

UNESCO, Cultural Industries and International Development Agenda: Between Modest Recognition and Reluctance

Antonios Vlassis

University of Liège

Abstract

This chapter analyses the policy process and the context through which the international agenda regarding the cultural industries/development nexus was formulated. It focuses on the political pathways through which UNESCO's broader agenda on culture and development first emerged, and the place of cultural industries within that. It also explores the reasons for the continued marginalisation of the cultural industries, despite their economic and symbolic importance, within international cooperation for development, and questions why the cultural sector—including the cultural industries—remains the 'Cinderella' in international development. To this end, the chapter identifies three contributing factors: the fragmented strategies of UNESCO, the reluctance of developed countries to promote the cultural industries/development nexus on the international stage; and the relatively weak transnational mobilization of arts NGOs.

Key words: cultural expressions; cultural industries; arts; cultural development; Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions; UNESCO; International Fund for Cultural Diversity; France; Canada; Spain; USA; China; UK; non-governmental organizations; International Fund for the Promotion of Culture; human development; sustainable development; creative diversity;

Mondiacult; Hangzhou Congress; cultural policy; private foundations; Coalitions for Cultural Diversity; international development.

Introduction

Between 2010 and 2015 the United Nations (UN) political arena was dominated by the international debate on the culmination of the Millennium Development Goals and on what would follow them—the post-2015 agenda. During the Rio+20 Summit, held in 2012, participants launched a process to determine a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that would frame the future development agenda. UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), along with many international actors, have sought to influence the post-2015 policy agenda, arguing that culture has an essential role in sustainable development and must be integrated into the SDGs.¹

Since the 1970s, UNESCO—the only UN agency with a legitimate and clearly recognized interest in culture—has worked to feed the international debate on the links between culture and development and, in doing so, it has become the main multilateral arena for the creation of international frameworks that bridge culture and development. A great number of UNESCO's initiatives and legal tools demonstrate this effort to embed the relationship at the international level and to raise awareness within the international community of the importance of implementing cultural policies in relation to development. The section that follows examines the historical emergence of UNESCO's policy agenda on culture and development, and then focuses more specifically on the place of the cultural industries within this agenda. The term 'cultural industries' refers to the economic organization of inputs and outputs for creativity, production,

distribution and exhibition, as well as the preservation of cultural expressions. The cultural industries include visual and performing arts, publishing, film and audio-visual arts, music, as well as crafts and design, which are not strictly speaking industries, but which are similar in their management and advertising (Singh 2011). According to the UN Creative Economy Report (2013, p. 9), world trade of cultural goods and services totalled a record US\$624 billion in 2011 and more than doubled from 2002 to 2011. As this indicates, a fundamental challenge for the cultural industries/development nexus comes from its multifaceted nature: the cultural industries make and circulate artistic expressions and are, at the same time, bearers of identity, values and meaning, and agents of economic, social and cultural change and development (Hesmondhalgh 2007).

Recent research emphasizes the legal, institutional and sociological features of the culture and development agenda (Clammer 2005; Da Costa 2010; Le Duc 2010; Nurse 2006) as well as associated policy outcomes. Further research has assessed the overall impact of the agenda on national and regional policies (Barrowclough and Kozul-Wright 2008; de Beukelaer 2015; Troussard et al. 2012). This chapter analyses the policy process through which the international agenda regarding the cultural industries/development nexus was formulated and explores the context in which that agenda evolved, as well as exploring why and how UNESCO includes the cultural industries/development nexus within its priorities (Author 2013 and 2015a). In this respect, this chapter fills a gap in the literature by focusing firstly on the political pathways through which the cultural industries/development nexus travels within UNESCO's agenda-setting, and secondly by highlighting why the nexus is still a 'Cinderella' within international cooperation for development.

International political pathways of ‘culture and development’ and the place of the cultural industries

UNESCO depends on its Member States to provide the necessary resources that give the organization its mandate. However, the organization (as an international arena for socialization and political lobbying) is also capable of mobilizing a collective imaginary and of producing new principles and concepts (Barnett and Finnemore 2004; Oestreich 2012). Since the 1970s, UNESCO has been the central site for the diffusion of ideas about culture and development and, within that, has sought to influence the connections between the cultural industries and development.

From Venice to Stockholm: Cultural industries without a concrete place

In the 1970s, in the wake of decolonisation, UNESCO was faced with the needs of a number of newly independent states with an approach that saw culture as ‘a marker of identity’ (UNESCO 2007, p. 76). The organization took the initiative to organize an Intergovernmental Conference on the Institutional, Administrative and Financial Aspects of Culture in Venice, from 24 August to 2 September 1970. This was the first intergovernmental conference on issues related to culture. The Conference acknowledged the responsibilities of national governments with respect to the cultural life of the nation (UNESCO 1970, pp. 7–11). Following this, UNESCO organised the World Conference on Cultural Policies (Mondiacult), held in Mexico from 26 July to 6 August 1982 and attended by delegations of nearly 130 Member States. The Mondiacult Declaration argued for the importance of strengthening the links between development and culture in the

broadest sense, and it called for ‘humanizing development’ (UNESCO 1982). The Mondiacult Declaration contained 181 recommendations for national governments and international organizations, addressing various issues such as cultural identity, the cultural dimension of development, culture and democracy, cultural heritage, artistic and intellectual creation and arts education, as well as planning, administration and financing of cultural activities.

Despite financial and symbolic challenges during the 1980s and 1990s,² UNESCO launched the World Decade for Cultural Development (1988–1997), the most tangible result of the Mondiacult conference, which aimed to place culture at the heart of development.³ As part of that Decade, in 1991, UNESCO established the World Commission on Culture and Development, chaired by former UN Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar. In 1996, the Commission presented the report *Our Creative Diversity*, which became a landmark document and has been highly influential in debates on culture and development (Aylett 2010, p. 357). Based on the concept of holistic human development, the report considers the overall dynamics of creative diversity, its powerful effect on development policies, as well as the effects of globalization processes that extend beyond the economic sphere. Finally, at the end of the World Decade for Cultural Development and following the conclusions of the World Commission, the Stockholm Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development was held in 1998, again aiming to embed cultural policy as a key element of development strategy.

These debates, however, did not push the normative work of the organization towards more prescriptive action. UNESCO’s multiple initiatives, somewhat ‘fragmented and dispersed’ (Maurel 2009, p. 134) were limited to general moral commitments, without establishing institutional mechanisms. In addition, ‘cultural development’ itself (the subject of the UNESCO

Decade) suffered from a muddled definition of culture and a confusing delimitation of its scope. As Gifford Philipps (1975, p. 238) has suggested, ‘the problem today may be that too much is expected of culture: it is expected to restore humanism, counter industrial alienation, prevent war. This may be asking too much—especially since there is no firm consensus on what is meant by “culture”.’ In his 1994–1995 report on UNESCO’s activities, the Director-General of the organization, Federico Mayor regretted that ‘while great strides have been made in advancing the conceptual case for linking culture and development, much still remains to be done to demonstrate how this approach can actually be applied practically in the field’ (UNESCO 1997, p. 50).

At this time, the debates invoked a broad concept of culture and the value of the cultural industries did not find a concrete place in the renewal of development thinking. Indeed, the link between the cultural industries and development has not yet been systematically explored, even though the term ‘cultural industries’ no longer carries pejorative connotations but has begun to be ‘used in academia and policy-making circles as a positive label’ (UNDP 2013, p. 20).

The Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions: The recognition of cultural industries for sustainable development and poverty reduction

During the 1990s, rapid economic globalization and integration, and the liberalization of trade exchanges, raised major concerns for many national governments and cultural organizations over the effects on cultural diversity. Given the dual nature of the cultural industries including both symbolic and material production (Caves 2000), their treatment within international economic

agreements became the subject of growing political interest. By the end of the 1990s, an alliance of actors including international organizations, national governments and non-governmental organizations had mobilized in favour of ‘the diversity of cultural expressions’ and the establishment of an international legal tool on this principle. As Jean Musitelli explains (2005, p. 515), the diversity of cultural expressions is built both on the impetus around the ‘cultural exception’ from trade negotiations and on the concept of creative diversity,⁴ conceptualized by UNESCO. Following hard negotiations on several issues such as the link between trade and culture and the scope of the legal tool, the Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions (CDCE) was adopted by UNESCO in 2005 and in July 2015 it has received the support of 138 Member States and of the European Union (EU). For the purposes of the Convention ‘cultural expressions’ refer to the ‘various ways in which the creativity of individuals and social groups takes shape and manifests itself. These manifestations include expressions transmitted by words (literature, tales ...), sound (music ...) images (photos, films ...)—in any format (printed, audiovisual, digital, etc.)—or by activities (dance, theatre ...) or objects (sculptures, paintings ...)’ (UNESCO 2005). In this sense, the object of the CDCE is particular vis-à-vis other legal texts of UNESCO and does not refer to cultural diversity in the broadest sense of the term, but to a specific aspect of the latter regarding the cultural goods and services created, produced and distributed by cultural industries. The CDCE also stipulates the integration of cultural industries into sustainable development (Article 13) and it aims to strengthen international cultural cooperation through many tools, such as the expert and information exchange among the Parties, the preferential treatment for developing countries, as well as the setting up of an International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereafter the IFCD), a multi-donor voluntary Fund established under Article 18.

The IFCD is one of the concrete initiatives and one of the main tools of the CDCE for promoting sustainable development and poverty reduction in developing and least developed countries through the development of cultural industries (Vlassis 2011 and 2014). Many countries have minimal cultural policies and their implementation remains problematic due to a lack of political will, of expertise and of financial resources. The IFCD became operational in 2010 and its implementation is based on the good faith and loyalty of state parties to the CDCE. In April 2015, the IFCD supports 78 projects in 48 developing countries with US\$5.2 million in funding. 48 per cent of its projects are in Africa (five each in South Africa and in Kenya, four in Cameroon) and 28 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean (three each in Uruguay and in Mexico). 61 per cent of the beneficiaries are non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and most of the projects focus on capacity development (see also Toggler, Sediakina-Riviere and Ruotsalainen 2012). In addition, 30 per cent of the projects deal with music or cinema/audiovisual arts and more than half of projects deal with gender equality or youth. The eighth session of the Intergovernmental Committee of the CDCE, held in December 2014, approved seven projects for funding through the IFCD. Four of those projects were allocated funds of approximately \$US100,000.⁵

Within the institutional frame of the CDCE, UNESCO and the EU also created an expert facility program (with a value of one million euros and funded by the EU) that sought to strengthen the system of governance for cultural industries through technical assistance missions, which took place between December 2011 and December 2012. Following three calls for applications, Barbados, the City of Buenos Aires, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritius, Niger, the Seychelles and Vietnam were chosen to benefit from technical assistance missions. The 13 selected projects dealt with many

domains of governance of the cultural industries, such as the promotion of cultural management and artistic entrepreneurship (Niger, Barbados, Mauritius, Malawi), the improvement of the legal and regulatory framework for the promotion of cultural industries (Vietnam, Democratic Republic of the Congo), the inclusion of cultural modules in education (Burkina Faso), as well as the development of cultural industries such as music (Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Seychelles), visual arts (Kenya), performing arts (Honduras, Cambodia), sculpture (Honduras), handcraft (Cambodia) and the broadcasting sector (Buenos Aires, Honduras).

More recently, UNESCO and many other international actors have advocated for the inclusion of culture within the post-2015 UN agenda (Vlassis 2015b). Numerous political actions, based largely on the normative framework of the CDCE, have been part of this advocacy strategy: the Hangzhou Congress organized by UNESCO and China in 2013 and entitled ‘Culture: key to sustainable development’; the Special Thematic Debate of the UN General Assembly held in May 2014 entitled ‘Culture and sustainable development in the post 2015 development agenda’; UNESCO’s ‘Third World Forum on Culture and Cultural Industries’ held in Florence in October 2014 and the adoption of the Florence Declaration; the establishment of the ‘Culture for Development Indicators’ Tool—supported by the Spanish Government—to assist in measuring the role of culture in development processes; and the publication of the third and Special Edition of the Creative Economy Report in 2013.

Cultural industries as the Cinderella of the international development cooperation

Despite these initiatives, the cultural sector—including the cultural industries—remains weak in comparison to other contributors to sustainable development and other motives for giving

international development assistance, such as economic, environmental, humanitarian, educational, or related to national security (Degnbol-Martinussen and Engberg-Pedersen 2003, p. 17). For instance, in the synthesis report of the UN Secretary General (United Nations 2015) on the post-2015 agenda, there is only one mention of culture in the broadest sense and no mention at all of the cultural industries or the creative economy. I argue that three factors help to explain why the cultural industries/development nexus remains marginal within the international development policy agenda: the fragmented strategies of UNESCO; the reluctance of developed countries to recognise and support the cultural industries/development nexus; a top-down approach to policy that lacks a strong transnational mobilization of art and culture organizations.

UNESCO: Fragmented strategies

To illustrate some of the structural problems of UNESCO and its fragmented strategies, we can look at the example of the pathways through which the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC) has travelled since its establishment in 1974 by the 18^e UNESCO General Conference. As a 2010 Report on the IFPC explains, recalling the recommendations of the 1970 Venice conference, ‘the General Conference was convinced of the urgent necessity of giving greater prominence to culture in the development of individuals and societies and strengthening international cultural cooperation’ (UNESCO 2010, p. 5). Alfred Davidson (1975, p. 223) claimed ‘the term *culture* for the Fund is undefined but includes painting, sculpture, music, dance, writing and other kinds of fine art, their propagation by the mass media and research, training and education in the arts’. Unlike other UNESCO funds such as the IFCD, the IFPC is not linked to any UNESCO cultural convention.

Bearing these points in mind, the operations of the IFPC should, it seems, contribute to: strategies for culture and development; the establishment or reinforcement of institution, structures and facilities whose purpose is cultural or artistic; the training of specialists in cultural action, as well as supporting artistic and cultural production and circulation. In the first session of the IFPC's Council in February 1976, the Director-General of UNESCO welcomed 'the first international mechanism for the financing of cultural development seen as a vital factor in development' (UNESCO 2010, p. 5). To achieve these aims, the Fund holds financial resources from voluntary contributions made by governments, other institutions, associations and private individuals.

However, the IFPC has functioned largely in a top-down manner (Sabatier 1986): its priorities have been expressed by a central authority largely disconnected from the specific needs of developing countries. Thus, there has been a gap between the intentions of the Council and the political will of the actors on the ground to implement policies for cultural development. The historian Chloé Maurel has argued that a large number of projects supported by the IFPC have not been successful. The IFPC, for example, had supported the creation of a Pan-African Cultural Fund, but UNESCO noted in 1981 that 'the projects have lagged (...) no project has really been achieved' (Maurel 2011). Moreover, in the early 1990s, the Director of the IFPC noted that the Fund was little known and its activities were dispersed. Its financial situation also gave cause for concern because the funding sources had not been tapped and administrative costs were too high in relation to project funding (UNESCO 2010, p. 7). At the end of 1990s, the Director-General of UNESCO regretted 'the Fund's decline since the early 1990s, on account of problems encountered in increasing its financial resources in order to implement all of the programs' (UNESCO 2010, p. 7). Most of IFPC's capital (almost US\$6 million since it was established) was paid in its early years in the form of voluntary government contributions, with three main

countries (Venezuela, Iran and Saudi Arabia) providing nearly 80 percent of public contributions to the Fund. Since 1999 the Fund has not drawn any more public funds, however private financing has not taken off either. From 1999 to 2006, only three partnerships were established (and for relatively small sums), namely with the Ford Foundation (US\$50,000), the Inter-American Development Bank (US\$26,000) and the French bank group Crédit Agricole (US\$300,000).

Thirty years after the Fund's creation, the IFPC has accumulated a plethora of structural problems: a crisis of governance and management, limited financial resources, a lack of visibility, dispersed activities and isolated impact. In 2006, UNESCO decided to suspend the Fund's operation. At that time, its resources reached US\$4 million. Among the last projects co-funded by IFPC, were projects to train 35 young private cultural promoters in management (Burkina Faso), to support an art school in Dandora (Kenya), to bring children's literature into the classroom (Rwanda), to train young people in theatre and television (Palestine), to support and urban arts festival in 2006 (Croatia), to support residencies in media arts for women (Canada). It is worth noting that between 1993 and 2006, the IFPC also administered the UNESCO-Aschberg Bursaries for Artists Programme in the fields of music, visual arts and creative writing, established by the sale of property constituting the Aschberg donation in 1994. The IFPC has, on several occasions, financed shortfalls in the Programme amounting to US\$240,065 (UNESCO 2010, p. 14) The suspension of the IFPC's activities seems to reflect several structural problems within UNESCO such as a lack of strategic planning, a lack of proper assessment and monitoring of activities, as well as inadequate criteria for choosing projects (Imber 1989; Courrier 2005; Maurel 2009; Singh 2010).

Following the request of four Member States (Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, and Venezuela) in 2011, the 36th General Conference of UNESCO took the initiative to restore the IFPC. Although the initiative could potentially play an important role in the cultural industries/development nexus, there are some issues regarding the usefulness of its restoration, the political and institutional implications of this action, and also about the link between the IFPC and the IFCD in relation to the CDCE. The re-establishment of the IFPC would seem to create competition for scarce financial and symbolic resources.

Added to this picture is the fact that UNESCO is, today, in an extremely difficult financial situation owing to the suspension, in late 2011, of its US contribution.⁶ Moreover, a recent audit report on UNESCO's management, published in April 2013, has pointed out that the reforms launched by the organization before 2010 were 'of limited efficiency' and have been undertaken 'too slowly and inconsistently owing to a lack of strict governance' (UNESCO 2013).

Developed countries: Between reluctance and indifference

The second factor that contributes to the weakness of the cultural industries in relationship to the development agenda focuses on the lack of a group of political entrepreneurs (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Ingebritsen 2002) with sufficient financial, social and symbolic resources to contribute to the dynamic inclusion of the cultural industries/development nexus within the international development policy sphere. Here, the adoption of the CDCE and the establishment of the IFCD provide illustrative examples.

During the negotiations for the adoption of the CDCE, a small number of developing countries, including Senegal, Burkina Faso, Morocco and Andorra, underlined the unequal structure of global cultural exchange and they favoured the establishment of an international fund to support weaker cultural industries. This initiated a debate about the mandatory or voluntary contributions of Parties to the IFCD. The major concern of the main promoters of the diversity of cultural expressions—such as France, Canada, Germany, Spain and China—was the international regulation of trade and culture rather than the strengthening of cultural cooperation. Other developed countries such as USA, Japan, New Zealand and Australia, reluctant to support a binding international tool on the diversity of cultural expressions, were also reluctant to support a Fund based on mandatory contributions (UNESCO 2004). The debate was finally resolved in favour of voluntary contributions but with the addition of a provision found in paragraph 7 of the CDCE's Article 18: 'Parties shall endeavour to provide voluntary contributions on a regular basis towards the implementation of this Convention.'

In July 2015 only 47 of the 138 Parties of the CDCE have contributed to the Fund and the total contributions received had reached US\$7.4 million. The combined contributions of France, Norway and Finland reached over US\$3.4 million. In the context of the international debt crisis and major budget cuts, the voluntary nature of contributions generates uncertainty about the financing and the visibility of the Fund and suggests serious difficulties for the elaboration of a structured and coherent approach to strengthening cultural industries in least developed countries. Canada, for example, which was very involved in the creation of the CDCE, has not contributed to the Fund since 2008.⁷ Neither have Greece, Austria, Denmark, and South Africa since 2009, and Spain and India since 2010. On the other hand, the Netherlands, Italy, South Korea, and the

UK—all very developed countries in terms of their own cultural industries and major donors in terms of aid to developing countries (Perroulaz, Fioroni and Carbonnier 2010)—have not yet contributed to the IFCD resources, and the contributions of other countries such as Germany, Australia, Austria, Denmark, Switzerland, and Sweden remain very low today (below US\$270,000).

It is obvious that many developed countries are reluctant to explicitly include the cultural industries within international development cooperation. This position was reflected in the Special Thematic Debate on ‘Culture and Sustainable Development in the Post-2015 Development Agenda’ that gathered a multitude of high-level representatives of developing countries and of regional and international organizations, but was marked by the absence of representatives of developed countries (EU member states, Japan, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand) and of the European Commission. Likewise, very few representatives of developed countries participated in the Hangzhou Congress in 2013 that advocated for culture’s inclusion in the SDGs.

The exception worth mentioning is Spain, which has been very dynamic regarding international development cooperation for the cultural industries.⁸ In relation to the Millennium Development Goals, the Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID) has supported 18 joint programmes linked to the theme of ‘Culture and Development’ with a financial allocation of US\$95.6 million.⁹ However, since 2011, the new conservative government, in the context of a public debt and deficit crisis, has radically changed the Spanish agenda on development policies and the place of culture within it.

Grassroots mobilisation

The third factor that weakens the implementation of concerted cultural industries/development policies, is the lack of a transnational movement of culture and art organizations seeking to lobby national governments and multilateral organizations for a more dynamic inclusion of the cultural industries within international development.

Two points can be made regarding the international behaviour of arts-based NGOs to date: on the one hand, during the CDCE development and implementation, the majority of NGOs were focused on the interface between trade and the cultural industries, leaving out of their major priorities the broader importance of cultural industries for sustainable development. For instance, numerous Coalitions for Cultural Diversity were established by the end of 1990s in order to promote the establishment of an international legal tool on the diversity of cultural expressions.¹⁰ The French and Canadian associations of cultural professionals had a leading role in the creation of this international cultural network. The question of the treatment of cultural goods and services within FTAs and the threat of FTAs to cultural policies, ranked high on their policy agenda, whereas the relationship between the cultural industries and development was a lesser priority. The Canadian and French Coalitions, for example, organized two international meetings (in 2001 and 2003) of cultural professional associations to address ‘cultural diversity, cultural policies and international trade agreements.’¹¹ On the other hand, most arts-based NGOs and cultural associations in Africa, South America or Asia lack the financial resources necessary to lobby national governments and international organizations (Pouligny 2001).¹²

I argue that a large transnational coalition of art and culture NGOs could serve to legitimate the cultural industries/development nexus. However, without the approval of and the contributions from NGOs, the global dissemination of the importance of cultural industries for sustainable development remains incomplete.

The desire to help shape the post-2015 development agenda has, however, resulted in a greater level of international integration and promotion of the value of the cultural industries in recent years. In 2013, international NGOs developed a common declaration in favour of the international integration of the cultural sector—including the cultural industries—within the SDGs. The statement entitled ‘Culture as a Goal in the Post-2015 Development Agenda’ was prepared by influential NGOs in the cultural sector such as the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), a worldwide network of national arts funding agencies in 80 countries; the Committee on Culture of United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG) that fosters the relation between local cultural policies and sustainable development; the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD); as well as Culture Action Europe, the major European voice of the cultural sector linking over 110 national and European networks. However, compared to the level of mobilisation that surrounded the CDCE, advocacy for the inclusion of culture in the post-2015 UN agenda seems to only echo the actions of UNESCO and of some developing countries rather than emerging from a genuine and widespread grassroots movement. Furthermore, a lack of financial resources and of support from developed countries, means that the action taken by these cultural NGOs remains largely declaratory, and is not accompanied by other advocacy activities such as international meetings to share ideas, or the production of specific expertise on the issue.

Conclusion

UNESCO remains the main international arena for the debate about the links between culture and development and the significance of cultural industries in this field. The CDCE (led by UNESCO) was an important step for the slow but genuine recognition of the cultural industries in national and regional development policies. Today, a coalition of actors—including developing countries, international organizations and NGOs—is emerging in favour of a more dynamic inclusion of the cultural sector within international development cooperation. Partnering with this coalition of actors, UNESCO continues to be a leading actor in advocating for the inclusion of culture in the post-2015 UN development agenda (Vlassis 2015b).

However, there are major challenges to the possibility of this actually happening. I have drawn attention to three major factors that explain why the cultural sector still remains somewhat of a Cinderella within the international development agenda: the fragmented actions of UNESCO; the reluctance and indifference of many developed countries towards the integration of cultural industries within international development policy agenda; the lack of a broad-based bottom-up transnational movement of art associations to give broader multilateral legitimacy to the cultural industries/development nexus. To these challenges can be added two others: UNESCO has not yet persuaded the increasingly influential ‘new’ development donors (the big private foundations and philanthropists) of the importance of cultural industries for sustainable development and poverty reduction; and on the other hand, the international pathways of the cultural industries/development nexus reflect national contexts in which the resources allocated to the

cultural industries remain very low compared to those for environmental, security or social issues.

Nevertheless, the international debate continues on a more explicit inclusion of culture—and of the cultural industries—among the frameworks of international development. Although many challenges still exist, it may be the case that the components of the debate and the configuration of actors are facing a turning point that could lead to a broader international institutional recognition of the potential of the cultural industries for job creation, economic growth and poverty reduction, as well as for inclusion of in social, political and cultural life.

References

- Aylett, Holly. 2010. An International Instrument for International Cultural Policy: The Challenge of UNESCO's Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions 2005. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 13(4): 355–73.
- Barnett, Michael and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Barrowclough, Diana and Zeljka Kozul-Wright (eds). 2011. *Creative Industries and Developing Countries: Voice, Choice and Economic Growth*. London: Routledge.
- Caves, Richard. 2000. *Creative industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CBC. 2010. Canadian Conference of the Arts winds down after 67 years. *CbcnEWS: Arts and Entertainment*. 30 October. Online: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/arts/canadian-conference-of-the-arts-winds-down-after-67-years-1.1237560> (accessed 28 November 2013).
- Clammer John. 2005. Culture, Development, and Social Theory: On Cultural Studies and the Place of Culture in Development. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 6(2): 100–19.
- Courrier, Yves. 2005. *L'UNESCO sans peine*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Da Costa, Dia. 2010. Introduction: Relocating Culture in Development and Development in Culture. *Third World Quarterly* 31(4): 501–22.
- Davidson, Alfred E. 1975. The New Unesco International Fund for the Promotion of Culture. *Leonardo* 8(3): 223–24.

- de Beukelaer, Christiaan. 2015. *Developing Cultural Industries. Learning from the Palimpsest of Practice*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.
- de Senarclens, Pierre. 1988. *La crise des Nations-Unies*, Paris: PUF.
- Degnbol-Martinussen, John and Poul Engberg-Pedersen. 2003. *Aid: Understanding International Development Cooperation*. London: Zed.
- Gifford, Philipps. 1975. UNESCO and cultural development: experience and policies. *Leonardo* 8(3): 238–40.
- Hanania, Lilian Richieri (ed.). 2014. *Cultural Diversity in International Law: The Effectiveness of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. London: Routledge
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change, *International Organization* 52(4): 887–917.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. 2007. *The Cultural Industries*. London: Sage Publications.
- Imber, Mark F. 1989. *The USA, ILO, UNESCO and IAEA: Politicization and Withdrawal in the Specialized Agencies*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Ingebritsen, Christine. 2002. Norm Entrepreneurs: Scandinavia's Role in World Politics. *Cooperation and Conflict* 37(1): 11–23.
- Le Duc, Florent (ed.). 2010. *Culture as a Tool for Development: Challenges of Analysis and Action*. Brussels: Arcade.
- Maurel, Chloé. 2009. L'UNESCO aujourd'hui. *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'Histoire* 102(2): 131–44.
- Maurel, Chloé. 2011. L'action de l'UNESCO pour promouvoir l'art contemporain des sociétés postcoloniales. *Africultures* 16 February. Online: <http://www.africultures.com/php/?nav=article&no=9947> (Accessed 28 November 2013).
- MDGIF. N.d. Culture and Development. *MDG Achievement Fund*. Online: <http://www.mdgfund.org/content/cultureanddevelopment> (accessed 14 September 2015).
- Musitelli, Jean. 2005. L'invention de la diversité culturelle. *Annuaire français de droit international* 51: 512–23.
- Nurse, Keith. 2006. *Culture as the Fourth Pillar of Sustainable Development*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Oestreich, Joel E. (ed.). 2012. *International Organizations as Self-directed Actors: A Framework for Analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Perroulaz, Gerard, Claudie Fioroni and Gilles Carbonnier. 2010. Trends and Issues in International Development Cooperation. *International Development Policy* 1: 143–60.
- Poulligny, Béatrice. 2001. Acteurs et enjeux d'un processus équivoque: la naissance d'une 'international civile'. *Critique internationale* 13: 163–76.
- Rist, Gilbert. 2007. *Le développement, histoire d'une croyance occidentale*. Paris: Presses de SciencesPo, 3rd edition.
- Sabatier, Paul A. 1986. Top-down and Bottom-up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical and Suggested Synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy* 6(1): 21–48.
- Singh, Jogendra Prasad. 2011. *Globalized Arts. The Entertainment Economy and Cultural Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Singh, Jogendra Prasad. 2010. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Creating Norms for a Complex World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Toggler, Barbara, Ekaterina Sediakina-Riviere and Mikko Ruotsalainen. 2012. *Evaluation of the Pilot Phase of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity*. Final Report, Paris: UNESCO, September.
- Troussard, Xavier, et al. 2004. Article 16: Preferential Treatment for Developing Countries. In *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions: Explanatory Notes*, ed. Sabine von Schorlemer and Peter-Tobias Stoll, pp. 405–55. New York: Springer.
- UNESCO. 2013. *Audit Report. Management of UNESCO's Budgetary and Financial Crisis: Impacts of Ongoing Reforms, Emergency Measures and the Resultant Structural Measures*. Executive Board, 191 EX/28, Part II, Paris: UNESCO, 12 April.
- UNESCO. 2012. *Strategic and Action-oriented Analytical Summary of the Quadrennial Periodic Reports*. CE/12/6.IGC/4, Paris: UNESCO, November.
- UNESCO. 2010. *Rapport sur le Fonds international pour la promotion de la culture (FIPC) incluant un audit et une évaluation couvrant la période 1999–2009*. Conseil exécutif, 185 EX/32, Partie I, Paris: UNESCO, 23 September.
- UNESCO. 2007. *UNESCO and the Question of Cultural Diversity, 1946–2007. Review and Strategies*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2005. *30 Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Convention for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2004. *Avant-projet de convention sur la protection de la diversité des contenus culturels et des expressions artistiques: présentation des commentaires et amendements, Partie II: commentaires spécifiques des États membres*, CLT/CPD/2004/CONF.607/1, Paris: UNESCO, December.
- UNESCO. 1997. *Rapport du Directeur général sur l'activité de l'Organisation en 1994–1995*. Paris: UNESCO, 29 C/3.
- UNESCO. 1982. *Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies*. Mexico: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 1970. *Rapport final: Conférence intergouvernementale sur les aspects institutionnels, administratifs et financiers des politiques culturelles*. Venice: UNESCO.
- UNESCO-UNDP. 2013. *Creative Economy Report 2013*. New York, Paris: UNESCO/UNDP.
- United Nations. 2014. *The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet*. Synthesis Report of the Secretary-General on the Post-2015 Agenda, New York, December.
- Vlassis, Antonios. 2015a. *Gouvernance mondiale et culture. De l'exception à la diversité*. Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège.
- Vlassis, Antonios. 2015b. Culture in the Post-2015 Development Agenda: The Anatomy of an International Mobilisation. *Third World Quarterly* (forthcoming in October 2015).
- Vlassis, Antonios. 2014. Cultural Development and Technical and Financial Assistance on the Basis of the CDCE. In *Cultural Diversity in International Law: The Effectiveness of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*, ed. Lilian Richieri Hanania, pp. 167–80. London: Routledge.
- Vlassis, Antonios. 2013. L'UNESCO face à l'enjeu «commerce-culture»: quelle action politique pour une organisation internationale? *Politique et sociétés* 32(3): 81–101.

Vlassis, Antonios. 2011. La mise en œuvre de la Convention sur la diversité culturelle: portée et enjeu de l'interface 'commerce-culture'. *Études internationales* 42(4): 493–510.

Vlassis, Antonios and Lilian Richieri Hanania. 2014. Effects of the Convention on Trade Negotiations. In *Cultural Diversity in International Law: The Effectiveness of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*, ed. Lilian Richieri Hanania, pp. 25–39. London: Routledge.

World Commission on Culture and Development. 1996. *Our Creative Diversity*. Report, Paris: UNESCO.

Notes

¹ Within its work on culture and development, UNESCO highlights three areas of particular interest: the cultural and creative industries, cultural heritage, and cultural tourism.

² Following the political controversy on the discussions about the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO), UNESCO went through an unprecedented political crisis that led to the US and UK withdrawing from the organization in 1984. The reasons for the withdrawal focused mainly on a harsh critique of the politicization of the organization, and on a lack of efficiency, relevance and pragmatism on the part of UNESCO (Senarclens 1988, pp. 169–99).

³ Since World War II the dominant view of development has seen it as synonymous with economic growth within the context of an international market. The World Bank, for example, categorizes countries' 'development' according to their per capita income. Similarly, since the 1980s and the end of the Cold War, the Washington Consensus has gained ascension in development policies. The consensus asserts that global welfare would be maximized by the liberalization of trade, finance, and investment, and by restructuring national economies to provide an enabling environment for capital (Rist 2007). However, the last two decades of the 20th century also saw the flourishing of alternative conceptions of development: the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development in 1986, the publication of the Brundtland Report *Our Common Future* prepared by the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development in 1987, as well as the first publication of the Human Development Report in 1990. The Preface of the 1990 Report explained that 'if the growth in gross national product is important for achieving all essential human objectives, it is also important to analyze how this growth is reflected – or not – in human development in different societies'. The Brundtland Report, dedicated to sustainable development, defined development as that which 'meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. Such initiatives paid attention to the non-economic aspects of development. Growth is not an end in itself, but needs to also have a positive impact on well-being. In addition, it was argued that development should be measured by a broad spectrum of data, including political rights, economic and social freedoms, the health system, environmental and educational policies (Rist 2007, pp. 345–416).

⁴ In the 1990s, a coalition of actors, driven by France and Canada, defended the term 'cultural exception' (*exception culturelle*) in order to exclude cultural goods and services from the agenda of international trade negotiations such as the last period of negotiations on the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1993, the negotiations on the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), as well as the negotiations around free trade agreements (FTAs) between the United States (USA) and Canada in 1989 and on the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. By the late 1990s, however, the term 'cultural exception' was abandoned and a more inclusive term 'cultural diversity' was gradually substituted (Vlassis and Richieri Hanania 2014).

⁵ These include: Empowering African youth to harness the potential of the music sector in Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, and the United Republic of Tanzania; Promoting young people's participation in the book and music industries in Mexico; Developing an efficient policy

for the promotion of cultural industries in Morocco; Fostering an active participation of vulnerable groups in the creative sector in Uruguay.

⁶ Since late 2011, the US has put their contribution to UNESCO on hold following the majority vote on making Palestine a full member of the organization.

⁷ In Canada, since 2006 and the voting in of a new conservative government, the latter has displayed reluctance towards supporting the cultural industries with a clear effect on CDCE implementation. In 2012, the conservative government announced major budget cuts affecting public radio in Canada, the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA), the National Film Board, the Library and Archives of Canada, as well as the Coalition for Cultural Diversity. In late 2012, the CCA, Canada's largest arts advocacy agency, wound down operations after 67 years (CBC 2010). Within a context of profound debt crisis in Europe, the cultural industries are being affected by budget cuts in many places, and particularly in countries with conservative governments. For instance, in 2010, the UK government announced the abolition of the UK Film Council and the Spanish government, in 2013, dramatically reduced public support for the national film industry.

⁸ For the majority of national governments, their share of ODA allocated to culture ranged from 0.21% to 1.3% between 2009 and 2012. In marked contrast, Spain's allocation was 14.41% in 2010 thanks to its contribution to the UN Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (UNESCO 2012).

⁹ The Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Achievement Fund was set up with a generous contribution of US\$710 million from the Government of Spain. Among its priorities, it's worth mentioning the strengthening of creative industries and the protection of natural and cultural heritage as effective instruments of economic development. The beneficiary countries of this Fund linked to the theme 'Culture and development' have been Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Senegal, Turkey, and Uruguay. Projects that specifically support the creative and cultural industries were funded in Cambodia, Honduras, Mozambique, Senegal and Uruguay (MDGIF).

¹⁰ In September 2007, the International Federation of the Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD) was created by 42 national coalitions for cultural diversity grouping in the aggregate more than 600 cultural professional organizations representing creators, artists, independent producers, distributors, broadcasters and editors in the publishing, motion picture, television, music, performing arts and visual art fields. The Federation is incorporated in Canada and has its Secretariat in Montreal. The French Coalition ensures the representation of the IFCCD at UNESCO in Paris.

¹¹ From 10–13 September 2001 in Montreal, the Canadian Coalition organized the first international meeting of cultural professional associations which brought together 40 culture organizations from 10 countries. The French Coalition organized the second international meeting in Paris, from 2 to 4 February 2003. The meeting brought together nearly 100 associations from 32 countries.

¹² For instance, in mid-2013, among the 43 National Coalitions for Cultural Diversity, only 12 have a website (South Africa, France, Canada, Chile, Togo, Paraguay, Peru, Austria, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom). Moreover, only the websites of the French and the Canadian Coalitions—translated into three languages (English, French, and Spanish)—contain reports, studies and specific publications, as well as archives of the movement and information on past and upcoming activities.