



Second meeting of the Advisory Committee of Experts (category VI) for the World Report on Cultural Diversity

UNESCO Office in Venice, 2-3 April 2007

Report

I. BACKGROUND

Following the conclusions of the first meeting of the Advisory Committee of Experts for the World Report on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO Headquarters, 25-26 September 2006), and in particular the approval of a provisional conceptual framework, the intersectoral group constituted within the Secretariat and animated by the World Reports Unit, pursued the efforts toward clarifying the subjects and compiling reference documentation available, in order to identify possible themes for background papers to be commissioned¹. In parallel, a first draft synopsis of the World Report was submitted for discussion to intersectoral group and to the College of ADGs in early February 2007 (attached in annex 1).

Hence the objectives of this meeting were to confirm and further the proposed orientations for the report, through a thematic discussion (day 1) and the review of a provisional Table of Contents and a provisional list of possible contributions to be commissioned, for which the contributors were to be identified (day 2).

II. INTRODUCTION

The second meeting of the Advisory Committee of Experts was held at the UNESCO Office in Venice (Palazzo Zorzi) on 2 and 3 April 2007. Ten experts participated in the meeting:

¹ To this end, the intersectoral group, at its 27 November 2006 meeting, decided to structure its work around eight non exhaustive subjects: cultural diversity and linguistic diversity (focal point: M. Rosi), cultural diversity and environment (focal point: D. Nakashima), cultural identities and religious identities (focal point: M. Goucha), cultural diversity and movements of populations (point focal : A.B. Preis), cultural diversity and creation/innovation (focal point: C. Piñan), cultural diversity and knowledge diversity (focal point: S. Schnuttgen), cultural diversity, the media, tourism and consumptions habits (focal point: A. Schischlik), cultural diversity and poverty/development (focal point: J. Crowley). Particular attention was to be devoted to women, youth people and indigenous populations for each of these subjects.

- Mr Neville Alexander, Director of PRAESA (South Africa) and Member of the African Academy of Languages (ACALAN)
- Ms Lourdes Arizpe, Professor of Anthropology at the Autonomous National University of Mexico (Mexico)
- Mr Tyler Cowen, Professor at the Georges Mason University
- Ms Biserka Cvjeticanin, Former Minister (Croatia), Director of the CULTURLINK network
- Mr Jean-Pierre Guingané, Vice-President of the International Theatre Institute
- Mr Luis Enrique Lopez, Principal Adviser to the Intercultural Bilingual Teacher Training Programme in Bolivia
- Mr Tony Pigott, CEO of J. Walter Thompson Advertising Canada
- Mr Anatoly Vishnevsky, Head of the National Institute for Demography, Russian Federation
- Mr Mohamed Zayani, Professor at the Sharjah University, United Arab Emirates
- Ms Benigna Zimba, Head of the Department of History at the University Eduardo Mondlane in Maputo, Mozambique.

UNESCO's Secretariat was represented by Ms Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Michael Millward, Director of the World Reports Unit, Ms Katérina Stenou, Director of the Division for Cultural Policies and Dialogue, Ms Marie-Paul Roudil, Culture Programme Specialist at the UNESCO Venice office, Mr Damir Dijakovic, Assistant Culture Programme Specialist at the UNESCO Venice office, Mr Frédéric Sampson, Editorial Coordinateur of the UNESCO World Report, as well as WRU's collaborators, Ms Arian Hassani and Mr Alessandro Giaccone. M. Engelbert Ruoss, Director of the UNESCO Venice Office, welcomed the participants.

ADG/CLT informed the experts that Mr Neville Alexander agreed to chair the second meeting of the Advisory Committee.

III. SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

III. 1. Substantive discussion concerning the thematic presentations

The thematic discussions on the first day served to develop a number of ideas outlined in the synopsis of the report and to clarify certain recommendations concerning the aims of the report and ways of achieving them. These have been summarized by the Co-Chair, Mr Neville Alexander, to facilitate the chapter-by-chapter discussion (see annex 3 attached).

The discussion concerning the presentation by **Neville Alexander** (see annex 4) emphasized the need to rethink cultural diversity in terms of fluidity and continuity, whereas the "fishbowl" construct, while it might in some circumstances be appropriate, represented people as self-enclosed. The participants examined the notions of civilization and modernization, underlining that it was a pure historical accident that modernization had originated in the Western world and emphasizing that it should be seen as the result

of the collective efforts of all of humanity (Einstein's physics being inconceivable without the contributions of the Greek, Phoenician, Arab and other scientific traditions). Each particular current formed part of the overall flow, in the manner of a “rainbow river”. Each culture was entitled to share equitably in the benefits of modernity in keeping with its chosen path, and it was particularly important to reforge the link (often broken by the years of colonization) between modernity and tradition. In that way, the benefits of modernity came to be accepted or were assimilated to specifically local customs or values (just as the aeroplane or cell phone were used in different ways and for different purposes). Such an emphasis on exchanges, particularly between North and South, should bring about a new understanding of tolerance, consisting not so much in “suffering” other people and their differences as putting ourselves in their place, thereby breaking down the barriers that separated us, particularly in the form of our individual worldviews.

The discussion concerning the presentation by **Anatoly Vishnevsky** highlighted the difference between the cultural diversity of the modern world and that of the traditional world - the first involving a diversity of individual behaviours and aspirations, while the second, behind the glittering array of languages, habits and traditional practices, often displayed great uniformity of human behaviour, everyone being “attached” to his or her particular way of life. Demographic transitions made it necessary to modify various cultural norms linked to the prescriptions of ancient societies with high mortality rates (hence, for example the liberation of women), even if the entrenched nature of certain values made this process particularly difficult. In the context of the third demographic transition, mass migrations were posing new difficulties - notably the need to avoid ghettoization - in receiving countries with a strong culture of mutual accommodation, especially where the large number of communities made polarization of the situation more difficult. Finding solutions to the problems of adaptation was not a new challenge; and what some politicians liked to represent as incompatibility between cultures was often little different from the case of rural inhabitants moving to the city and discovering modern lifestyles (even if urban life could also be synonymous with a return to traditional forms of living, as in some Latin American countries). It was because migrants were often faced by social inequality, and were also very easily manipulated, that integration mechanisms had broken down and new forms of solidarity were being created - in the form, for example, of ethnic-based associations that could become a source of tension and conflict. Receiving societies should therefore make a genuine attempt at integration and should not rely solely on a policy of assimilation.

The presentation by **Lourdes Arispe** provided an opportunity to revisit some important questions relating to current lines of scientific research on cultural diversity. Firstly, a distinction needed to be made between universals and “universalizables”, i.e. between elements common to humanity as a whole and those specific to a particular culture but gradually universalized. This was related to the current debate on the innate character of certain cultural competencies, which were incidentally also found in certain families of great apes, thereby raising questions about the specifically human nature of culture. The term “culture” was increasingly polysemic in usage, pointing either to a need for certainty (accentuated by new forms of insecurity generated by social change and

globalization) or the need to establish new kinds of solidarity in the face of growing inequalities. Cultural diversity was thus linked to a world of greater interactivity, with its winners and losers. From that perspective, migrations should be viewed from the point of view of the sending countries (with the preservation of close links between the diasporas and the communities remaining in the country of origin). The report should also reflect the fact of post-multiculturalism - those spaces of multiple cultural allegiance where the emergence of new identities went hand in hand with the temptation of a return to authenticity and where consumerism had become the only common ground in the vacuous coexistence of insular cultures,.

Luis Enrique Lopez's presentation highlighted the specificity of indigenoussness in Latin America where, unlike tribalism in Africa or Southern Asia, it was first and foremost a political resource used to challenge the established patterns of power distribution in societies marked by profound inequalities. What were we to make, then, of the "authenticity" of indigenous groups and how were such groups to be distinguished from others? Their main concern was to recover what had been taken from them, so that the issue here was the link between cultural diversity and social justice. The demand for multilingualism in basic education and also higher education, with the rediscovery of alternative rationalities, related not only to the link between language and worldview but also to the fact that monolingualism had often been imposed by the conquerors. In the South American context, metissage, interculturalism and hybridity were not interchangeable terms, whether it involved a genuine concern by individuals to rediscover their roots or the reinvention for political ends of a supposedly « pure » cultural identity. Whatever the case, the existence of claims for indigenous rights reminded us that cultural diversity should not be conceived as a one-way street but as a two-way process

In her presentation, **Benigna Zimba** stressed the importance of giving sufficient weight to the theme of women in the report. Reflection on strategies for giving autonomy women had progressed significantly in recent years, and the report should consider how far cultural change could contribute to liberating women through basic education and the evolution of attitudes in societies in the process of modernization. For, in the end, were not women themselves, as key agents in the transmission of values, prime movers in cultural change?

Tony Pigott stressed the existence of new trends in the content creation industries, with new "do-it-yourself" media enabling people to create their own content. Whereas mass culture had revealed its limitations, the question was whether the prospects of diversification were sufficient to guarantee the interest of content industries in cultural diversity. It was a fact that authenticity was an increasingly saleable commodity, as shown by the example of cultural tourism. The debate turned on the capacity of cultural industries to pursue something more than the standardization of tastes and the stereotyping of cultural content. What could be done to ensure that consumers of content pitched their demands higher? Finally, it was not certain that cultural standardization was uniquely the consequence of a bias specific to cultural industries: it could also point to the existence of universals that would manifest themselves in the longer term.

Mohamed Zayani pointed out that, in today's mediated society, culture was powerfully influenced by the media. The nature of that influence depended on the kind of media involved: some were agents of globalization and privileged the power centres rather than the periphery; others, under the control of governments, were agents of mobilization at the local level; others again were remote from the centres of power and were more in the nature of instruments at the individual level. What was at issue, then, was the promotion of content at the centre or at the periphery (made more complex by the question of the links between diasporas and countries of origin), the means of revitalizing local production, and the inevitable distortions in the way others were portrayed (stereotypes), magnified by the kind of journalism favoured by certain media (sensationalism). On the question of media diversity and pluralism, it was said that a greater choice of sources was not sufficient in itself, since too much information always ended up by overloading the receiver. It was therefore important to promote local production capacities without recourse to the intermediaries that invariably distorted the reality they purported to describe. Quotas were one solution, but they were not the only one. More generally, there was a need to give greater prominence to marginalized groups.

Following the presentation by **Tyler Cowen** on the difficulty of making an unequivocal judgement on the adverse or beneficial effects of globalization (as the example of tourism in Venice demonstrated), the discussion focused on the wide range of perceptions and representations of cultural diversity and the grounds for viewing it in positive terms. On the one hand, we could be said to be witnessing a growing derealization of cultural diversity as the result of successful marketing strategies of the kind used to promote tourism, which exploited the universal "wish to escape". On the other hand, there were positive reasons for valuing cultural diversity as synonymous with greater freedom.

The presentation by **Jean-Pierre Guingané** focused on the importance of tolerance and of taking the human factor into account when implementing policies involving social or cultural change. Individuals or communities were often reluctant to abandon their distinct characteristics, and such an undertaking called for time, unfailing trust in the agent of change (who should be well acquainted with the societies concerned) and the direct participation of those concerned in any ensuing benefits. Thus tolerance, which presupposed the capacity to recognize the contingent nature of one's own cultural attachments, implied: i) a capacity for recognizing other people as valuable and respectable beings, avoiding any suggestion of playing the teacher; ii) a capacity to accept other people, even if that did not mean wholly sharing their values; iii) a capacity for sharing and friendly exchange. For example, the greatest mistake in combating excision would be to approach the female excisor and tell her outright that she was wrong. What was required was rather to plant doubt in the minds of those who cultivated this practice - if possible, with the help of the religious authorities - and when people were ready to abandon it to provide for rehabilitation measures for the excisors. The social theatre, and the arts in general, could be a powerful vector for social change grounded in respect for other people. Penalizing and punishing were not necessarily the best way of eradicating a harmful practice. An example in case was that of brush fires: often, it was sufficient to explain to those concerned that they could perform what they saw as their ancestral duty symbolically on a small patch of land.

Finally, **Bisserka Cvjeticanin** drew attention to the fact that some of the problems of cultural diversity could not be limited to the national context and had a transnational dimension, the appearance of new networks being an attempt to respond to that situation. In that connection, the question was raised whether the existence of global networks had made the role of intermediaries irrelevant in intercultural exchanges and communication.

The detailed discussions on the table of contents the following day would take the above discussions as their point of departure.

Conclusion: specific recommendations for the report

The thematic discussion also elicited a number of practical suggestions that might be taken up in the world report:

- A list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) could be prepared on the subject of cultural diversity
- Consideration should be given to including some detailed strategies to influence the positions and mindsets of policy-makers, particularly in the post-9/11 epoch
- The report should serve as a marker for groups claiming rights and seeking to redress social inequalities
- The report could include the findings of qualitative studies on perceptions of cultural diversity (the type of public opinion research carried out, for example, by GlobalScan or TNS/Gallop)
- Publication of the report should be linked to an appropriate marketing strategy, including a clear vision of the message to be conveyed and the target audience
- The report should enlist the help of institutions and networks to inform the public, although its message should be formulated in terms corresponding to the way diversity was generally perceived
- The important thing was not only what was said but how it was said, since the aim of the report should be to make cultural diversity a positive factor of social transformation
- The report should include an executive summary offering the reader new perspectives on the question, together with a brief account to enable the media wishing to do so to reflect its findings.

III. 2. General comments on the draft table of contents

The discussion of the draft table of contents, including a general introduction and then a detailed chapter-by-chapter presentation, helped to clarify the main lines of the document without dwelling on points of semantic detail, which would be covered at a later stage in the preparation of the report.

It was decided that the report would not necessarily take up a position on the main questions debated at the meeting, but should try to set out as clearly and honestly as possible the different options with respect to possible lines of approach.

It was stressed that the report was intended to protect, as a necessary corollary of *managing*, cultural diversity - an essential condition of social development that was not recognized in equal measure by all States. However, it was important to respect the wide variety of contexts relating to the management of diversity, while attempting to identify the different options possible.

It would be necessary, however, to address the contradictions inherent in cultural diversity, which must be described very clearly (for example, the tension between safeguarding local languages and the need for a lingua franca).

Finally, in view of the trends discernable in the dynamics of cultural change, what attitude should be adopted towards the inevitability of certain transformations? Was there not a case for adopting the attitude of the doctor who knew that someone was dying but did not wish to accelerate the process or act as though nothing could be done? The report should doubtless try to take stock of the phenomena it described, while avoiding the temptation to protect and museify the existing forms of cultural diversity.

As regards the crosscutting themes and certain of the report's specific targets such as women or young people, it was decided that they would not be the subject of a separate chapter but would be treated recurrently throughout the report and, in more developed form, in a clearly identified subchapter.

III.3. Specific comments chapter by chapter

The following comments were exchanged on chapter 1:

- Was it meaningful to say that what to be protected was not each individual expression of cultural diversity but rather the "fact" of diversity? You did not protect a fact; a fact existed.
- To document this "diversity of diversity", it would be helpful to have some brief ethnographic studies in which individuals explained their link to cultural diversity
- Was the approach in chapter 1 sufficiently dynamic? Cultural diversity should not be conceived as though it were a museum in which everything must remain intact. Were not certain cultural forms fated to disappear? Should the report not pose the

question of whether some forms were more or less effective in the selection process? How far could one intervene and how far was there a pressing need to protect cultural diversity?

The following comments were exchanged on **chapter 2**:

- The tourist industry should be seen as a subset of the marketing of cultural diversity
- More visibility should be given to the economic and developmental aspects of languages and literacy, including cultural and intercultural literacy (or competency)
- It was not only knowledge that was exchanged but also values
- The importance of family life in the everyday experience of cultural diversity should not be overlooked: mixed marriages were a vector of interculturality

The following comments were exchanged on **chapter 3**:

- It was important to go beyond ethical questions and consider the epistemological issues at stake in the diversity of knowledge
- Concerning religions, the issue was less one of religious practice than of religious dogma. Religion had long been considered a component of culture, but was that true of all religions? Was the opposite not equally conceivable, and in that case how did religions contemplate interculturality?
- The report should identify projects on which the different religions could cooperate as a pragmatic means of promoting cultural diversity
- Since the report's concern was not the proximity of dogmas, it should focus on the capacity of religions for dialogue
- Intercultural dialogue often became an alibi for resolving unresolved political, economic or social issues. The limitations of dialogue, the question of what could not be resolved through dialogue, should therefore be addressed.
- An over-mechanistic view of cultural competency should be avoided
- The consensus reached at the Vienna Congress concerning the universality of human rights should not be called into question.

The following comments were exchanged on **chapter 4**:

- This chapter should capture new phenomena (not a new paradigm). See, for example, the case of neo-identities, such as Aztec dance in Mexico
- The chapter could refer to transcultural communities developing on the Internet
- It could include transnational contacts between indigenous groups

The following comments were exchanged on **chapter 5**:

- The chapter should be restructured around the idea of democracy, unless it was covered by the idea of public debate
- It was important not to overlook the question of inequalities. There was a great deal of discussion on the impact of globalization in some regions of the world, such as Latin America, Africa and South-East Asia. Subsidies to farmers in Europe and in North America were having an impact on cultural diversity in the rural world in the countries of the South. The issue of differentialism (different rights for different communities) was subsidiary to the imperative of equal opportunity for all

The following comments were exchanged on **chapter 6**:

- Avoid moving surreptitiously from a discussion on cultural diversity to a discussion on culture and development
- Was cultural diversity really the "key" to sustainable development? While it was doubtless an important element in it, the report should not convey the wrong message. There was no unanimity on the concept of sustainable development, which needed to be placed in perspective. The report should address very specific questions
- Intercultural understanding opened up a new market turning to account exchanges, creativity and diversity, whose potential needed to be measured as a possible driving force of development (e.g. the handicraft market or "equitable" products)
- We should be very careful in speaking about a "culture of poverty". Poor people too had a rich culture (dancing, music, etc). Did it make sense to talk of people being excluded from cultural life?
- The development perspective should be addressed in the early part of the report (for example, the introduction)
- How was development to be measured in qualitative terms (mutual appreciation, exchanges, etc)

The following comments were exchanged on the **conclusion**:

- A new “tool box” was required to manage diversity. But another approach, rather than asking how to manage diversity, would be to think of cultural diversity as something that "is" and therefore managed itself. What was needed, then, was to accompany, understand and influence diversity to ensure where necessary that it functioned equitably
- The report should be more future-oriented. What united us was a common past and a common future. A greater effort should be made to understand the trends that were taking us towards the future, which did not necessarily mean renouncing our capacity to act upon reality. Our aim should be to make the future richer than the past, rather than simply preserving the riches of the past
- More should be said about the actors and cultural groups involved. Who were the custodians of cultural diversity?

III.3. Discussion of the envisaged contributions

The names of the different experts mentioned during the discussion were noted with a view to finalizing the plan for commissioning the expert contributions

IV. Closure of the proceedings

IV.1. Conclusions of the meeting

ADG/CLT expressed UNESCO's gratitude to the experts for having responded to this second invitation and contributed to the Secretariat's critical thinking about the content of the world report

The meeting had yielded a consensus on the aims and main lines of the report, which would be taken into account in the finalization of the documents

IV.2. Follow-up to the work of the Advisory Committee of Experts

The World Reports Unit would be responsible for preparing the report of the meeting and finalizing the plan for commissioning the expert contributions, starting during April 2007. A revised version of the synopsis, in the form of an annotated table of contents, would also be prepared.

Drafting would begin at the beginning of May, initially on the basis of the available documentation and then as the commissioned papers were received.

A very preliminary version of the draft report would be circulated in mid-August 2007



UNESCO WORLD REPORT ON CULTURAL DIVERSITY PROVISIONAL SYNOPSIS

Building on the considerable amount of contemporary reflection that lies behind the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) and its Action Plan, the main purpose of the report should be to identify better policies and policy instruments (or at least new approaches to be explored) to ensure that cultural diversity, sometimes perceived as a threat or a source of insecurity, is truly fruitful (as the UNESCO Constitution states) and can flourish in full measure to the benefit of all. Such policies have ramifications in all fields of competence of UNESCO, not only culture, but also education, communication, and the natural, social and human sciences.

In **Part I** (“**A diagnosis of contemporary changes in cultural diversity**”), by way of a study of recent and long term manifestations of cultural diversity, seen both circumstantially as an array of fast-changing contexts (**Chapter 1**) and subjectively in terms of specific experiences faced by individuals/groups (**Chapter 2**), the aim is to demonstrate how necessary it is becoming to propose new ways of considering policy-making, both by taking into account the complexity of cultural diversity itself and by using cultural diversity as a tool for new social, economic or technological policies.

Then, **Part II** (“**A new perspective to clarify policies: from dialogue to multiple identities**”) aims at critically assessing the quest for mutual and respectful understanding through dialogue (**Chapter 3**), and proposing a broader view that underscores the need to respect the dignity of individuals and groups with complex and multiple identities (**Chapter 4**). Since the approach of interculturality alone cannot cover the entirety of the problem comprehensively, the case will be made for a new approach to be formulated, encompassing the need for mutual understanding but also questioning some of the possible over-simplifications of the “dialogue” approach and showing the complexity of cultural identity issues captured from within.

Part III (“**New areas of inquiry and policy-making**”) seeks to demonstrate how cultural diversity, if taken seriously with a particular interest in ongoing research, may become a powerful instrument for policy-making in many different fields. Indeed, not only governance and human rights could be revisited from the cultural diversity

perspective (**Chapter 5**), but also the very aspects of sustainable development tailor-made for each group or context (**Chapter 6**).

* * *

At the outset, in **Chapter 1 (“Protecting the fact of cultural diversity: from a heritage-based perspective towards the dynamics of cultural change in a globalizing world”)**, cultural diversity will be considered in the great complexity of its occurrences and contexts, including through the many different approaches it allows around the world. With this attentiveness to the diversity of circumstances, the impact of globalization will have to be carefully examined in order to shed light on new forms of diversity that are emerging in new contexts and by new means. What has to be kept in mind, indeed, is that it is the fact of cultural diversity that should be protected and not a given state of such diversity. A too heavily heritage-based approach should thus give way to one that pays greater attention to the dynamics at play in cultural change.

Furthermore, cultural diversity is not just a given, but is also a set of everyday life experiences of individuals for whom diversity is not so much threatened as threatening, bringing into question their certainties or value systems. Thus, **Chapter 2 (“Greater exposure to cultural diversity: how is it transmitted?”)** will focus on the channels through which cultural diversity occurs (the media, TV, radio, cinema, etc.) and on the means by which it is handed down from generation to generation, notably through education and language systems, with a special emphasis on the more recent forms by which this diversity is experienced and consumed.

Having set out this diagnosis of the real and perceived dynamics, Chapters 3 and 4, through a critical assessment of current policy instruments that seek to « manage » this diversity successfully, will propose a new perspective aiming to acknowledge a greater degree of complexity. First, **Chapter 3 (“Rights and wrongs of the ‘dialogue’ approach”)** intends to reassess the experiences and discourses relating to intercultural dialogue. It recalls that cultures are never spontaneously inward-looking and that mutual understanding is a key for managing possible conflicts that may arise between different, long-standing and competing approaches all claiming to be “universal”. Mutual understanding should be promoted at every level of cultural interactions, and not only within high-level fora. So the workings of cultural and intercultural competency should be more thoroughly understood so that they can be turned to fuller account in enhancing interculturality in learning and the media. But ultimately, the notion of “cultures” is just a simplification and more accuracy should be given to the complexity of cultural issues from the perspective of individuals, whether alone or collectively.

The positive aspects of the “intercultural” approach, which are not always adequately conveyed by the “dialogue” paradigm, therefore need to be more comprehensively developed in a way that does more justice to the complexity of identities as they are experienced or mobilized, including “transcultural” situations. This is what **Chapter 4**

(“Coping with multi-form identities and transculturality”) will set out to do. The aim is not, however, to reinvent culturalism, which in the 60s extolled the singularity of cultural identities as national identities. On the contrary, the proposed perspective underscores the multi-dimensional nature of identities that cannot be reduced unharmed to a stereotype, whatever the process. This helps to understand how new cultures (or « counter-cultures ») emerge, and how the problem of the dignity of certain individuals or groups has grown in importance, even sometimes to the point of adding certain caveats to the dialogue-based ideals of openness in the name of the protection of traditional cultural expressions.

Thus cultural diversity can become a powerful instrument for policy-making, from the perspective of its political, social, economical, environmental and technological implications. This is why Chapters 5 and 6 will explore the manifold aspects of new policies to be considered, following the paths of the most recent developments in research and taking into account new practices experienced in many different contexts.

Chapter 5 (“Thinking the universal in diversity: issues of governance and human rights”) will focus on drawing concrete policy recommendations with regard to managing the social and political consequences of a better recognition of cultural diversity. Thus, it will re-explore policies within this new cultural diversity framework with the following possible focuses: 1) human rights violations, peace, security, history, reconciliation and solidarity, 2) the inter-linkages between local (or indigenous) and mainstream scientific knowledge systems and 3) bioethics. This analysis will demonstrate that effective policies in these domains demand not only an “identity approach,” but also elements of the dialogue approach that remain relevant in the modern context.

Chapter 6 (“Cultural diversity, the key to tailor-made sustainable development?”) will focus on drawing concrete policy recommendations with regard to sustainability and poverty alleviation. In this respect, this chapter will show that cultural diversity is not only integral for effective policymaking, but that it also plays an essential role in creating the conditions that facilitate the implementation of these policies. As such, this chapter could address cultural diversity’s role in shaping pressing development issues that are especially pertinent to UNESCO’s mandate, namely 1) resource and environmental disaster management, 2) education, creativity and innovation, 3) HIV/AIDS prevention and 4) social cohesion. This chapter could also examine how cultural diversity can be vital in mitigating the negative effects of the “culture of poverty,” which tends to slow/block policy implementation.

The concluding chapter will summarize the policy recommendations of the report, advocating that cultural diversity will be no more than what we wish it to be, a fruitful instrument for new policies or a source of threat and insecurity if it is not well managed.

Annexe 2 : documents presented at the second meeting of the Advisory Committee of Experts

WRU/CLTDIV/ACoE/07/02

01.04.2007

Original: English



**Second Meeting of the Advisory Committee of Experts
for the World Report on Cultural Diversity
Venice, Palazzo Zorzi, 2-3 April 2007**

Agenda of the meeting

Day 1: Monday 2 April 2007

Morning session

9h: Welcoming speech by Mr Engelbert Ruoss, director of the UNESCO Venice Office

9h10: Introductory presentation by Ms Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director-General for culture

Thematic discussion

9h30: Mr Neville Alexander, "Ways of Seeing Culture with respect to the Maintenance and Promotion of Cultural and Linguistic Diversity"

Followed by an open debate

10h10: Mr Anatoly Vishnevsky, "Cultural diversity: a Key for Understanding Recent Demographic and Social Change? Distinguishing Urban and Rural Contexts" (provisional title)

Followed by an open debate

(10 minutes coffee break)

11h: Ms Lourdes Arizpe, "Ongoing Anthropological Research and the Debate over Universalism" (provisional title)

Followed by an open debate

11h40: Mr Luis.Enrique Lopez, “Language and Culture in Indigenous Education: towards Intercultural Education for All”

Followed by an open debate

12h20: Ms Benigna Zimba, “Identity and Gender Issues Today: the Quest for Cultural Assertion”

Followed by an open debate

13h: End of the morning session

(Lunch break at the Giardini restaurant)

Afternoon session

14h30: Mr Tony Piggott: “ Consuming Diversity and Stereotypes in Everyday Life: Fashions, Trends and Marketing Interest for Cultural Diversity” (provisional title)

Followed by an open debate

15h10: Mr Mohamed Zayani: “Cultural Diversity and the Media”

Followed by an open debate

(10 minutes coffee break)

16h: Mr Tyler Cowen: "Globalization, Cultures and Development"

Followed by an open debate

16h40: Mr Jean-Pierre Guingané, “The Importance of the Human Factor for the Implementation of Cultural Diversity Policies” (provisional title)

Followed by an open debate

17h20: Ms Bisserka Cvjeticanin, “Intercultural Dialogue and Identities from the Perspective of Networks and NGOs”

Followed by an open debate

18h : Closure of the thematic discussion

Day 2: Tuesday 3 April 2007

Morning session

10h: Synthesis of the thematic discussion and presentation of a revised version of the synopsis and the provisional table of contents (WRU team)

11h: Open discussion

13h: End of the morning session

(Lunch break at the Giardini restaurant)

Afternoon session

14h30: Introduction to the discussion over the experts to be commissioned for a paper (WRU team)

15h: Open discussion

17h: Conclusion and next steps, by Ms Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director-General for culture