

The International Convention on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO). Context, Evolution and Perspectives

Martí Petit

■ *In recent years, the world's consumption of cultural goods and services has grown significantly, spurred on by the digital evolution and the consolidation of the information society. At the same time, deregulatory policies have been applied to both international and domestic markets which have promoted unprecedented processes of economic and territorial concentration. This situation, which threatens the manifestation of cultural diversity and exchange, has set alarm bells ringing and multilateral organisations such as UNESCO, the European Parliament and even the G8 have responded by promoting cultural diversity on their agendas. UNESCO approved the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity in 2003 and launched a preliminary project in the form of a convention on cultural diversity. This was an international instrument that was to be binding in nature and with the legal force to ensure cultural diversity in the new context of digital globalisation. At the end of this article, I have included a chronological list of legal instruments in force in relation to cultural diversity*

The Growth and Concentration of the Cultural Industry

Because of the multiplication of trade exchanges that contribute to bringing down production costs, globalisation can have positive effects on intercultural dialogue. Cultural products have become an importance source of the creation of wealth and jobs. On the other hand, opening up markets leads the way to prospects, at least theoretically, with regard to creators in local cultural industries. Finally, progress in ITCs (information and communication technologies) is one way to participate in the social, cultural and economic life of cultures and languages.

Domestic and international markets have seen the rise of commercial operators that become oligopolies acting from a dominant position. These business conglomerates make the most of the synergies of technological convergence and the processes of business concentration in the sector. Their dynamics thus threaten to marginalise cultural diversity as well as independent cultural creators, producers and disseminators who work outside of the established official circuits.

In fact, arguments that hold that globalisation is an instrument for eradicating poverty appear to be unaware of the reality. The text entitled *Human Development Report 2003*¹, released by the UNDP (United Nations for Development Program), found that one-quarter of the world's population is not benefiting from the new model of economic growth based on the expansion of international trade and the development of new technologies. In absolute figures, the number of people excluded from *digital globalisation* stands at 1,200 million, who live in extreme poverty with an income of under a dollar per person per day.

A result of this exclusion is the abyss that has appeared between the production of cultural goods and services in

Quaderns Article

Martí Petit

Editorial chief, Quaderns del CAC

wealthy countries and in the developing ones. In most developing countries, the production of cultural content (and, even more, its exportation) is particularly thin on the ground. This leads to major imbalances in the cultural sector's trade account in favour of a minority of rich countries.

The *Study on International Flows of Cultural Goods*, published by UNESCO, found that the value of the world's trade in cultural goods and service rose from \$US95.34 million in 1980 to \$US387.93 million in 1998. In other words, in nearly two decades the economic worth of cultural exchanges in the world rose by 400%. Most of this trade, which includes printed material, music, visual arts, film, photography, radio, television, videogames and sports merchandising, took place in a small group of countries. In 1990, Japan, the US, Germany and the UK were the leading exporters in the sector, with 55.4% of total volume. Throughout the 1990s, this accumulation of percentages fell slightly. However, there was one big change: by the end of the decade, a new player, i.e., China, had emerged to become the third-biggest exporter of cultural products.

Despite problems in statistical comparability between the parameters of each country, figures suggest that the global trade in cultural services is growing much faster than exports of traditional merchandise². Generally speaking, the expansion in the trade of cultural services is due to a rise in demand. For example, in 1995 French households spent an average of 3.5% of their annual budgets on cultural products. The so-called 'digital revolution', with the appearance of marketing behind it, has led to a rise in demand for cultural content, particularly audiovisual goods. In the final years of the 20th century, something occurred that fed this rise: the information society. Leisure consumption patterns changed both in rich countries and developing ones.

In the past 10 years, the structure of cultural industries around the world has changed profoundly, thanks in part to new digital technologies and the application of deregulatory policies at the national, regional and international levels. These factors have profoundly transformed the context in which the trade exchanges of cultural goods and services are carried out. The process of the internationalisation of sector companies, together with progressive concentration, has fostered the creation of a reduced number of big business conglomerates. Economies of scale and vertical

integration (which links the production of a good, such as a film, with its distribution, marketing of the soundtrack, marketing of the film, theme parks, websites and the online trade it generates) have brought an even greater hegemony to the US. This has set alarm bells ringing about the rise of a new world oligopoly, with some analysts comparing it to the car sector at the beginning of the 20th century.

According to figures published in *The Economist*³, 36% of sector companies in 1993 were headquartered in the US, 36% in the EU and 26% in Japan. Just four years later, in 1997, more than half the companies were headquartered in America. In fact, even though there are other big audio-visual-content producers (India makes seven times more films than the US), Hollywood is the major exporter. In 1980, the US obtained 30% of its profits from exports, while by the end of the 1990s this figure had grown to 50%. Meanwhile, the trade deficit in the audiovisual sphere in Europe rose from \$US3.5 million in 1993 to \$US6 million in 1998. Even further behind it was Africa, which at the end of the 1990s produced an average of just 42 films per year.

As this information suggests, the cultural industry is growing and concentrating. Given that trend, what does the future hold for cultural diversity at the international level? Will markets alone be able to guarantee the survival of a (minimum) level of cultural, linguistic and symbolic diversity in the new digital context?

Cultural Diversity and International Trade

The first big discussion (and the first big diplomatic battle) about the need to regulate the cultural sector at the international level took place within GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). The idea of regulating cultural trade was debated at the round of negotiations that began in Uruguay in 1986 and which in 1993 led to the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). Some countries, led by France and the European Commission, argued that cultural and audiovisual activities transmitted a society's fundamental values and as such, were of essential importance to questions of social identity and development and should not be subject to the same treatment as regular goods. This argument quickly came to be known in the media as "the cultural exception". Culture

would be excluded from international free-trade agreements and could be subject to protection and State aid.

The opposing side of the argument was taken up by the US, which defended that cultural goods and services (with audiovisual goods at the forefront) should be considered entertainment products and thus be subject to established trade regulations like any other product. Everybody was aware that, beyond the short-term trade interests of the two sides, there was a radically ideological confrontation. Pascal Lamy, the EC Trade Commissioner responsible for negotiations on the part of the 15 EU members before the WTO, said in his book *L'Europe en première ligne*: "The method the Americans recommend is the opposite of ours: they want to 'frame' the notion of cultural diversity so that it does not hinder market development. We want to 'frame the market' on the basis of common values and precepts so that market development becomes respect for cultural diversity."⁴

Before the new round of negotiations began in Doha (Qatar) in November 2001 (which is still open), the US set out its position in an official communication to the WTO on 18 December 2000. In this statement, the US government considered that the audiovisual sector had changed significantly since the Uruguay Round ended in 1993-94. During this period, negotiations had centred on film production and distribution and terrestrial broadcasting. The new digital technologies, the statement explained, had provided the opportunity to access consumers from around the world and stimulated the development of audiovisual goods and services from across the planet. On the other hand, technical innovations such as digital compression were bringing down production and transmission costs, while broadband was opening the door to content distribution at a much cheaper cost. Finally, the audiovisual sector had been a driving force behind the development of telecommunications networks. The rise in demand for audiovisual goods and services had thus encouraged investment in infrastructures.

However, the US statement to the WTO contained some concessions, for the first time, on State intervention in cultural policies. It recognised that Member States could consider aid to satisfy each country's need to promote its cultural identity, in an environment favourable to the maintenance of local culture. With this aim, it said, many Member States subsidised theatrical film production. The

statement concluded by saying there was a precedent in the WTO to create regulations that recognised the application of subsidies carefully circumscribed to specifically defined goals, so long as the potential effects of market distortion were minimal or neutralised.

This conclusion is partially correct, as State intervention in the sector can change spontaneous market behaviour, but there are other factors that also provoke distortions:

- High levels of business concentration that form *global oligopolies*
- Different access to economies of scale for reasons of business size, size of the population or language
- The lack of ability on the part of developing countries to promote their creative talent
- The ability of the big US companies to sell distribution rights for audiovisual content at greatly reduced prices once they have written off production costs on the domestic market

These and other dynamics peculiar to cultural markets require regulatory, institutional and financial measures to ensure the availability of different domestic and foreign content.

On the other hand, it is generally agreed that one objective difficulty in applying international agreements is precisely the lack of a uniform criterion for their interpretation. Not only are there differences in economic interests, the parties also disagree on values and cultural structures, making it possible to draw very diverse evaluations from the same facts. Furthermore, many bilateral agreements between States very often contradict the principles established by the WTO, e.g., non-discrimination with third countries. That is why it is crucial to agree on a better understanding of the issue, particularly for developing countries. Each State and community must identify areas of strategic interest for their respective cultural sectors. To this end, multilateral cooperation has to play a fundamental role.

Multilateral Declarations and Commitments In Favour of Cultural Diversity

Since the end of the 1990s, a strategy has been developed by multilateral countries and organisations aimed at defen-

ding and promoting cultural diversity at the international level. The Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, organised by UNESCO in Stockholm from 30 March -2 April 1998, established that sustainable development and cultural dynamism were intimately linked. Referring to article 27 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights on the right to access and participation in cultural life, the UNESCO Member States approved a Plan of Action that concluded: "The purpose of cultural policies is to determine objectives, create structures and obtain adequate resources to create a favourable human environment"⁵.

The Council of Europe took the same position in a declaration adopted on 7 December 2000. In this agreement, the committee of ministers established that "cultural and audiovisual policies that respect and favour cultural diversity have to be considered as a necessary complement to trade policy. (...) The big cultural industries that encourage linguistic diversity and artistic expression, as a true reflection of diversity, have a positive impact on pluralism, creativity, competitiveness and jobs"⁶.

The G8 meeting that took place in Okinawa (Canada) in July 2000 declared in its final communication that the eight members (the US, Germany, Japan, France, Italy, the UK, Canada and Russia) held cultural diversity to be a priority on their agendas. They also recognised "the work of relevant international organisations, in particular UNESCO, in this field"⁷.

In fact, UNESCO has taken up the mantle in the promotion of cultural diversity. In November 2001, one week before the new round of WTO negotiations began in Doha, UNESCO approved the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity at its 31st General Conference⁸. In the words of its director-general, Japan's Koichiro Matsuura, UNESCO wanted this declaration to become as powerful a reference point "as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights". With this goal, both the declaration and the plan of action that went with it proposed creating an international instrument on cultural diversity.

A number of international forums have considered establishing an instrument of this type. One example is the International Organisation of the Francophonie (OIF), the institution founded by French-speaking countries and which currently has 51 members⁹. In its meeting in Beirut (Lebanon) in October 2002, the heads of states and governments

gave their full support to the project undertaken by UNESCO.

Another example is the International Network on Cultural Policy, which brings together the culture ministers of 62 countries, including Spain, France, the UK, Russia, Brazil and China¹⁰. At their meeting in Paris of 5-6 February 2003, the ministers agreed that UNESCO had the mandate in this field, as it was the seat of the international instrument on cultural diversity because of its responsibility for culture, in the same way that the WTO was responsible for trade. It thus identified UNESCO as the "appropriate institution for preparing and implementing" an agreement of this type, and said so to Koichiro Matsuura, who was present at the meeting¹¹.

Another example of these international positions is the *Report on the Preservation and Promotion of Cultural Diversity* presented by the European Parliament on 15 December 2003¹². In this document, the European Parliament "considers it essential to recognise, in the area of international legislation, cultural diversity through the negotiation and approval, in the short term, of an international convention on cultural diversity in the framework of UNESCO. [It also] considers that the International Convention [...] is appropriate for promoting cultural policies and ensuring at the international level the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural content and artistic expression, which appear to be particularly threatened by globalisation."

The European Commission weighed in with a Communication to the Council and the European Parliament (27 August 2003)¹³ which concluded by saying that "the culture ministers meeting in Salonika have detected the need to safeguard and promote cultural diversity and that an international instrument from UNESCO could be the legally appropriate response at the international level. The Commission believes it is important that EU members state their unanimous commitment to cultural diversity at the international level. The Commission calls upon the EU to have an active function in the subsequent UNESCO General Conference, particularly in the preliminary discussions about the preparation of an international regulatory instrument on cultural diversity".

As we can see, the goal of this joint diplomatic strategy consists of creating an international instrument on cultural diversity that is binding in nature and with legal force.

UNESCO: International Convention on “The Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Content and Artistic Expressions”

At the initiative of countries such as Germany, Canada, France and Mexico, the 166th meeting of the UNESCO Executive Council, which took place on 18 July 2003, approved the *Preliminary Study on Technical and Legal Aspects Relating to the Appropriateness of Preparing a Regulatory Instrument on Cultural Diversity*¹⁴. On 17 December 2003, Koichiro Matsuura opened the first experts’ meeting on the preliminary project.

Firstly, the study recognised that international law still did not offer a clear definition of the content of cultural rights. Furthermore, the provisions relating to these rights were dispersed among different international instruments, something which undermined their consistency and global legibility. In general terms, it could be considered that cultural rights are the rights that protect “each person’s participation in cultural life and their access to it”; the freedom of creative activity and scientific research, the right to education and the right to access artistic expressions and scientific and technological know-how. This approach made it possible to establish a relationship between cultural diversity and the universal principles of human rights and democracy.

All up, the idea the study highlighted was the need for the new instrument to be legal in nature, in line with the Declaration on Cultural Diversity. The Declaration, a non-binding text although with an undeniable moral authority, invited participants to adopt an international agreement - a more ambitious and, in principle, more effective instrument. The sphere of application was a reference point to bear in mind, as it would no longer be a declarative document but a binding instrument that would establish a set of rules that the greatest number of States possible should assume and voluntarily enact.

The two questions that should be taken into account in the agreement would be authors’ rights and the need to recognise the singular nature of cultural goods and services as transmitters of identity, values and meaning. With regards authors’ rights, UNESCO had already enacted two conventions in this area: the 1952 Universal Convention on Authors’ Rights, revised in 1971¹⁵, and the Rome Conven-

tion for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations¹⁶. However, the sphere of application of the two conventions was updated with the approval of the Trade Related Aspects on Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) at the WTO¹⁷.

The sphere of application of the new agreement would have to therefore be the singularity of cultural goods and services in international trade. There are two regulatory binding instruments from UNESCO, the 1950 Florence Agreement¹⁸ and the 1976 Nairobi Protocol¹⁹ that deal with the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials, and thus promote the free movement of books, newspapers, magazines, documents, works of art, films and sound recordings, and scientific instruments aimed at teaching and the blind. However, this agreement established a clause by which each signatory state could “totally or partially suspend the contracted agreements if imports into its territory [of cultural goods] lead to a relative rise that constitutes or could constitute serious prejudice to domestic producers of similar products or ones in direct competition.”

The 1976 approval of the Nairobi Protocol updated the Florence Agreement. Taking developing countries’ needs into account, the text extended the agreement’s sphere of application and eliminated a string of discriminations. However, the economic, technological and political context in which they were approved was very different. That is why the best option would be to approve a second protocol of the Florence Agreement that would include the social and cultural needs of the information society. These can be summarised in six major headings:

1. The promotion of linguistic diversity in cultural industries
2. The condition and situation of the artist
3. The movement of people, goods, services and know-how related to cultural activity
4. Culture as an element of development
5. Dialogue between cultures and international cultural cooperation
6. Cultural policies

The convention would thus provide an international framework for governments to define the policies needed to promote the production and availability of local content for their own citizens. The final aim of this instrument on cultural

diversity is in fact guaranteeing access to different cultural goods and services, both domestic and foreign. This does not involve restricting the international trade of these products or legitimising protectionist measures. On the contrary, it is based on the principle of balance between the right to promote local creation and its access on the one hand and the duty to be open to cultural content from other countries on the other. The agreement is born from the need to promote cultural cooperation as a way to disseminate cultural diversity.

Final Considerations

As the annex to this article shows, there is a very long list of international instruments relating to culture, diversity and intercultural dialogue. However, the vast majority are only statements or, when they involve an agreement between States, do not include an arbitration and/or disciplinary mechanism for breaches of agreement. The few exceptions are the WTO agreements, which consider culture as an indistinct good. On the other hand, the problem of cultural diversity in a process of economic globalisation is relatively new and so there are few instruments that include this perspective. In this framework, and as Ivan Barnier²⁰ says, we can find some major shortfalls that the UNESCO instrument should take into account:

- **Lack of a comprehensive vision of the effects of globalisation on cultural diversity.** The most serious deficiency stems from the fact that the existing instruments establish a partial approach to the problem. There are perspectives related to human rights, intellectual-property rights, the protection of heritage, cultural policies, linguistic rights, cultural pluralism, cultural development, international cultural cooperation, etc. What is missing is in fact an international legal instrument that covers all these perspectives and monitors what is known as *cultural biodiversity*.

- **The weakness of the cultural perspective compared to the trade perspective.** In the rounds of negotiation about international trade deregulation, the process is followed by trade experts but not by experts in culture. This is logical, but at the end of the day it undermines the strategy that defends culture as a specific good. As a tactical proposal, it

raises the need to project the slogan “Culture Is Not Just Any Old Good” in society.

- **Imbalance in cultural exchanges.** This imbalance, particularly noticeable in the audiovisual field, arises not just in developing countries but also in the majority of developed ones. We thus find a minority of countries that produce and export cultural products flooding the markets of developing and developed countries alike. Cultural diversity is thus suffering not just in terms of own national expression but also in terms of know-how and dialogue with other, non-exporting, cultures. In fact, this trade imbalance establishes a common standard of international culture, i.e., Hollywood.

- **Not enough attention paid to local requirements.** Cultural diversity is based on international, national and *local* spheres. Diversity is not the monopoly of multilateral institutions and nation states, but rather local communities have their own important role in building public networks of participation and exchange.

This is the situation UNESCO is currently facing when it comes to preparing an instrument on cultural diversity. However, it is important to mention a final issue that will be key to it being a truly useful and effective initiative. To date, the defence of cultural diversity under international law has been, as I have already said, mainly based on releasing statements. Agreements of all types have failed to anticipate any effective control or disciplinary mechanism. This is the central point because, if we begin from an object that is hard to define legally, the efficacy of any initiative will be null and void. The international instrument on cultural diversity that UNESCO is preparing could become just another bureaucratic initiative without any effective applicability.

Notes

1. <http://www.undp.org/hdr2003/>
2. Statistical definitions are very disperse, even with the OECD. For example, in the OECD publication *Services Statistics on International Transactions 1970-1994*, the figures for Japan are grouped under the heading “film rentals”, while those of Germany fall under the heading “films and television”, in France they were “audiovisual programmes”, in Canada “films and broadcasting” and in Austria “culture and entertainment”. Furthermore, one of the main difficulties in interpreting figures on cultural services is the fact that many trans-border operations within a same multinational in a sector are not entered into the accounts.
3. *The Economist*. 21 November 1998.
4. LAMY, Pascal. *L'Europe en première ligne*, Paris, Seuil, 2002, p. 142.
5. www.unesco.org/culture/laws/stockholm/html_sp/actionpl1.shtml
6. <http://cm.coe.int/ta/decl/2000/2000dec2.htm>
7. <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2000okinawa/finalcom.htm>
8. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>
9. <http://www.francophonie.org/>
10. <http://206.191.7.19/>
11. The International Network on Cultural Policy includes Argentina, Armenia, Austria, the Bahamas, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Luxemburg, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the Central African Republic, Rumania, Russia, St. Lucia, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunis, the Ukraine, the United Kingdom, Vietnam and Zimbabwe.
12. http://206.191.7.19/w-group/wg-cdg/news0206_s.shtml
13. <http://www2.europarl.eu.int/omk/sipade2?L=ES&OBJID=40464&LEVEL=3&MODE=SIP&NAV=X&LSTDOC=N>
14. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/es/com/cnc/2003/com2003_0520es01.pdf
15. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001307/130798s.pdf>
16. http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/copyright/html_sp/page1.shtml
17. <http://www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/rome/index.html>
18. http://www.wto.org/spanish/tratop_s/trips_s/trips_s.htm
19. http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/florence/html_sp/page1.shtml
20. http://www.unesco.org/culture/laws/florence/html_sp/page4.shtml
21. http://206.191.7.19/w-group/wg-cdg/reader/questions_e.shtml

Annex:

Chronological list of instruments in force on cultural diversity, whether binding (charters, agreements, conventions, protocols and treaties) or non-binding (declarations, resolutions, recommendations, plans of action, principles and guidelines).

- League of Arab Nations, Arab Cultural Treaty, November 1946.
- European Cultural Agreement (ETS No. 018, 1954).
- UNESCO, Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials (Florence Agreement, 1950) and updated Nairobi Protocol, 1976.
- Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, 1954.
- OECD, Code of Liberalisation of Current Invisible Operations, 1961. This code covered a range of services, including audiovisual services, which were the object of special regulations expressly authorising the establishment of broadcasting shares and subsidies for their protection.
- UNESCO, Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Cooperation, 1966.
- U.N., International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Resolution 2200A (XXI) from the General Assembly, 16 December 1966. Article 27: Recognition of the Rights of Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities within the States.
- U.N., Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States in Line with the United Nations Charter, Resolution 2625 (XXV) of the General Assembly, 1970.
- General Recommendation from the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Europe, Helsinki, 1972.
- Declaration from the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Asia, Jogjakarta, 1973.
- Declaration from the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Africa, Accra, 1975.
- Organisation of African Unity, Cultural Charter for Africa, 1976.
- ASEAN, Declaration of Agreement of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 1976.
- UNESCO, Recommendation on the International Exchange of Cultural Goods, Nairobi, 1976.
- UNESCO, Recommendation Concerning the Participation and the Popular Masses Contribution to Cultural Life, Nairobi, 1976.
- Declaration of Bogota, Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1978.
- Final Declaration Adopted by the World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico City (1982).
- UNESCO - MONDIACULT, World Conference on Cultural Policies, Mexico, 1982.
- Council of Europe, Recommendation 1043 (1986) on Linguistic Heritage and European Literature.
- Council of Europe, Recommendation 1059 (1987) on the Economy of Culture, 1987.
- Council of Europe, Recommendation 1067 (1987) on the Cultural Dimension of Broadcasting in Europe.
- Organization of American States (OAS), Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (San Salvador Protocol), 1988.
- European Union, European Directive on Television Without Frontiers (ETS-132, 1989, in force as of 1993).
- UN, Declaration on the Rights of People Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious or Linguistic Minorities,

Resolution 47/135 from the General Assembly, 18 December 1992.

- Council of Europe, Recommendation 1216 (1993) on European Cultural Cooperation.

- North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), 1994. Agreement between the US, Canada and Mexico: Articles 2106 and Annex 2106 referring to the relative exemption of measures that affect cultural industries.

- GATT Agreement (1947), Article IV of 1994 on the special provisions relating to films.

- General Agreement on the Trade of Services (GATS, 1995). Articles II (Most Favoured Nation Treatment), XVI (Access to Markets) and XVII (National Treatment).

- Council of Europe, Recommendation 1265 (1995) on Enlargement and European Cultural Cooperation.

- Council of the European Union. Decision 96/664/EC of 21 November 1996 – Promotion of Linguistic Diversity in the Community in the Information Society.

- MERCOSUR, Cultural Integration Protocol, MERCOSUR /CM/Dec. Decision No. 11/96. By virtue of this instrument, signatory States agreed to promote cooperation and exchange among the respective cultural institutions and their representatives (article 1, paragraph 1).

- Council of Europe, European Charter of Regional or Minority Languages (1998); ETS 148.

- Council of Europe, Recommendation R (98) 6 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States related to Modern Languages.

- UNESCO, Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, Stockholm, 1998.

- UN, Resolution Approved by the General Assembly 53/184. Cultural Development, 1998.

- International Organisation of the Francophonie (OIF): Final Declaration from the Moncton Summit (1999).

- Council of Europe: Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2000).

- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Decision Declaring the European Year of Languages, 2001 (8 June 2000).

- European Union and the African, Caribbean and the Pacific Group of States (ACP). Cotonou Agreement (23 June 2000), Adapted in Replacement of the Lomé Convention.

- UN, Resolution Approved by the General Assembly 55/192. Culture and Development, 2000.

- Council of Europe: Declaration on Cultural Diversity 2000.

- International Organisation of the Francophonie, Third Ministerial Conference on Culture, Cotonou Declaration (2001).

- International Network of Cultural Policies, Cape Town Declaration, October 2002.

- UN, Report on the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, Plan of Application, chapter 1, Resolution 2, annex (September 2002).

- International Organisation of the Francophonie, Beirut Declaration (2002).

- UN, Resolution 57/249 Approved by the General Assembly. Culture and Development, 2002.

- Council of Europe, Resolution 1313 (2003), Cultural Cooperation Between Europe and the Southern Mediterranean Countries.

- Council of Europe, Recommendation R (2003) 9 from the Committee of Ministers to Member States concerning measures to promote the democratic and social contribution of digital broadcasting.