Patrice Meyer-Bisch

Cultural Rights, Ends and Means of Democracies? The Protection and the Creation of Cultural Rights, Condition of any Citizenship

Argument

The right to take part in the cultural life, with all its rights, freedoms and responsibilities it implies, is a misunderstood condition in the creation of human rights and real participatory democracies. How can we take part in the common values of the nation, if we don't take part in the culture of those values, in the knowledge and to the development of cultural heritage of the country, as well as to develop knowledge of other heritages and other democratic traditions? There can be no political ownership without the possibility of understanding it. With this in mind, Human rights are the "grammar" of every democratic policy, within which it is necessary to specify the function of cultural rights. Those rights guarantee the access of everyone to the cultural resources that are essential to them and they have a "leverage" effect" on all the other human rights, and therefore on the development of citizenship integrating all dimensions (1). Cultural rights guarantee that the other human rights, among others those that constitute the democratic procedures (all civil liberties), are really adapted to the diversity of people and situations. In other words, cultural rights are not only ends, but also factors and means of democratic development. They allow people to enhance the capacities of other people in their territories, their social links and their jobs. This concerns both the democratic development on the different levels of the nations and the democratisation of international relationships, more particularly within Europe and its partners. The argument is that the development of cultural freedoms is a condition for the synergies of the liberties: the principle of democracy (2). This synergy is the dynamic that forges and constitutes a nation, where the development of people and communities can mutualise. (3) To transform this approach into a strategy, it is necessary to identify indicators of connection, which demonstrate the interdependence between ends and means (4).

1. Cultural Rights in the Centre of the "Democratic Grammar"

In international instruments, Human Rights, based on the necessity to respect, protect and promote human dignity, are currently interpreted according to three constitutive principles: universality, indivisibility and interdependence, which implies the prohibition to organize rights into hierarchies. It is therefore not (or not anymore) about a list of variable standards, even though many states and many authors still consider them as such, but rather about system, which must become more and more restrictive. This whole can be interpreted in democracy as a "political grammar": they structure and authenticate topics, their actions and interactions, and determine rules and coordination. ³⁰⁹

- On the level of substance, this grammar puts people, enjoying rights and actions, in the centre of considering that every right: civic, cultural, ecological, economic, political or social is a vector of personal development and also a balance of systems (civil, cultural, ecological, economic, political and social). Every Human Right can therefore be understood as a "conductor of capacities"³¹⁰, on individual and social levels, a capacity of conjunction.
- On the level of procedures, every right guarantees freedoms and responsibilities that structure spaces for debates and decisions, and touch every social actor. The civil and politic freedoms are not an addition to the democratic principles such as elections and separation of powers, they constitute them. It is also the case for cultural freedoms that are the ends of the merging of knowledge, just as the economic freedoms for everyone are the ends of the market structures when they are politically well-ordered; it is far from being the case.

If freedoms, which respect everyone's rights, are on the basis of democratic development, it obliges us to pay attention to the way they are put into practice, and therefore to the legitimacy of freedoms and responsibilities. This thesis is classical, but it is not systematically used. My goal is to locate the specificity of cultural rights within this "universal grammar."

It is out of the question to oppose cultural rights with the other human rights. Cultural rights are a part of Human Rights. UNESCO has been conceiving

http://www.unifr.ch/iiedh/fr/publications/ds

 $^{^{309}}$ See DS 19 from IIEDH, 2012 : A Human Right's Based Approach to Development. New perspectives by taking cultural cultural rights into account?

³¹⁰ "An often asked question is to know if freedom to take part in political life or right to the opposition are or not "conductors" - with the same meaning as for electricity - of development", Amartya Sen, Un nouveau modèle économique. Développement, justice, liberté, Paris, 2000, Odile Jacob, p.57 (Development as Freedom, 1999).

culture largely and transversally since 1982³¹¹ and defined culture as "the rights of a person, alone or in group, to choose and express their identity, accede to the cultural references and to as many resources they need in their identification process". Rights do allow every person, alone or in group, to develop their capacities of identification, of communication and creation, by having access to knowledge. Like every other human right, cultural rights guarantee everyone the right, the freedom and also the responsibility to take part in social life. Their specificity is to make clear the value of these links rests on the importance of shared knowledge.

Putting cultural rights into practice guarantees the development of links between people and their environment. This means the respect of:

- the identity of people and communities and the specificity that every actor can bring;
- their freedoms and capabilities to choose their values in the respect of other people's rights, as well as the respect of the cultural resources that are necessary to practice their rights, their freedoms and their responsibilities;
- their freedoms and capabilities to participate and organize oneself according to the most appropriate democratic structures and institutions.

Cultural rights are multipurpose links: they guarantee accesses, permit freedoms and identify responsibilities. By guaranteeing accesses of people to specific works, cultural rights permit the merging of knowledge, without which the human is nothing.

Furthermore, cultural rights guarantee that the other Human Rights, among others those that constitute democratic procedures (the whole civil freedoms), are really adapted to the diversity of people and situations. They emphasize the capabilities of people in their territories, their social links and their jobs. Civil freedoms are only real when they have a cultural package. Who can use their freedom of conscience and religion if they do not have a good knowledge of the concerned religious traditions? Who can take part in a political life if they do not have knowledge of the history of their country, their region and their district, the constant mixes of populations and the pressing issues?

-

³¹¹ The recent instruments took this definition, among others: the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) and Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005).

³¹² P. Meyer-Bisch, M. Bidault, Déclarer les droits culturels, Commentary from the Fribourg Declaration, Zurich, Brussels, 2010.

If the previous analyses prove to be correct, then culture is the heart of the system of human rights, where indivisibility and interdependence plays a main role. This is why Joseph Wresinski claims that

"the cultural action is essential. It allows us to question ourselves about human exclusion in a more radical way than the access the right of housing, working, the access to resources or health care. We could think that the access to these other rights becomes ineluctable when the right to culture is recognised." ³¹³

The formula is revolutionary; even though it is true, it considerably modifies the dominant perspective: not only are the cultural rights on the same fundamental level as the other human rights, but they have a specific transversal function of "conductor". The demonstration can be done via capabilities. Cultural rights protect the *act of identification*, with which everyone recognizes their personal capacity through contact with the others and with artworks, by the appropriation of cultural references: places and means of communication (languages, religion, arts, etc.) if they are used as spaces for debates. *This act is therefore a condition for the exercise of any other right*. It expresses an interface capacity between oneself and the others through artworks: interface without which an individual is alone, without limbs, *idle*.³¹⁴

The current argument is: for the synergy of freedoms, constituent of a free political community, to develop, it is essential that the freedoms instruct themselves permanently and mutually cultivate one another. There is nothing more classical, but the cultural rights remain underdeveloped.

2. Culture of Freedoms or the Importance of Choices

What constitutes the indivisibility of freedoms? Why are they not only concurrent, according to the general opinion? This is most likely because there is no real freedom without the necessary knowledge of their responsible practice. And yet, this responsibility consists of *taking into account* the freedoms of the others: not only respect them, but also trying to discover them. Between concurrence and cooperation, it appears that the link, the common goal, is the reciprocity in the exercise of freedoms, based on the merging of knowledge. The freedom of everyone does not end, but starts,

³¹³ Joseph Wresinski, Culture et grande pauvreté, Editions Quart-Monde, Paris, 2004, p. 40.

³¹⁴ I developed this argument in: Les droits culturels ou le renforcement des capacités personnelles, in Droit de cité pour les droits économiques, sociaux et culturels : la Charte québécoise en chantier, Bosset, Lamarche (éds.), Montréal, 20111, Editions Yvon Blais, pp. 299-330.

where the freedom of the other starts. Everyone can be co-responsible, but we can also talk about "co-freedom": we are not, at first, free individuals, and then responsible of one another; we receive freedom capacities as life goes on: freedoms are mutually given.

The argument consists in considering freedoms as capacities that cannot be understood as a "system of instructed freedoms", a system in which wealth is assured by the mutual fertilisation of knowledge, which differentiates it from a "jungle of freedoms". It does not remove the potential anarchy of freedoms, their capacities to contest the established orders and disorders, because there is no high-level organisation. The order – information of the system- is built by the activity of every sector: no one being able to assure the coherence of this system. The constant search for an ordered dynamic³¹⁵ is essential to emphasize the complementarities as well as the contradictions. This means that a freedom must not be analysed without any context, but in a relation of balance or valorisation with other freedoms; this relation is not ironical, it implies difficult cooperation and concurrences. Therefore, for every human activity, we should in principle be able to draw up a "balance sheet" of freedoms. Two types of balances are necessary: between all the freedoms, of a person or a community, between the freedoms of one another.

The exercise of freedoms looking for knowledge, allows people to interiorize and emphasize contradictions. Cynthia Fleury develops in an accurate way the opposition between virtue and democratic pathology. "For democracy, danger lies in the fact of believing that Evil is outside. The democratic virtue and its value lie, in this way, in the consciousness of opposing forces." 317 The oppositions between freedoms are their principle of mutual evolution, according to a dialectical logic, if and only if the different types of knowledge bang together, according to the democratic rules that are the "game" of rights, freedoms and responsibilities. The virtue develops with this evolution, provoked by the reciprocal exercise of freedoms in search of culture. The principle of "democratic security" lies in the internal dialectic of freedoms, and not in an authoritarian relationship against an enemy outside of its national identity, inside and/or outside its borders. A democratic pathology is like a "grammar mistake", populism or an authoritarianism that ignores the rules of links between the freedoms. I will define this politic pathology as an uneducated use of freedoms.

236

³¹⁵ As defined by Mireille Delmas-Marty in: Le pluralisme ordonné, Paris, 2006, Seuil

³¹⁶ I developed the economic dimension of this argument in: La réciprocité des libertés. De l'équilibre entre concurrence et cooperation, in Revue Economique et sociale, 2012, (RES, vol 70, no1, march), Lausanne, pp. 53-66

³¹⁷ Cynthia Fleury: Les pathologies de la démocratie, Paris, Fayard, 2005, p. 260.

It is not only about tolerating cultural diversity or opinion diversity, but about considering them as factors of wealth, as long as it is quality diversity. Diversity brings freedom of choice; quality of references brings freedom of being or freedom of self-realisation through a mastered cultural discipline. We can distinguish two types of diversities:

- the multiplicity of possible choices, which means a multiplicity of access (in the double need of physical access to artworks and formation: objectified cultural capital and incorporated cultural capital, as developed by Bourdieu);
- the quality of cultural references and their access, more or less cultivated, or developed.

These two types define two dimensions of the *importance of choices* to the extent that they are interacting, because it is the quality of appropriation of a cultural resource that permits and validates the comparison and the choice. The bigger the extent of possible choices is, the bigger the risk is for the subject to be disconcerted. The bigger the understanding of choices is, that is to say the intelligence of the quality of cultural resources, the bigger the probability is for a "prolific choice". The two dimensions complete with each other to form capacities of choice. It is in the awareness and the exercise of these capacities that is the deepest source of peace; which can be described as multiple confidences:

- *internally*, the experience of *the importance of choices* which are possible in its double dimension (extension and comprehension),
- externally, the experience of availability of these choices and exchanges, and therefore another double confidence:
 - o in the wealth of cultural values: the different sorts of knowledge
 - o in the fact that this wealth is disseminated as a great number of people able to dialog.

This requires everyone to rely on people and teaching and communication institutions that give them access to artworks and their diversity and difficulty of interpretation. This is why the triptych of cultural rights, information, formation (education throughout the life) and participation in heritage, is the principle of reciprocity of freedoms that mutually raise their culture.

3. A People under Construction, or Mutual Culture of Public Freedoms

Every cultural community is not specifically political, even though it participates in the political responsibility, which is the case, for example, of scientific communities, although many people contest it under the pretext of

conserving their unrealistic neutrality to the challenges of the city. A political community can be considered as a cultural community that specifically emphasizes the "public use of reason", according to the Kantian expression 318, which means that mutualisation of *publicly protected* freedoms. There is no reason to deny the political community the cultural adjective, since values that constitute it are culturally built and expressed in languages, and interpretations of history, territories and fundamental rights.

In this meaning, a nation is not a group, linked by an incorporated "national culture", or by the random factors of history. A nation is an act, a whole set of freedoms in interaction with the voice and the engagement. Being a nation, being public, is being in act of constitution, in the legal sense of the term: the nation is the permanent author of the constitution of the nation, and it is not a iuridical fiction because all its actors have the common responsibility to give life to the fundamental law³¹⁹. The constitution of a nation, its permanent primitive state means the conservation and the development of the "political link", which establishes and favours the reciprocity of public freedoms. Everyone is co-responsible for this multiform link; everyone carries and supports one or several nations, according to his means and cultural references. This link of reciprocity is fragile, because every freedom has its risk: it comes from the free movement of knowledge, in every sense, both laterally (between contemporaries) and vertically (between generations). The consistency of a nation is in this multiple link of cultural relation, creator of "co-freedoms".

As long as the freedoms are comprised in the logic of an invisible hand, as if the general interest came from the sum of individual preferences – within an electoral system or the principle of the markets – their cultural build cannot be understood. And yet, it is in the understanding of conditions that make the interaction possible that lies the problem. A nation is not a sum of individual freedoms, it is a sharing, a mutual confidence in the responsible use instructed in the freedom of *the others*. The reciprocity of freedoms looking for knowledge constitutes the power to become a nation in sovereignty. This is why the notion of nation, that works, argues, gives birth, transmits, but also revolts, is closely linked with the notion of peace: confidence in the personal capacities of people, as long as the cultural conditions of synergies are respected.

³¹⁸ Kant, What is the Enlightment?, XI, IV.

³¹⁹ This theme is developed in : Une souveraineté populaire, originale et fragile, territorialisée et universelle, in La démocratisation des relations internationales, S. Gandolfi, P. Meyer-Bisch, J. Bouchard (ss la dir. de), Paris, 2009, L'Harmattan, pp. 33-48.

It is a lot more accurate than solidarity, because it means reciprocity in responsibilities, and everyone agrees on this, everyone can sign a contract with the partners he despises. The *Mafiosi* also know solidarity. Reciprocity of freedoms means more: a confidence based on a shared experience and freedoms of the others is a resource that cannot be despised nor reduced. Its freedom is not anything, insofar as it can be cultivated and looking for knowledge, wherever it comes from.

Democratic culture is also expressed by the principle of a cultural, private, public or civil actor; it can be a theatre company, a school, a university, a publisher, a house for culture or a heritage association, "creates public", which means it develops places and means of reciprocities of freedoms in public spaces. In a cultural democracy, cultural actors are the most important thing in factors of democracy.

4. Six Principles of Connection

If the general principle is interaction, in order to realise more concretely a better mutual development of people, fields and actors. And more into details, the guiding principle is undoubtedly correspondences, with many other words like resonance: this link between pluralities of terms that answer and a singularity that realizes their correspondence. To develop this strategic principle of cultural and social creation, it is possible to identify at least six borders that we have to re-interpret continuously just like any border: two lines of distinction and not demarcation, crossing points, connection lines between fields, connections and interactions between actors: people and organisations. The strategic advantage of an approach that is not only intersectorial, but that emphasizes connections, is that by taking one sector into account, or only one public, we address to the whole cultural, social and political web. 320

1. Inter-discipline(s): Cultural fields, or disciplines, answer each other and give birth to each other. The thorough practice of every discipline allows the expression / realisation of a dimension of the person who reconciles them with themselves and makes their capacities for a social link better. The correspondence between disciplines leads to a mutual emphasis of liberating power of every activity. "Sounds and smells answer each other" Poets, for example, are inspired by the correspondence of materials, spaces and lights of a house, or by a picture, a photograph or the layout of a garden. A photograph is inspired by a scientific print, a plastic surgeon by sounds, etc.

 $^{^{320}}$ For example, see the Recommendation adopted by the European Parliamentary Assembly, 24.01.2012.

³²¹ For example, the mutual resonance of arts and practices.

We need to fight against the "division" of the fields, and not systematically think of, for example, arts by categorizing them (plastic arts, visual arts, live performances, activities of writing, etc.), and not dissociate "fine arts" to other "arts". Crafts are a way to aesthetics, including aesthetics of the "freest" arts: we need to emphasize the continuities without removing the specificities. Inter-discipline is a discipline and also a creative indiscipline between disciplines.

2. Inter-public(s): Moreover, inter-discipline offers a communication spectrum and therefore a better visibility and attractiveness. This interaction leads to a wealth of correspondences between actors and publics, since public is more sought after by the multiple invitation. But we have to consider here that "public" does not mean a passive group. A public is a collective actor: it chooses and invests its time, he moves, interacts, transports "publicity" (the "word-of-mouth") and everyone finds their resources for their own creativity. He finally has varied desires that are important to be satisfied. A public is invited to exist through an actor that creates a more or less rich public space, more or less appropriate.

Inter-discipline therefore favours the meeting of publics and emphasizes the social link, not only between cultural communities characterised by their different origins, but also between social classes and different "communities of knowledge", between ages and social status. The meeting of publics that are not only alongside each other in a room, is a strong principle of social integration and crossing of references.

Said explicitly, a "cultural excellence", not in the sense of academism, but of the projection of values, a "coming out of the shadow" of an artwork able to boost, feed and free "publics", tend towards a social excellence. The term "public" can therefore not mean a passive group of consumers or receivers. A "public" is acted and becomes active, because it through the work of sharing common resources; it interacts, participates in a citizen unit; creates a fragment of "nation" in the meaning of democracy. It is neither about creating programmes for "target-publics", or marginal publics, nor inviting these publics to general activities of meeting. We have to "praise the general public."

3. Inter-places: Every cultural activity is the meeting, of booth the inhabitation of a place and moving of people and / or artworks. Every space deserves to be inhabited; every space can be an invitation. Clearly localised activities that are

_

³²² According to Dominique Wolton's expression for television. D. Wolton, Eloge du grand public, Paris, re-edited in 2011, Flammarion.

intended for chosen publics remain important to develop particular disciplines: informed publics that meet in a theatre or in a museum; students that inhabit classes, corridors and school lessons; group of inhabitants that animate a district.

But it is also essential to favour mixed spaces, those that emphasize both capacities of an urban territory or villager and the diversity of the invited people to live in it or just stay in it for a party. A street is polymorphic, it is not only a passage; a business is not only a distributor. This mixing is however a capacity that we get from any space. The bank counters in a bank can offer an original and remarkable place for exposition.

Anyhow, we need to pay attention to the protection and enrichment of real "cultural ecosystems", taking the double value of the space into account: inhabitation / circulation, sedentary / nomad activity.

- 4. Inter-time(s): Cultural works accumulate times; it mixes them and mutually gives birth to them. It gathers past and future in a present full of experience. It allows the capitalisation of knowledge, its transmission / interpretation in the continuity of personal life and in the passing of generations. Cultural work demands time, and allows the slow development of "cultural capital" The analysis of activities must be able to accumulate long and short times, but also the dialectic linked to time: the length and the moment that appear, the daily life and time for party and festival, organized moment that structures and organizes social time. Cultural politics must emphasize the time traces, conditions for any personal and social creativity.
- 5. Inter-institution(s): We have to give back every to every room of the democratic house every institution or organisation its capacity of hospitality and of rethinking its doors. To decompartmentalise is the political challenge that is both ordinary and crucial, because it is about creating the best synergy between the institutions in the service of rights, freedoms and responsibilities of everyone. And yet, every social system has a tendency to isolate, and subsequently sterilize, empty its content. Every cultural actor is concerned: they have a function of mediators: museums, schools, theatre companies, universities, press... In general, every actor in the extent of their cultural function.
- 6. Inter-economy(-ies): We have to continuously rethink the "marketplace" within the city. Economics allow the flow of values via the mutual valorisation of resources, in the extent that it is in the service of humans. The mission of the cultural action is to "cultivate" resources, create and maintain "tree nurseries", let grow, select, replant... and it is in the heart of a well-understood economy. Economics is a discipline of organized reciprocity, a consciousness of

scarcity and need for exchange and for the donation. To be long-lasting, an economic activity must respect and emphasize its main resources – knowledge in its diversity – and, to be also long-lasting, a cultural activity has to find its economic coherence by the mixing of financing.

A democratic policy does not only respect freedoms that existed before in the nature of everyone; it "products" them, cultivates them, by the wealth of a web of interactions and correspondences between order and disorder. A cultural policy is a "culture of freedoms" in the fields of politics. The economic context of today can be put forward to considerably increase the means, and particularly the strategic reflexions, to consider the cultural factors of development in all their dimensions.

Conclusion

These six principles of connection all imply the clarification of every actor's mission and of the content of every field, in what they have and makes them unique, and in their connections. The reciprocity of freedoms must concretely appear in the reciprocity of missions, and not only in their complementarities. Our freedoms interpenetrate each other. Democratisation is long-lasting and supportable when a nation, constituted in democratic communities, finds the ways to evaluate and emphasize in a permanent manner all their cultural resources, on the level of every person and institutions. Its resources allow it to develop a sovereignty tuned into its environment and its universal values of reason. Such is the purpose of cultural rights, for every person, alone and in group, within the indivisible whole of Human Rights. Consequently, to interpret a nation in democratic constitution as a politically cultural community is not only to provide the wealth of the internal link, the development of a sovereign political will based on culture of freedoms, it is also to go beyond divisions between nations and democratize international and transnational relations. It is not possible to think of developing cultural democracies on the national level without developing democratisations of intra and extra European relations.

Patrice Meyer-Bisch

Observatory of Diversity and Cultural Rights, Interdisciplinary Institute for Ethics and Human Rights (IIEDH), University of Fribourg (Switzerland) and UNESCO Chair

Translated from the original French by Mr. David Fadeur.

Raymond Weber

Culture and Citizenship: Which Issues for Europe?

"Crisis only occurs when the old world continuously disappears and the new world continuously appears. And, in this chiaroscuro, monsters can appear".

Antonio Gramsci

Culture, democracy, citizenship, cultural rights: how can we make these concepts interact in the long-term, even though the political and economic situation seems to be "imposing" short-term technocratic answers. We really lack of vision of the future, even considering the Arab Spring, of the Indignant movement and of sustainable development.

The "Arab Spring"

These movements from North Africa and the Near East that strongly questioned democracy in an Arab-Muslim area where it seemed to be banned could end, as we hope, with the emergence of democracies, even if by another "model" than ours. People have expressed themselves- and still do – in profound protest, coming from the will of men and women to get free from this heavy supervision and control their own destiny. It was – and still is – a fine lesson in democracy, knowing the ethnical or religious communitarianism. The fact that the Muslim political parties have won the first elections in Tunisia and in Egypt does not mean the end of a democratic hope, but shows that the citizens' debate about new constitutions, sharia and role of women in our societies has started. It will probably be long and marked by ups and downs, in quite a chaotic way.

The Indignant Movement

For the Indignant, from Puerto del Sol in Madrid to Syntagma Square in Athens, to many other cities, the borders of the acceptable have been reached and measures of austerity and harshness, although legal, seem to be illegitimate for the citizen suffering directly – economically and socially – from financial crises and exclusion from decision-making processes concerning both his present and the future of his children.

What is impressive among the Indignants, is not only this resistance to the political despotism and to the financial oligarchy, but also their creative

imagination, being able to mobilize, in a World Day, Spaniards, Americans from Wall Street, Israelis and representatives of Arab democratic movements.

This indignation, this "obligation of screaming" (Emmanuel Levinas) can end up in an "indignAction" and be a first step to a new boost to citizenship and governance: the citizen has to be recognized in his dignity, being able to release his imagination and invent a new live-together.

Sustainable Development

The organisation of sustainable development for everyone today and tomorrow is part of a new dimension of citizenship. Even though it is still present in political speeches, we feel that concrete measures, such as those against global warming, have been the collateral victims of economic and financial crises.

Europe tried to fight against the crises inside the continent – social, economic and financial – that question not only the governance in the European Union, but also the future of the euro currency, or even a supposedly open and helpful Europe. Unfortunately, because of this "systemic crisis", only few questions arose about prospects, sustainable development and the process for acquiring citizenship.

And yet, crises challenge us to react to various threats that touch every one of us and those that touch the survival of the planet, which obliges us to review our models of development, as well as our ways of consuming and living. It also invites us to take a critical look at the religion of the gross domestic product (GDP) and its growth that is supposed to answer all our questions.

At least four questions follow these crises:

- 1. Are we facing a global disorder that would bring together all the powerless citizens and states from around the world in order to fight against the unsure future?
 - Submission to less-and-less controlled economic or financial movements;
 - Deep uncertainty about the future environmental conditions of our daily life;
 - Questioning of some "social benefits" such as work time, salaries, pensions and reinforcement of inequalities;
 - Crisis of the European and World governance in order to get tomorrow's society ready?

- 2. Are we able to find the proper political forms to the double need of democracy?
 - Implying "never-ending discussions" and availability time, and supra-nationality;
 - Knowing that the European Council is gaining more and more power in comparison with the European commission and the European Parliament;
 - With the need to react quickly and briefly to the crises without showing too much the position of the states?
- 3. How skilled are we, as responsible citizens, to directly get involved in complex phenomena such as the financial crisis in Europe and in the world?
 - Here, we can sense that the field of European citizenship has only improved as the result of an emergency, but also under constraint of the collective interest, but not because of a long-lasting growth. It is not however understood by the citizen who does not understand what shared sovereignty or subsidiarity can mean.
- 4. Doesn't this world of crisis represent a kairos to:
 - Organise helpful, responsible and democratic governance?
 - Change to a new world-society?
 - Work out organisation models as alternatives to hegemony, both integrated and pluralistic?
 - Implement principles of responsibility, hope and inter-solidarity?
 - Promote the emergence of global citizenship?

As recently said by Edgar Morin: "(we have to) link creative resistance, proactive experimentation and transformative vision", to try and make of Europe an open forum for creation and experimentation, in the service of a global vision of sustainable human development.

"While the many aspects of the crisis may seem difficult to discern for non-economists, the dangers of the crisis should be painfully clear for everybody; Our old, industrial paradigm and our European social model is severely strained, and in its place we see rising xenophobia, extremism, nationalism, inequality and social exclusion – threats to our vital values of democracy, tolerance and human rights. As concerned citizens and indeed as human beings we must both

personally and collectively muster a meaningful response to the crisis. In this, we turn to culture."

Text from Team Culture, Danish EU Presidency, 1st half-year of 2012

The Citizens' Europe

The European Union provides, concerning citizenship, a concrete and original departure point for deliberation. By introducing a citizenship of the Union, the Treaty of Maastricht gives a new dimension to the European "Community". Today, this citizenship is effective but still being constructed, even though it does not seem to be considered as natural in people's minds.

The essential paradox of Europe is to be a large internal market trying too belatedly to evolve to a citizens' Europe, and even though "the Europe of States" and "the Europe of Offices" remain widely dominating to "the Europe of citizens" (Luc Van Middelaar), the European citizenship, despite its primitive state, is also a real destiny and a big project. It shapes a modern and instrumental citizenship with more rights than explicit duties, but also a multicultural citizenship beyond the national framework, as pointed out by Catherine Wihtol de Wenden. But it also has to face some resistance coming from the lack of common socialisation on a clear project and from the problems caused by the gap between those who feel like a European citizen and those who feel excluded, developing removed identities.

Still according to Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, several principles of citizenship exist alongside each other:

- citizenship based on living together, implying the concrete involvement in public affairs and sometimes, multiculturalism as an implicit dimension of this democratic definition;
- citizenship based on social contract, that is to say reciprocity among rights and responsibilities;
- citizenship lying on reciprocity of rights between Europeans, which completely splits apart the concepts of citizenship and nationality.

This European citizenship, very beneficial for Europeans, but only allowed to a restrained part of the population, goes hand in hand with a retrained access and status condition for new migratory categories caused by the trade globalisation model: asylum seekers, parties of mixed marriages, temporary workers, illegal residents or illegal workers and students.

The present context invites us to get back to the main principles of the international order. The first principle mentions that every single human has

the right to live on this planet with dignity. But the defensive policies, which are repressive or selective towards the migrants, lead to a criminalisation of the migratory phenomenon from the poor countries, to mass violence of fundamental rights of the migrants and European societies tend to be considered as fortresses under siege, which causes more xenophobia and all sorts of groundless fears.

In brief, European citizenship is still an institutional problem and political and philosophical issue for a post-national society.

However, if Europe is not recognised by culture, education and exchanges, without European civic education or even places of European memory, European citizenship will always be less important than national citizenship. New public spaces and forms of activism should therefore be invented from a common history built in the diversity and from a constant reference to Human rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

The European Commission should thus be congratulated for taking the initiative, at the request of the European Parliament, of declaring 2013, as 20th anniversary of the creation of European citizenship (within the context of the Treaty of Maastricht that has come into effect in November 1993), as the "European Year of Citizens". And the goal of this conference organized by the Cultural Coalition for a Citizens' Europe is to take part in this important task, among others by underlining the contribution of the artists, arts and cultures to an active, participative and dynamic European citizenship.

European Citizenship

One of the originalities of the construction of Europe is the important role it gives to citizens. Normally, in classic international organisations, only the states are directly concerned by the decisions taken (like for example, the United Nations). In the European Union, citizens have their own legal personality, apart from the states.

European citizenship was introduced by the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, and is not meant to replace national citizenship, but rather to complete it by giving new rights to every person who has the nationality of a Member State of the European Union: "Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union". It is called a "superposing" citizenship. Individuals only have access to it via a state in which they are citizen. It is therefore not open to people beyond the European Union. It has been embryonic in the beginning, but European citizenship slowly strengthened. In this manner, every new treaty, and notably the treaties of Amsterdam (1997), Nice (2001) and Lisbon (2007), adds new rights for European citizens.

It is based on the common principles of the Member States: freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the rule of law.

The initiative A Cultural Coalition for a Citizen's Europe is neither supposed to be a theoretical discussion, nor juridical or philosophical. Citizenship has to be lived in the daily life (which shows how important it is to give examples of good or bad practice). We also have to focus on "proving" that arts and culture, is not only "profitable" for citizenship and governance, but also allows us to question those concepts and therefore strengthen democracy and human rights.

Why is it important for us to emphasize this cultural aspect of citizenship?

Because:

- only culture seems to differentiate the contradiction between ethnical and religious diversity on one hand, and the promotion of a citizens' democracy on the other hand;
- by fully dedicating ourselves to artistic creativity and cultural innovation, we will step by step manage to create a multicultural citizenship, based on human rights, and more particularly on cultural rights;
- it is culture, in a social and a political transformation, that will manage to make citizenship something different than only a juridical concept, without internal dynamics and without openness to others and to the universal:
- cultural democracy, by insisting not only on the participation of the citizen, but also on the development of "capabilities" (Amarty Sen) and on empowerment of the weakest, somehow "structures" not only citizenship, but also governance
- cultural citizenship has to be recognised at all levels: local, national, European, citizenship of the World and of the Earth.

New Projects

Therefore, lots of new "projects", reflections and actions can be made by the European Union and its Member States, in order to work deeper this new paradigm of "culture" and "citizenship". In this document, we will be briefly tackling four of them: culture and democracy, culture and development, culture as 4th bedrock of the sustainable development, culture and education / formation to citizenship.

Culture and Democracy

Despite unquestionable improvements, Europe remains affected by democratic deficits that are getting more and more difficult to manage, since 2008, with financial and euro crises. As the German Chancellor talked about (maybe a bit unwisely) "democracy that conforms to the market" ("marktkonform"), the management of the financial crisis by the European Union has shown not only a lack of intellectual consensus on the nature of the economic and financial crisis in the euro area, but also a worrying weakening of political solidarity in the involved people, as well as the dramatic weaknesses of an institutional system and a profoundly inadequate governance. To make a long story short, the management of the crisis was neither European (intergovernmental practices for adjusting the national profit margins replaced the Community method, which would help the general interest), nor democratic. We are far from a market that conforms to the democracy (the contrary of what Mrs. Merkel said) and from a political regulation of banks and markets.

Jürgen Habermas, in order to rework the principles of democracy in the light of the changes in the society, proposes the concept of deliberative policy: "a "popular sovereignty" expressed by a series of communication networks needs no "basis" of a more or less homogeneous nation. What the European democracy needs is after all a social basis in the civil society and a public space to create a common political culture".

The issue of democracy is both the field of our public political life and a project to launch, feed and permanently adjust. Culture, either as reference or as working field, depends on democracy as much as democracy depends on it. Between culture and democracy, there is a relation of reciprocity.

The issue of democracy, notably in the field of culture respects two logics and two main lines that we hope will meet and interact: a movement from the top to the bottom, coming from the institutions to the civil society (inhabitants, within the context of the policy of the City, for example); a movement from the bottom to the top, coming from people forming a community, from their skills, potentials and initiative ability.

It is probably in the Arc-et-Senans Declaration (1972), where it was first stated in a clear and foretelling way, that "every cultural policy has as fundamental goal to realise a whole of means able to develop possibilities of expression and make sure they are free. The objective is that humankind should have the right to be the creator of life styles and social practices that have a meaning. Subsequently, it is important to focus on conditions of creativity wherever

they are located, to recognise a cultural diversity by ensuring the existence and the development of weak environments".

In a recent article, Sabine de Ville, president of "Culture and Democracy" defines it well:

"In order to find legitimacy, Europe has to make a quick change and to become more democratic. It has to foster the development of a European citizenship based on new solidarities and logics. It has to build a new culture of politics, economics and society and spread it to the whole European territory. In a more vigorous and direct way, it has to focus more on culture in order to give back meanings and links and make of everyone, wherever he comes from, the emancipated inventor of his personal destiny, within the context of a profoundly rethought European project".

Sure, it is not culture's task to provide us a way out of the crisis and on its own give a new boost to the weakening democracy in the European Union, but it can make huge contributions, as currently shown, in more ways than one, by the "cultural platforms", associations such as "Culture and Democracy" or "Association Marcel Hicter for cultural democracy", or even a network of towns and districts, such as Agenda 21 of culture, or even others.

This cultural democracy must have an intercultural dimension. It is necessary to help the expansion of an intercultural citizenship within a same democratic system that is able to be both united and diverse. Such a multi- or intercultural democracy implies the creation of a group of active citizens with the same rights and obligations and who share the same public space and the same democratic project respecting the law and legal and political procedures. Those citizens might also have the various identities and cultural or religious practices they want, either privately, or publicly. But those cultural and identical choices, that are revocable, mustn't influence their position in the social, economic and political order, and that position has to be made in the respect of the choices of the other citizens (see Will Kymlicka or Marco Martiniello).

Finally, with cultural democracy comes the question of cultural rights, as mentioned in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (and also on the Protocol on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, article 27).

For the Freiburg Group, and for Patrice Meyer-Bisch, culture is not a random field. It surely has its own values: the free movement of knowledge, practices and goods "that bring value, identity and meaning". But this value, for which the specificity is to link people, their activities and their institutions, is a way of

access to human capacities, at personal level as well as at the level of the societies in all their diversity.

Freedoms, in their ecological, economic, social or politic dimensions, are nurturing. Rights, freedoms and cultural responsibilities have a "leverage effect" on the prism of the social creation. This is the origin of democracy.

Every human right expresses a capacity of integration, of freedom and of responsibility. Within this range of freedoms, cultural rights, protect rights and freedoms for everyone, alone or in a group, to live his own process of integration and access the cultural resources that are necessary for him. Those rights link the capacities of people and capacities of fields together: they "conduct capacities". This is why they have a leverage effect on every social creation.

People and systems are a circle: to give everyone the right to take part to the cultural life is to strengthen social fabric; to develop cultural wealth is to allow everyone to take part to this stronger and more creative life.

"If cultural rights must occupy a central role, it is because they have a link all human rights together. Culture is the essence of our internal freedom. It is also our platform of expression the essence of our extern freedom by which we link ourselves to the works and to others. A culture is a permanent link and work capacity to make this capacity grow, recognise it in the others and receive it from them. It is a capital, a personal and social wealth essential for any enrichment".

Culture and Development

Even though interactions between culture and development are nothing "new" (an Association such as "Culture and Development" in Grenoble has been existing for now 50 years), their interactions have "materialized" in the last fifteen years, such as demonstrated by the United Nations which passed a resolution in December 2010, a resolution that asked countries to "promote capacity building in order to give birth to a dynamic cultural and creative sector" and to "actively support new local markets for cultural goods and services, and to make it easier for them to enter officially in international markets".

What do we mean by this interaction between culture and development?

Culture is a condition of development.

A society expresses its relationship with the world and its originality via culture, where it analyses and foresees its own future. It is the core of the creation of the organisation of the society and how it works, which determines

the style and the content of its own economic and social development. As said by president Senghor, "Culture is both the beginning and the end of all development";

Culture is a determining element of social and human development (and progress).

It allows not only the conservation and emphasis of heritage (identities, languages, customs and religions) and strengthening of social cohesion, but also the creation of new social links and new solidarities. What emphasizes the role of culture as a factor of identity, as a factor of empowerment and of the development of capabilities (Amartya Sen) as a factor of citizenship and democratic governance;

Culture is an important economic resource, in terms of GDP and employments.

Society of knowledge and creative economy allow developing countries to emphasize their traditional and heritage treasures and their immense cultural and creative potential. Cultural creative industries, natural and cultural heritage, traditions and tourism can become vital sources of economic development and jobs creation, as shown by, among others, UNCTAD's works on creative economy (2008 and 2010).

The EU developed, from 2006, a "invest on human resources" programme, and adopted in November 2007 a "European Agenda of Culture in the era of globalisation", which sees culture as social, economic and political investment, and organised a major conference in Brussels in April 2009 on "culture and creation, factors of development", insisting on the necessity of developing the cultural sector, but also the necessity of a horizontal approach in the other sector policies. The EU, in its new programme "Agenda for Change", does not mention culture, as the "Creative Europe" programme insists heavily on the economic and commercial dimensions of culture, completely neglecting its impact on the development and on the social aspect (citizenship and governance);

Culture as 4th Pillar of the Sustainable Development

The idea of considering culture as 4th pillar of the sustainable development (among environmental, social and economic pillars) was developed in the years 2000 by the Australian Jon Hawkes, and then taken up, among others by UNESCO, by the International Organisation of Francophonie and by Agenda 21 of culture.

According to this theory, cultural diversity, development of artistic and cultural practices, cultural creation and innovation, all the non-material wealth that we can consider as essential in the development of the human — as tools of relation and knowledge — are in the centre of the sustainable development that should put the economic field in the service of social development and of fight against poverty and inequalities, while conserving as much as possible the limited natural resources on the planet.

The interaction between culture and sustainable development leads to a paradigmatic change (see Jean-Michel Lucas):

- It is founded on cultural rights and on the equal dignity for everyone;
- The purpose is therefore not only to protect the environment, to encourage the economy and to be considerate of social situations, but also to check if the individuals can express their humanity better thanks to the actions taken;
- The economy of culture is now not only the management of the resources in a world of products and cultural resources, but also the collective "management" of those people-to-people contacts that cultural rights demand;
- The notions of "progress" and "growth" have to be completely rethought in order to allow a transition from a society of "acquire more" to a community / civilisation of "live better"

Education to Democratic Citizenship

It remains, despite all our efforts, on the level of the Council of Europe and of the European Union, one of the major issues in Europe.

Democracy is a fragile and fleeting political system. Education in democracy and citizenship is a factor of integration and equality between individuals. Such an education has to combine the disciplinary and horizontal approach, without forgetting the "project" dimension, which will give concrete expression to this approach.

In this way, our society of knowledge must become more and more, a society of initiation and formation all along the life.

The democratic organisation invites us to be the Resistance fighters of our times, and create together, rich of our differences. As emphasized by Dominique Schnapper: "whatever the concept, it is important to repeat that the man might learn, know and respect the practices of public life and more precisely, understand the idea that there is a public field".

"Only free citizens, conscious of their rights, will be able to imagine, realise and defend new political programmes; never a submissive group. Without citizens, there is no politics. If you want to build a house, you first have to start with the foundations, and not with the roof. The renewal of public-spiritedness is not a second-product but, on the contrary, something that goes hand in hand with politics. The urgent need for a public-spiritedness as necessary condition of any politics remains constant, while politics in itself keeps changing. It's a never-ending and inexhaustible demand that still has needed to be answered to for a long time, but still hasn't. Public-spiritedness is courage, love for truth, always awakened conscience, interior-freedom and a real responsibility for public affairs. So many merits that will probably never fully be fulfilled."

Vaclav Havel, Le Sens de la Charte 77, 1987.

Raymond Weber

President of the Marcel Hicter Association for Cultural Democracy

Translated from the original French by Mr. David Fadeur.

Bibliography

Avgeri Parthenia/Guillobez Thomas/Jagodnik Edouard. Citoyenneté démocratique et droits de l'homme. Culture et citoyenneté européennes, Foucher 2006

Broquet Hervé. Les nouveaux défis du « vivre-ensemble ». Citoyennetés, cultures et démocratie, Couleur Livres 2007

Jackson Tim. Prosperity without Growth. Economics for a Finite Planet, Earthscan/Routledge 2009

Kymlicka Will. Multinational Citizenship : a Liberal Theory of Minority Rights, Oxford University Press 1995

Le Pors Anicet. La citoyenneté, PUF 1999

Lucas Jean-Michel (Doc Kasimir Bisou). Culture et développement durable. Il est temps d'organiser la palabre..., IRMA 2012

Martiniello Marco. La démocratie multiculturelle. Citoyenneté, diversité, justice sociale, Presses de Sciences Po 2011

Nussbaum Martha. Creating Capabilities. The Human Development Approach, The Belknap Press, Harvard University Press 2011

eadem: Not for Profit. Why Democracy needs the Humanities, Princeton University Press 2010

Schnapper Dominique (en collaboration avec Bachelier Christian). Qu'est-ce que la citoyenneté ?, Gallimard 2000

Van Middelaar Luuk. Le passage à l' Europe. Histoire d'un commencement, Gallimard 2012

Viveret Patrick. La cause humaine. Du bon usage de la fin d'un monde, Les Liens qui Libèrent 2012 254

Wihtol de Wenden Catherine. La citoyenneté européenne, Presses de Sciences Po 1997

ETUDES janvier 2012. Démocratie et citoyenneté, avec des articles d'Abdelwahab Meddeb, Jacques Semelin, Pierre de Charentenay, Olivier Galland, Frédéric Sarter, Jean-Philippe Pierron, Christoph Theobald

Le Monde Diplomatique. Supplément Démocratie, septembre 2012

Team Culture. Manifesto « Turn to Culture », Danish Presidency of the European Union, June 2012. The interrogation of this Manifesto is : « What can art and culture do in time of crisis ? ». Three answers are proposed: Learning through Culture. Cultural coopération and Inspiration; Creative Empowerment. Citizenship and Democratic Involvment; Creative Industries and Cultural Innovation

UNCTAD/CNUCED. Report on Creative Economy (2008; 2010)

UNESCO: Déclaration universelle sur la diversité culturelle, 2001

UNESCO : Convention sur la protection et la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles, 2005

Cristina Ortega & Roberto San Salvador del Valle

Key Co-creation and Co-Responsibility in the Governance of Culture

In the search for responses to the need to construct citizenship via the governance of culture, we propose three steps that form part of a long itinerary. The first step involves recovering the classical approaches pursued by policies geared to culture and its users or consumers, i.e. the citizens themselves. The second step pauses to reflect on cultural policies in a world that is undergoing transformation, which requires *another approach* to citizens. The third step takes into consideration the features of this *other approach* taken by cultural policies with regard to citizens.

First step

Policies have tended to approach the field of culture as follows: in its capacity as a fact, entwined with the very existence of mankind; in its capacity as an asset, generated by individuals who gain professional status around it; via the nature of it as a product, as the fruits of the individual revolution; and via the added value it provides as a service, within the evolution of the economic model itself. However, such policies have not studied the matter sufficiently in depth in terms of the emerging feature of *culture as an experience*.

Furthermore, policies have had a bearing on a fragmented view of the field of culture, both separately from and independently of other areas of the leisure experience gained by citizens. This has prevented a significant part of cultural policies within a context involving a search for significant, memorable experiences to be fully understood as a whole by citizens.

Cultural policies have been developed as such in terms of ideology, i.e. as different ways (in terms of key value, a sector that acts as a driving force, and as a political and socio-economic model) of understanding culture and policy itself according to different schools of thought (conservative, liberal, Christian-democrat, social-democrat, Marxist socialist, alternative left, nationalist, populist, etc.).

However, above all, activity and concerns regarding cultural policies have meant that it has had a bearing on an improvement in the praxis, as a a political action (programmes, services, products, facilities, infrastructures, events, norms and budgets, etc.) or as political morphology (distribution of competences and organisation of cultural institutions).

Yet despite this, such features approach the citizen from outside via a governing of rational, pragmatic culture, albeit unrelated to the major subjectivity attached to human nature and to the behaviour of citizens towards culture – within a framework of a life experience.

Second step

We need to take a look at the major transformations currently underway in order to design another approach to cultural policies.

Since the 18th century, the scientific-technological paradigm has been substantially modifying the nature of space and time variables (the former in putting into practice its steady globalisation and continuity and the latter in terms of a gradual acceleration process). This affects all walks of life (the environment, socio-demographics, the economy, politics, health....and also the leisure phenomenon and the field of culture).

Our search should not focus solely on new structures and processes, as would be done using any of the previously-mentioned classical approaches. Rather, we need to embark on a process that involves generating another approach to reality, to different means and ways for citizens to experience culture in that emerging society.

Nowadays, cultural policies focus on citizens who experience times and spaces that are different from those that are already known. This means that experiencing culture, as other walks of life, is done via different diverse coordinates: in terms of individuality or the company chosen to enjoy them (individual, couple, circle of friends or group); the vast agenda of possible activities from among those to choose; the distribution of budget-time fragmented and pressurized by the acceleration and use of the range of activities being offered; and a variety of both open and confined spaces and facilities which would have been unthinkable in previous decades, and with limited resources available owing to the crisis, albeit ones which are geared to leisure and culture in far greater volumes than in any other previous timespace.

Third step

We need to take a new step that will enable us to find another approach to cultural policies via that plural and kaleidoscopic form of citizenship deriving from a world that is undergoing a major transformation.

Placing oneself on this stage of the itinerary implies having a bearing on the generation of both subjective and immaterial well-being, without overlooking the function of cultural policies as a generator of welfare. Cultural policies

viewed via classical approaches have tended to pursue the correct governing of individual-group, activity, budget-time, space and resource variables. In the case of this other approach, cultural policies focus in depth on motivation, values, benefits, emotions and needs. Thus, we now understand cultural policies as being an exercise in the generation of citizens' experiences in leisure and culture, rather than the impeccable range of programmes, activities and services on offer.

Yet citizens' cultural and leisure experiences are both multi-dimensional and multi-faceted. Additionally, they vary throughout one's life itinerary, being marked by age from childhood to old age in a diachronic process of development – and by personal and social conditions that pass through the same age group simultaneously until such time as different experiences are generated.

All this gives rise to the need for us to seek out another way of designing cultural policies – a way that would enable us to understand the diversity existing among citizens and the great variety of experiences that they live and yearn for. Cultural policies are turning round their position so as to be *devised* and *made*, as has been the case since previous times – yet above all to be *felt* and *learnt*, by providing a response to citizens who live in a world that is undergoing transformation. Rationality and pragmatism tended to surround the cultural policies of the 20th century. The advent of the 21st century demands major doses of empathy and empowerment.

And these advances compel us to seek out a greater democratic radicalisation in the sense of going back to one's roots, to the basic principles of democracy (people power), in which e-governance (the action of governing online and via social networks) may prove to be a great ally. The search for *informed citizens who enjoy transparency with regard to institutions* may constitute the core of our initial effort. However, although this may be worthy of merit, it is not enough in the world in which we live. Neither does working with a view to achieving *connected citizenship of those who listen, talk, give their opinions and co-decide* – even assuming major advances – constitute the essence of the approach we are seeking. This other approach is backed up by the construction of citizenship of those who co-create and share what is created, while at the same time being co-responsible for the result. This gradual exercise can be sustained by the possibilities that moving on from a 1.0 world to a 2.0 world and from the latter to a 30.0 world entail.

Co-creation and co-responsibility divide up leading roles played by public institutions, private business and social, non-profit-making entities, etc. - and citizens themselves. Cultural policies find a source of innovation and

transformation in a relational model of how to understand their design, development and assessment.

Nonetheless, we are not referring to just any cultural policy – we are not expressing a commitment to a neutral approach, but rather, to an approach in which we may enable there to be a balance between the search for external economic appeal and a safeguarding of internal social cohesion, within the framework of sustainable development.

Dra. Cristina Ortega, ENCATC President

Dr. Roberto San Salvador del Valle

Institute of Leisure Studies

University of Deusto

A Cultural Coalition for a Citizens' Europe

Europe cannot be a mere political framework for the convenience of governments. It must be made clear that the purpose of European integration is primarily to enhance the quality of life for its citizens. The active involvement of citizens is unthinkable without participation that is taken seriously.

A Citizens' Europe implies participation beyond the dry confines of bureaucratic regulation and job creation programmes. It involves all the activities necessary for real social justice and dialogue. It requires the political structures to provide citizens with the mobility, freedom and resources to make the most of the opportunities of our time.

At its very core, a Citizens' Europe is a cultural concept. It has to encompass the wealth of languages, traditions, cultural knowledge and experiences of people in Europe, regardless of where they are originally from. The Coalition believes in the catalyst role that culture – in all its diverse forms – can play in the development of society. Culture and the arts are a vital element of Europe's social and democratic fabric. Culture shapes our common value system and at the same time helps to establish a sense of self in an increasingly fast-paced and fragmented world. Culture and the arts can simultaneously strengthen social bonds, enable communication and stimulate out-of-the-box thinking across European borders in a unique and "avant-garde" way.

A Cultural Coalition for a Citizens' Europe proposes this basic and activating role of culture to politics and business. It expresses a demand for supporting the development of Europe from the bottom up: as a coalition based on the creative force of culture and in continuous dialogue with all strands of society. The Cultural Coalition thus brings together those whom political institutions will need in order to deliver European integration that has real meaning for citizens. Without such a coalition the current level of indifference, hostility to and alienation from the European project will continue to undermine it, strengthening the hand of those who wish to revert to narrow nationalism.

Developing and implementing a new understanding of the cultural component of citizenship will give the Coalition its guiding line. Building Europe means integrating national histories, value systems and world views, and fostering intercultural dialogue. Citizenship includes the right to participate in diverse cultural life, not limited to the majority culture of any nation state or linguistic group. It also includes the willingness to learn about and be aware of the

cultural traditions of the community within which citizens reside and draw conclusions for their own active responsibility for the development of society (the community). This should not just be a nation state, but also a region, city or community — and it should include all residents living in that common "Union" space.

European Year of Citizens 2013

The European Year of Citizens 2013 will give the "Cultural Coalition for a Citizens' Europe" its time frame. The Year is an opportunity to make European policy and European citizens aware of their rights and responsibilities as Europeans: we want to give the European Year of Citizens its urgency.

A Cultural Coalition is the expression of the hearts and minds of Europe's citizens: active in debate, innovative in thinking and creative in their activities. This Coalition provides the political and official institutions (whether local, regional, national, European or global) with the interlocutors they need to help them develop. That is what drives the Coalition's work: to develop a new understanding of cultural citizenship and cultural rights in order to create a democratic Europe from the bottom up.

Join, follow and contribute to the Cultural Coalition for a Citizens' Europe at www.asoulforeurope.eu

"A Soul for Europe"

Since 2004, "A Soul for Europe" brings together citizens, reputable NGOs and foundations, world re-known artists, high-level politicians, business representatives and public intellectuals from all over Europe. Towards 2014, Year of European elections, and 10 years since its set up, "A Soul for Europe"'s main aim is to increase its coalition in order to activate more citizens from all strands of society to shape a joint understanding of responsibilities: Europe: That's us!