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The Convention on Diversity of Cultural Expressions (CDCE), adopted by UNESCO in 2005 and entered into force in 2007, has so far received the membership of 133 States and of the European Union (EU). The CDCE recognizes the specificity of cultural goods and services (which should not be seen as simple commodities), it allows States to pursue cultural policies and it ensures that they contribute to the diversity of cultural expressions. In addition, the CDCE recognizes culture as an important aspect for sustainable development. It strengthens international cultural cooperation through the exchange of expertise and information between Parties, as well as the setting up of an International Fund for Cultural Diversity (UNESCO 2005).

During the building of the CDCE, a transnational network of cultural groups was created: the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD). The network becomes a stakeholder of the global governance of the cultural industries and an international actor within the legal framework of the CDCE. According to the Article 11 of the latter, “Parties acknowledge
the fundamental role of civil society in protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions. Parties shall encourage the active participation of civil society in their efforts to achieve the objectives of the Convention”. The IFCCD totals so far 43 national Coalitions for Cultural Diversity\(^1\) grouping more than 600 cultural professional organizations.

On the one hand, given that the sociopolitical building of CDCE is based on the implication of several actors (Vlassis 2014), the implementation process seems to get an impact on many actors beyond the natural recipients of an international policy tool, namely the States. On the other hand, the CDCE implementation seems to be very interesting because it is a fragmented process involving policy actions beyond the normative frame of the CDCE (Vlassis 2011).

The building and the implementation of international legal tools signify that the international anarchy - the absence of global authority above the States (Battistella 2012)\(^2\), distinctive property of International Relations - could now be institutionalized in order to produce regulations through international public policies (Petiteville 2009). The adoption of the CDCE supposes the rise of a regulatory interdependence of actors in the cultural sector that aims to structure the international cooperation.

The starting point of my paper deals with a recent issue of the discipline of International Relations, namely the construction and the implementation of international norms. An abundant literature - from the international regimes theory and the constructivist approach to the global governance studies – describes new ways of multilateralism and of international regulation (Young 2002; Carbera 2011). It focuses on the conditions of international cooperation and the impact of international norms on the selfish interests of States (Weiss 2011), as well as on the contribution of international organizations and of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to disseminate and to build new international norms (Ripinsky et Van den Bosche 2007; Willetts 2011; Oestreich 2012). However, the *problematique* is that the majority of studies have not taken into account on the one hand if the implementation of international norms influences the behavior

---

\(^{1}\) 16 Coalitions in Africa, 13 Coalitions in Europe, 11 Coalitions in Americas, 3 Coalitions in Asia-Pacific.

\(^{2}\) Anarchy does not mean the absence of a global government *per se*. The government is based on the units of the system instead. In other words, it means the establishment of a « governance without government » and of regulatory mechanisms that do not emanate from a central authority.
of NGOs and their political agenda and on the other hand, if these actors can affect the evolution of the implementation of the norms, prescribed by an international legal instrument.

I argue that any building and implementation of an international policy tool brings about changes on the preferences and strategies of the recipients (Smith and Petiteville 2006; Lascoumes and Le Galès 2010). In order to explore the dynamics of the CDCE, my proposal focuses on a key actor, the IFCCD and especially on the role of French and Canadian Coalitions for Cultural Diversity. My proposal has three main objectives: a. Assess the degree of changes resulting to the behavior of the Coalitions through the building and the implementation of the CDCE; b. Point out how the IFCCD seek to use the CDCE, by interpreting its provisions and by including new challenges in the CDCE implementation process; c. Explore their ability to act in common and with other stakeholders.

In order to explore the link between the CDCE and the non-state actors, firstly I propose to illustrate the conditions of the political construction of the international tool. Secondly, the CDCE building is going to lead us to understand the ways that the implementation of the CDCE influences the practices and the interests of non-state actors such as the Coalitions.

1. Building an international tool and the quest of recipients.

A. The international trade integration and the transnationalization of culture groups.

The implementation of international norms for cultural industries has risen since the early 1990s. This is based on two major issues: a. the “cultural exception” affecting cultural goods and services in international economic exchanges; b. the link between culture and development, formulated within the UNESCO (Gagné 2005; Musitelli 2006).

During the 1990s, the US administration sought to tackle the financial and regulatory measures of countries for their audiovisual services and to include the latter in several trade and investment agreements such as the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI-OECD). However, followed by culture groups and several
countries, France and Canada defended the cultural exception in order to insist on the fact that cultural goods and services cannot be treated as commodities and to exclude the audiovisual sector from the trade agreements. On the one hand, the audiovisual sector was included within the GATS, but the European Union, the Canada and other countries excluded audiovisual from the negotiations and did not submit to the restrictions of the organization. On the other hand, during the negotiations for the MAI, the French government faced a widespread social unrest against the negotiations and decided to withdraw from the negotiations in October 1998.

In the late 1990s, the cultural exception was abandoned and the more inclusive “cultural diversity” gradually came to dominate the discourse of the actors. Jean Musitelli explains that the diversity of cultural expressions was built by exceeding the cultural exception arisen from the trade agreements and by the link between culture and development theorized within UNESCO (Musitelli 2005). French and Canadian governments, cultural professional organizations, several expert groups and the *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie* (OIF) took the leadership of a wide initiative for the international recognition of the importance of cultural policies for the protection and the promotion of diversity of cultural expressions and the establishment of an international legal instrument on the cultural industries.

During the battle against the MAI and the possible inclusion of the culture sector in the negotiations agenda, the Quebec Coalition for the cultural diversity was created in spring 1998 by the main culture associations of Quebec. Since the fall of 1999, all the major Canadian associations for cultural industries have established the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity. Moreover, the SACD (*Société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques*), the ARP (*Association Auteurs, Réalisateurs et Producteurs*) and the SFA (*Syndicat français des artistes interprètes*) put in place a Vigilance Committee for the MAI (*Comité de Vigilance pour l’AMI*) in February 1998.

---

3 Since the late 1970s, UNESCO has explored the debate on the links between culture and development seeking to become the main international arena for the expression of the concept of cultural development. The organization has aimed to make a change from a strictly economic conception on development to a more enlarged approach, integrating other dimensions such as culture. Several UNESCO’s meetings and normative tools demonstrate the effort to diffuse cultural development at international level and to make the international community aware of the importance to implement policies on this issue: the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (1974); the World Conference on cultural policies (MONDIAACULT) in 1982; the World Decade for the cultural development (1988-1997); the Report “Our creative diversity” by the World Commission on Culture and development (1996); the International Conference on cultural policies for the development in Stockholm (1998); the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001).
At the domestic level, the goal of the Canadian Coalition dealt with diffusing its ideas and informing the cultural sector and the public authorities regarding the issue of cultural diversity. At the international level, the Coalition claimed to establish platforms in order to coordinate the culture associations and disseminate the main interests of the organization, namely the importance of cultural policies and the specificity of cultural products and services regarding the trade agreements. From 10 to 13 September 2001, the Canadian Coalition organized an International Meeting of Cultural Professional Associations and the main issue of the meeting dealt with “Cultural Diversity, cultural policies and international trade agreements”. The meeting brought together 40 culture organizations from ten countries⁴, as well as representatives of the Canadian and Quebec governments and experts on the issue. Besides, in early 2004, the French culture groups abandoned the structure of Vigilance Committee and decided to create a French Coalition for cultural diversity. « Le Comité de vigilance était créé pour les négociations sur l’AMI, mais ça faisait plutôt une réunion des syndicalistes. C’était un problème de nom. Le nom « Coalition » a marqué notre appartenance à un mouvement mondial, nous, dès le début, on défendait les mêmes idées »⁵.

B. The Coalitions and the building of the CDCE: mutual legitimation

The French and Canadian Coalitions, through their financial, social and political resources, ensure the leadership and the coordination of the Coalitions movement. They seek to build alliances and to establish platforms in order to diffuse their ideas, enhance their action and assert their interests. They put in place three platforms seeking to transform the network of coalitions as a major actor of the issue of cultural diversity: a. In March 2003, the Vigilance Committee and the nine existing Coalitions decided to establish an International Liaison Committee among them, in order to coordinate and to facilitate the emergence of coalitions in other countries; b. In September 2007, the International Liaison Committee was replaced by the International Federation of the Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD), created by 42 national coalitions for cultural diversity grouping in the aggregate more than 600 cultural professional organizations representing creators, artists, independent producers, distributors, broadcasters and editors in the publishing, motion picture, television, music, performing arts and visual art fields. The Federation is incorporated in Canada and has its Secretariat in Montreal. The French Coalition

⁴ Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Chile, South Korea, Denmark, Spain, France, Mexico, Poland.
⁵ Interview, French Coalition for Cultural Diversity.
ensures the representation of the IFCCD at the UNESCO in Paris. The IFCCD seeks to participate in the implementation of the CDCE, supports the ratification process, strengthens the participation of civil society and put pressure to the public authorities against the liberalization of the cultural sector; c. Instigated by the French Coalition, European Coalitions launched the European Committee of Coalitions in January 2005 in order to make pressure within the European authorities regarding the issue of cultural diversity.

In addition, the Coalitions are mobilized within several international bodies and institutional arenas: national governments, the International Network on Cultural Policy\(^6\), the OIF, UNESCO and the EU. Their mode of action is very similar to the action of interest groups (Grossman and Saurugger 2006: 11). They have a wide repertoire of action in order to promote their ideas and influence the process of decision-making. We can distinguish three main mechanisms of action (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 200, Bostrom and Tamm Hallstrom 2010); (Ryfman 2002: 321) based on social, discursive, political and financial resources:

A. Organization of International Meetings. The first mechanism of action is an important operation in order to encourage on the one hand the creation of new national coalitions and to promote cultural diversity to the public and the medias and on the other hand to enhance international visibility of coalitions, the reputation and the socialization of their ideas. The French Coalition – supported by the French Ministry of Culture – organized the Second International Meeting of Cultural Professional Organizations in Paris (from 2 to 4 February 2003). The meeting brought together nearly 100 associations from 32 countries. The meeting was marked by the presence of several political figures, such as Jacques Chirac and Koichiro Matssura, General Director of UNESCO. In his opening speech, Jacques Chirac proposed the adoption of a Convention on Cultural Diversity and invited the Executive Board of UNESCO to include this proposition on the agenda of the fall 2003 General Conference, with the objective to be adopted by 2005. The Third Meeting, organized by the Korean Coalition for Cultural Diversity (1-4 June 2004, Seoul), brought together 400 organizations from 57 countries, and the Fourth Meeting, organized by the Spanish Coalition (9-11 May 2005, Madrid) gathered 170 organizations from 60

---

\(^6\) Instigated by Canada in June 1998, the International Network on Cultural Policy was an informal, international venue where national ministers responsible for culture explored and exchanged on new and emerging cultural policy issues and developed strategies to promote cultural diversity. The last meeting of the Network took place in 2007.
countries. In the Final Declarations, cultural professional organizations claimed the adoption of an international tool on diversity of cultural expressions, as well as the recognition of cultural policies and the specificity of cultural goods and services.

B. The organization of conferences/seminars and the publication of a newsletter. The second mechanism of action seeks to offer specific expertise and to increase awareness of the interested actors. The Canadian Coalition for cultural diversity, with collaboration of IFCCD, publishes an electronic newsletter providing updated information on the issue of cultural diversity and trade negotiations and sending to more than 700 professional organizations in 90 countries. In addition, the Coalitions organized with UNESCO two seminars (side events) aiming to persuade ambassadors regarding the need to support the adoption of an international convention. The first seminar, entitled “Why should UNESCO adopt a convention on cultural diversity?” took place one month before the 32th General Conference of UNESCO on 12 September 2003 and the second on “The challenges of the future convention” was held on the eve of the first meeting of governmental experts for analyzing the draft of the convention (14 September 2004). In addition, on the margins of the 10th Summit of the OIF (Ouagadougou, 26 and 27 November 2004), the French and Canadian Coalitions organized a meeting of cultural professional organizations of the member countries of the OIF. The purpose of these meetings was to inform the participants of the impact of trade negotiations on cultural industries and the evolution of the issue of cultural diversity.

C. The third mechanism of action is lobbying, internal pressure and diffusion of Coalitions position papers within international organizations and national governments. The Liaison Committee is an insider within the international negotiations. With the status of observer, it attended meetings of intergovernmental experts for the preparation of the CDCE and defended its positions during the negotiations. Besides, it was regularly invited to participate at the meetings of the International Network on Cultural Policy. Further, when cultural policies are threatened by attempts of liberalization, the French and Canadian Coalitions provide support to professionals, sending letters of disapproval at the national governments (South Korea, Mexico) and organizing press conferences (Morocco).
In conclusion, Coalitions emerge as a principal stakeholder of the CDCE’s building through which they aim to defend their major interests such as the international recognition of cultural policies. Moreover, the participation of the culture groups within the CDCE building is part of a political exchange that strengthens the legitimacy of the CDCE. The international trade integration had as consequence the emergence of the movement of Coalitions. Further, the CDCE’s building required the transnationalization of culture groups as social partner for the legitimacy of an international tool for the global governance on cultural industries (Batterlson 2006). Without an international tool on cultural diversity, cultural policy is strongly threatened by trade agreements; without the cooperation and the active involvement of the Coalitions, the CDCE has no social recipient.

2. The implementation of the CDCE: Change of scale and return towards the national sphere

By the entry into force of CDCE, the regulation of cultural industries returned to the regional and national levels. Firstly, since the mid of 2000’s and the structural crisis of WTO (Abbas 2005), the United States have preferred bilateralism and eclectic multilateralism. During the period between 2004 and 2011, USA administrations signed 16 bilateral trade agreements7, including provisions for the liberalization of cultural and audiovisual sector (Richieri-Hanania 2009: 210-220). Secondly, within the sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee of the CDCE and the Conference of Parties8, the interface “culture-trade” and the implementation of articles 20 and 21 related to the link between the CDCE and the trade agreements9 remain marginalized among the priorities of States Parties (Vlassis 2011, 2012).

---

7 Chile, Singapore, Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa-Rica, Dominican Republic, Australia, Bahrain, Oman, Morocco, Peru, South Korea, Panama, Colombia.
8 The functions of the Intergovernmental Committee is to promote the objectives of the Convention and to encourage and to monitor the implementation thereof; to prepare and submit for approval by the Conference of Parties, upon its request, the operational guidelines for the implementation of the provisions of the Convention. The Conference of Parties is the plenary and supreme body of the CDCE.
9 V. Relationship to other instruments
Article 20 – Relationship to other treaties: mutual supportiveness, complementarity and non-subordination
1. Parties recognize that they shall perform in good faith their obligations under this Convention and all other treaties to which they are parties. Accordingly, without subordinating this Convention to any other treaty, (a) they shall foster mutual supportiveness between this Convention and the other treaties to which they are parties; and (b) when interpreting and applying the other treaties to which they are parties or when entering into other international obligations, Parties shall take into account the relevant provisions of this Convention.
The movement of Coalitions and especially the French and Canadian Coalitions are moving on to national and European sphere where the institutional and policy evolutions affect strongly their interests. Therefore, due to a change of scale, the activities of Coalitions are dominated by concerns regarding national and regional issues; their recent activities reveal the reduced capacity of the implementation of the CDCE for integrating the interests and visions of the involved actors, but also the unequal resources of Coalitions and the attachment of the latter to the national sphere, despite their transnational structure.

A. Protocol on Cultural Cooperation and persistence of an old split

The European Commission included a Protocol on Cultural Cooperation in the appendix of the Free Trade Agreements (FTA) with the five Caribbean countries (CARIFORUM) signed on 15 October 2008 and with South Korea signed on 15 October 2009. The protocol sets out the main provisions of the CDCE and allows the inclusion of a preamble in which it is stated the States that have not yet ratified the CDCE consent to do it as soon as possible. The protocol explicitly recognizes the dual and specific nature of cultural goods and services and excludes them from the main body of the FTA. It seeks to promote the circulation of artists and to encourage audiovisual coproduction (Loisen and Deville 2011).

However, the inclusion of the Protocol in FTA gave rise to worries from the part of culture organizations. The French Coalition for Cultural Diversity (FCCD) and the French government were reluctant vis-à-vis the initiative of the European Commission, while insisting that the protocol is not consistent with the spirit of the CDCE and the commitments of Commission in favor of cultural diversity. In this regard, they complained that the European Commission sought,

2. Nothing in this Convention shall be interpreted as modifying rights and obligations of the Parties under any other treaties to which they are parties.

Article 21 – International consultation and coordination

Parties undertake to promote the objectives and principles of this Convention in other international forums. For this purpose, Parties shall consult each other, as appropriate, bearing in mind these objectives and principles.

under the pretext of implementing the CDCE, to bring the cultural industries in the agenda of the FTA and to treat them as a “trade-off” for granting concessions in other economic areas (Vlassis 2010). In addition, in collaboration with the FCCD, the French government published a report (Communication de la France 2009) focusing on concrete proposals about EU foreign cultural policy. According to the report, the European Commission had to establish independent teams of negotiations - more adapted to the specific concerns of the cultural sector - and to make a clear distinction between the negotiation on trade agreements and the cultural cooperation protocols.

Even if the EU has ratified the CDCE and the European Commission has participated to the negotiations for the CDCE, representing the State members, its discourse constantly creates a big distrust among European culture groups. Because of its dual discourse between economic regulation of broadcasting sector and the establishment of European audiovisual policy (Littoz-Monnet 2007), the relationship between the European Commission and the European and especially French culture groups is based on suspicions dating back to the debate on the Television without Frontiers Directive in 1989 and to the controversy surrounding the cultural exception in 1993 (Littoz-Monet 2003, Vlassis 2013).

B. The return of the exception culturelle and the primacy of national considerations

Over the last five years, the agenda of the IFCCD has been dominated by the issue of the place of cultural industries in the light of the negotiations of FTA between Canada and EU, United States and EU, as well as of the multilateral negotiations on services within the WTO. Launched in 2009, the negotiations between the EU and Canada for a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) raised many concerns from the European and Canadian Coalitions, as well as from parliamentarians about the place of cultural industries in the agenda of the agreement. In late March 2013, the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity presented Canada's position. It claimed that Canada and EU pursued the goal of a cultural exception, but the EU included a limited exemption for audiovisual services, while the Canadian exemption dealt "with all cultural industries and with all the relative chapters of trade agreements”\(^{11}\). In this regard, Canada seeks to adopt a new approach to cultural exemption including three elements: a) the preamble of the

\(^{11}\) « Cultural exemption: reaching an agreement with the Europeans », Canadian Coalition for cultural diversity, 27 March 2013.
Agreement would make explicit reference to the CDCE and the reasons why the two trading partners agree on a cultural exemption; b) Canada includes its usual definition of cultural industries; c) the cultural exemption would be required in each section of the Agreement where Quebec and Canada have cultural policies and measures.

In addition, in June 2013, the United States and the EU have agreed to deepen their economic relations by agreeing to open negotiations for the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on trade and investment. Similarly, the Obama administration and the EU aim to launch plurilateral trade negotiations in the services sector within WTO including 21 economies.

A major issue of the negotiations is based on the inclusion of audiovisual services, and especially the non-linear audiovisual services¹² in the negotiating mandate of the European Commission, and by extension in the negotiating agenda. Following an initiative of the French Coalition for Cultural Diversity (FCCD), the European Coalitions for Cultural Diversity have sent two letters to José Manuel Barroso in January 2012 and in April 2013, reminding him "the commitment by the EU to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions and urged the exclusion of the cultural and audiovisual sectors of trade negotiations with the United States". Similarly, the FCCD have sent a letter to the President of the European Commission in late July 2012, followed by a contribution of the European Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (20 September 2012) in the context of the consultation of the European Commission on a future trade agreement between the US and the EU. Further, in early June 2013, the FCCD organized a debate in Paris, attended by the French Minister of Culture, media professionals and calling for the cultural exception in the trade negotiations between the EU and the U.S. Besides, the President of the FCCD, Pascal Rogard, addressed letters to Laurent Fabius, French Minister of Foreign Affairs (15 November 2012), to the French Minister of European Affairs (12 December 2012), and to the French President François Hollande about the issue of the cultural exception.

In this sense, we need to make two provisional conclusions: a. from the GATS negotiations until the current mobilization, cultural exception is supposed to be a discourse of ideological convergence combining the interests of film industry professionals and those of the French.

¹² Linear audiovisual services such as traditional television services, DVD or theaters, ‘push’ content to viewers. Non-linear audiovisual services, such as video on demand, where viewers ‘pull’ content from a network.
government; it is a political discourse with a double vocation, embodying the relation “give and take” (Risse-Kappen 1991) between the French governments and film professional groups. It is obvious that the institutional link between French government and cinema groups – illustrating a neo-corporatist structure (Depetris 2008, Vlassis 2014) - has a considerable impact on the orientations of the FCCD; b. the FCCD, with wide financial, social and political resources, is an important actor and seeks to define the priorities of the movement of Coalitions at the European level, highlighting an asymmetric action within Coalitions.

C. Asymmetrical resources within the Coalitions

Since the emergence of the movement of Coalitions, the interface “trade-culture” has remained at the core of the political discourse of coalitions, while other issues included in the CDEC such as the development of cultural industries in less advanced countries or the strengthening of links between culture and sustainable development has been marginalized within their agenda.

Therefore, assuming the dense exchange of resources and interdependence among the Coalitions, this does not seem to exclude the question of hierarchy. Behind the International Federation of Coalitions, marked by the emergence of universal values (cultural diversity) and the construction of a common discourse, we encounter asymmetric capacities and unequal distribution of resources. French and Canadian Coalitions can play on multiple registers: the operational, the dissemination of an idea, the internal and external lobbying. The French and Canadian Coalitions - relied on financial (contributions, funding from the Canadian, Quebec and French government) and social resources (representation of all professional organizations in culture of a country), their partisan neutrality, and a wide repertoire of action - is a major player within the movement and the main contact of UNESCO and national governments. Therefore, from the beginning, the discourse of coalitions has been marked by concerns about the "trade-culture" interface, while the development of cultural industries in less developed countries, the strengthening of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, or even the question of the status of the artist – big concern of Coalitions in Africa and Latin America - remain in the margin of the priorities of the movement or are completely ignored. The fact that the French and Canadian Coalitions occupy a central position within the coalitions’ movement is well illustrated by the number of websites hosted by the Coalitions. Mid-2013, among the 43 Coalitions for Cultural Diversity, only twelve
have a website (South Africa, France, Canada, Chile, Togo, Paraguay, Peru, Austria, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom). Moreover, only the websites of the IFCCD, the French and the Canadian Coalitions - translated into three languages (English, French, and Spanish) - contain reports, studies and specific publications, as well as records and information on the history (archives) of the movement and on the past and upcoming activities.

To this can be added that the production of expertise, the putting pressure on national governments and international forums, the organization of events and activities are expensive and therefore inaccessible to the majority of culture organizations of Africa, Asia or Latin America (Smouts 1997). On the one hand, during the sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee and of the Conference of Parties to the CDCE, the delegations of the IFCCD is largely composed of members from the French and Canadian Coalitions; on the other hand, the implementation of the CDCE does not deal with the major concerns of the two Coalitions and therefore, the delegations of the IFCCD are constantly fewer. As highlighted Charles Vallerard, president of the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity and General Secretary of the IFCCD at the last session of the Conference of the Parties held in mid-June 2013 in Paris, "on doit passer au cœur du débat, il y a plein de sentiers où on ne se réfère pas, comme l’accord plurilatéral sur les services ou l’accord de libre-échange entre États-Unis et Union européenne; remettez alors le vrai débat dans cette salle et la société civile revient" (CEIM, 2013).

Therefore, we should admit the assumption that the movement of Coalitions is subject to hierarchies on the distribution of resources and of capacities for action. From this point of view, the most important distinction regarding the issue of distribution of resources is probably "much less between state and non-state" than between those who can set up forums and international networks and influence how things work, and the others (Pouligny 2001).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the IFCCD is a major actor for the building of the CDCE, while the implementation of the latter creates a lack of interest from the Coalitions and a strategic turning towards the national sphere. On the one hand, the link between the CDCE and the IFCCD should be understood in interaction with other actors and especially with the national governments and
on the other hand, we need to take into account the political context in which resources and strategies unfold (Hasseunteufel 2012: 211):

a. **Reciprocal legitimation:** The action of transnational networks seems essential for strengthening the ‘cultural diversity’ within international arenas and persuading other involved actors. The CDCE includes some main principles of Canadian and French Coalitions, such as the importance of cultural policies and the specificity of cultural goods and services. Moreover, the inclusion of the Coalitions within the CDCE building is part of a political exchange that aims to reinforce the CDCE and its legitimacy. Until the CDCE entering into force, the Coalitions are a social partner of the Convention giving bottom-up support. In other words, the CDCE offers legitimacy and recognition to the actions of Coalitions, and without the involvement of the latters the Convention has no social recipient.

b. **Asymmetry of resources and control of the agenda:** Behind the IFCCD, we encounter asymmetric capabilities and unequal distribution of resources. The French and Canadian Coalitions, with a wide range of resources, control tightly the agenda of the movement, as well as the orientation of strategies. The turning of strategies to regional and national sphere is due to the weak integration of the CDCE, to the change of institutional scale, as well as to the leadership of the French and Canadian Coalitions.

c. **Circumstantial transnationalization:** The CDCE is a tool of cooperation between involved actors, providing a frame of reference for further negotiations of all kinds in the question of the diversity of cultural expressions. It is not an instrument from which policies are directly implemented and the integrative process among actors is weak. Therefore, the transnationalization of the IFCCD is circumstantial and limited. Due to the CDCE building and implementation, the culture groups created new transnational structures for defending their interests and included the term of “cultural diversity” and the CDCE in their agenda. However, Canadian and especially French Coalitions are rooted in the state context because their primary concern is the preservation of distributive resources and regulatory power of national governments. Since the implementation of the CDCE and the change of scale in the priorities of governments, the strategies of French and Canadian Coalitions have turned towards the regional and national level in order to
defend their interests, such as the importance of cultural policies and the specificity of cultural goods and services. In this regard, on the one hand, the institutional link between governments and culture groups is essential in order to understand the resources of the Coalitions and the turning of their strategies. On the other hand, even if the challenge of IFCCD could be supranational and international, the target remains largely national (Della Porta and Kriesi 2009: 3).
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