Gabriele MAZZA, Director/Directeur

Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage/Direction de la Culture et du Patrimoine Culturel et Naturel

Ms Catherine ROTH, Director/Directrice

Ms Evelyne PORRI

Directorate of Youth and Sport/Direction de la Jeunesse et du Sport

Mr Ralf-René WEINGÄRTNER, Director/Directeur

Mr Peter LAURITZEN

Central Division/Division centrale

Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the Central Division a.i.

Ms Danielle SCHMITT

Ms Isabelle BILBEAU

Ms Ann MASON

Protocol/Protocole

Mr Muammer TOPALOĞLU, Director of Protocole/Directeur du Protocole

Ms Isabelle FLECKSTEINER

Press Service/Service de Presse

Mr Andrew CUTTING, Press Officer/Attaché de presse

Mr Sandro WELTIN, Photographer/Photographe

Information Office of the Council of Europe in Poland/Bureau d'information du Conseil de l'Europe en Pologne

Mrs Hanna MACHINSKA, Director

Ms Wiesława KOSTRZEWA-ZORBAS, Information Specialist, Warsaw

Organising Committee/Comité d'organisation

Ms Malgorzata DZIEDUSZYCKA, Director of International Relations and European Integration Department, Ministry of Culture, Warsaw



**Mr Krzysztof KOPYTKO**, Deputy Director of International Relations and European Integration Department, Ministry of Culture, Warsaw

**Ms Hanna JEDRAS**, Specialist, Department of International Relations and European Integration, Ministry of Culture, Warsaw

**Mr Marcin FENGLER**, Ministry of Culture, Warsaw

**Ms Magdalena POLACZYK**, Warsaw

### **Interpreters/Interprètes**

**Mr Robert VAN MICHEL**, Head of Team/Responsable d'équipe, Council of Europe/Conseil de l'Europe

**Mr Leonid VEKCHINE**, Strasbourg

**Mr Pavel PALAZHCENKO**, Moscow

**Ms Daniela ASCOLI**, London

**Ms Noemi PLASTINO**, Vienna

**Mr Olaf BROSIG**, Berlin

**Ms Irène CHEVALIER**, Vienna

**Ms Catherine Margaret GAY**, Berlin

**Ms Christine MARTEAU**, Paris

**Ms Helen FERGUSON**, Berlin

**Mr Christian KODERHOLD**, Vienna

**Mr Krzysztof BRZEZINSKI**, Warsaw

**Ms Justyna SEWERYNSKA**, Warsaw

### **Journalists/Journalistes**

**Ms Anna GODZISZ**, Spokeswoman to the Minister of Culture, Poland

**Mr Krzysztof KRUKOWSKI**, Press Officer, Ministry of Culture, Poland

**Mr Piotr SZYMANSKI**, Press Officer, Ministry of Culture, Poland

**Ms Amélie MEFFRE**, Radio France Culture

## Appendix 4

### The New Dimensions of Europe

#### Background Document prepared by the Polish Authorities

*Professor Kasimierz Krzysztofek*

#### The new scope of Europe

The European Cultural Convention was created in a very different historical context than that of Europe today. In the coming decades, the Council of Europe will encounter - in the area of culture broadly defined - new challenges brought about by substantial changes of a varied nature, both positive and negative; including the effects of European integration, globalisation, the democratisation of Central and Eastern Europe, the information and communication technologies and, last but not least, the generation shift. The face of Europe will soon be shaped by generations do not remember the Cold War and the ideological divisions imposed by the Iron Curtain. This creates a new framework for the Council of Europe's activities. These challenges are numerous, yet five of these seem particularly important and have been addressed in the Wrocław Declaration.

#### 1. Shared and diverse identity of Europe

When the European Cultural Convention was brought into being, the signatory States formed the core of Europe seen as a civilisational formation. They did not ask themselves whether they were Europeans or not; it was evident per se. Today, with 46 member States of the Council of Europe, the new members outnumber the old and we have a new setting which gives importance to the question of European identity. The Council will remain that "of Europe"; and the need for a common denominator of values, resulting from the cultural heritage shared in common, is critical for European cohesion.

The historically formed European identity was the basis of the European Cultural Convention, and united nations with a similar catalogue of values shared a strong conviction that these values are of a universal nature and form the basis of human solidarity. This requires translating the idiomatic identities of European peoples into discursive ones without which it is not possible to understand each other and enable the resolution of our common problems.

Fifty years later, we still believe in the beneficial and universal force of these values yet we are fully aware of many different identities in Greater Europe. If there is any sense in believing in the Pan-European identity it means these plural but multiple and shared identities as a common denominator of values transmitted



through education, scholarly and popular interpretation and the memory of suffering as well as glory. Europe needs this set of values to build its cohesion which defends the original vision of Europe undivided in cultural and human terms and continuing to affirm its common heritage.

Regional and transnational identities are as important as the transformations in national identities brought about by redrawing the maps in former Eastern Europe. This places in a new light the right to free choice of belonging to regional and national communities as well as to transnational, European ones. Here, emphasis should be placed on the link between European cultural values and common civic values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the defense of these is seen by the Council of Europe as the core of its political mission.

A better future for Europe can only be realised if her citizens are able to share their aspirations as an international community. In building such a community, we – the Council and cultural networks of Europe – should learn to experience what we have in common through cross-border cooperation and collaborative engagement.

## **2. Cultural diversity, civil society and new citizenship**

The Declaration on Cultural Diversity adopted by the Council of Europe in 2000 states that cultural diversity has always been a dominant European characteristic and it therefore remains the central task of cultural cooperation to sustain, protect and promote it. Cultural diversity is expressed in the coexistence and exchange of culturally diverse practices and in the provision of culturally diverse services and products.

Fifty years ago, the European nation States were relatively homogeneous. During the last three to four decades, the scale of their diversity has dramatically increased, first and foremost due to the emergence of new nation States following the break-up of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. This means the emergence of new neighbourhoods and new border areas.

Trans-frontier mobility and migrations constitute another factor making for rich diversity and transforming Europe into a complex system. This complicates the problem of civic integration paired with respect for the "right to be different". This is what is advocated in almost all the formulated models of desired multiculturalism to be found in international documents. Their recommendations are presented as the highest standard for democracies which wish to make people equal on a civil basis, but without also making them culturally similar. It quite clearly follows that for this diversity strategy, the most desirable form that the influence of global culture could take is one which does not undermine identity-based cultures, the sense of belonging to a community and individual-community relationships. This makes inter-ethnic relations in many cases more complex than inter-state ones. Managing multiculturalism and multi-ethnicity becomes one of the crucial factors in combating exclusion and creating a social order internally and internationally. Hence the question arises of whether the notion of citizenship, dating back to the 19th Century and the sense of belonging should not be revised to be functional for the reality of the new diverse Europe.

The plurality of cultures and languages of Europe has been the cornerstone of the European Cultural Convention. They promise a vibrant diversity but multiply challenges to be faced in forthcoming decades. One of these is the problem of the *lingua franca* which is critically needed by European networking. At present, this depends on a command of English.

It is becoming critically important for most European countries to learn to live in their new cultural neighbourhood; to acquire intercultural competence and become acquainted with new neighbours, their history, tradition and culture, and destroy definitively the "mental curtain" brought about in the second half of the 20th Century by the iron curtain.

This aims at building new dialogue between civilisations and avoiding cultural clashes which must not replace the ideological division that split Europe during the Cold War.

### **3. New actors and partners on the European cultural scene**

The European Cultural Convention was signed when the state was the most important actor on the European scene. Over the last 50 years, a great number of new actors and partners have worked – with the Council's encouragement – for the new structure of Europe: NGOs, regions, towns, cultural institutions, social milieux and individual people. They form a dense fabric of the New Europe woven by the free flow of information, knowledge and ideas. An important role in European exchanges is also taken by the private players operating in the area of culture, education, sport and youth. The Council of Europe should promote the new partnerships, and thus the rise of European civil society.

The plurality of actors does not relieve States from responsibility for the embodiment of the European Cultural Convention in culture, education, youth and sport. The role of governments in our four sectors is defined, to a great extent, by the need to balance the known failures of the market mechanisms, ensuring equity between citizens and social groups and access by all to the cultural resources required for personal freedom and human development. This requires the responsibility of European governments in legislation and co-financing of major initiatives in the four sectors, as well as strengthening their role in the standard-setting and policy cooperation on regulatory functions to secure the public sphere, equal rights and equal conditions for a participatory citizenship.

### **4. Culture and education for a knowledge-based Europe and the information society**

It is a matter of a few years before the problem of the "last mile" will be resolved and most households, in most parts of Europe, will be connected to the broadband infrastructure. The effect will be a permanent tele-presence of people, events and realities. At stake is how to avoid a digital divide in Europe.



The vitality of national and regional cultures, as well as European culture, depends on the ability to produce and promote cultures and their creators, through the Internet and related culture and knowledge industries. The involvement of the Council of Europe, aimed at protecting cultural identities by securing a high quality and diversity of cultural offer, is fully justified.

As an integral part of the global information society, European countries will face the biggest challenge in trying to include their own culture into world cultural exchanges. This process must avoid any extremes. The first would be a situation when one's own culture is absorbed by the global one, the second being a temptation to protect national culture from foreign influences. In an open society, the second threat seems unlikely, but the first is possible. If it happens, it would damage the conditions for national creativity.

The Council of Europe's mission is to identify those aspects of cultural, educational and youth policies which are in need of special consideration in the context of the knowledge-based societies and the new global economy.

The victorious concept of intellectual property rights has serious implications for the future of sustainable development as defined in relation to culture, education and sports. It affects the possibility of assuring one's self-representation and self-portraiture through one's own culture and meeting the needs of new generations with respect to the production, provision and exchange of different services, products and practices in all four sectors.

Over the last 50 years, the role of culture in societal life and public policies has changed markedly. Emphasis was placed on democratisation and participation as well as the revitalisation of urban space. These functions remained important but new functions have emerged: culture as a factor of economic development, the basis for knowledge and creative industries, creative economy and intellectual properties. There has been a shift from economisation of culture to the re-culturation of the economy. Culture and cultural diversity have become the cultural capital which is one of the most important resources of the creative economy.

#### 5. The Generation shift towards Network Europe

Europe is ageing. This, on the one hand, is bringing about important consequences for social and cultural policies and on the other is leading to a shift in the age balance. The future of European cultures and Europe itself will be created by younger Europeans. The culture of young Europeans is increasingly created in social networks and spread among them. These networks have been reinforced by the new information technologies. The cultural activities of young Europeans flow out of institutions and into networks in which the social and cultural capital of Europe is increasingly embodied: networks of self-organisation and self-regulation of people creating cultures.

Do the new cultures promise us A NETWORK EUROPE? – a Europe which offers much more to coming generations than it did to their predecessors, and creates an

opportunity that Europe will not be that of a clash of civilisations but of fertile exchanges of values, life-styles and inspirations and not be built only on hierarchies, institutions and markets as was the case until now.

It is worth trying to answer the question about the kind of culture that is emerging in youth networks, the kinds of cultural activities of young people, as well as how young people will feature in European integration and what new institutional forms they will need. From this, we can track future trends of cultural development, catch a glimpse of the kind of future Europe which will be created, and assess how far this will form a continuity, and how much new cultures will change Europe.

In this new setting, the role of the European institutions and organisations is changing. Considering this, as well as its limited resources, the Council of Europe's mission lies in inspiring rather than organising these processes. In this way, we exercise our commitment together with European governments to European cultural cooperation and citizenship. We will support all efforts to develop a new strategy of cultural action that enhances mobility, strengthens cooperation, encourages communication and debate, and consolidates trans-national networks; a strategy based on new partnerships. This will be crucial for new European governance. The Council of Europe cannot "go alone" on its major initiatives without such important actors on the international scene as the EU, UNESCO, the OECD, the World Bank and others. This underlines the role of the Council of Europe and its European Cultural Convention it must take on in this new environment including a new institutional framework with other governmental players and spontaneous civil society networks.



## Appendix 5

### European Cultural Convention (Paris, 19.XII.1954)

The governments signatory hereto, being members of the Council of Europe,

Considering that the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose, among others, of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage;

Considering that the achievement of this aim would be furthered by a greater understanding of one another among the peoples of Europe;

Considering that for these purposes it is desirable not only to conclude bilateral cultural conventions between members of the Council but also to pursue a policy of common action designed to safeguard and encourage the development of European culture;

Having resolved to conclude a general European Cultural Convention designed to foster among the nationals of all members, and of such other European States as may accede thereto, the study of the languages, history and civilisation of the others and of the civilisation which is common to them all,

Have agreed as follows:

#### Article 1

Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate measures to safeguard and to encourage the development of its national contribution to the common cultural heritage of Europe.

#### Article 2

Each Contracting Party shall, insofar as may be possible,

a encourage the study by its own nationals of the languages, history and civilisation of the other Contracting Parties and grant facilities to those Parties to promote such studies in its territory, and

b endeavour to promote the study of its language or languages, history and civilisation in the territory of the other Contracting Parties and grant facilities to the nationals of those Parties to pursue such studies in its territory.



### **Article 3**

The Contracting Parties shall consult with one another within the framework of the Council of Europe with a view to concerted action in promoting cultural activities of European interest.

### **Article 4**

Each Contracting Party shall, insofar as may be possible, facilitate the movement and exchange of persons as well as of objects of cultural value so that Articles 2 and 3 may be implemented.

### **Article 5**

Each Contracting Party shall regard the objects of European cultural value placed under its control as integral parts of the common cultural heritage of Europe, shall take appropriate measures to safeguard them and shall ensure reasonable access thereto.

### **Article 6**

1 Proposals for the application of the provisions of the present Convention and questions relating to the interpretation thereof shall be considered at meetings of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe.

2 Any State not a member of the Council of Europe which has acceded to the present Convention in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article 9 may appoint a representative or representatives to participate in the meetings provided for in the preceding paragraph.

3 The conclusions reached at the meetings provided for in paragraph 1 of this article shall be submitted in the form of recommendations to the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, unless they are decisions which are within the competence of the Committee of Cultural Experts as relating to matters of an administrative nature which do not entail additional expenditure.

4 The Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall communicate to the members of the Council and to the government of any State which has acceded to the present Convention any decisions relevant thereto which may be taken by the Committee of Ministers or by the Committee of Cultural Experts.

5 Each Contracting Party shall notify the Secretary General of the Council of Europe in due course of any action which may be taken by it for the application of the provisions of the present Convention consequent on the decisions of the Committee of Ministers or of the Committee of Cultural Experts.

6 In the event of certain proposals for the application of the present Convention being found to interest only a limited number of the Contracting Parties, such proposals may be further considered in accordance with the provisions of Article 7, provided that their implementation entails no expenditure by the Council of Europe.

## Article 7

If, in order to further the aims of the present Convention, two or more Contracting Parties desire to arrange meetings at the seat of the Council of Europe other than those specified in paragraph 1 of Article 6, the Secretary General of the Council shall afford them such administrative assistance as they may require.

## Article 8

Nothing in the present Convention shall be deemed to affect

- a the provisions of any existing bilateral cultural convention to which any of the Contracting Parties may be signatory or to render less desirable the conclusion of any further such convention by any of the Contracting Parties, or
- b the obligation of any person to comply with the laws and regulations in force in the territory of any Contracting Party concerning the entry, residence and departure of foreigners.

## Article 9

- 1 The present Convention shall be open to the signature of the members of the Council of Europe. It shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.
- 2 As soon as three signatory governments have deposited their instruments of ratification, the present Convention shall enter into force as between those governments.
- 3 With respect to each signatory government ratifying subsequently, the Convention shall enter into force on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification.
- 4 The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe may decide, by a unanimous vote, to invite, upon such terms and conditions as it deems appropriate, any European State which is not a member of the Council to accede to the present Convention. Any State so invited may accede by depositing its instrument of accession with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe. Such accession shall take effect on the date of receipt of the said instrument.
- 5 The Secretary General of the Council of Europe shall notify all members of the Council and any acceding States of the deposit of all instruments of ratification and accession.

## Article 10

Any Contracting Party may specify the territories to which the provisions of the present Convention shall apply by addressing to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe a declaration which shall be communicated by the latter to all the other Contracting Parties.



## **Article 11**

1 Any Contracting Party may denounce the present Convention at any time after it has been in force for a period of five years by means of a notification in writing addressed to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, who shall inform the other Contracting Parties.

2 Such denunciation shall take effect for the Contracting Party concerned six months after the date on which it is received by the Secretary General of the Council of Europe.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorised thereto by their respective governments, have signed the present Convention.

Done at Paris this 19th day of December 1954, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy which shall remain deposited in the archives of the Council of Europe. The Secretary General shall transmit certified copies to each of the signatory and acceding governments.

