



ERICarts

<http://www.ericarts.org>

European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research
Europäisches Institut für vergleichende Kulturforschung gGmbH
Institut Européen de recherche comparative sur la culture
Instituto Europeo de Investigación cultural comparativa

Secretariat: Dahlmannstr. 26, D - 53113 Bonn
Tel. (+49-228) 2420996/7 * Fax 241318
e-mail: info@ericarts.org

SHARING DIVERSITY

National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

of a study prepared for the European Commission
by the European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts)

March 2008

This study was carried out for the European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture. The views taken and analyses presented are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission or of individual EU Member States. The findings of the study are based on research carried out in 2007. Final editing was completed in early 2008.

Core ERICarts team (Bonn and Helsinki):

Andreas Wiesand (Team Leader);
Ilkka Heiskanen and Ritva Mitchell (Scientific experts);
Danielle Cliche (Research Co-ordinator);
Marion Fischer, Leena Marsio

Key experts:

Jude Bloomfield; Simona Bodo; Vesna Copic; Vjeran Katunaric; Naseem Khan; Mogens Kirkeby; Judith Neisse; Elka Tschernokoshewa; Michael Wimmer.

Special advisors:

Robert Palmer (Council of Europe) and Traugott Schoefthaler (Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures).

National correspondents:

Network of researchers covering all 27 EU member states, three applicant countries and the four EEA/EFTA countries (see Annex 2).

Technical and administrative staff, translation:

Fiona Gallagher, Charlotte Gemende, Olivier Goebel, Johannes Euler
Joerg Torkler (Website www.interculturaldialogue.eu)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The more we share, the more we have!

Mohamed Mounir, Egyptian singer, author and actor (2007)

1. INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AS AN EMERGING ISSUE ON POLITICAL AND POLICY AGENDAS

Since the arrival of the new millennium, a number of developments have given intercultural dialogue (ICD), cultural diversity and social cohesion a more prominent place on political agendas such as: migration flows that have significantly changed the population diversity of some European countries; EU enlargement; globalisation and geopolitical changes; new means of communication and a related expansion of media content; an increase in controversies and debates on value systems; a reported rise of incidents of discrimination, racism, and populism. Indeed, the results of the Eurobarometer survey *Discrimination in the EU* published in January 2007 show that visible differences and practices play a main role in discriminatory thinking and the latter can be considered as a key barrier to, or a motive for, ICD. The November 2007 Eurobarometer Flash on ICD in Europe shows, however, that the majority of EU citizens tend to agree that diversity and intercultural dialogue could enrich their country's cultural life.

The promotion of ICD has been identified in the European Commission's Agenda for Culture in a Globalising World (2007) as a tool contributing to the governance of cultural diversity within European societies, trans-nationally across European countries and internationally with other world regions. Support for this agenda is extended through, for example, its new *Culture Programme 2007-2013*, the Programme *Europe for Citizens* and the *Year of Intercultural Dialogue 2008* (EYID). Intergovernmental organisations such as the Council of Europe, the OECD and UNESCO as well as NGOs and civil society platforms have also made ICD one of their priorities.

2. APPROACH TO THIS STUDY

In this context, it became increasingly important to understand how national governments across Europe actually address ICD, be it as part of an integrated policy framework or in different sector specific policy fields. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to map national approaches, policies or strategies in Europe to ICD, including but not limited to those addressing:

- **Education** as a means to provide the basis for understanding and respecting diversity;
- **Youth** programmes and **sports** activities which facilitate practical experience with ICD;
- **Culture** connecting different value systems and challenging established aesthetic criteria.

From January to December 2007, the core *ERICarts team* assigned to the study worked together with a group of 10 *key experts*, two *special advisors* and a research network of *correspondents* in 34 countries to address questions such as: How is ICD as a concept understood? Who are the main actors involved in its promotion? What challenges do the sectors face in their work? Can we speak of legal or policy frameworks for ICD? If so, what are the main rationales for developing ICD policies? According to which criteria could such policies, programmes and projects be assessed?

Given the timeframe for the study, no extensive new research was to be undertaken. Therefore, the project team collected and reviewed mainly existing information and data related to ICD drawn from a number of European as well as national studies and with a focus on ICD within countries.

3. LEGAL FRAMEWORKS AND NATIONAL APPROACHES TO INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE

Intercultural dialogue is not a specific legal category that is regulated by international, European or national law in the strict sense. It is argued, however, that ICD can only take place in an environment where a person is guaranteed safety and dignity, equality of opportunity and participation, where different views can be voiced openly without fear, where there are shared spaces for exchanges between different cultures to take place. From this point of view, there are indeed several

international or European conventions, EU directives and national legal frameworks outlining **basic human, civic, economic and social rights**, upon which intercultural dialogue depends. As regards **cultural rights**, there are instruments which recognise and enable support for maintaining cultural difference, providing special rights to ethnic or linguistic minorities such as promoting their cultures and the use of their languages in education and through the media.

Specific articles of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (2000) are of particular importance to intercultural dialogue by addressing: equality (e.g. non-discrimination and cultural, religious and linguistic diversity); freedoms (e.g. freedom of expression, of thought, conscience and religion); and citizens rights (e.g. of movement and residence, to vote). Accompanying the EU Charter are several directives which address equality, two of which include: the Racial Equality Directive (2000), and the Employment Equality Directive (2000). These principles and rights are reaffirmed in the Commission's Social Agenda (2005), Culture Agenda (2007) as well as in the December 2007 EU Treaty of Lisbon.

The results of this study indicate that such principles have not been implemented in a uniform manner into **national legislation or policies** addressing traditional minorities, refugees or the integration of new migrants, even if universal human rights or the rule of law set standards in all European countries. The diversity of interpretations is particularly obvious as regards national ICD approaches among which one could distinguish those based on social cohesion or cultural diversity traditions or strategies – both of which are under scrutiny as to whether they are able to foster an open dialogue.

In many EU member states, the **social cohesion approach** has gained ground. It aims at a more unified society with political stability, internal security, economic growth, and equal opportunities for all individuals and groups, regardless of their origin, to participate in both the work environment and social spheres. To this end, a common national identity, related values and the use of a main national language are being promoted and concepts or requirements in immigration / citizenship laws and policies were developed or tightened. On the other hand, some ICD-related programmes or events are also part of this approach; they often aim at supporting the socio-cultural integration of groups or individuals with a migrant background. This approach is found in countries, which:

- Have *ethnically diverse communities*, which are often a result of their colonial past, such as *Belgium, France or the Netherlands*;
- Attracted, mainly during the last decades, large numbers of *migrant workers* from both in- and outside of the EU, such as *Austria, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Luxembourg or Spain*;
- Used to be part of the former Soviet Union or Yugoslavia from which times certain *groups with unclear legal status* remain in the population, for example: stateless people (in some of the *Baltic States*) or so-called "erased people" (*Slovenia*).

With reference to *refugees and asylum-seekers*, whose number has been on the rise above all around the Mediterranean; *social fringe groups in the suburbs of large cities in Western Europe*; or specific minorities such as the *Roma in Central, Southern and Eastern Europe*, priority is placed more on improving their basic socio-economic conditions than on ICD. In fact, experts or speakers from these communities often argue, that ICD should not be seen as a replacement for policies related to basic social needs in housing, employment, education, health care, etc.

The second important approach focuses on the **legal or political recognition of defined minority cultures and identities** that coexist within a territorially defined area, be it that of a nation, region or locality. Minorities are provided with specific rights, some of which are accompanied by affirmative action measures in the fields of culture, education and the media. This approach has been traditionally prevalent in most of the *Nordic countries* and in the *United Kingdom*; it seems to gain ground in *Belgium (FL), Ireland, Lithuania, Macedonia (FYROM) and Slovenia*. For example, in *Slovenia*, a law defining the scope of special rights for the Roma Community was passed in 2007.

The results of the study show that attempts are being made to bring together these different approaches: the instrumentally integrative and the cultural equity oriented. For example, in the *UK*, a "Community Cohesion and Race Equality Strategy: Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society" was developed (2005); similar aims has the National Integration Plan in *Germany* (2007). In *Estonia*, the new 2008-2013 Integration Action Plan aims to address both the social harmonisation of

society, around "a strong common national core", based on knowledge of the Estonian language and Estonian citizenship as well as the opportunity to maintain ethnic differences, including the provision of education in minority cultures and languages.

Countries such as *Belgium*, *Portugal*, *Spain* and *Sweden* try to go a step further by identifying *intercultural dialogue as a key element of their integration plans*. For example, in *Spain*, a new Strategic Plan on Citizenship and Integration (2007-2010), was passed to promote social cohesion by recognising equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for everyone, while at the same time advocating respect for diversity and interculturality. In *Belgium*, the French Community "Governmental Action Programme for the Promotion of Gender Equality, Interculturality and Social Inclusion" (2005) aims at implementing a broad spectrum of measures to be applied transversally across all government departments aimed at equal opportunities, promoting cultural diversity, improving access of minorities to work in public institutions, fighting against racism etc.

Beyond the legal and policy spheres, there are, already today, certain professional groups and many young people which could serve as examples for a *new, more mobile and more intercultural generation of Europeans*, be they exchange students, artists or media professionals and other skilled specialists. As emphasized by the Slovenian EU Presidency, at the launch of the EYID 2008, they represent agents which link ICD with the main goals of the EU Lisbon Agenda. They are recruited from all parts of the world to work in fields such as business, research, sports and entertainment. While their lingua franca may be English, their careers can only benefit from additional linguistic and intercultural competencies.

These latter developments could be interpreted as improving the base for intercultural dialogue and open up the road towards *the "Unity in Diversity" concept of European citizenship*. However, some EU member states have interpreted this concept as a call to maintain strong national identities within an enlarged European space of cultural diversity and dialogue. Consequently, national efforts and **trans-national activities** such as conferences, debates, publications or artistic events often give preference to promoting national cultures or reach out to Diaspora communities.

In many cases, trans-border activities have traditionally focussed on particular geographic or language areas yet their scope is expanding with the introduction of ICD as a policy priority. For example, in addition to its traditional focus on relations with Latin America, *Spain* has been, together with *Turkey*, a motor for the new "Alliance of Civilizations" initiative with emphasis on ICD between the Orient and Occident. *German* agencies (e.g. Goethe-Institute; IfA) have launched various programmes such as "CrossCulture Internships" to give incentives for dialogue with predominantly Islamic countries. Complementing language concerns, issues related to inter-religious dialogue have been developed by governments in the context of the *Francophonie* network, led by *France*.

Evidence collected during the study shows that dialogue-oriented approaches to foster trans-national cooperation are gradually replacing some of the more traditional bilateral activities that are, or used to be, characteristic of cultural diplomacy. **Public support for intercultural exchanges and cooperation projects** has evolved and can be seen as making important steps towards creating new spaces for dialogue both across internal EU borders and with other world regions, e.g. in development contexts. Indeed, this has been a major thrust of recent government action and policies to promote ICD. The study acknowledges, however, that there are barriers to promoting trans-national cooperation and dialogue which need to be addressed both within the EU (e.g. mobility related issues of social security and taxation) and with its neighbours or other world regions (e.g. increasing visa costs and difficulties in obtaining short or longer term work permits).

Taking into account the varying contexts for ICD in Europe and, in some cases, cross-border feelings of resentment due to historical events, one single model encompassing all national approaches to intercultural dialogue cannot realistically be expected, at present.

4. MAIN ACTORS

ICD is part of an emerging, complex system of governance which involves, in addition to actors on the *international/European level*, e.g. in some of the EU Neighbourhood programmes, public bodies on the national, regional and local levels as well as non-governmental civil society actors.

On the **national level**, several ministries or public agencies are involved. These include:

- *Ministries or government bodies responsible for traditional minorities for the integration of new migrant groups.* These differ across Europe and can be identified as: special departments located in the Prime Ministers or Presidents Offices (e.g. *Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary*); the Ministries of the Interior (e.g. *Finland, Greece, Italy, Poland, UK*); Ministries of Labour and Social Affairs (e.g. *Czech Republic, Italy*); Ministries of Immigration and Integration (e.g. *Denmark, France, the Netherlands*); Ministries of Justice (e.g. *Ireland, Iceland*). In *Portugal*, a special High Commission for Immigration and Intercultural Dialogue has been established;
- *Ministries with sector specific portfolios* in the fields of education, youth, culture and sport. Although none of these ministries take a lead role in coordinating ICD related activities as part of an integrated transversal framework or national strategy, the Ministries of Culture in several countries are playing a lead role coordinating the main activities and events during the 2008 European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, e.g. in *Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden*.
- *Ministries for foreign affairs promoting trans-national ICD* and cultural cooperation with countries within Europe and around the world directly or via mandated national cultural institutes in 24 of the countries studied;
- *Semi-public bodies or "quango" agencies*, such as advisory councils for national minorities, human rights committees, national bureaus against racism, youth or education boards, development agencies etc. most of which cooperate with relevant government Ministries. They are playing a lead role in the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (EYID) in countries such as: *Denmark, Hungary, Latvia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, UK*.

The results of the study show that there are few strategic efforts to facilitate or coordinate a *government wide exercise on intercultural dialogue*. This would require the setting up of e.g. inter-ministerial committees or working groups with other levels of government and NGOs to address ICD and to foster cooperation on specific projects bringing together departments responsible for traditional minorities, immigration and integration, culture, education, sport, youth, social and labour affairs, etc. However, in some of the 34 countries surveyed, such **national cooperation bodies or strategies** do exist, for example in:

- *Belgium:* The government of the French Community has adopted a strategic plan to coordinate policy efforts on transversal issues such as ICD, bringing together those responsible for: culture, education, sport, youth care, social affairs and health prevention. The national Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism (CEOOR) is also involved;
- *Bulgaria:* The National Council for Cooperation on Ethnic and Demographic Issues is to coordinate interaction between the government and NGOs, "aiming at the formation and realisation of a national policy regarding ethnic and demographic issues and migration";
- *Cyprus:* A committee of experts from various ministries (Interior, Labour and Social Insurance, Education and Culture, Health) has been established to formulate a policy framework for the integration of legally residing foreigners and to prepare an action plan on the necessary measures each Ministry and Department would take;
- *Germany:* Contributions to the National Integration Plan were made by sector-specific working groups, including one for "culture and integration"; the latter was co-ordinated by the Commissioner for Cultural and Media Affairs at the Federal Chancellery, with members drawn from the different levels of government: federal, Laender and municipalities, plus representatives of non-governmental organisations;
- *Poland:* The Division of National Minorities in the Department of Denominations and National Minorities has created an advisory body to the Prime Minister composed of representatives from several ministries to address national minorities and the Roma.

In preparation for the EYID 2008, national working groups or bodies coordinating government and civil society participation were established. For example, in *Austria* the Ministry of Education, Arts

and Culture is responsible for this committee while in *Ireland* the existing National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism has been entrusted with this function.

Regional and local authorities play a very important role not only in the implementation of ICD related programmes, but also in the development of intercultural policy positions. A few examples: The *City of Vienna*, Department for Intercultural and International Activities, has developed a "diversity strategy" to support cultural activities and the cohabitation of immigrants; the *City of Salzburg* included the promotion of diversity and intercultural projects into its overall cultural strategy. In Germany, the government of the *Land NorthRhine-Westphalia* began experimenting with artistic projects under the label of "InterKultur" a few years ago. Aimed at diversifying public services ("interkulturelle Öffnung"), the government created an intercultural management training programme in 2007. In Italy, regional and local authorities have been leading the way with intercultural experiments in cultural policies, institutions and activities, for example the "Porto Franco" project in the *Region of Tuscany*, the "Heritage for All" programme in the *City of Turin* or the "Cultures and Integration" project of the *Province of Milan*. The latter is aimed at creating a shared public space to encourage participation and interaction between different communities. In many European cities, other *socio-economic issues need to be addressed in order for the conditions for intercultural dialogue to emerge* as witnessed in the north of *England* or on the *Paris* periphery. Challenges faced by traditional minorities such as the Roma who are living on the outskirts of large cities remain a task for mainly regional / local authorities to address.

During the past decades, regional and local authorities became more active in pursuing trans-border cooperation activities. Among the results has been the emergence of *Euro-Regions* which connect citizens, municipalities, institutions and NGOs across the borders. A Europe-wide example of the proactive engagement of cities is the *Agenda 21 for Culture* initiative which commits local authorities to promote cultural diversity and human rights as integral to local urban development. It promotes dialogue, co-existence and interculturality as basic principles in the relationship between citizens.

Non-governmental civil society actors can be described as driving forces to promote ICD. Whether they are local neighbourhood groups, minority or migrant agencies, church organisations and charities, arts, culture, youth or sports clubs or trans-national networks bringing together professionals in different sectors/fields, it is acknowledged that they have been actively engaged in intercultural dialogue activities long before it became a political priority on national agendas.

Local NGOs and *national professional organisations* play a particularly key role where formal ICD structures, policies or programmes are less developed. They provide important services and act as focal points for training and education, providing documentation, workshops or seminars. The scope of their actions is very wide: protection of minorities' rights, fight against xenophobia, advocacy for better legislation in the field, organisation of numerous ICD events, initiatives aimed at mutual understanding, press and media programmes on ICD-related issues, etc. Many ICD activities undertaken by NGOs and other civil society organisations are increasingly carried out in collaboration with local authorities, supported by national or European programmes.

Trans-national NGOs are instrumental by creating new spaces for dialogue within the EU and with other world regions. Depending on their aims and agenda, they work together with other international organisations such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, UN agencies, etc. Their work could be of an activist nature, they may take on unofficial monitoring role or engage in shadowing activities, provide political representation and lobby for citizenship rights, fight discrimination on different levels, etc. Sector specific trans-national networks provide: opportunities for direct encounters between professionals; platforms for the exchange of information or of artistic cooperation across borders; independent spaces for confrontation and dialogue, etc.

Different *private foundations* which have been proactive in fostering transborder cooperation have also made promoting ICD part of their main activities. This mission is carried out in cooperation with other NGOs, civil society networks and individuals, and they have frequently played an important role in launching new *public-private initiatives* aimed at cross border dialogue and debate. One example from the culture sector is the partnership created between the European Cultural Foundation/European Forum for Arts and Heritage to create a *Civil Society Platform for ICD*. Different in

nature to the role of public authorities, foundations in Europe can provide support to activities which do not easily fit into funding categories prescribed by traditional public policies.

5. MAPPING SECTOR APPROACHES

A main goal of the study was to understand national approaches to ICD in a *broader context* and as an *issue of policy* in the sectors of education, culture, youth and sport.

A. Education: basis for understanding and respecting diversity

National policy approaches to intercultural dialogue in the education sector range from a focus on *civic education* (throughout Europe) to *intercultural education* (in some countries). ICD-activities are also found in higher education, be it in specific courses or in the context of international academic exchanges. The development of *intercultural competencies and skills as part of an overall political vision or national strategy on life-long learning processes* - starting from kindergarten, extending into primary and secondary education and reaching far into the different areas of professional training and life-long learning programmes - has yet to be achieved.

Acquiring ***civic competence through education*** means equipping individuals to fully participate in civic life based on knowledge

of democracy, citizenship, and civil rights. The results of the April 2007 EU conference on European Citizenship Education show that there is no common approach to civic education across Europe or even within one country. One of the main issues of civic education from the point of view of ICD is the *content* of educational materials whether for social studies or history teaching. National strategies to proactively provide a diversified view of history are few. The main approach is reactive, i.e. action taken to remove discriminatory content from textbooks, as has recently been the case in Denmark and Hungary.

Intercultural education as a policy objective has been identified in some EU member states such as *Finland* (2007 Programme for Global Education) or *Italy*, (1994 Ministerial Memorandum on Intercultural Dialogue and Democratic Coexistence). Intercultural dialogue guidelines for schools have been developed in countries such as in *Austria, Finland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Slovenia* and the *UK*; *Lithuania* targeted higher education in a 1999 White Book. Such guidelines encourage schools and training institutions to develop intercultural projects aimed at, e.g., promoting tolerance, developing curiosity for other cultures and learning about their traditions, including main celebrations and symbols. The 2007 Dutch plan *School Culture which creates Bonds* has gone a step further by identifying 5 policy routes to follow in the future.

In addition to guidelines, special resources are being developed for teachers and students to draw upon. For example, the Austrian *Intercultural Learning in Schools* database or the Danish project *This Works at our School* (2006-2007). The Boards of Education are also engaged in such activities by providing teaching material, special courses for teachers and public campaigns on how to combat ethnic discrimination in countries such as *Finland* or *Liechtenstein*. The Creative Partnerships programme of the *Arts Council England* works together with local schools and cultural institutions and provides specific teacher training resources to help students in deprived social areas (usually with an above average migrant population). The European *eTwinning* programme provides a framework for cooperation between schools through which students collaborate on the Internet.

Across Europe, one of the main objectives of educational policy to promote dialogue is by providing resources for ***language learning***. This takes many forms such as language training:

- *aimed at minorities and migrants* to learn and practice the official language of the country where they live in order to e.g. facilitate integration and provide them with better opportunities to participate in the marketplace, or, less frequently,
- *available to all students* to learn e.g. the language of a neighbouring country or the mother tongue of pupils with a foreign background;

A combined approach has been developed in *Austria* which promotes bilingual literacy, i.e. learning the official language (targeted to first generation migrants) and their language heritage (targeted to second and third generation migrants). Second or third language training is not necessar-

ily the main focus in countries or regions of Europe which have recently regained the use of their native language in all spheres of public life including education such as in the *Baltic States*.

In some East-Central Europe countries, efforts are underway to address the discrimination of traditional minorities, i.e. the Roma in the overall school system where they have been separated into special classrooms or schools. For example, in *Bulgaria*, several thousand Roma children have been recently taken out of segregated schools and put into mixed schools and in the *Czech Republic* a new project, "Re-Integration of Roma Pupils" has been launched to identify Roma pupils who were inappropriately placed in special schools.

Informal intercultural learning activities are also pursued independently of educational institutions through media programmes, exhibitions of culture and heritage institutions, training and employment schemes, etc., which aim at providing multiple perspectives of the past, an understanding of the present and a diversified vision of a common future.

B. Inter-Culture: policies, institutional strategies and artist led approaches

Intercultural dialogue in the arts and related fields can take on many different meanings ranging from promoting: formal cultural relationships across national boundaries (cultural diplomacy) or artist-led partnerships within Europe or internationally (cross border cultural cooperation); Diaspora connections with communities of the same ethnic origin settled in other countries; creative work within a country that is the outcome of different cultural perspectives, traditions or styles;; partnerships between arts groups or artists within a country based on different traditions; mainstream arts producers, managers and directors to respond to and take in new cultural perspectives and voices. Private sector companies, e.g. in book publishing, film production, or in the music industry, are rarely considered in such strategies, despite their large potential for the promotion of ICD.

One of the **main cultural policy approaches** adopted to promote ICD within countries has been to showcase different cultures and cultural expressions through support for one-off projects, events and media programmes. The objective is to give visibility to artists who are not part of the mainstream cultural landscape and as an educative strategy to inform the public about different cultures. On the other hand, there are many artists who reference their own cultural roots in their works, yet want to be recognised for their artistic talents irrespective of their ethnic background.

In some countries, **comprehensive cultural policy strategies** to foster 'internal' intercultural dialogue have been in place for some time. For example, in the *UK*, the Arts Council England has developed a wide-range of initiatives aimed at diversifying institutional structures, decision-making processes and audiences. It is reported that the introduction of many of these programmes were greatly aided by a change in the law - the 2002 Race Relations (Amendment) Act – which imposed the obligation on all public institutions to be able to demonstrate that they were working towards racial equality. In the *Netherlands*, a new cultural policy was adopted in 1999 aimed at opening up cultural institutions to minorities. Among its objectives were to mainstream minority youth arts by changing the priorities of the funding system to favour emerging artists from the neighbourhoods and multicultural initiatives, compelling funding bodies to earmark part of their budget for young and immigrant artists and regularly review their subsidy to established institutions. The new Dutch policy programme for 2005-2008 aims to focus on the establishment of "intercultural connections".

New intercultural strategies for the arts are being developed in some countries. For example, in *Belgium*, the Flemish government has introduced a Plan of Action on Interculturalisation (2006-2009) which includes the culture sector: Its focus is on diversifying public structures, their policies and programmes through positive action measures, i.e. setting a 10% quota. A separate budget has been created to subsidise projects addressing interculturalism. In *Ireland*, a national intercultural arts strategy is currently being developed by the Arts Council, including a specific action plan with a range of initiatives, e.g. the development of an intercultural dimension to some key mainstream arts funding initiatives. In *Latvia*, its State Cultural Policy Guidelines 2006 – 2015 include the principles of ICD, stressing the need for dialogue, understanding and diversity.

In other countries, **promotional campaigns** were introduced which tried to combine different approaches. For example, in *Sweden*, the Ministry of Culture declared 2006 the "Year of Cultural Diversity" and leaned on major institutions to open their doors more fully to new Swedes. An evaluation report shows that the Year "helped to lift the issue up the public agenda and has raised awareness among decision-makers, cultural practitioners and audiences about the importance of a

more open, inclusive cultural life" and that cultural agencies and institutions made internal efforts to change structures, overhaul recruitment guidelines and train staff in diversity promotion.

Due to the parameters of the study, two fields were selected to be examined in greater detail:

- **Museums** across Europe have gradually developed a range of policy approaches to ICD. These vary from the celebration of difference and the promotion of cultural self-awareness in migrant communities to their integration within mainstream culture. An option which is being increasingly explored is the development of compensatory or celebratory exhibitions and events drawing on collections that might hold particular significance for an immigrant community. On the other hand, action is required to develop shared spaces where visitors can cross borders of belonging and become creators rather than consumers of identity (e.g. Manchester Museum, Collective Conversations project). Calls are also made to rethink *all* the fundamental functions of a museum – from collection and conservation to exhibition strategies – from an intercultural perspective. This includes policies to improve the diversity of staff and governing boards in order to build real intercultural competencies, as well as to share some of the responsibility for exhibitions and their interpretation with external stakeholders (e.g. Museum of World Culture in Gothenburg, "Advantage Göteborg" project).
- The example of **the performing arts** marks a field, in which much intercultural work has taken place over decades, especially in countries with post-colonial migration and citizenship. Independent companies and artists – many of whom were often ethnically designated by critics and funders, and thus marginalised from the mainstream – took a lead in establishing themselves in an inherently intercultural way, with mixed artists, audiences, repertoire, forms and collaboration. Their continuously evolving strategies include efforts to: diversify marketing; make buildings more accessible and welcoming; take theatre to the people by travelling to the provinces and suburbs; get young people involved in the staging of a performance; diversify the cast of artists and those involved in production.

New opportunities have opened up in recent years for *independent companies and performers* to cooperate with mainstream institutions at home. For example: the Artistnet of INTERCULT, an independent Stockholm based production company, which aims to bring the work of performing artists with an immigration background living in *Sweden* into professional working relations with local performing arts and media companies. In *Italy*, some highly subsidised dance companies have given up some of their performance slots – minimum number of slots required to gain subsidy from the Ministry of Culture – to unsubsidised companies. Festivals in *Spain* have opened up spaces for diverse artists who have no access to the funding system in order to showcase the work of unsubsidised small migrant companies.

C. Promoting integration through sports

National approaches to promote intercultural dialogue in the field of sports are often "challenge oriented" and / or "target group oriented". As reflected in the 2007 EU White Paper on Sports, the major challenges are often identified with **social inclusion and empowerment** of excluded or marginalised individuals and groups; combating racism and xenophobia; or post war reconciliation. While it is true that sport and its informal settings can provide shared spaces which are more interactive and face fewer barriers than in other parts of society, there is a heavy burden placed on local and voluntary associations to promote the social inclusion of specific target groups such as immigrants (cultural focus); children (age group focus); Muslim female teenagers (gender focus).

Despite of all caveats, such approaches are prevalent in most countries. For example, the policy of the *Swedish* Ministry of Culture states that sport plays a key role to integrate migrants into society and to improve Swedish understanding of foreign cultures. In the UK, the Department of Culture, Media and Sport, created the *Through Sport England* programme to support a number of initiatives aimed at increasing participation from black and ethnic minority groups, physically or mentally disabled people, lower socio-economic groups as part of an overall social cohesion strategy. In *Finland*, the sports policy of the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture is aimed at promoting equality and tolerance and provides support for the diversity of cultures through sports. Few countries have implemented significant long-term national strategic programmes and projects, such as the *German*

project "Integration through Sport" or the Swiss "Concept for a Sport Policy in Switzerland" which considers social integration through sport activities as a transversal policy issue.

In the context of the FARE network (Football Against Racism in Europe), several countries have initiated **anti-racism campaigns** both within the world of sport as well as part of a strategy to use sport to promote tolerance in the wider societal context. Among examples of the first type of approach found throughout Europe are the *Belgian* campaign "Ne faites pas le singe – Dites non au racisme!" of the Football Association launched in 2006 or the *Polish* campaign "Let's kick racism out of the stadiums", organised by the Association "Never Again". Examples where strategies are extended also "off-the field" are found in *Norway*, where the Football Association runs a project "Fargerik Fotbal" (Colourful Football) that uses football as a tool to fight racism and other forms of discrimination. The Europe-wide campaign *Show Racism the Red Card* uses the profile and popularity of sport to educate against racism. It is important to stress that while such types of campaigns are popular instruments, they have not been evaluated as to their effectiveness as regards their goal to change mindsets and behaviour.

D. Youth: a challenging generation to target

New generations of "third culture kids" (second and third generation immigrants) have been growing and youth are reported to be the fastest growing group of mixed race in Europe; some of them feel alienated in their present home country and are looking to a "return to their cultural roots". Multiple, hybrid identities and complexities are the norm and will determine the process of dialogue and communication in the future. This can be seen through many new hybrid forms of (inter)cultural expressions being created by youth with a migration background, particularly in pop music (e.g. Hip Hop in Paris or Turkish rap in Berlin). They have also created new forms of dialogue and intercultural links through the Internet also displayed in the escalating number of youth blogs.

National approaches in Europe are mainly focused on:

- **Addressing acts of racism and discrimination.** This approach is at the heart of many of the programmes organised by publicly funded bodies, for example, the *Cyprus* Youth Board which organises youth camps with a strong focus on the theme of racism. In *Liechtenstein*, the government has recently launched the national prevention campaign "Respect – please" (2007), which was generated out of a concern for increased youth violence.
- **Bringing a greater number of young migrants into schools or less formal youth education** programmes. For example, the Secretary of State for Youth and Sports in *Portugal* provides support to 120 projects aimed at promoting the social inclusion of children and youth from vulnerable social and economic contexts, particularly from migrant and minority communities. In *Central European countries* efforts are made to raise the enrolment of Roma children into the compulsory school system.
- **Providing support for cross-border projects and exchanges.** This approach is found most commonly across Europe. For example, in July 2007 the *Belgian French Community* introduced a Government action programme "Living Together" which provides support for cross border projects such as "Faut qu'ça bouge!" or Axes Sud. In *France*, the Institut National de la Jeunesse et de l'Education Populaire is a state institute attached to the Ministry of Youth, Sports and the Voluntary Sector which is concerned with promoting European and international youth activities. Indeed, bringing together young people from different regions and countries to work on the same project can stimulate their awareness of other cultures and introduce them to new perspectives which can have a wider impact on their own communities. However, in many formalised youth programmes, classical models of proportional representation are reproduced which maintain diplomacy type interactions.

Integrated approaches to ICD play a less important role in official national youth policies; an exception is *Ireland*, where the Department for Education and Science currently develops a new intercultural strategy for youth work in cooperation with the National Youth Council.

The European Commission promotes intercultural dialogue in different fields of **European youth policy**; it tackles this subject in the framework of its priorities for participation (structural dialogue with young people on this issue), volunteering and fight against racism and xenophobia and other

forms of discrimination. A main instrument for the promotion of ICD is the EU's *Youth In Action* Programme. *Euromed Youth* is also a useful tool for the promotion of ICD; even though it has often been understood mainly as interfaith dialogue.

The youth partnership agreement between the European Commission and the Council of Europe has intercultural dialogue at its centre. It is in this framework that the European Commission supports the campaign "All Different – All Equal", but also research seminars and trainings for youth workers and young people from the EU and CoE countries as well as from third countries and in particular from the Euromed region, the Balkans, and Eastern and Central Europe.

6. FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE: CLARIFYING CONCEPTS, ASSESSING PROJECTS, UNDERSTANDING EXPERIMENTS

The results of the study show that Intercultural Dialogue as a concept has multiple meanings and that there is no uniform approach to ICD which is employed across Europe. This is mainly due to the fact that national approaches both to human or cultural rights and to diversity are determined by different historical experiences, legal and substantive contexts within which ICD concepts and strategies are being developed across EU member and neighbouring states.

In the past few years, a wealth of projects considered to be good practice have been collected in different trans-national stock-taking exercises. Their results help to clarify the meaning of intercultural dialogue, highlight recent achievements and inspire the development of new initiatives. Determining whether a project is good practice or not can be a highly subjective exercise in the absence of a clear definition of ICD and of standard indicators for evaluation and monitoring.

During the course of this study, the team examined a number of exemplary projects from which some fundamental observations emerged:

- The ***sources of good practice projects are multi-fold***: They can be generated proactively out of local circumstances and run by civil society organisations, or constructed in response to specific directives or funding programmes initiated by European or national, regional or local authorities. Individual or business initiatives which pursue social goals such as ICD are as important as publicly funded projects;
- ***Successful ICD projects are to be found in "shared spaces"***; both institutional spaces and non-institutional spaces. Within *institutional spaces* they are those which strive to ensure equality of participation by all groups at levels of both governance (making decisions) and management (execution of the project) and which *bring the activities of minorities and migrants in from the margins and into mainstream organised spheres*. An important aspect of institutional ICD activities is their potential for sustainability, i.e. not here one day, gone the next. *Non-institutional spaces* such as the neighbourhood, city streets, train stations, public parks, marketplaces etc., but also virtual environments, are important spaces for intercultural dialogue. It can be easier for people to understand how they themselves could become innovators of change, if ICD activities become part of the lived daily life experience rather than a separate activity.;
- ***Diversity can be fostered at all stages of cultural/artistic production, distribution and participation***: In the cultural field, good practices are those which involve a diversity of artists, who synthesise different sources and traditions into new works, bring the public into a conversation or trigger a change in the perception of and relationship to others. Artists, in particular, seem to be among the most important facilitators of ICD since their aspirations and passion can lead, not only to a change in attitudes, but also to a fresh, creative language in which this change is being expressed. In the heritage field successful ICD projects are those which have a dynamic or dialogical understanding of heritage and which engage both individuals and groups with a minority or migrant background in a process of interactive communication;
- There is a need for more projects which strive to ***develop intercultural competences and skills among all members of society***. Those which direct attention to the majority population are equally important as those directed to minorities/migrants. The goal of the

former is to open minds and to change the perceptions/stereotypes of the majority not only towards "others" but to also discover "otherness" in themselves;

- Projects which emerge from **trans-national cooperation activities** provide opportunities for participants to engage in dialogue process and to create new forms of expression through their common work. New communication technologies are also employed to create new cross-border spaces for dialogue;

At the heart of many successful projects is the recognition that **interactive communication processes, empowerment or the development of self-confidence in individuals, and a sense of collective responsibility** are crucial ingredients for longer term impact and for future policy and programme developments.

Based on these observations, the following definition of intercultural dialogue developed within the context of this study could be proposed for further debate:

Intercultural dialogue is a process that comprises an open and respectful exchange or interaction between individuals, groups and organisations with different cultural backgrounds or world views. Among its aims are: to develop a deeper understanding of diverse perspectives and practices; to increase participation and the freedom and ability to make choices; to foster equality; and to enhance creative processes.

In this sense, intercultural dialogue processes or encounters are to go beyond a mere 'tolerance of the other' and can involve creative abilities that convert challenges and insights into innovation processes and into new forms of expression. The "shared space" in which such processes take place can be located outside of physical spaces, situated in the media or in a virtual environment.

7. TOWARDS A COMMON STRATEGY FOR ICD

During the past decade, knowledge and understanding of an increasingly diverse demographic and sub-cultural make-up of European societies has been steadily growing. The corresponding changes in policy and research paradigms have yet to be fully implemented. In the future, they could be built upon a broad vision, where economic and social inclusion policies and policies for cultural diversity are integrated and push each other forward. This vision calls for strategies going beyond a promotion of good practice projects. European, national and local authorities and the various ICD actors of civil society could work together in a four-step approach:

- **Mapping roads:** identify exclusion or discriminatory practices and develop plans to improve socioeconomic conditions required in order for ICD processes to take place;
- **Breaking down walls:** remove barriers to equality and fight against prejudice, racism and stereotypes; introduce incentives or regulatory measures to increase the presence of individuals, their works and ideas which are not "mainstream" in political, economic, educational and cultural spheres in order to diffuse power from hitherto predominant groups;
- **Building bridges:** develop intercultural skills and competencies through e.g. educational, artistic and media programmes which could equip individuals with the necessary tools to fully and successfully engage in ICD processes; and
- **Sharing spaces:** create spaces where ideas, experiences and beliefs can be respectfully exchanged – in case of conflict, "participants can agree to disagree agreeably" – and where interactive communication can freely flow. This could result in a deeper understanding of diverse views or practices, or lead to new creative processes or forms of expression.

At what stage are we in Europe today? The findings of this study show that there are many policies and actions aimed at *Mapping Roads* and *Building Bridges* and that more efforts are needed to *Break down Walls* and to create *Shared Spaces*.

8. MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS : SHARING DIVERSITY WITHIN AND BETWEEN CULTURES

A number of areas for future action have been identified in the study:

- A. **Recognise that intercultural dialogue depends upon the full implementation of human, civic, economic, social and cultural rights**, as outlined in international and European legal instruments, into national legislative and policy frameworks. Since intercultural dialogue is not a legal category in itself, it relies on the active enforcement and monitoring of fundamental rights in practice. Specific articles of the *EU Charter of Fundamental Rights* (2000) are of particular importance to intercultural dialogue by promoting: equality, non-discrimination, cultural, religious and linguistic diversity, freedom of expression and movement, citizenship rights to economic and political participation. This shows that in the context of intercultural dialogue, universal human rights (as individual rights) and cultural rights (recognising specific and/or multiple cultural identities) are not incompatible and could be further developed.
- B. **Acknowledge intercultural dialogue at the heart of citizenship and integration strategies**. This would imply the recognition of equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for everyone, while at the same time advocating respect for diversity and interculturality as expressed in the 'unity in diversity' concept of European citizenship. In this context, the expression of values based on different cultural and religious traditions, world views or lifestyles could become a subject for dialogue rather than a pretext for exclusion or assimilation.
- C. **Approach intercultural dialogue as a transversal issue which is part of a complex system of governance based on diversity, equality and participation**. This requires strategic efforts which bring together policy fields addressing: human rights and citizenship, integration of minorities, immigration, social affairs, employment, health, security, social and labour affairs, sectors such as culture, education, sport, and youth. This would also imply the introduction of mechanisms to facilitate cooperation between different levels of government – European, national, regional/local. Designated cross-sector partnerships with civil society actors are equally important as they have been driving forces to promote ICD long before it became a political priority. At the moment, NGOs play a key role where formal ICD structures, policies or programmes are less developed. They require additional support in the form of grants for activities and/or basic infrastructure, particularly in South and Central/Eastern Europe.
- D. **Develop strategies which recognise intercultural dialogue as a process of interactive communication within and between cultures** which aims to develop a deeper understanding of diverse perspectives and practices; to increase participation and the freedom and ability to make choices; to foster equality; and to enhance creative processes. In particular, such strategies could be built upon the identification of specific ICD barriers within countries such as incidents of discrimination against "visible minorities" or specific groups (e.g. the Roma or Muslims) and could be combined with existing programmes to promote trans-border cooperation and dialogue within and beyond Europe.
- E. **Intercultural dialogue depends upon the opening up of institutional structures**. This applies to all institutions regardless of whether they are operating in specific sectors. In the field of *education* this would mean increased efforts to diversity teaching staff, to re-examine educational resources such as textbooks, to foster multi-perspective and multi-language learning, avoid segregated schools which separate children on the basis of their social or cultural origin. ICD approaches in *arts and heritage* institutions could mean diversifying governing boards and staff as well as the content of programmes by involving artists with different cultural backgrounds and artistic visions. Institutions can create shared spaces which encourage dialogue and cross-cultural mixing and engage the public in programme development, encouraging people to become creators rather than only consumers of identity.
- F. **Encourage the active participation of the media/culture industries in ICD**. A three-fold strategy could be developed which addresses diversity in: staff policies and governing boards; audits and codes of conduct; and content production and coverage of intercultural and inter-faith issues reflecting European guidelines. The public is an important resource to involve in the creation of such programmes. Industry representatives and public policy makers are encouraged to work together to find creative ways to implement the UNESCO Convention on the diversity of cultural expressions.

- G. ***Integrate the development of intercultural competencies and skills as part of an overall political vision or national strategy on life-long learning.*** Such a strategy would involve the production of special resources such as manuals, toolkits, glossaries to assist teachers at the kindergarten, primary and secondary school levels, the introduction of intercultural modules at the university level for different professional fields, such as journalism or heritage management, and programmes to 'train trainers' in intercultural literacy and mediation.
- H. ***Strengthen ICD in EU Neighbourhood policies*** and conduct an evidence-based evaluation of successes / failures in present and past schemes; the latter is to be developed together with specialists from neighbouring countries. There is also a need to further clarify the potential role of ICD in other development strategies and policies.
- I. ***Further expand EU cooperation with other European and international bodies.*** For example through initiatives to monitor ICD and cultural diversity policies in a new framework agreement of cooperation with the Council of Europe in the culture sector or through creating links between EU and UN Years or designated days which focus on issues relevant to cultural diversity, tackling racism and improving intercultural understanding.
- J. ***Establish a clear concept/definition of intercultural dialogue.*** This is especially important for the future development of European, national, regional/local policies, strategies and funding programmes to promote intercultural dialogue. It will help avoid potential misinterpretations of their objectives and make it easier to evaluate their success.
- K. ***Implement and harmonise evaluation methods for ICD programmes and activities,*** including quality criteria and indicators to assess their impact, taking account of the dynamics at the heart of such processes. Innovation, institutional and attitudinal change as well as sustainability are to be introduced as criteria in the evaluation of intercultural projects.
- L. ***Improve research methodologies for intercultural comparisons.*** Further improvements in the comparability of ICD related research and statistics are required. This could be achieved through a support programme for in-depth trans-national investigations (e.g. on the impact of different ICD policies/programmes) and through the creation of a new *Eurostat* working group open to independent researchers and specialists from minority communities.