New Directions

William Gibson’s frequently quoted statement “the future is already here; it’s just not evenly distributed”, applies to cultural diplomacy. The new directions promise to usher in a transformation of cultural diplomacy. They will add new strands of activity, lead to a re-assessment of existing ways of operating and introduce new items to the cultural diplomacy toolkit.

This essay surveys the new directions in global cultural diplomacy. A standard difficulty in surveys is the lack of an agreed terminology. Is the field to be referred to as “cultural diplomacy”, “cultural PR”, “public diplomacy”, “nation branding”? Different countries, different organizations, different authors use the terms almost interchangeably. This essay uses “cultural diplomacy” and returns to the terminology issue in its final section.

It will be useful to start with a set of opening parameters in mind. Rod Fisher has a seven point list of the principal objectives of a country’s foreign cultural policy. They are:

- to promote cultural diplomacy
- to develop cultural relations
- to support the export of a nation’s cultural products and creative industries
- to underpin the development of beneficial new trading arrangements
- to attract tourism and perhaps inward investment
- to enhance programme aid in developing countries and
- To create an informed and primarily favourable picture of a country to the “outside world”.2

---

1 Steve Green is Team Leader for the EUNIC presidency. The views expressed in this essay do not reflect those of member organizations of the EUNIC network. The essay develops themes presented by the author at the conference “La acción cultural exterior: definición de nuevas estrategias”, organized by the Instituto Cervantes and Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid, 14-15 December 2009. A fuller version will be published in 2011.


NB: All websites referenced in this essay were accessed in early May 2010.
In addition to these seven points, promotion of language and a country’s educational opportunities are significant elements of cultural diplomacy.

This essay deals with three aspects of the new directions: it surveys the organizations and structures involved, reviews the way the directions are implemented and sees how they respond to the question “why and for what purpose”.

Who is doing cultural diplomacy?

Any review of the literature of cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century leads to the conclusion that it was overwhelmingly carried out by just a handful of mainly Western countries, with many academic studies focussing on the Cold War aspects. The only other country with a major global cultural diplomacy presence has been Japan, which has followed the European model.

Post 1989, many Central and Eastern European countries adopted a Western approach to cultural diplomacy and many other operated a smaller scale cultural diplomacy programme. These were based on support from their Embassies for arts events or, as in the case of Australia, a strong focus on a single strand: attracting international students. A few countries developed a global presence: France, the UK, Italy and Germany. Many others had a regional or neighbourhood presence with offshoots in the major capitals of the world or where there was a significant diaspora presence.

The classic model of cultural diplomacy as an activity of a nation state, conducted bilaterally, is now developing in two very active directions. The first involves the arrival of new players; the second, the development of a multilateral approach.

The most notable change in international relations in the last few years has been the move to a multi-polar world with an increasing emphasis on Asia. This trend is obvious in many areas of the international sphere and it is no surprise that it is also visible now in cultural diplomacy. As with other areas, China is leading the way.

The need for China to have a strong cultural diplomacy role in the world has been highlighted by its leaders. It is explicit in the growth of the China Cultural Centres and the Confucius Institutes. The latter have expanded spectacularly. In their first five years since 2004, over 300 have opened in more than 80 countries worldwide. The intention is to reach 1,000 by 2020, matching the current Alliance Française network. Each Institute is set within a university and partners a Chinese university. Their core

---

3 Hanban Institute http://english.hanban.edu.cn/index.php?language=en

4 See www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2010-04/23/content_9766116.htm
programmes focus on language and the arts. Increasingly they now include seminars and lectures about China’s recent history and current policies. The Hanban Institute – an offshoot of an organization linked to the Ministry of Education – is the central management agency.

China is by far the most active, but not the only Asian country seeking to expand its cultural diplomacy activities. Korea plans to expand its cultural centre network to 150 by 2015 as a key component of its nation branding campaign. India also has ambitious expansion programmes for its networks of cultural diplomacy, especially in other Asian countries. Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and other Asian countries are also reviewing their cultural diplomacy.

This growth in active cultural diplomacy extends to Turkey, Brazil, Russia, South Africa and many other countries worldwide. It is also spreading into regions and cities.

Catalonia provides a good indication of this. The proceedings of the December 2009 conference “Cultural Diplomacy: Reflections and proposals from Catalonia” are a textbook example of a region seeking to expand its cultural diplomacy. The lines of argument and discussion are almost directly along the lines listed by Fisher. It would be perfectly possible to substitute the name of almost any country, region or city into the conference reports, instead of Barcelona/Catalonia, as an example of an outward promotion approach to classic cultural diplomacy.

---

5 The Confucius Institute in Scotland gained the “Confucius Institute of the Year” award for 2009. Its programme goes beyond the arts and language core activities including partnering a project with the British Council. [www.confuciusinstitute.ac.uk](http://www.confuciusinstitute.ac.uk/)

6 For more on China’s cultural diplomacy see [www.eai.nus.edu.sg/BB308.pdf](http://www.eai.nus.edu.sg/BB308.pdf). The University of Southern California’s Centre on Public Diplomacy has set up a special research project on China’s cultural diplomacy. [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/research/project_detail/confucius_institutes/](http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/research/project_detail/confucius_institutes/)

7 Korea nation branding: “In a more specific move to raise Korea’s awareness, the Korean administration also announced in October this year that it plans to set up 150 Korean-language schools overseas by 2015 as part of efforts to promote cultural exchanges. The language schools, all called the King Sejong Institute, will play a central role in globalizing the Korean alphabet or hangeul, as well as providing information about the country, officials said.” [http://nation-branding.info/2009/11/11/south-korea-non-stop-nation-branding/](http://nation-branding.info/2009/11/11/south-korea-non-stop-nation-branding/)


8 In 2009, the ICCR opened centres in Kabul, Kathmandu, Bangkok, Tokyo, Dhaka, Kuala Lumpur and Abu Dhabi. Bhutan will have one by next year and talks are on with Pakistan and the Maldives for similar centres. "My idea was to first consolidate our region and to 'look East'. We have also started a centre in China as an extension of our mission as there is a ban on cultural centres there," says Singh, who took over as ICCR head in 2007. [http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/sunday-toi/special-report/How-to-be-a-cultural-superpower/articleshow/5256363.cms](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/sunday-toi/special-report/How-to-be-a-cultural-superpower/articleshow/5256363.cms)

9 Sam Powney has written a useful review of East Asian cultural diplomacy. See: [www.culturaldiplomacy.org/pdf/case-studies/a-glance.pdf](http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/pdf/case-studies/a-glance.pdf)

By 2020 it is reasonable to expect that there will be considerably more countries engaging in cultural diplomacy in a significant manner. The pattern will be similar to the current spread: some countries with a global reach; others with a focus on regional and neighbouring countries, with offshoots in the larger countries and diaspora countries.

The second emerging new direction in cultural diplomacy is perhaps more radical than the entry of new countries. Cultural diplomacy is traditionally bilateral. The new trend is multilateralism.

Since 2007 there have been two parallel, unrelated trends in European cultural diplomacy.

EUNIC, created in the summer of 2006, is the network of European Union National Institutes for Culture. It brings together over 25 organizations working at arm’s length from their governments and outside their national borders\(^\text{11}\). With offices and programmes in over 150 countries, EUNIC members have unrivalled experience and expertise in cultural diplomacy. Its members encompass almost the full range of organizational structures of cultural diplomacy players. The scope of their activities spans all aspects of international cultural activity outlined by Fisher. Several have an even wider sectoral scope.

As a first step, EUNIC is building up its partnerships at local country level by forming “clusters” or groupings of the institutes operating in a country. The growth of clusters has been rapid within the European Union and is expanding worldwide. Within a cluster the members agree on joint activities in the arts and language sectors. As EUNIC develops, its members are coming together for larger projects in a range of topics. These currently include language policies and use, literary translation and shared arts projects.

In 2007 the European Commission issued its agenda for culture under the heading “A European agenda for culture in a globalizing world”\(^\text{12}\). This reviewed the Commission’s programmes in the cultural field. Formally “culture” (as in national cultural policies’) is not a competency of the Commission under the subsidiarity policy. The Commission proposed a strategy based around:

- promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue

---

\(^{11}\) EUNIC membership in May 2010: Adam Mickiewicz Institute, Alliance Française, Austrian Cultural Forum*, Balassi Institute (Hungary), British Council, Bulgarian Cultural Centres*, Camões Institute, Centre Culturel de Rencontre Abbaye Neumunster, Czech Centres, Culture Ireland, Danish Cultural Institute, Estonian Institute, Finnish Cultural and Academic Institutes, Goethe Institute, Italian Cultural Institute*, Hellenic Foundation for Culture, House of Cyprus*, ifa – institute for foreign cultural relations, Instituto Cervantes, Institut Français*, Latvian Institute, Lithuanian Institute, Polish Institute, Romanian Cultural Institute, SICA, Slovak Institute*, Swedish Institute, Vlaams-Nederland Huis de Buren, Walloon Brussels International.

• promotion of culture as a catalyst for creativity in the framework of the Lisbon Strategy for growth and job creation
• promotion of culture as a vital element in the Union’s international relations.  

This strategy was adopted the following year and introduced a new significant player into cultural diplomacy.

At a landmark conference in Ljubljana in 2008, Gijs De Vries made a keynote speech which has had a marked impact. He put the case for a European cultural strategy:

Developing a European strategy of cultural diplomacy would benefit EU Member States in other ways as well. EU Member States increasingly find that the lack of an EU strategy of cultural diplomacy puts them at a disadvantage. Bigger Member States notice that foreign audience often want to know about experiences and opinions in Europe as a whole, and not only about views in London or Madrid. In the absence of a European framework, national diplomats do not always succeed in satisfying this curiosity about ‘Europe’. Smaller Member States, which mostly lack the widely spoken languages of their bigger neighbours, and which tend to lack significant resources to invest in cultural diplomacy, find it difficult to make their voice heard. All would benefit from a European strategy of cultural diplomacy, to complement and support national efforts financially and operationally.

In the same speech De Vries introduced an important role for the EU in helping countries implement the various conventions and agreements in the cultural sector. Of key importance is the UNESCO Convention on Diversity in Cultural Expressions. The effect of this Convention may take a while to be felt, but it will have a significant impact in many countries.

The move to a more multilateral approach to cultural diplomacy is evident in other international organizations. The Council of Europe has widened its operations beyond cultural policy and into cultural projects in the Eastern European countries and on shared issues such as intercultural cities.

Another trend in multilateral cultural diplomacy has been the formation of Foundations set up by governments to pursue cultural objectives at “arm’s length”. Two examples include the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and

13 EC Communication, ibid. paragraph 3.
15 Council of Europe Intercultural Cities at www.coe.int/T/dq4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/default_en.asp
16 More at www.asef.org/
the Anna Lindh Foundation.\textsuperscript{17} Both, coincidentally, currently work with 43 countries and both regard multi-country activities as a cornerstone of their programmes.

A final trend which is worth mentioning is the considerable increase in nation, or place, branding. This concept has been around since the 1990s but in the last two or three years has taken on a new lease of life. A glance at one of the current leading websites\textsuperscript{18} on this subject indicates the global interest in nation branding. Countries from Ghana to Ukraine, Australia to Greece are currently actively developing a brand project. The Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index attracts considerable and increasing attention every year. Although branding is not the subject of this essay it does crossover with cultural diplomacy. Arts and culture play a key role in branding campaigns. In the Anholt-GfK Roper NBI, “culture” is one of the six attributes by which a nation brand is measured. Of equal importance is the attribute “people” to which the essay will return.

**How cultural diplomacy is broadening its scope**

The core sectors of classic cultural diplomacy are arts and language. These two areas account for the majority of activities undertaken by cultural diplomacy organizations. The arts cover a wide area, from the promotion of traditional crafts, fine arts and heritage, through to the contemporary arts sector.

These are promoted in a variety of ways but mostly by one-off events involving local partner organisations. Few countries can now afford to organize their own performing arts tours or major travelling exhibitions, but a few do support major multi-event festivals: the Brussels 2009 Europalia, for instance, focussed on China, attracted over 1.1 million visitors with over 500 events. The promotion of languages holds centre stage in cultural diplomacy, delivered through teaching centres, support for language teachers or lectors at universities. Over 2 million people learn European languages every year at the teaching centres of EUNIC members’ worldwide.

As well as these structural changes there are now significant new trends in the content of cultural diplomacy.

Underpinning these new trends is a clear tendency, sometimes explicit, sometimes implicit, to adopt a wider interpretation of the term ‘culture’. The traditional view, especially in the arts sector itself, is that culture and the arts are synonyms. Cultural diplomacy becomes arts diplomacy, cultural cooperation, artistic cooperation.

This view often leads to a concern that cultural diplomacy strategies and programmes should be designed to promote the mobility of artistic

\textsuperscript{17} More at www.euromedalex.org/

\textsuperscript{18} http://nation-branding.info/
expression and of artists. This is indeed a major objective of many cultural diplomacy players and forms a centrepiece of their work.

However there are developments which adopt a wider interpretation of ‘culture’.

The European Commission’s Communication gives this definition:

Culture is generally recognised as complex to define. It can refer to the fine arts, including a variety of works of art, cultural goods and services. “Culture” also has an anthropological meaning. It is the basis for a symbolic world of meanings, beliefs, values, traditions which are expressed in language, art, religion and myths. As such, it plays a fundamental role in human development and in the complex fabric of the identities and habits of individuals and communities.  

This broader definition is contributing to a broader range of activities, of objectives, coming into the cultural diplomacy arena.

*Intercultural dialogue* is perhaps the most obvious current example. Cultural diplomacy programmes, at both national and multilateral level, are now tackling issues such as social cohesion, racism, inequality, discrimination against minorities and migrants, the cultural dimension of inter-religious issues, post conflict resolution. An example is the British Council’s project Our Shared Europe. This is a response to one of the major cultural challenges facing Europe today: the growing mutual mistrust between Muslims and non Muslims.

Cities also form the basis of intercultural dialogue, as in the case of “The Promised City” – a joint project of the Goethe Institute and Polish Cultural Institute which links Berlin, Warsaw and Mumbai, or of “Open Cities”, the British Council’s project which explores how immigration can significantly contribute to cities’ success.

The Council of Europe has a similar project, Intercultural Cities:

As communities across Europe grow increasingly diverse, the way they manage diversity becomes a key challenge for the future. Successful cities and societies of the future will be intercultural: they will be capable of managing and exploring the potential of their cultural diversity to stimulate creativity and innovation and thus generate economic prosperity and a better quality of life.

---

19 EC Communication, *ibid*.
21 [www.promised-city.org/](http://www.promised-city.org/)
These projects demonstrate the thematic shift in cultural diplomacy into a wider cultural agenda. This shift is based on projects, rather than events, and takes a multilateralist approach. Projects are involving a widening range of partners.

*Climate change* is entering the stage as a major new theme as the need for the world’s citizens to adopt a more sustainable and resource efficient way of living becomes more apparent. Cultural diplomacy players are moving into this area and seeking to work with artists who are active on this subject.

The Goethe Institute\(^{24}\) and the British Council\(^{25}\) have developed policy strands around the climate change topic. Both were connected with the Culture|Futures event, led by the Danish Cultural Institute, which took place alongside the COP-15 conference in Copenhagen in December 2009. The event’s and the platform’s premise\(^{26}\) was and is:

The cultural sector has a unique part to play in creating an Ecological Age by 2050. It is trusted, collaborative, interactive and transformative - and it is everywhere in all communities, in rich and diverse shapes and forms.

Cultural actors are people, institutions and enterprises in art, design & architecture, film & media, cultural heritage, sport, education, leisure, communication and many more areas. In diverse and wonderful ways they express identity, communicate and bring their perspectives alive in practice.

This event brought together artists, cultural managers, teachers and activists from around the world to explore the role of culture in shaping behavioural change. A global platform of partners is starting to take the event’s premise into new projects.

Intercultural dialogue and climate change are just two of the emerging thematic approaches to cultural diplomacy. Both are wide topics and encompass a diverse range of specific issues. Both have also to defend themselves against claims that the arts are being instrumentalised. This argument, often directed at their proponents, is having less of an impact as the number of artists and community artists working in social and educational contexts expands. The term ‘artist’ now encompasses a wide range of practitioners.

The third trend, concurrent with the move to a more thematic approach, is the rapid growth of the use of the web in cultural diplomacy. This is

---

\(^{24}\) [www.goethe.de/ges/umw/enindex.htm](http://www.goethe.de/ges/umw/enindex.htm)

\(^{25}\) [www.britishcouncil.org/climatechange.htm](http://www.britishcouncil.org/climatechange.htm)

\(^{26}\) [www.culturefutures.org/](http://www.culturefutures.org/)
explored in more detail in another essay in this book. There is no doubt that the web will have a major impact in coming years although it is difficult to determine exactly what the nature of that impact will be given the rapid pace of change.

Cultural diplomacy organizations currently use the web primarily as an extension of their marketing or information activities. It is another outlet through which they can inform their audiences of something happening. This will change as more and more programmes are delivered through the digital media. The Instituto Cervantes and the Goethe Institute already reach over 50 million people a year through their online activity. The "Cervantes TV" is a pioneering use of online streaming in cultural diplomacy.

The opportunities for interaction as well as one-way communication will expand. A good example is the Slovenia Cultural Profile. It was originally produced as a book describing in considerable detail the country’s art sector. A website followed. Its new version is in wiki-format enabling updates and comments from anyone. This interactivity will come to dominate the use of the web for cultural diplomacy aims.

The web brings a new dimension to cultural diplomacy not least the ability to reach but to engage. This will progressively change the way cultural diplomacy operators prepare programmes.

As the web migrates from computers to mobile phones its reach grows exponentially. It introduces an instant reality check into attempts to messaging under the banner of cultural diplomacy and certainly impacts on nation branding campaigns.

Often overlooked but increasingly vital is the web’s ability to act as a relay function. It is not just the direct participants who will be engaged but their ability to relay to others. This acts as a massive indirect extension of the audience. A core element of this relay is how the web creates a new form of trust: a comment on a hotel advisory site can have far more impact than a hotel’s own advertising. This sends a strong message to nation branders: positive but perhaps overblown messages can be far more easily undone in the digital age. The web has already changed the business model of the music business. It is doing the same now with the publishing business (it will introduce far more opportunities for translated literature for example). Over the next decade, it will change cultural diplomacy.

The fourth emerging trend in how cultural diplomacy is conducted is almost the opposite of cultural diplomacy on the web. It is the increasing trend to engage with people in networks built around a common theme. This people to people approach brings together the broader definition of culture, the move to multilateral activity and the focus on a theme. It

---

takes cultural diplomacy further away from the arts-based definition used by Fisher.

An example of this approach is the “Generation 89” project. In 2009 many cultural diplomacy organizations in Europe ran events reflecting on the end of the communist systems, with references to the fall of the Berlin wall becoming typical event titles, like the EUNIC/Council of Europe conference on cultural policies “Breaking down Barriers”. The “Generation 89” project explored the same theme but took as its starting point a network of people – born in 1989 – from nine West and East European countries. The project was put together by EUNIC in Prague and led by the Romanian Cultural Institute. Its activities took place in Bucharest, Prague, Warsaw and Brussels. The project is an example of the face-to-face networking projects now developing. The British Council has several in operation based around climate change and young social activists (“changemakers”), the latter having been developed alongside the World Economic Forum.

Why?

This final section seeks to put these emerging trends into the standard rationales for cultural diplomacy and to draw some conclusions.

To summarize, the new directions include an increase in the number of countries, regions and cities with an active cultural diplomacy programme; concurrently there is an increase in multilateral cultural diplomacy; the content of programmes is becoming more thematic, with a broader purpose in mind, and the nature of programmes is influenced by the web and by people to people engagement.

The new trends will see a marked increase in activity in all of Fisher’s seven objectives as more countries, regions and cities enter into cultural diplomacy through their arts and language. Most countries will also promote their creative industries and all will seek to project a positive image of their country.

These programmes will increase the global opportunities for cultural cooperation. The main beneficiaries will be the audiences and participants. The last decade has seen an explosion in the number of arts festivals and events worldwide. The demand for international artists at these festivals has also increased. Internationalism being one of the key values of all practitioners in cultural diplomacy, this increase in the number of players is to be welcomed. It will open up new areas for partnership and co-working.

---

28 Focus 89 [http://www.focus89.eu/breaking_down_barriers.asp](http://www.focus89.eu/breaking_down_barriers.asp)
The European Union’s current policies of putting culture into its external relations have a clear focus on networks and capacity building. The EU is also exploring new policies for culture in development.

The new directions enhance and develop the classic set of objectives set down by Fisher. However it is necessary to return to the opening issue of terminology to fully comprehend their impact. How do the new directions relate to public diplomacy, cultural PR, cultural diplomacy, nation branding?

Analysts of these fields often use visual imagery to explain their theories, like concentric circles, dimensions, a spectrum.

Joseph Nye, the originator of the soft power thesis uses a set of concentric circles. These are broadly similar to Mark Leonard’s three dimensions. Both start from the viewpoint of a government.

They envisage an inner core of information management best carried out by governments. This is the news media management on the issues and policies of the day.

The middle circle/dimension moves into communications and public relations and is on a longer timescale. This is where awareness and changing perceptions come into play.

The outer circle/dimension is that of building and sustaining relationships – the people to people dimension – and is on an even longer timescale.

This three-step approach echoes the standard marketing categories of awareness/perceptions/attitudes/beliefs. To change a person’s view on each of these takes a progressive and deeper engagement.

Many of the activities of classic cultural diplomacy sometimes fall into the middle circle.

The new directions of cultural diplomacy are moving from the middle to the outer circle. There is a shift from “product orientation” to “process based facilitation”. In practical terms longer-term projects emerge alongside the previous pattern of isolated and unconnected events.

---

29 A good example is the culture section of the Eastern Partnership programme.


33 See Nye’s lecture at www.britishcouncil.org/new/about-us/75th-anniversary/lecture-series/joe-nye/
In making this change cultural diplomacy operators require a new set of skills and attributes. These can be linked to a spectrum of approaches along these lines:

Listening - facilitation – building networks - cultural exchange - cultural diplomacy - broadcasting – direct messaging.34

The importance of “listening” as a key attribute is expressed by John Worne:

It’s easy to think of public diplomacy as being one way – we give to (or often tell) them. The central premise of cultural relations, and I think the ‘smarter’ versions of public diplomacy is we listen to and engage as equals with them.

Listening is the single most influential thing a person can do. It builds trust, engagement and the platform for discussion, negotiation and informed disagreement. It also enables people to begin to work together effectively and know what they share and what they don’t.35

A recent review of a contemporary dance event also highlights the emphasis on “we” and makes the crucial point that today’s world is interconnected and information-overloaded:

With the continuing exponential proliferation of communication across borders, what now constitutes true cultural diplomacy are the elements of exchange and mutuality. I absolutely agree that effective cultural diplomacy "promotes, enhances, and enriches the culture of critical nations." However, in today's vast networks of information and communication, diplomacy of any kind is ultimately disserviced by being contextualized in a construct of "us" and "them." Though such labels will obviously be necessary to some factual degree, diplomacy is more about striving to achieve a sense of "we." Cultural diplomacy in particular is critically important to integrating individuals from distinct backgrounds who are interested, invested and participatory in a mutual cultural practice.36

A key word emerging in these comments is “mutual”. Many cultural diplomacy operators aim to increase mutual awareness.

---

35 John Worne, Deaf is Dumb, Why listening is important http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/newswire/cpdblog_detail/deaf_is_dumb_why_listening_is_powerful/
36 Linda Constant, Huffington Post, 1 April 2010 www.huffingtonpost.com/linda-constant/the-foundation-of-movemen_b_521816.html
At the heart of the shifts in cultural diplomacy is a re-assessment of how that mutual awareness can be achieved: moving from perceptions to attitudes. "Mutuality" and "trust" are becoming the objectives.  

This change is being recorded. The ERICarts “Mobility Matters” report in 2008 noted this shift towards the thematic approach not just with the national cultural diplomacy agencies but also with Foundations and other agencies. In detecting this movement the report authors showed that the "culture" in cultural diplomacy was increasingly no longer fully synonymous with the arts.

Further evidence has come from Thailand. Chulamanee Chartsuwan has surveyed 17 international cultural diplomacy organizations. They include bilateral and multilateral, European and Asian. The organizations’ activities principally remain in the classic sectors of the arts, language and educational marketing. She too detected the shift both in activity and in objective.

Her research shows a significant trend from “self” promotion to “value promotion”:

“[The] inclination has been shifted from promotion to
• building of common understanding on issues relating to humanity as a whole;
• a building of confidence and social cohesion;
• changes from monologue to dialogue and
• an expression of tolerance and openness to different ideas”

This change in direction and objective through the adoption of values such as listening, mutuality and trust earning, requires a change in the attitudes and behaviours of cultural diplomacy players. De Vries developed his Ljubljana arguments in this way:

Cultural diplomacy therefore has a reflective, self critical component. In reaching out to others, it dares to reflect on a country’s shortcomings as well as its ambition and achievements.

Cultural diplomacy differs from cultural public relations in terms of its purpose. Cultural diplomacy is not only soliciting admiration or sympathy through the showcasing of national cultural achievements. It is above all about building trust. Its purpose is to

37 For a fuller discussion of this point, see: “Mutuality, trust and cultural relations”, Martin Rose and Nick Wadham Smith, Counterpoint, 2004 [www.counterpoint-online.org/mutuality-trust-and-cultural-relations/](http://www.counterpoint-online.org/mutuality-trust-and-cultural-relations/)


establish mutually beneficial cooperation and partnership. It is about establishing mutual benefit as the basis for mutual trust. This approach is an explicit recognition that

Fundamentally it reflects a new reality where the ability of any power to dominate the global agenda – no matter how strong, no matter how consensual in its form of leadership – is over. This is reflected in a reference back to the Nye thesis of soft power but bringing it up-to-date from its original Cold War influences. The new directions include both a shift in the values of approach and a broadening of the sectoral scope of cultural relations:

At its heart is the ability to attract and influence through so called soft power rather than hard power. We need to be clear about our own value set, yet shouldn’t seek to transplant those values. Our proposed solutions need to be attractive and use other “languages”, such as the language of sport. And finally we should be clear that quick fixes won’t work.

Conclusion

The start of the essay noted the overlapping use of terms – public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, cultural PR and nation branding. Given the diversity of writers around the world and their own contexts, it is perhaps inevitable that there is no agreed terminology. “Public diplomacy” seems to be increasingly the term used by governments. It is an umbrella, strategic term and generally includes all the activities within Nye’s three concentric circles. A complete national public diplomacy strategy would be a wide ranging document. Many countries might not adopt such a comprehensive approach; many nation branding campaigns take a narrower view. Cultural diplomacy and cultural relations form parts of these more comprehensive programmes.

To a significant extent the term used is less important than the concepts it embraces. There is a dividing line. Effective cultural diplomacy and cultural relations reflect the difference between selling and communicating

---

40 Gijs de Vries "Winning Friends and Influence" www.britishcouncil.org/new/about-us/75th-anniversary/lecture-series/gijs-de-vries/
41 Tyler Brule, Monocle, September 2009.
42 Martin Davidson, speech given at Cultural Relations and NATO seminar, Brussels, March 2010.
44 The British Council defines cultural relations as "the building of engagement and trust between people of different cultures through the exchange of knowledge and ideas" www.britishcouncil.org/new/about-us/who-we-are/vision-purpose-and-values/
identified by Jurgen Habermas.\footnote{See Fisher and Bröckerhoff, Options for Influence p 7.} They require listening, mutuality and the acceptance of self-criticism.

There is growing recognition of the important role that culture (in both its arts and wider meanings) can play as an international public good.

In the past, 'cultural diplomacy' was seen as a part of the broader field of 'public diplomacy', and politics were believed to generate the necessary space for cultural exchange. Yet things are different today: it is culture which can generate the operating conditions for politics; in addition, culture is no longer a tool for the exercise of power and should be interpreted in terms of mutuality and respect; finally, it should be accepted that governments have very limited control over what happens in the cultural world nowadays. Because of this, cultural diplomacy should be seen as part of the broader field of 'cultural relations'.\footnote{John Holden, speech at Cultural Diplomacy: reflections and proposals from Catalonia, December 2009. www.interarts.net/descargas/interarts756.pdf}

In summary the newer approaches to cultural relations involve moving:

- from events to projects
- from bilateral to multilateral
- from presentation to co-operation
- from products to process
- from one-way to two-way
- from telling to listening
- from self promotion to values promotion

The new directions will bring more and innovative cultural co-operation and see a significant shift to building lasting and sustainable, cultural and personal relationships.

\footnotetext[45]{See Fisher and Bröckerhoff, Options for Influence p 7.}