CULPOL COMMENTARY 3

CULTURAL DIPLOMACY FROM THE BOTTOM-UP

Matea Senkić

Content

Abstract

The concept of cultural diplomacy has traditionally been understood as a governmental practice conducted in the national interest. However, the possibilities of person-to-person communication have changed; non-state actors have emerged as significant players in the global sphere, assuming roles that previously belonged to states. Taking into account the European Union's (EU) policy framework, as well as EU activities concerning the role of culture in its international relations, this paper focuses on new approaches to cultural diplomacy: the proliferation of non-state actors; as well as the shift from self-promotion to the promotion of dialogue, the building of trust, the pursuit of conflict resolution and the establishment of bonds between individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds. These new approaches are also highlighted through the analysis of selected projects that serve as good examples of *new* directions in cultural diplomacy.

Key words: cultural diplomacy, international cultural relations, international cultural cooperation, non-state actors, new cultural diplomacy, bottom-up approach

Introduction

Contemporary social, economic, cultural and technological changes have led to both a rapid dissemination of information and a new mode of global mobility, thus obliging cultural diplomacy, as traditionally understood, to adapt to a new global environment. Non-state actors have emerged as significant players in the global sphere, changing the focus of cultural diplomacy from the practice of informing foreign audiences to that of engaging such audiences, as well as pursuing new objectives and means. According to Melissen (2015, p.23), today's diplomacy takes place in an international environment that can no longer be described as exclusively state-centric, where diplomats are having a stake in one of many different forms of trans-national relations. Cultural diplomacy, "defined in a large part by national governments as a prime example of '*soft power*'"[1], or the ability to persuade through culture, values and ideas, used to be considered an exclusively governmental practice, conducted in the national interest (Gienow-Hechtand and Donfried, 2010, p.21)[2]. Today, cultural diplomacy is understood as a particular form or dimension of public diplomacy (a wider covering term). However, as a result of this close relationship, the boundary between the two modes of diplomacy has become rather blurred. Public diplomacy is considered more of a citizen-oriented form of diplomacy than that of the traditional diplomatic model. Targets are no longer other governments, but a diverse array of national and global audiences and publics (Ang, Isar, and Mar, 2015, p.368). The University of Southern California (USC) Center on Public Diplomacy defines public diplomacy as "the public, interactive dimension of diplomacy which is not only global in nature, but also involves a multitude of actors and networks. It is a key mechanism through which nations foster mutual trust and productive relationships and has become crucial to building a secure global environment."[3]

Considering the potential contribution of culture to the processes of peace building, the concept of cultural diplomacy has been expanded to include 'exchanges of ideas, information, art and other aspects of culture among nations and their people in order to foster mutual understanding' (Cummings, 2003, p.1). The complexity of culture, reflected in the variety of available definitions describing culture as a phenomenon, is

---

1Soft power is a concept developed by the political scientist Joseph S. Nye (2004) to describe the ability of a country to persuade others to do what it wants through appeal and attraction and without force or coercion (hard power). A defining feature of soft power is that it is non-coercive; the currency of soft power is culture, political values and foreign policies.

2 E.g. in the early stages of the Cold War, the U.S. government became the key propagandist of American values and consumer goods focusing on arts, academic exchange and cultural self-presentation (Gienow-Hechtand and Donfried, 2010). According to Cynthia Schneider (2003) popular culture was the arena in which the West gained a very decisive advantage in the East-West conflict and it was very important to the outcome of the Cold War.

3*What is PD?* USC Center on Public Diplomacy. [online] Available at: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd (Accessed 10 February 2017).

the basis for a broad variety of cultural diplomacy objectives and interests. Today, cultural diplomacy operates, on the one hand, as a promotional activity conducted in the national interest, and, on the other hand, as a practice which enhances inter-cultural dialogue, promotes cultural diversity, and strengthens peace and solidarity between peoples. Cultural diplomacy programmes, at both the national and multilateral level, are trying to tackle diverse issues such as social cohesion, racism, inequality, discrimination against minorities and migrants, the cultural dimension of inter-religious issues, post conflict resolution, etc. (Green, 2010, p.7). In recent years, the European Union (EU) has put a strong emphasis on cultural diplomacy in its foreign policy, culture being seen as an essential tool for the delivery of important social and economic benefits, both within and outside the EU. Thus, the classic model of cultural diplomacy as the activity of a nation state, conducted bilaterally, has been expanded in two main directions (Green, 2010, p.2): (i) through the arrival of new players, such as non-state actors; and (ii) through the development of a multilateral approach which is particularly recognized and encouraged by EU strategies, programmes and official policies.

According to La Porte (2012, p.4), non-state actors are becoming important actors in contemporary cultural diplomacy, often assuming roles that previously belonged to states. In today's society, which is facing many rapid social, political, economic and cultural changes, effective cultural diplomacy requires new tools to ensure the efficacy of intercultural dialogue and interaction. For such reasons, the traditional mode of cultural diplomacy is currently facing important challenges, new approaches being required for the development of new and effective modes of cultural diplomacy.

Taking into account the wider framework and trends of public and cultural diplomacy, this analytical commentary will look into how the EU has framed its discourse and related activities concerning the role of culture in its international relations. Following new trends in EU cultural diplomacy, the commentary will present project examples of cultural diplomacy from the bottom-up.

Cultural Diplomacy: broadening the concept

The semantic implications of the term 'cultural diplomacy' have broadened considerably over the years, today applying to the various practices supporting purposeful cultural cooperation (Ang, Isar, and Mar, 2015, p.366). Today, the term has come to be interchangeably used with other terms such as international cultural relations, international cultural exchange, international cultural cooperation, public diplomacy, people's/citizen diplomacy, as well as branding and propaganda. This semantic confusion arises from the fact that cultural diplomacy is very different from other sorts of diplomatic interaction. According to Gienow-Hecht and Donfried (2010, p.13), cultural diplomacy doesn't simply entail the government-to-government communication inherent to other sorts of diplomatic interaction, but communication

between both the governments and citizens of foreign countries. The broad field of cultural diplomacy can be described by referring to the following definition: "Cultural Diplomacy may best be described as a course of actions, which are based on and utilise the exchange of ideas, values, traditions and other aspects of culture or identity, whether to strengthen relationships, enhance socio-cultural cooperation, promote national interests and beyond; Cultural Diplomacy can be practiced by either the public sector, private sector or civil society" (Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, 2017).[4] Thus, the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy emphasises that the ultimate goal of cultural diplomacy is the promotion of peace and stability through intercultural relations.

In order to distinguish cultural relations from cultural diplomacy, former cultural diplomat Richard Arndt used the role of government as the criteria for his delineation, distinguishing between cultural relations that "grow naturally and organically without government intervention" and "cultural diplomacy that involves formal diplomats in the service of national governments who support national interests" (Arndt in Gienow-Hecht and Donfried, 2010, pp.13-14). These definitions quite explicitly link diplomatic practice to both the role played by governments and the achievement of policy objectives. According to Rivera (2015, p.11), cultural diplomacy utilises cultural content in its programming, and takes an "advocacy" approach to support policy objectives and advance national interests. On the other side, the approach of cultural relations goes far deeper than the advocacy of public and cultural diplomacy. Cultural relations focus on achieving a better understanding amongst different peoples, inviting a deeper level of engagement with "others" than "promotional cultural diplomacy". Thus, supporting national interests can only be an indirect by-product of the trust, understanding, and relationships developed through cultural relations (Rivera, 2015, pp.11-13).

Although cultural diplomacy is sometimes linked with promotional activities and cultural propaganda, it differs from cultural propaganda in terms of its purpose. Jora (2013, p.50) suggests that cultural diplomacy should be based on the principles of dialogue, not monologue, and that effective cultural diplomacy is all about building trust. On the other hand, cultural relations that take place outside of a governmental context also aim at building mutual trust and understanding; thus, this could be identified as the common purpose of any kind of cultural diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy has become inseparable from cultural relations, issues from the grassroots of civil society having become "the bread and butter of diplomacy at the highest level" (Melissen, 2015, p.24).

The global dissemination of information, ideas, culture, and the widening participation of public non-state actors in international relations lead Melissen (2005)

---

[4]*What is Cultural Diplomacy?* Institute for Cultural Diplomacy. [online] Available at: http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/index.php?en_culturaldiplomacy (Accessed 10 February 2017).

to coin the term "new public diplomacy." According to Melissen, this new mode of public diplomacy moves away from simply informing, to engaging with foreign audiences through the use of information and communication technology. Manuel Castells (2008, p.91) went one step further when he claimed that public diplomacy is the diplomacy of the public; that is, an international projection of the values and ideas of the public. Castells (2008, p.91) considers that public diplomacy "seeks to build a public sphere in which diverse voices can be heard in spite of their various origins, distinct values, and often contradictory interests." This kind of public sphere would act as a "communication space in which a new common language could emerge as a precondition for diplomacy" (Castells, 2008, p.91). This just further highlights how digital technologies (especially social media) have revolutionised the possibilities of person-to-person communication, and have become useful tools for individuals to share information with a global audience. Thus, cultural (and public) diplomacy has become more widely practiced by ordinary citizens, as well as advocacy groups that use digital networks for the production, communication, and worldwide distribution of their ideas.

Cultural Diplomacy in the context of the EU

Policy framework

Focusing on new trends in cultural diplomacy, this chapter will look into how the EU has framed both its discourse and activities concerning the role of culture in its international relations. Even though, due to the subsidiarity principle, the European Union has not developed a common cultural policy, in recent years the EU has recognized the potential of culture as a means to peace building, and has focused on the issue of cultural diplomacy more strongly. In 2007 the EU Commission proposed a "European Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World", which included three priorities: 1. To promote cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue; 2. To promote culture as a catalyst for creativity in the framework of the Lisbon Strategy; 3.To promote culture as a vital element in the Union's international relations. Since then, Member States, the European Parliament and civil society representatives have requested a more strategic EU approach to international cultural relations. In 2008 the European Council adopted "Conclusions on the Promotion of Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue in the External Relations of the Union and its Member States", stressing the importance of intercultural dialogue for conflict prevention and reconciliation processes, as well as the importance of cultural exchange and cooperation for the strengthening of civil society, processes of democratization and good governance, and the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In 2011 the European Parliament adopted a "Resolution on the Cultural Dimensions of the EU's External Actions" proposed by the Parliament's Culture Committee. The report recognised artists as "de facto cultural diplomats exchanging and confronting

different aesthetic, political, moral and social values"; new media and communication technologies as instruments for freedom of expression, pluralism, the exchange of information, human rights, development, freedom of assembly, democracy and inclusion and for facilitating access to cultural content and education; and cultural cooperation and cultural dialogue as the building blocks of cultural diplomacy, which can serve as instruments for global peace and stability (European Parliament, 2011). This was the first time the term "cultural diplomacy" appeared in any official EU documents (Isar, 2015, p.502). The European External Action Service (EEAS) and the European Commission (EC) currently use the term cultural diplomacy to cover a wide number of activities such as intercultural dialogue, people-to-people exchange, institutional cooperation and bottom-up grassroots action (European Parliament, 2016, p.15). On the other side, representatives of the cultural and creative sector prefer to use the term cultural relations instead of cultural diplomacy (Fisher, 2011, p.11). This is due partly to the fact that, as a term, cultural diplomacy still mostly alludes to governmental practice—something that could dissuade target groups and the wider public from participating in projects.

The European Commission commissioned a consortium of cultural institutes and organizations to carry out the Preparatory Action "Culture in EU External Relations" from 2013-2014. The report highlighted the considerable potential for culture in Europe's external relations, as well as recommending how Europe could be more effective in the field of international cultural relations. As a cultural priority for Europe, one of the series of operational recommendations presented in the report was the strengthening of civil society in countries subject to major social and political transformations. Also, the report highlighted the importance of cooperation between EU institutions, national cultural relations agencies and civil society bodies in promoting cultural diversity and understanding between European societies, as well as strengthening international dialogue and co-operation with countries outside Europe.

The fact that the EU has put a stronger emphasis on cultural relations in its foreign policy was clearly shown in 2016, when the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy adopted a Joint Communication "Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations". This document demonstrated an increasing awareness and political willingness amongst the leadership of EU institutions to promote and enhance cultural diplomacy and cultural relations. The Joint Communication put its focus on supporting culture as an engine for sustainable social and economic development (particularly through cultural and creative industries, SMEs and the tourism sector); promoting culture and intercultural dialogue for peaceful inter-community relations; and reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage. Culture is seen as a tool for the delivery of important social and economic benefits, both within and outside the EU, which could play an important role in conflict resolutions, the integration of refugees, countering violent radicalisation

and the protection of the world's cultural heritage. It also stresses the need for a greater degree of involvement and cooperation on the part of the public and private sectors and civil society. The importance of the bottom-up approach for the EU can be seen in the document "Council Conclusions on an EU Strategic Approach to International Cultural Relations" (adopted on the 23rd of May 2017), which specifically highlights the need for a bottom-up perspective, the independence of the cultural sector, freedom of expression and artists' integrity, cooperation between artists, cultural operators and civil society, etc. On 5th of July 2017, the European Parliament adopted its Report on the Joint Communication "Towards an EU Strategy for International Relations" especially recognising and highlighting the need for a people-to-people approach in cultural diplomacy. In both the EU and partner countries, young people are seen as one of the main target groups, and the performing arts, visual arts, street arts, music, theatre, film, literature, social media, and digital platforms in general are seen as the best channels for reaching and engaging them.

The EU Policy Framework on cultural diplomacy confirms four emerging trends in European cultural diplomacy, which Steve Green (2010) pointed out in his paper "New Directions": 1. The emergence of new content within the field of cultural diplomacy, which can be seen in the broader range of activities and objectives entering the cultural diplomacy arena, such as social cohesion, inequality, discrimination against migrants and minorities, racism, post-conflict resolution etc.; 2. A shift from bilateralism to multilateralism encouraged by EU official policies, which can be seen in strengthening international dialogue and co-operations with countries outside of Europe; 3. The entry and validity of new actors in the field of cultural diplomacy (an example being the recognition of artists and civil society representatives as cultural diplomats); 4. The impact of new technologies, especially new media and communication technologies, on freedom of expression, the exchange of information, democracy, inclusion, etc.

The role of cultural institutes in cultural diplomacy activities

The most important actors of cultural diplomacy, those engaging in concrete activities that translate the EU policy framework into concrete projects, are the existing national cultural institutes. For many decades, national cultural institutes have played an important role in developing and implementing the cultural diplomacy strategies of EU Member States, mainly through the promotion of national cultures and languages abroad. However, the new approach toward the development of cultural diplomacy and cultural relations, currently being pursued by various governments and cultural institutes, is pushing a number of cultural institutes to play a broader role and engage in activities beyond those traditionally associated with nation branding. A number of cultural institutes are reshaping their thematic and geographical priorities and organizing more activities that fit into the local context and address the challenges that societies face around the world (European Parliament, 2016, p.48). Most of the

thematic priorities of such institutes are in line with those of the EU. Such priorities and issues include migration and refugees, preventing the radicalisation of young people, the promotion of fundamental values (freedom of speech, gender equality etc.), cultural diversity, interreligious dialogue, social cohesion/inclusion, conflict/crisis resolution, intercultural dialogue, etc. (European Parliament, 2016, p.48). There are a number of examples of cultural institutes showing a growing interest in pursuing an intercultural dialogue with the civil society of another country. For instance, the Goethe-Institute offers training in the field of intercultural communication and integration as part of its educational and training programmes. It also initiated a programme of work with artists in Ukraine, Russia and Egypt. Similarly, the British Council is running the 'Stability and Reconciliation Programme' in Nigeria to encourage non-violent conflict resolution and help reduce the impact of violent conflicts on the most vulnerable groups of society (European Parliament, 2016, p.49).

Another trend in European cultural diplomacy is the shift towards multilateralism. In 2006, the European Union National Institute for Culture (EUNIC) was formed "to create effective partnerships and networks between the participating organizations by forming clusters, to improve and promote cultural diversity and understanding between European societies, and to strengthen international dialogue and co-operation with countries outside Europe"[5]. Also, the formation of foundations set up by governments or international organizations (such as the Asia-Europe Foundation, the European Cultural Foundation and the Anna Lindh Foundation) present another trend in multilateral cultural diplomacy (Green, 2010, p.5). In 2011, the European Cultural Foundation launched an initiative called "MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations", a public-private partnership of cultural institutes, foundations and civil society networks, based on the promotion of fundamental values, two-way dialogue and the recognition of the role of civil society. Also, the Cultural Diplomacy Platform was established in 2016 in order to help the EU implement its strategy and create synergies among all EU stakeholders (EU delegations, national cultural institutes and foundations, public and private enterprises and civil society).

Selected voices are critical of the role that culture plays in foreign policy and international relations, the question being what of value do such pursuits actually bring to the countries and peoples involved. Thus, in continuation of this commentary, we will present three different cultural diplomacy projects from the bottom-up in order to show their significance in today's society and to see how the *new* directions of cultural diplomacy (new content and new actors) analysed in this paper work in real projects.

---

[5]European Union National Institutes for Culture – EUNIC. [online] Available at: https://www.eunic-online.eu/?q=content/who-we-are (Accessed 22 March 2017).

New actors of cultural diplomacy: project examples from the bottom-up

Despite the fact that cultural diplomacy is practiced by a range of actors (national governments, public and private sector institutions, civil society, and individuals, etc.), today, non-state actors have emerged as significant players in cultural diplomacy activities. Researchers such as La Porte (2012, p.4) define a wide range of non-state actors. Out of those relevant to cultural diplomacy, we would like to specifically highlight NGO's and individuals who, either through wealth or through new technologies, are influencing the international arena. The main mode of visibility and dissemination for non-state actors (e.g. activists, *artivists*, advocacy groups, and other nongovernmental organizations) is virtual space (Jora, 2013, p.48). Digital networks have provided more people with better and easier access to information, as well as, new channels and tools of production, communication, and distribution.

By using their art as a medium for raising awareness, many non-state actors (such as artists, theatre directors or film-makers) are reaching people in their everyday environments and confronting them with social injustices that are otherwise easily ignored. This new understanding of the role of cultural actors in social change has led Schneider to comment that: "a new way of doing cultural diplomacy is to leverage local voices" (British Council, 2013, p.22). Arts and culture (in its broadest definition) can be used as an instrument of cultural diplomacy, raising awareness and understanding of issues, building trust, promoting dialogue, and establishing bonds between individuals of diverse cultural and professional backgrounds. Cultural diplomacy has changed over the years, adapting from a bi-polar international system to a multi-polar one. The crisis of the state, the emergence of a powerful civil society, and the impact of new technologies have multiplied the number of players acting in the global sphere (La Porte, 2012). Non-state actors have become key for ensuring a wide margin of collaboration and participation in cultural diplomacy activities. The European Union has recognised the importance of non-state actors (civil society, artists, cultural operators, grassroots organizations) in cultural relations between the EU and non-EU countries. Thus one of the EU's goals is to strengthen and support civil society initiatives in the cultural field through various cooperation frameworks and financing instruments (European Commission, 2016, p.14).

The following examples of good practice were observed from two key approaches of the *new* cultural diplomacy: the *conceptual* and the *structural approach* (Gienow-Hecht and Donfried, 2010, pp.16-21). The conceptual approach refers to motivations and objectives: what do governments and citizens desire to achieve by familiarising others with their culture (i.e. referring to the content of the programmes, the activities, and the promotion of the desired national image). Here the focus is on a broader range of cultural diplomacy objectives and interests, such as enhancing

intercultural dialogue, promoting cultural diversity, peace-building and strengthening solidarity between peoples. The structural approach, in turn, addresses the set-up of cultural diplomacy (i.e. who are the agents responsible for cultural diplomacy and how do they correlate with state interests). Here the focus is on non-state actors, such as civil society representatives, artists, cultural operators, grassroots organizations, individuals etc.

The art project Conflict Kitchen[6]

Conflict Kitchen was a restaurant in Pittsburgh, USA, which served cuisines from countries with which the United States was currently in conflict. The project 'Conflict Kitchen', which started as a takeout restaurant in 2010, has since introduced the cuisines of Iran, Afghanistan, Cuba, North Korea, Venezuela, Palestine, and Iroquois. The menu focused on the nations at the time of the conflicts, rotating cuisines every few months in relation to current geopolitical events, along with various educational and cultural programs (lunch hour with scholars, film screenings, etc.). The idea of running a restaurant that offered customers the chance to learn more about people living in 'hostile' countries, as well as people from such countries living in the US, began as a Carnegie Mellon University art class project by art professor Jon Rubin and artist Dawn Weleski. Through the use of digital technology, the Conflict Kitchen had a global reach for sharing knowledge, raising awareness, building trust and starting a new dialogue. Every two weeks, the restaurant would support a different Instagrammer documenting his or her daily life in the country they were focusing on by uploading it to their Instagram account. There was also a performance art piece called 'The Foreigner", where customers had a chance to lunch with someone in Iran/Afghanistan/Cuba etc. using headphones and a microphone. The project has received extensive coverage in both the American and international press, and was nominated for the2015 International Award for Public Art by The Institute for Public Art in Hong Kong. Unfortunately, controversy erupted in 2014 when the Conflict Kitchen started serving Palestinian cuisine. The restaurant was closed for several days due to death threats. After the incident, the Conflict Kitchen continued to operate as a restaurant until May 2017, announcing "a new phase in the life of the project." Most recently, the Conflict Kitchen has received the Andy Warhol Foundation Visual Arts Curatorial Fellowship to travel to selected American cities and investigate the potential for Conflict Kitchen iterations throughout the United States. Although no longer based in Schenley Plaza, Pittsburgh, the post on the *conflictkitchen.org blog* said the project will continue to provide "a forum for critical dialogue, challenging

---

[6] Conflict Kitchen [online] Available at: http://conflictkitchen.org/ (Accessed: 6 October 2017); Schafer, B. (2016). Conflict Kitchen: an Interview with Dawn Weleski and Jon Rubin, USC's Public Diplomacy Magazine, Crisis Diplomacy Issue 16, Summer 2016, pp. 46-53 [online] Available at:

http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Crisis_Diplomacy.pdf (Accessed: 12 February 2017).

xenophobia by supporting voices less heard and cultures less considered in the United States with the continuation of the production of curriculum, performances, public events and publications with cultural institutions, community organizations and schools through the greater Pittsburgh region."

The art project Conflict Kitchen continues its mission to encouraging discussion and foster a better political understanding and cultural awareness through the medium of food. In this case, the public was directly engaged with the project whilst not even recognising that they were actually engaged in cultural diplomacy activities and objectives (such as enhancing intercultural dialogue, promoting cultural diversity and strengthening solidarity between people). Here the focus was on a broad range of cultural diplomacy objectives and interests, but also on non-state actors, the Conflict Kitchen being a project in which cultural diplomacy was practiced not only by the project's founders, but also by the public.

Drama, diversity and development project (DDD)[7]

The Drama, Diversity and Development project is an example that shows how street theatre can be used as a medium for cultural diplomacy activities. DDD uses street theatre as a tool to promote diversity and challenge discrimination against minorities in the MENA (Middle East and North Africa) region. It is a three-year project that started in 2014, and has been funded by the EU under the regional programme MedCulture. This programme aims to support the efforts of the Southern Mediterranean countries (Jordan, Egypt, Palestine, Israel, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia) in building a deep-rooted democracy and to contribute to their sustainable economic, social and human development through regional co-operation in the fields of media and culture. The project enables local artists to promote the principles of diversity through the creation of theatre for the general public, making contact with new audiences and raising awareness of the role of culture in social cohesion through various street theatre projects, training and advocacy projects. For example, the street theatre project "Jordan Valley Vulnerable Stories" implemented by the ASHTAR Theatre (dynamic local Palestinian Theatre, a non-profit organization) and the Jordan Valley Solidarity campaign (a network of Palestinian grassroots community groups) in Palestine targeted youth from these communities and provided training in theatre techniques, allowing them to raise their voices through the production of a street theatre play depicting their stories of oppression. Through various street theatre projects, trainings and advocacy projects, people from civil society organizations and grassroots community groups (non-state actors) are promoting diversity, raising awareness and establishing bonds between individuals of diverse cultural

---

[7] Drama, Diversity and Development Project [online] Available at: https://actfordiversity.org/the-project-2/ (Accessed: 6 October 2017).

backgrounds (all of which meaning that they are actually pursuing cultural diplomacy from the bottom-up).

Performance(s) between two shores: Arab artists in Europe[8]

"Performance(s) between two shores: Arab artists in Europe", a European Commission supported programme which started in 2016, is a project responding to one of the most pressing issues facing Europe, that of the mass movement of refugees and migrants across the continent, and the stereotyping and racism they face. This project addresses this issue by working with recently arrived Arab artists based in Europe, and is a collaboration between some of Europe's leading independent festivals and cultural organizations in the field of the performing arts.

It has a two-stage programme of activity. The first is focused on the development of skills and the transference of knowledge; the second on the creation of innovative new performances and participatory practices that engage with many of those audiences and communities currently excluded from cultural provisions in Europe, with a special attention to migrants and refugees. The project aims to support artistic professional development in Europe through creation and touring support, create new international audiences with a focus on engaging under-represented audiences and facilitate the sharing of skills and knowledge between partners. The project engages the wider public by working with artists and cultural organisations (non-state actors) and focuses on migrants and refugees in Europe, addressing key themes such as stereotyping and racism.

Conclusion

The current political situation in many regions and countries, as well as many of the challenges facing today's world, have shown the growing need for cultural dialogue, understanding and trust amongst nations and cultures in order to achieve global peace and stability. Today, ordinary citizens and different advocacy groups (non-state actors) are engaging in cultural diplomacy/cultural relations activities for the production of art projects, communication, and the distribution of ideas worldwide.

This paper has analysed new directions in cultural diplomacy by focusing on a complex network environment, in which non-state actors are becoming important players, as well as exploring (beyond the pure representation of a country's culture) the broad range of current cultural diplomacy objectives and interests. The art project *Conflict Kitchen* is a good example of the new dimensions manifest in cultural

---

[8] Performance(s) between two shores: Arab Artists in Europe. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/projects/ce-project-details-page/?nodeRef=workspace://SpacesStore/4c85e05b-711e-4189-af67-5227749d62a5 (Accessed 6 October 2017).

diplomacy (as approached from the bottom-up). Although the primary goal of the project was to make an impact on the local community by raising awareness, building trust and promoting dialogue between individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds, thanks to digital technologies, the project achieved a global reach. This new kind of cultural diplomacy from the bottom-up engages new stakeholders and pursues new objectives via an array of means different to those of traditional diplomacy. Crucially, it moves away from simply informing, to engaging with foreign audiences. Issues addressed by grassroots movements have gained importance in EU cultural diplomacy projects; the same can also be said regarding the inclusion of non-state actors thereof. This new approach can be seen in the various EU cooperation frameworks and financing instruments promoting inter-sectoral collaboration, as well as collaboration at the civil, national, regional and global levels—both forms of collaboration being present in the project examples in this article. Without adequate institutional and financing support, these projects could not continue their work and mission. This principle is particularly demonstrated by the *Conflict Kitchen* project, which closed its restaurant in Pittsburgh. However, with the financial support of the Andy Warhol Foundation, the project will continue its creative and programmatic activities in Pittsburgh and around the U.S. On the contrary, the other two examples in this study are financially and institutionally supported by the EU, which ensures, throughout the implementation of the project, their short-term sustainability.

Today's European cultural diplomacy is focused on partnerships (between civil society actors, ministries, private and public institutions involved in culture, as well as other related actors) and on advancing cultural cooperation with partner countries, with a mind to the importance of different actors in cultural diplomacy activities. However, the questions remain unanswered as to how many and which actors are to be included in such global initiatives and projects, and whether/how such projects effectively reach a wider population, including new EU member states, and (upon completion) make a long-term impact. Strengthening such initiatives by making them a cultural priority, especially in countries where major social and political transformations are occurring, and focusing on different non-state actors from the grassroots levels (activists, *artivists*, advocacy groups, entrepreneurs, individuals and other non-governmental organizations) would be beneficial for the fostering of bottom-up cultural diplomacy activities. Furthermore, in order to achieve long-term social and cultural development, the EU could focus more on long-term funding instruments supporting cultural cooperation with third-party countries. This paper, going far beyond the presence of arts/cultural organisations alone, has shown how important supportive conditions are for cultural practitioners. Policy makers and funders could go much further in supporting the access to space, expertise and networks that increase artists' freedom to create and advocate. However, there is still a need for systematic theoretical and empirical research in the field of the new dimensions of cultural diplomacy and the role of non-state actors in order to develop innovative and contemporary cultural diplomacy policies.

References

1. Ang, I., Isar, Y.R. and Mar, P. (2015). Cultural diplomacy: beyond the national interest? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), pp.365-382.

2. British Council (2013). *Influence and attraction: culture and the race for soft power in the 21st century*. London: Demos [online] Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/influence-and-attraction-report.pdf (Accessed 5 February 2017).

3. Castells, M. (2008). The new public sphere: global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), pp.78-93.

4. Conflict Kitchen [online] Available at: http://conflictkitchen.org/ (Accessed 6 October 2017).

5. Council of the European Union. (2008). *Council conclusions on the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue in the external relations of the Union and its Member States*. Brussels: Council of the European Union. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:42008X1221(02)&from=EN (Accessed 20 March 2017).

6. Council of the European Union (2017*). Council conclusions on an EU strategic approach to international cultural relations*. Brussels: Council of the European Union. [online] Available at: http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-7935-2017-INIT/en/pdf (Accessed 1 September 2017).

7. Cultural Diplomacy Platform [online] Available at: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/ (Accessed 22 March 2017).

8. Cummings, M. (2003). *Cultural diplomacy and the United States Government: a survey*. Washington: Center for Arts and Culture. [online] Available at: http://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/MCCpaper.pdf (Accessed 3 February 2017).

9. Drama, Diversity and Development Project [online] Available at: https://actfordiversity.org/the-project-2/ (Accessed 6 October 2017).

10. European Commission (2007). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world*. Brussels: European Commission. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0242:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed: 20th March 2017).

11. European Commission (2014). *Preparatory action 'culture in EU external relations'*. Brussels: European Commission. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/publications/global-cultural-citizenship_en.pdf (Accessed: 22 March 2017).

12. European Commission (2016). *Joint communication 'towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations'*. Brussels: European Commission. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016JC0029&from=EN (Accessed 22 March 2017).

13. European Council (2008). *Council Conclusions on the Promotion of Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue in the External Relations of the Union and its Member States.* Brussels: European Council. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:42008X1221(02) (Accessed: 22 March 2017).

14. European Parliament (2011). *Report on the cultural dimensions of the EU's external actions.* Brussels: European Parliament. [online] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&mode=XML&reference=A7-2011-112&language=EN#title1 (Accessed 20 March 2017).

15. European Parliament (2016). *Research for Cult Committee - European Cultural Institutes abroad.* Brussels: European Parliament. [online] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/563418/IPOL_STU(2016)563418_EN.pdf (Accessed 15 March 2017).

16. European Parliament (2017). *Resolution of 5 July 2017 on towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations (2016/2240(INI))*. Brussels: European Parliament. [online] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+TA+P8-TA-2017-0303+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN (Accessed 1 September 2017).

17. European Union National Institutes for Culture – EUNIC. [online] Available at: http://www.eunic-online.eu/ (Accessed 22 March 2017).

18. Fisher, R. (2011). *Revisiting EU Member States' international cultural relations.* Brussels: More Europe. [online] Available at: http://www.moreeurope.org/?q=content/revisiting-eu-member-states%E2%80%99-international-cultural-relations (Accessed 22 March 2017).

19. Gienow-Hecht, J. and Donfried, M. (2010). The model of cultural diplomacy: power, distance, and the promise of civil society. In: J. Gienow-Hecht and M. Donfried, eds., *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy.* New York: Berghahn Books, pp.13-33.

20. Green, S. (2010). New directions. In: *Cultura y Proyeccion Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Accion*. Madrid: Real Instituto Elcano.

21. Institute for Cultural Diplomacy. [online] Available at: http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/index.php?en (Accessed 5 February 2017).

22. Isar, Y. R. (2015). Culture in EU external relations: an idea whose time has come? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), pp.494-509.

23. Jora, L. (2013). New practices and trends in cultural diplomacy. *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations*, 10(1), pp.43-52.

24. La Porte, T. (2012). The legitimacy and effectiveness of non-state actors and the public diplomacy concept. In: *The International Studies Association (ISA) annual convention: public diplomacy theory and conceptual issues*. San Diego: USA, 1-4 April 2012. pp.1-13.

25. Melissen, J. (2015). *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

26. More Europe – External Cultural Relations. [online] Available at: http://www.moreeurope.org/ (Accessed 22 March 2017).

27. Nye, S.J. (2004). *Soft power: the means to success in world politics*. Jackson, TN: Public Affairs.

28. Performance(s) Between Two Shores: Arab Artists in Europe. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/projects/ce-project-details-page/?nodeRef=workspace://SpacesStore/4c85e05b-711e-4189-af67-5227749d62a5 (Accessed 6 October 2017).

29. Rivera, T. (2015). *Distinguishing cultural relations from cultural diplomacy: the British Council's relationship with Her Majesty's Government.* LA: Figueroa Press.

30. Schafer, B. (2016). Conflict kitchen: an interview with Dawn Weleski and Jon Rubin. *USC's Public Diplomacy Magazine*, *Crisis Diplomacy*, Issue 16, Summer 2016, pp.46-53. [online] Available at: http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Crisis_Diplomacy.pdf (Accessed 12 February 2017).

31. Schneider, C. (2003). *Diplomacy that works: 'best practices' in cultural diplomacy.* Washington: Center for Arts and Culture.

32. USC Center on Public Diplomacy. [online] Available at: https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/(Accessed 10 February 2017).

Sažetak

Kulturna diplomacija se tradicionalno doživljavala državnom praksom koju, u prvom redu, kroz razne oblike kulturnog predstavljanja i razmjene provode državne vlasti radi ostvarivanja međusobnog razumijevanja i suradnje, te promocije vlastite kulture i izgradnje pozitivnog imidža. Iako nacije-države predstavljaju središnje nositelje kulturnodiplomatske djelatnosti, s pojavom novih digitalnih tehnologija, sve veći izražaj dobivaju i drugi ne-državni akteri koji se uključuju u međunarodne odnose razvijanjem vlastite kulturne i javne diplomacije. Danas se funkcija kulturne diplomacije u međunarodnim odnosima promatra iz dva aspekta: unilateralnog aspekta izgradnje nacionalnog imidža i meke moći; te multilateralnog aspekta poticanja međunarodne kulturne suradnje i jačanja mira i solidarnosti, koje je posebno prepoznato i poticano u vanjskoj politici EU-a. Uzimajući u obzir strateški pristup i politiku EU-a u pogledu kulturne diplomacije i međunarodnih kulturnih odnosa ovaj rad se fokusira na nove smjerove kulturne diplomacije: pojavu ne-državnih aktera i pomak od samo-promocije do promicanja međukulturnog dijaloga, izgradnje povjerenja, sprječavanja i rješavanja sukoba, integracije izbjeglica, suzbijanja nasilnog ekstremizma te uspostavljanja veza među pojedincima. Novi smjerovi kulturne diplomacije koji se nazivaju *bottom-up* pristupom kulturne diplomacije su dalje elaborirani i prikazani kroz tri odabrana primjera postojećih projekata. Primjeri pokazuju koliko je važna uloga ne-državnih aktera u kulturnoj diplomaciji, te jačanje potpore organizacijama civilnog društva i raznim kulturnim subjektima koji su uključeni u kulturne odnose s partnerskim zemljama.

Ključne riječi: kulturna diplomacija, međunarodni kulturni odnosi, međunarodna kulturna suradnja, ne-državni akteri, nova kulturna diplomacija, *bottom-up* pristup

Bilješka o autorici / Note about the author

Matea Senkić stručna je suradnica u Odjelu za kulturu i komunikacije Instituta za razvoj i međunarodne odnose (IRMO) u Zagrebu. Završila je diplomski studij sociologije znanstveno-istraživačkog usmjerenja 2014. godine na Filozofskom fakultetu Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Njeni istraživački interesi uključuju kulturnu raznolikost, međukulturni dijalog i suradnju, kulturnu diplomaciju, kulturni turizam, aktivizam i civilno društvo, te strateško planiranje u kulturi i turizmu. Pohađala je brojne međunarodne konferencije, kongrese i edukacijske seminare u Hrvatskoj i inozemstvu iz polja kulturne diplomacije, kulturnih politika, menadžmenta u kulturi, kulturnog turizma, EU fondova i poduzetništva (npr. The Professional Development Certificate Program in International Relations & Cultural Diplomacy, Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin, Germany; Unicult2020–International Arts & Culture Management and Policy Programme, Rijeka, Croatia). Članica je tima mreže Culturelink od 2015. godine.

Matea Senkić is Associate at the Department for Culture and Communication at IRMO, Zagreb, Croatia. Matea holds a Master Degree in Sociology (2014) from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia. Her research interests include cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and cooperation, cultural diplomacy, cultural tourism, activism and civil society, and strategic planning in culture and tourism. She has attended numerous international conferences, seminars and training events in Croatia and abroad in the fields of cultural diplomacy, cultural policies, culture management, cultural tourism, EU funds and entrepreneurship (e.g. The Professional Development Certificate Program in International Relations & Cultural Diplomacy, Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin, Germany; Unicult2020– International Arts & Culture Management and Policy Programme, Rijeka, Croatia). In2015 she became a member of the Culturelink Network, and has since worked for the Culturelink Network as an editor.

Jean Monnet projekt EU kompetencije i nacionalne kulturne politike: kritički dijalozi / CULPOL (broj: 575442-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPJMO-PROJECT), koji je sufinanciran sredstvima programa Europske unije Erasmus+, ima za cilj poticanje diskusije i kritičkog dijaloga o utjecaju EU agende na hrvatsku kulturnu politiku.

The Jean Monnet Project EU Competences and National Cultural Policies: Critical Dialogues / CULPOL (575442-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPJMO-PROJECT) has been supported by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. It aims to promote discussion and reflection on the impact of the EU agenda on the Croatian cultural policy.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

cul—
pol

Institut za razvoj i međunarodne odnose
Odjel za kulturu i komunikacije
LJ. F. Vukotinovića 2, HR-10000 Zagreb

Institute for Development and International Relations
Department for Culture and Communication
LJ. F. Vukotinovića 2, HR-10000 Zagreb

Tel. +385 1 48 77 460
Fax. +385 1 48 28 361
culpol@irmo.hr
http://culpol.irmo.hr/
http://www.irmo.hr/