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The book contains two studies prepared especially for the conference “New Paradigms, New Models – Culture in the EU External Relations”.

The first study, “A Europe Open to Culture: Proposals for a European strategy of cultural diplomacy”, was prepared by Gijs de Vries, a Senior Fellow at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations “Clingendael” and Chairman of the European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF). The paper analyses the achievements and limitations of current EU policies, and offers proposals for elaboration on the European strategy of so-called cultural diplomacy. In addition to exploring the potential of culture for the EU’s policies in the fields of foreign affairs, security, and development, the paper discusses potential synergies with the policies of Member States. Particular attention is devoted to the Union’s relations with neighbouring countries in Europe and across the Mediterranean, and to cooperation with partners in Asia and North America.

The second paper, “International Relations in and of the European Union – Perspective of EUNIC”, was prepared by Jozef Batora and Monika Mokre, researchers at the Institute for European Integration Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna. The paper discusses the possibilities of enhanced cooperation among EU member states in the area of cultural promotion, with a special focus on the creation and maintenance of network partnership and the role of EUNIC as the incubator of such partnerships both inside and outside of the EU. A number of practical steps are suggested.

We hope that the papers will serve as a solid background for discussion at the conference, and as a reference for future studies on this challenging new paradigm. We would like to thank the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Austrian Presidency of EUNIC for their support. We also thank the authors for their valuable contributions.

Helena Drnovšek Zorko
Ambassador
Head of Division for International Cultural Relations
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Slovenia
Every day our lives are affected by culture and interpretations of cultural identity. Who we think we are affects how we think about others and how we behave towards them - whether in our local community, our country, or at international level. Culture matters intrinsically, as one of the conditions of a life fulfilled. In our globalising world, torn by ethnic and religious strife, culture also matters as a co-determinant of peace - and of conflict. At a time when extremists spread their message of hate and of the alleged incompatibility of Islam with the universal values of liberty interpretations of cultural identity are at the very centre of international affairs.

Foreign policy is about the defence of our security and interests in the world. How countries are perceived by others is one of the factors affecting their influence in the world. This is why countries practice public diplomacy: the promotion of the national interest by informing, engaging, and influencing people around the world. Cultural diplomacy is a significant dimension of public diplomacy.

Foreign policy is about more than the defence of material interests, or about hard power. It is also about the promotion of immaterial interests and values, and about soft power, “the ability to get what you want by attracting and persuading others to adopt your goals.” In Europe these values form the essence of our composite European identity. Javier Solana has summarized them as follows: compassion

---

with those who suffer; peace and reconciliation through integration; a strong attachment to human rights, democracy and the rule of law; a spirit of compromise, plus a commitment to promote in a pragmatic way a rules-based international system. Today these values are under threat, first and foremost from extremists. Promoting European values thus must be at the core of our common European foreign and security policy. Defending and promoting values is not only a responsibility of traditional diplomacy, at the government-to-government level. Relations with civil society through public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy have a critical part to play.

The importance of public diplomacy and of cultural diplomacy has long been recognised by many European governments. Neither has, as yet, been officially recognised by the European Union. In a variety of ways the EU provides information about its policies, structures and subsidies to its international partners, but these activities do not reflect a strategy for public diplomacy – nor do they amount to one. In its relations with non-European countries the EU also engages in cultural affairs; it does not yet have a strategy for cultural diplomacy. The purpose of this paper is to explore how cultural diplomacy could contribute to the EU’s soft power, in defence of its values of tolerance and liberty.

The structure of the paper is in three parts. First, the concept of cultural diplomacy will be discussed. This will be followed by an analysis of the European Union’s current cooperation with third countries in the field of culture. Finally, recommendations to the Member States and the institutions of the European Union will be formulated.

MAPPING THE FIELD

Before we embark on this journey it is necessary to define our terms. What do we mean when we speak of culture, and cultural diplomacy?

---

3 Speech at the Institute for Security Studies of the EU (Paris, 6 October 2006)
What is the relationship between cultural diplomacy and the wider concept of public diplomacy?

Public diplomacy is often regarded as a category of diplomacy *tout court*. Jan Melissen, for example, defines it as “the relationship between diplomats and foreign publics with which they work”.

Others argue that the domain of public diplomacy is not exclusive to diplomats, but that international organisations, business, and other non-governmental actors engage in it as well.

Definitions also vary with respect to the objective. Public diplomacy has traditionally been regarded as a way of influencing the perceptions of foreign audiences.

Modern definitions stipulate that the aims of public diplomacy also include changing foreign behaviour.

A third difference regards the question whether public diplomacy is one-directional or interactive. Public officials sometimes espouse the former notion. The American diplomat Richard Holbrooke wrote: “Call it public diplomacy, call it public affairs, psychological warfare, if you really want to be blunt, propaganda.”

Others emphasise that, to be effective, public diplomacy must differ considerably from propaganda: it should be about building trust and long-term relationships. Therefore,

---


5 For example Edmund A. Gullion: “By public diplomacy we understand the means by which governments, private groups and individuals influence the attitudes and opinions of other peoples and governments in such a way as to exercise influence on their foreign policy decisions.” (http://fletcher.tufts.edu/murrow/pd/definitions.html)


7 “Work aiming to inform and engage individuals and organisations overseas, in order to improve understanding of and influence for the United Kingdom in a manner consistent with governmental medium and long-term goals.” (Carter Review, 2005) See Fisher and Bröckerhoff, loc. cit.

it should be a two-way street, and practitioners must prove themselves to be open to the views of target groups. All, however, agree that the aim of public diplomacy is to exercise influence.

According to Jian Wang, three levels of public diplomacy can be distinguished. Public diplomacy is about promoting a country’s national goals and policies, communicating a nation’s ideas and ideals, beliefs and values, and building common understanding and relationships. Cultural diplomacy can play a role at each of these levels. Cultural diplomacy has been characterised as the linchpin of public diplomacy, “for it is in cultural activities that a nation’s idea of itself is best represented.”

According to one leading diplomat,

“nations, like people, do not act solely in accordance with an objective, detached evaluation of their best interests. This is of course an important ingredient in inter-state relations. But decision-making at all levels, whether the award of a state contract, the private sector purchase of goods or services, political support or opposition, is more often than not informed by emotional, psychological factors, by innate and sometimes unarticulated affinities or antipathies. It is in this area, often intangible and difficult to quantify in terms of balancing the day-to-day political and financial books, that cultural diplomacy plays a leading part.”

‘Culture’ is one of the most elusive concepts in social science. Many have struggled to define it. Scholarly and lexicographical definitions of culture abound. In 1952 a list of 164 definitions was compiled, and more have been added since. Definitions of culture employed by EU

---


11 Anthony Parsons, “‘Vultures and philistines’: British attitudes to culture and cultural diplomacy”, *International Affairs*, Winter 1984/85, p. 1

Member States differ widely. According to one of the more concise definitions, culture is "the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought". Dispensing with academic distinctions, T.S. Eliot felt that "(c)ulture may be even described simply as that what makes life worth living." 

In everyday parlance culture is often interpreted in a narrow sense, as a generic term for arts and heritage. Academics and public agencies, including UNESCO and the Council of Europe, tend to employ wider definitions.

"In its widest sense, culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs" 

For the purposes of this paper this wider definition will be employed. A strategy based on this comprehensive understanding of culture will not only aim at cooperation in arts and heritage, but will also integrate education, science, sports, and youth policy, as well as civil society dialogues on social, political, and religious subjects. The cultural diplomacy strategy advocated in this paper, therefore, covers not only cultural cooperation in the traditional sense, but also dialogue about questions de société.

Cultural diplomacy, finally, is another slippery notion. Academic literature contains a bewildering variety of terms which tend to be used interchangeably, including: foreign cultural affairs, international

---

13 Diane Dodd, Melle Lyklema, and Kathinka Dittrich-Van Weringh, A Cultural Component as an integral part of the EU’s Foreign Policy? (Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies, 2006), p. 11
15 T.S. Eliot, Notes Towards a Definition of Culture, 1948, rev. ed., 1962, p. 27
cultural relations, foreign cultural policy, cultural relations diplomacy, cultural relations policy, and cultural diplomacy.

Milton Cummings has defined cultural diplomacy as "the exchange of ideas, information, art, and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual understanding." However, cultural diplomacy is not only about creating mutual understanding. It is also, and crucially, about the promotion of fundamental values.

There are three sets of reasons why a country may wish to develop a strategy of cultural diplomacy.

One reason has been indicated above: it is to exercise influence in support of foreign policy priorities. Cultural relations can support diplomatic objectives: to create an atmosphere that is favourable to peace, for example, or to promote democracy, respect for human rights, or sustainable development. Channels of cultural communication can be particularly valuable in situations where regular diplomatic contacts are absent or weak. Cultural operators can open doors in countries where diplomats find it difficult to operate. The British Council's presence in countries such as Iran and Burma, for example, provides British diplomacy with privileged insights and access.

Cultural diplomacy can also contribute to maintaining or improving a country's image abroad. Austria, for instance, assumes that “culture shapes the image of Austria on the world stage. For the majority of people, the first contact with Austria is made via culture.”

Culture matters intrinsically but also economically. Robust cultural industries, capable of holding their own in global markets, are an economic asset for Europe. The cultural industries include: advertising, architecture, arts, crafts, educational and leisure software, fashion clothing, film, graphic design, interior design, live and recorded music, museums, performing arts and entertainments, photography, television, radio and internet broadcasting, video and other audiovisual produc-


tion, and writing and publishing. In 2004 the cultural sector employed at least 5.8 million people in Europe, and in 2003 it contributed 2.6% of EU GDP. Cultural competitiveness is a significant dimension of economic competitiveness.

Instruments of cultural diplomacy (such as showcasing artistic productions) are often used as an instrument to promote economic interests, such as attracting foreign direct investment, foreign tourists, or foreign students and scientists. Furthermore, international contacts and exchange (another key dimension of cultural diplomacy) are critical to maintain and improve European competitiveness in global cultural markets. Of course, cultural industries also play a prominent part in traditional diplomacy, such as international trade negotiations.

Anthony Parsons sums it up nicely:

“It is really dazzlingly obvious. If you are thoroughly familiar with someone else’s language and literature, if you know and love his country, its cities, its arts, its people, you will be instinctively disposed, all other things being equal or nearly equal, to buy goods from him rather than from a less well known and well liked source, to support him actively when you consider him to be right and to avoid punishing him too fiercely when you regard him as being in the wrong.”

There are several additional reasons why the European Union needs to develop its own strategy of cultural diplomacy.

EU Member States, first of all, face common challenges. In the field of security these challenges include terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, regional conflict, failed states, and organized crime, but also pandemic diseases and climate change. Countering several of these threats requires not only the cooperation of foreign governments,

---

19 UNESCO et al, *Data Collection and Analysis for Cultural Industries Sector Development in the Asia-Pacific Region* (Bangkok, 2005), p.8
21 The defence and promotion of cultural interests in EU policy on international trade and foreign investment will not be discussed as part of this paper.
but of their citizens as well – violent extremism and climate change in particular. Reaching out through cultural diplomacy can be a way of winning popular understanding and support.

Secondly, the effectiveness of the Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy partly depends on the image of the Union in third countries. While the EU on average enjoys a positive reputation, sympathy for the EU differs considerably from country to country. Throughout part of the Muslim world, in particular, the EU’s image is negative. As this makes it difficult for the EU to realize its objective of working with mainstream Muslims to prevent and combat violent radicalisation, EU cultural diplomacy needs to be deployed to improve the European image, especially (though not exclusively) in key Muslim-majority countries.

There are also competitive pressures the European Union needs to take into account. Spurred by globalisation, international competition between countries and regions has intensified. States and regions vie for political influence and economic power. They compete in cultural terms as well. In the international markets for films and television productions, for example, U.S. products often carry advantageous prices, costs having been recovered on the huge domestic American market. In 2006 France launched an initiative to create a European multimedia search engine, Quaero, allegedly in response to the dominance position of Google and Microsoft on the Internet. Countries also compete in terms of cultural diplomacy. China, for example, has embarked on a major campaign to improve its image and influence across the world. Since the first Confucius Institute opened in Seoul in 2004 many more have been established in other countries, including in at least 14 EU Member States. The Chinese Ministry of Education estimates that, by the year 2010, there will be approximately 100 million people worldwide learning Chinese as a foreign language, and it is working to set up more than 100 Confucius Institutes worldwide.23 EU Governments need to decide how to respond to this extra-ordinary Chinese effort at deploying soft power. European Foreign Ministers and the High Representative have yet to address this issue.

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 audiences 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. 24

Before assessing the European Union’s current international cultural relations and offering a series of recommendations – the subjects of the next chapters – two caveats are in order.

First, whereas there is much a strategy of cultural diplomacy can accomplish, it is important to recognise the limits of any such strategy. The image of a country – or the European Union – is not determined by its cultural wherewithal alone. At least as important for a country’s image abroad is the perception of that country’s foreign policy. Trust and sympathy first and foremost depend on how a country’s actions and intentions are perceived. Even competent cultural diplomacy does not compensate for policies judged harmful or deficient. Cultural diplomacy may accomplish much, but a panacea is it not.

It should also be realized that cultural diplomacy rarely delivers returns in the short run. Trust, sympathy and understanding take time to build. Politicians interested in securing ‘deliverables’ during their period in office are best advised to try their hand in other areas. Dedication and perseverance, particularly in difficult times, are indispensable for cultural diplomacy to succeed. Lord Palmerston famously

24 For assessments of national approaches to cultural diplomacy, see Julia Sattler, Nationalkultur oder europäische Werte? Britische, deutsche und französische Auswärtige Kulturpolitik zwischen 1989 und 2003 (Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag, 2007) and Rod Fisher, A Cultural Dimension to the EU’s External Policies – from Policy Statements to Practice and Potential (Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies, 2007)
remarked that the United Kingdom did not have permanent allies, only permanent interests. However, governments need to be prepared to preserve cultural exchange and cooperation even when short-term foreign policy interests may bring about a temporary cooling of regular diplomatic relations.

CURRENT POLICIES

Cultural diplomacy must encompass elements of traditional diplomacy – aimed in particular at promoting peace and safeguarding political, social, economic, and cultural rights – as well as practical, long-term programmes to promote cooperation and understanding. The latter should include instruments to support capacity building, mobility across borders, and the establishment of spaces and opportunities for cooperation and dialogue, at grass-roots level. Over the years, the EU Council of Ministers and the European Commission have engaged in aspects of cultural diplomacy. On balance, however, they have done so in a disjointed manner, without common objectives and without mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of their policies and projects.

That the EU’s cultural policy must have an external dimension has long been recognized. Article 151 of the Treaty requires the Community and the Member States to foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organisations in the sphere of culture. Over the years the EU has collaborated with the Council of Europe and UNESCO and has signed cooperation and association agreements containing cultural clauses with many non-EU states.

The Union established a single financing and programming instrument for cultural cooperation, entitled the ‘Culture Programme’, for the period from 2007 through 2013. It is aimed at improving knowledge among European citizens of European cultures other than their own, while at the same time heightening their awareness of the common

25 "We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and these interests it is our duty to follow." Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates, March 1, 1848
European cultural heritage they share. The Programme is not intended for EU citizens alone. It also has an external dimension. To ensure coherence and complementarity with Community policies in the field of cultural cooperation with third countries the Commission has been charged with ensuring a link between the Programme and EU external relations. Third countries (EFTA countries, i.e. Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein; candidate countries, countries in the Western Balkans, and countries with association or cooperation agreements which include cultural clauses) may participate in or cooperate with the programme under certain conditions.27

Still, the external dimension was originally felt to be secondary to the internal objectives of the programme. This is clear from the Commission's online consultation about its 2007 Communication on Culture. In preparing what is clearly intended to be a key policy document, the Commission stated it has two objectives in mind: developing European citizenship and promoting the objectives of the Lisbon agenda. There was no mention of the external dimension.28 This appears to have been added only at a later stage, shortly before adoption of the final Communication by the Commission.

The Commission's approach is symptomatic of a more general problem. Even though the Union carries out or finances quite a range of cultural activities in third countries, its policies lack focus. Indeed, the external dimension of the Union's cultural relations is characterized by conceptual confusion.

Sometimes youth policy is regarded as a dimension of international cultural policy, sometimes it is taken to be a subject in its own right. Similarly, education policy in relation to third countries is occasionally treated as part of cultural policy, but at other times not. Sometimes tourism is mixed in with culture, at other times it is not. In the EU Action Plan with Morocco intercultural dialogue is part of cultural cooperation; in the Action Plan with Tunisia it falls under education, training, and youth. In cooperation with Turkey projects to preserve cultural

27 Communication the general approach to enable ENP partner countries to participate in Community agencies and Community programmes, COM (2006) 724

diversity are part of human rights cooperation, and the Culture in Action Programme is used not only to fund cultural cooperation, but also information activities about the EU. It is all a bit of a muddle.

From 2007 to 2013 the European Union will use seven instruments for external assistance, six of which could be used to finance cultural diplomacy.29 These are:

- the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI), which provides assistance to 17 countries: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, the Palestinian Authority, Russia, Syria, Tunisia and Ukraine.
- the European Development Fund (EDF), which finances co-operation with 78 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACP) and the overseas countries and territories of Member States.
- the Development Co-operation Instrument (DCI). This provides assistance to South Africa and 47 developing countries in Latin America, Asia and Central Asia, and the Middle East (only those countries not covered by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument or the European Development Fund). It also supports the restructuring of sugar production in 18 ACP countries. Under the DCI five thematic programmes are being financed: environment and sustainable management of natural resources including energy; food security; migration and asylum; non-state actors and local authorities in development; and investing in people. The latter two can cover support to cultural cooperation. All five programmes can support initiatives in all developing countries (including those covered by ENPI and the EDF), as well as global actions.
- the Instrument for Stability (IfS). The IfS has two components: crisis response and preparedness, and capacity building to address global and regional trans-border security challenges.
- the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA), which is a financial support mechanism for the countries which are candidates or potential

29 The seventh instrument is the Nuclear Safety Co-operation Instrument
candidates for EU membership. The IPA, too, can be used to fund cooperation in the sphere of culture.

- the European Instrument for Democracy & Human Rights (EIDHR). EIDHR contributes to the development of democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It complements the other financial instruments.

In 2007, for the first time the Commission issued an exploratory policy document on the external aspects of European cultural policies: the Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world.\(^{30}\) In the contested field of cultural policy this was a bold step, which has served to attract attention to the policy options available to the Union. However, in the political reality of the European Union, a Communication by the European Commission does not amount to a strategy by the European Union as a whole. No horizontal strategy has been formulated which ties together the responsibilities of the Commission with those of the Council and the Member States, and many opportunities for cultural cooperation have yet to be explored.

Symptomatic of the lack of conceptual clarity and policy focus is the treatment allotted to cultural cooperation in the Union's relations with its 18 partners under the European Neighbourhood Policy.

**European Neighbourhood**

Two multilateral, regional schemes, Euromed Heritage and Euromed Audiovisual, are the flagship programmes in the field of culture between the EU and its Mediterranean partners. Several Member States (notably through national cultural agencies) and the European Commission have also financed smaller, bilateral cultural projects, including the website www.babelmed.net. Some of these projects have been jointly, such as the annual film festivals in several North African countries. Culture has been integrated into the Civil Society Dialogue between the EU and Turkey. However, cooperation with the countries around the Mediterranean is more advanced than with the EU’s Eastern partners. Furthermore, politically and financially the European Union has invested considerably

\(^{30}\) COM (2007) 242
more into the regional programmes under Euromed than into bilateral programmes with individual North-African or Middle Eastern states. Compared to the multilateral programmes, cultural cooperation with most ENP partners is still relatively underdeveloped. This is the case, for example, with regard to Israel, Morocco, and Egypt.

European history and the history of the state of Israel are inextricably intertwined. Dialogue between Europe and Israel, one of only two democracies bordering the Southern and Eastern Mediterranean, is of critical importance to both sides. A multi-annual series of encounters between a broad range of civil society participants, properly prepared and financed, could be instrumental in dispelling mutual misunderstanding and distrust. As Israeli distrust of European policies and intentions is one of the main impediments to greater European influence on the Middle East Peace Process, strengthening ties with Israeli civil society should be central to European foreign policy.

In their joint Action Plan the EU and Israel stated they would enhance cultural cooperation. Some projects have indeed been funded. Until now, culture appears to have been interpreted in a narrow sense. The projects supported by the Commission all relate to artistic events such as a dance festival, a film festival, a theatrical production. None have a wider focus. Opportunities to engage wider sections of the population across a wider range of fields and subjects have thus far not been explored. In addition, the emphasis is on projects with a limited time-horizon, including one-off events. No multi-annual joint programmes have been identified. The projects also mainly concern projects based in Israel. Only in the domain of film do opportunities to bring Israeli cultural products and producers to Europe seem to have been identified.

It would appear, therefore, that the EU has yet to tap the full potential of cultural cooperation - culture being understood in its wider sense, as defined by UNESCO - for its relations with Israeli civil society. The recent EU Strategy Paper and Indicative Programme for Israel, which cover cooperation under the European Neighbourhood and Partner-

ship Instrument, do not contain any specific proposals in the field of culture, whereas Israel, both for cultural and for geopolitical reasons, ought to be a priority country in EU cultural diplomacy. The European Commission and EU Member States should draw up - and finance - the necessary proposals as a matter of urgency.

Moroccan ties with Spain, France and other European countries are long-standing and deep. Morocco’s significance to Europe is not only historic and cultural, but political and economic as well. Under the reign of King Mohammed VI the country is charting a course between the competing forces of modernisation and fundamentalism. As a source of illegal migration, drugs, and Islamist extremists, Morocco has a manifest impact on European security. Morocco’s future as a stable, prosperous, and moderate country is important to Europe. In view of the social, political, and religious forces at work in Morocco, improving mutual cooperation and understanding at the level of civil society should be a priority of European diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy, involving public as well as non-governmental actors on both sides, could play a major role in dispelling anti-European sentiments in Morocco and Islamophobia in Europe. For the moment, however, cultural cooperation between the European Union and Morocco remains weak and imbued by a lack of imagination.

Some useful steps have been taken. Morocco participates in Euromed Heritage and in Euromed Media. It has improved access to foreign films. The Commission has financed a series of cultural projects with Morocco. However, notwithstanding the EU’s frequent use of the word ‘strategic’, culture has not been identified as a strategically important sector of bilateral cooperation between the EU and Morocco. The EU Strategy Paper for Morocco under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, (2007-2013) contains only a passing and tentative reference to culture, at the end of a paragraph devoted to the development of social policies.

35 “The possibilities of enhanced cultural cooperation will also be examined.” Morocco Strategy Paper 2007-2013, p. 22
The EU’s 2007-2010 National Indicative Programme for Morocco, which includes a highly detailed set of commitments in fields ranging from institutional support to social, economic, and environmental cooperation, contains three proposals in the field of culture: support for the creation of a national history museum, an institute of contemporary history, and a policy on archives. These three initiatives may prove valuable contributions to the search for reconciliation in Morocco. They do not, however, reflect a comprehensive strategy of cultural cooperation between the European Union and Morocco.

_Egypt_ has long been one of the most important Arab countries. Its importance to regional security and development is huge. Without Egypt’s cooperation no sustainable peace between Israel and its neighbours, including the Palestinians, is feasible. Egypt has been a source as well as a target of Islamist terrorism, and fundamentalist propaganda and agitation are rife. The Egyptian political system is brittle and based on oppression; political reform aimed at improving accountability and the protection of human rights is long overdue. Traditional diplomatic instruments, with their emphasis on government-to-government cooperation, are not well suited to reach and influence broader sections of the Egyptian population. Egypt, therefore, should be a prime target for European cultural diplomacy.

As is the case with other Mediterranean partners, however, cooperation with Egypt in the wider field of culture has so far been limited in scope, and current policies do not offer much prospect of improvement. In fact, not a single proposal for cultural cooperation has been included in the recent seven-year Egypt Country Strategy Paper - not even in relation to the development of tourism as a mainstay of the Egyptian economy.[^36] A number of cultural projects have been funded over the years by the European Commission, predominantly in the arts, and Egypt has participated in Euromed programmes. Some culturally-relevant projects have also been financed under the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights. But few initiatives to involve academics, journalists, social and religious opinion leaders have been taken, and no strategy of cultural diplomacy has been formulated. Re-

[^36]: "The possibilities for enhanced co-operation in the field of culture will be examined." - p. 25
reflection and debate on the more contentious issues of society is mostly left to national cultural institutes such as the Goethe Institute. Yet it is precisely these issues - including the role and development of Islam in Egypt and Europe - that should be central to the dialogue.

In its regional strategy under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument for the southern Mediterranean countries (Regional Strategy Paper (2007-2013) and Regional Indicative Programme (2007-2010) for the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership) the Commission has set three priorities: (a) justice, security and migration cooperation, (b) sustainable economic development, and (c) social development and cultural exchanges. This regional strategy is complementary to the bilateral strategies agreed with each of the partner countries under the Barcelona process.

With respect to social development and cultural exchanges four sub-programmes are envisaged: ‘gender equality and civil society’, ‘information and communication’ (support for EU information activities about the Partnership), ‘Euromed Youth’, and ‘Dialogue between cultures and cultural heritage’ (support for Euromed Heritage and for the Anna Lindh Foundation). Compared to previous programmes, this Euromed regional programme contains two new accents: a greater focus on civil society and on information provision. In general, however, the programme contains little fresh thinking about the role of culture in a regional context. No provision has been made, for instance, to finance a cultural dimension of the EU’s maritime strategy. All around the Mediterranean, coastal zones suffer from lack of public planning and ruthless exploitation. Brutal and insensitive economic development has destroyed much of the tangible and intangible heritage. Measures are urgently required to help preserve the natural and cultural heritage of littoral zones around the Mediterranean, including the southern and eastern rim. A multi-nation, comprehensive approach is required, which integrates cultural policy priorities into environmental and economic planning. Such a joint Euromed strategy of maritime and coastal heritage protection around the Mediterranean could give a powerful and revitalising boost to Europe’s languid Barcelona strategy.

The ENPI Eastern Regional Indicative Programme covers regional cooperation between the EU and Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia,
Moldova, the Russian Federation and Ukraine. The five Central Asian republics of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan also qualify for limited financial support. There are five priority areas, including ‘people-to-people activities, information and support’. Presumably, cultural cooperation may be covered as part of this category. The programme, however, does not mention culture anywhere. As mentioned, the Union’s Mediterranean partners benefit from EU financing to protect and promote cultural heritage, the Euromed Heritage Programme. They also participate in the Euromed Audiovisual Programme. The EU’s Eastern European partners lack such mechanisms, which, in view of their history, geography, and political orientation must be considered an anomaly. The cultural paragraphs of the Action Plans between the EU and Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia are brief and unimaginative; those with Moldova are only slightly less bland. Nor have opportunities for conflict prevention through regional cultural cooperation been identified. In sharp contrast to the southern strand of the European neighbourhood strategy, therefore, the eastern strand lacks an explicit cultural dimension.

Culture was mentioned in the conclusions of the summit between the EU and Russia on 10 May 2005. At that meeting, ministers agreed that the EU and Russia would work together in four so-called spaces. The fourth space was identified as that of Research, Education and Culture. Progress since 2005 has been slow. In 2007 an EU-Russia Joint Working Group on Cultural Cooperation was established, and the Commission Delegation in Moscow launched its first call for projects to be funded. Eight projects were selected.

For some years the EU has operated a Northern strategy which includes a cultural dimension. Promoting an open cultural area, raising awareness of cultural heritage, and promoting cultural mobility were among the objectives of the Second Northern Dimension Action Plan. Some cultural projects have indeed been financed, but mostly on an incidental basis.

---

37 ENPI Eastern Regional Indicative Programme 2007-2013
Finally, as part of the ENPI a separate policy document on cross-border cooperation between EU Member States and neighbouring countries (both southern and eastern) has been issued by the Commission. Its objectives are to promote economic and social development, work on ‘common challenges’ (environment, health, crime), improve border infrastructures, and promote ‘people-to-people’ actions. Cultural heritage and media are cited as areas for ‘people-to-people’ actions; other cultural fields, however, are not. Neither have cultural industries or cultural tourism been identified as promising sectors for economic development. And when the authors underline the importance of coordination between the cross-border programmes and related policy areas, from trade to research, cultural policy is not mentioned. Still, the programme, if properly used, could play a welcome role in stimulating cultural cooperation (including artists’ mobility and heritage protection) around the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea, and the Mediterranean. With EU support, cultural cooperation between Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania, and the other countries bordering the Black Sea could play a significant role in reducing tensions and improving mutual perceptions in this volatile region, and the Commission must make sure that ENPI-funding will be available for relevant projects.

Cultural cooperation was one of the three priority areas identified in the 1995 Barcelona Declaration. In reality, however, culture plays only a small part in the bilateral cooperation between the EU and individual Mediterranean partners. This inconsistency cannot be attributed only to a lack of interest (‘ownership’) among the EU’s partners, even though this does play a role. The Union itself has so far failed to develop coherent policies in the field of culture. As mentioned above, culture barely registers as an area of cooperation in the EU’s own seven-year Strategy Papers under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument. In its recent Communication on the implementation of

41 Between Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Germany, Norway, Russia and Belarus
42 Between Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey, Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan
43 http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/euromed/bd.htm
the European Neighbourhood Policy in 2007 the Commission does not mention culture. The last year’s Communication by the Commission on “A Strong European Neighbourhood Policy” contains references to sectoral policy dialogues from energy to fisheries, but omits any reference to culture. As the examples of Israel, Morocco and Egypt illustrate, neither the Commission nor the Council has developed an overarching view of the role of cultural relations with their southern Mediterranean partners. The EU has projects, it does not yet have a policy.

Much the same could be said about the EU’s cultural cooperation with other regions of the world.

Western Balkans

The Union’s financial mechanism to support stability and peace in the Western Balkans (CARDS), for example, included support for independent media, freedom of opinion, and other aspects of human rights, but lacked objectives in the area of arts and heritage - even though cooperation in these fields arguably could have a major contribution to make to regional understanding and the eradication of prejudice. As Gottfried Wagner has written, this neglect of cultural cooperation to improve perceptions and understanding between the EU and the Balkan countries “virtually amounted to a paradoxical neo-Marxism in which the power of the ‘basis’, of material investment, was given precedence over the power of the ‘superstructure’ (Überbau) – with only education, which opened its cooperation mechanisms to the region step by step, granted exemption.”

The CARDS programme, which covered Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro, and the former Yugoslav republic of Macedonia, has been superseded by the Instrument for Pre-Accession
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46 CARDS Assistance Programme to the western Balkans, Regional Strategy paper 2002-2006
Assistance from 2007. The relevant regulation does not mention culture as such.48 Support, however, may be granted to the development of civil society, reconciliation, the promotion of human rights, and regional and cross-border cooperation, as well as to education, media reform, and youth. Cooperation in the fields of arts and heritage is, of course, highly relevant to each of these objectives. The Commission has in fact funded some projects in the field of heritage protection. In November 2007 it announced it will establish a new facility under IPA to promote civil society development in eight areas, including ‘media’ and ‘culture’.49 The Western Balkan countries have also been given access to Community Programmes such as Erasmus Mundus. Croatia participates in the Culture Programme 2007-2013.

In addition to the EU itself, EU Member States such as France, Germany, the UK and the Netherlands have financed projects in the sphere of the arts in Western Balkan countries.

The Balkan Incentive Fund for Culture, which has been initiated by the European Cultural Foundation and other NGO’s, is an example of an important private sector initiative to stimulate cultural cooperation and exchange between the EU and the countries of South-East Europe.50

Still, it is hard to escape the impression that much more could be done, in particular by the European Union. Cultural exchange and cooperation can play an important part in integrating the Balkan into the European Union. Negative perceptions of the Balkans are still widespread in other European countries. All too often, the Balkan is described as ‘the other’ in relation to Europe. Art and culture are of crucial importance in exposing and overcoming the stereotypes and mental borders which still haunt our continent. Balkan NGO’s working in the arts often suffer from a lack of funding, training, and access to

---

50 The Balkan Incentive Fund for Culture is an initiative of the European Cultural Foundation, the Dutch humanist institute HIVOS, the Open Society Institute, and foundations in Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Serbia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
other European countries. Discontinuity caused by high staff turnover could be countered by greater core funding and capacity building as well as mobility aid that would facilitate international travel.\textsuperscript{51}

Wars and neglect have seriously affected the region’s cultural heritage, including in the field of architecture. Independent journalists frequently experience political interference. And the potential of cultural cooperation – both in its traditional and its wider sense – for reconciliation between nations and minorities in the region has hardly been tapped.

Asia

Asia could be cited as a third region where EU cultural diplomacy could potentially play a very significant role. Home to one third of mankind, Asian countries are rapidly becoming indispensable to the solution of most global problems, from security to the environment. How Europe is perceived in Asia should thus be of prime concern to European policy-makers. Asian views of Europe tend not to be very flattering. In economic terms Europe is seen as yesterday’s continent, in political terms we are perceived to be weak and divided. And yet, Europeans and their cultural heritage are generally regarded sympathetically. Asia should be a natural candidate for European cultural diplomacy. Of course individual European countries should continue to operate their national cultural policies. But would they not pack considerably more punch if they would, at least on occasion, band together? Building on the success of EU film festivals in several parts of the world, why not jointly present European research efforts, or opportunities for education in Europe? The Asia-Europe Foundation could help in organising the necessary activities. Branching out into public diplomacy, why could European bilateral embassies not organise a series of events about aspects of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy, including Europe's experience in crisis management? The world has many questions about Europe.

\textsuperscript{51} Chris Keulemans, ‘Reaching the Heart of the Matter’, in Chris Keulemans and David Cameron (eds.), The Heart of the Matter. The role of the arts and culture in the Balkans’ European integration (Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation, 2005), p. 35
In the absence of a common European foreign service it is the task of national diplomatic representations to answer the many questions the world has about European policies, experiences, and values. This task should not be left only to the Commission.

New financial instruments have been approved which will govern cooperation between the EU and its international partners until 2013. Will these new instruments offer greater opportunities for a coherent and consistent external cultural policy?

Though it contains little fresh thinking, the Regulation establishing the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument does include among its objectives "promoting multicultural dialogue, people-to-people contacts, including links with communities of immigrants living in Member States, cooperation between civil societies, cultural institutions and exchanges of young people". It also aims at "protecting historical and cultural heritage and promoting development potential, including through tourism".

Unfortunately these objectives are entirely lacking in the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) that will govern relations between the EU and Croatia, Turkey, the former Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia, Montenegro, and Serbia, including Kosovo (as defined in UNSCR 1244) until 2013. Still, the IPA does include the development of civil society, reconciliation, regional and cross-border cooperation in its scope for assistance. The Cross-Border Cooperation Component of IPA, in particular, aims at promoting good neighbourly relations, stability and security of all countries concerned. There seems to be scope, therefore, for the fostering of cultural cooperation and inter-cultural dialogue under the IPA, even in the absence of explicit policy objectives. That would certainly appear in line with the intentions of the European Council, which, in December 2004, stated that, in parallel to accession negotiations, the EU should engage in "intensive political and cultural dialogue" with every candidate country.52

A third new external financial tool is the regulation establishing a financial instrument for development cooperation. Cultural cooperation

is addressed in Articles 5 and 12, which cover, *inter alia*, inter-cultural dialogue, promotion of cultural industries, and promotion of respect for cultural values. Contrary to the 2005 Cotonou Agreement (Article 37) between EU Member States and 78 ACP countries, recognising, preserving and promoting the value of cultural heritage and supporting the development of capacity in this sector are not explicitly mentioned in the new EU instrument.

In the words of the UNESCO World Commission on Culture and Development, “(t)he support of new, emerging and experimental forms of artistic expression (is) not a subsidy but an investment in human development.”

Acting in the spirit of the Commission, several EU Member States have assigned cultural cooperation an explicit part of their national development policy - Austria, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK among them. Interest in Germany is growing. The World Bank has made an effort to include concern for culture in its drive for poverty reduction, empowerment and social inclusion. Cultural activities in ACP countries have also been supported by the European Commission. Since 1989 the Commission has contributed about € 116 million to some 380 projects in the areas of music, dance, audiovisual, fashion, crafts, oral tradition and literature. Under the current, 9th European Development Fund two cultural programmes have been identified: one for the Cinema and Audiovisual sector, and one for cultural industries. Thus far, most EU aid to ACP countries appears to have been dedicated to traditional aid projects. Promoting inter-cultural cooperation and dialogue with Europe has not figured prominently.

Culture does not yet occupy its natural place among the priorities of international development cooperation. Notwithstanding the 2003 Common Framework for Development Cooperation in the Cultural Domain, when the European Commission and the Council of Ministers adopted the European Consensus on Development in 2005, culture was not included among the nine priority areas for action, nor as one of the four cross-cutting issues. Culture was also left out of the Commission
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Communication about increasing the impact of aid (2006). In 2006, the Commission's Directorate General for Development initiated work on a draft Communication on culture in EU development policy, but no such policy statement has been issued. However, the Commission did announce it intends to include a cultural chapter in all economic partnership agreements with ACP countries, and in all free trade agreements with industrialized countries.

The purpose of these chapters would be to encourage preferential treatment for cultural goods and services, and to make the mobility of artists and cultural co-production with these countries a reality. There is clearly scope for a more systematic approach to cultural cooperation as a dimension of European development policy.

As this brief overview illustrates, there is no coherence in the way cultural cooperation is dealt with by the Union. Culture does play a part - though a relatively small one - in the Union's relations with the ACP countries and with its Mediterranean partners, but its significance in relations with the Balkans, Asia and Latin America appears to be considerably underrated. Even in relation to the countries across the Mediterranean much of the potential of cultural diplomacy as an instrument of foreign policy has yet to be developed. Synergies between the Neighbourhood Instrument and the Instrument for promotion of Democracy and Human Rights worldwide also still need to be established. Nor are opportunities to promote the Union's values being identified systematically. It is time, therefore, for the Union to define its principles and to set priorities based on a common view. In other words, it is time for the European Union to develop an overall policy framework for culture in its external relations.
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TOWARDS A STRATEGY OF CULTURAL DIPLOMACY

What should a European policy of cultural diplomacy entail? How can the current disparate collection of projects and programmes be moulded into a coherent strategy serving both Europe's cultural interests and its foreign and security policy, following the example of several of its Member States? In addition to traditional tasks such as defending the worldwide economic interests of Europe's cultural sectors, such a strategy should include at least four dimensions: (1) strengthening the rule of law; (2) developing cultural diplomacy as an instrument of conflict prevention and management; (3) protecting and enhancing cultural heritage; (4) creating mechanisms for civil society cooperation, dialogue, and exchange (people-to-people contacts).

Strengthening the rule of law

The right to have access to culture and to enjoy its delights is essential to a life lived in freedom and dignity. It is a right essential to all human beings, as was recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 27 (1) of the Universal Declaration reads:

“Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts, and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.”

Strengthening the rule of law, not only in Europe but globally, is one of the central objectives of European foreign policy. This objective is relevant also in relation to culture. EU foreign policy should be used systematically to promote cultural freedom, both in the regions bordering the Union and worldwide. Two priorities would be particularly important for EU foreign and cultural ministers to embrace: the universal ratification and implementation of the standards set in relevant international conventions, and the defence and promotion of freedom of information and expression.
Ratification of the UNESCO conventions is one of the objectives of the Union - at least in relation to the partner countries covered by the European Neighbourhood Policy. Ratification of the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity has even been made a prerequisite for participation by ENP-countries in the MEDIA 2007 Programme. References to the need to ratify this Convention have been included in the EU Action Plans with several ENP partners. Important as these initiatives are, they do not yet form part of a wider EU strategy to promote the ratification and implementation of all UNESCO conventions. Rarely - if ever - do EU Foreign Ministers include a call to ratify and implement cultural conventions in dialogues with their counterparts from third countries.

Campaigning for universalisation of international Conventions is an established practice of the Union - from the Convention against the financing of terrorism to the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court. The time has come for the European Union to systematically urge its partners to ratify and implement all six main UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture, including the 2005 Convention on Cultural Diversity. The Union should also encourage ratification and implementation of the relevant Council of Europe's Conventions, such as the Convention for the Protection of Architectural Heritage. The European Parliament, through its network of delegations, could equally bring useful pressure to bear.

Many of the EU’s most privileged partners are years behind in ratifying the most important international legal instruments in the fields of culture.

- Of the seven countries covered by the Instrument of Pre-Accession Assistance, only Croatia is a party to all six main UNESCO conventions. Croatia is also the only one of the seven to have joined all seven key Council of Europe conventions. Of the latter, Serbia has only joined three,56 Albania and Bosnia-Herzegovina only two.57

---

56 European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, European Cultural Convention
57 European Cultural Convention, European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage – revised
None of the 16 partners of the EU under the European Neighbourhood Policy has joined all six main UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture. Moldova is a party to only one, and Israel to only two. Algeria is not yet a party to three, including the important Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

Russia has joined only three of the six UNESCO conventions. Of the seven key Council of Europe Conventions in the field of culture it has joined only two.

Of the six main UNESCO conventions in the field of culture, the United States has declined to join four, including the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

However, the EU’s partners are not the only countries with a lot of catching up to do. Many EU Member States have been just as lax. Of the 27 EU Member States, only Lithuania, Romania and Spain are a party to all of the six main UNESCO Conventions in the field of culture. Ireland, Malta, and the Netherlands have the worst record – they still need to join four of the six conventions. All other Member States still have to ratify one, two or three of the instruments.

No EU Member State has ratified all seven main Council of Europe Conventions in the field of culture. Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Italy, Luxembourg and Malta have the worst record – they still need to ratify four of the seven (see annex).

International law is of critical importance to protect the cultural heritage of mankind and to guarantee everyone’s right to participate in
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58 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict
59 World Heritage Convention, Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict
61 European Cultural Convention, Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe
cultural life. As the United States, regrettably, cannot be counted upon to uphold and promote international law in the field of culture, the responsibility to stand up for global standards squarely rests on Europe’s shoulders. Europeans, however, cannot expect to defend international law effectively unless they respect it themselves. EU governments and parliaments need to speed up ratification and implementation of the international cultural treaties.

*Promoting freedom of expression and cultural choice*

The right to a dignified life includes access to culture. Expanding cultural freedom must form an integral part of policies to promote fundamental rights. Cultural liberty is about allowing people the freedom to choose their identities and to lead the lives they value without being excluded by political or religious forces from other choices important to them (such as those for education, health or job opportunities).62

Recognition of the link between culture and human rights is essential. Efforts to defend culture through by invoking norms and traditions in violation of international law must be squarely resisted. Human rights are universal and indivisible. The international community should guard, for example, against the tendency of governments to invoke the need to protect cultural diversity in order to maintain practices incompatible with human rights, such as female genital mutilation, or to stifle dissident political opinions and other unwelcome voices. As has been stated in the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Art. 2.1):

> “Cultural diversity can be protected and promoted only if human rights and fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, information and communication, as well as the ability of individuals to choose cultural expressions, are guaranteed. No one may invoke the provisions of this Convention in order to infringe human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in the Universal Declara-
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tion of Human Rights or guaranteed by international law, or to limit the scope thereof”.

Other threats to cultural liberty can be more insidious and indirect. This is the case, notably, when national policy-makers promote ‘national culture’ to the detriment of minority cultures. Or when officials tailor financial support to restrict rather than widen opportunities for foreign travel or cooperation with foreign artists. As UNDP has rightly warned, neither cultural diversity nor safeguarding cultural heritage are goods in themselves; they are means of promoting cultural choice for individuals.63

European cultural diplomacy should be about expanding cultural choice for individuals. Where foreign governments seek to restrict or control the cultural freedom of their citizens, through commission or omission, these individuals should find the European Union their ally. EU governments and institutions should be careful not to let well-intentioned policies to promote ‘inter-cultural dialogue’ or ‘inter-religious dialogue’ - which necessarily often require working with foreign governments - obscure the objective of expanding individual liberty and choice.

Strengthening the rule of law also implies defending and promoting freedom of expression. With depressing frequency writers and journalists fall victim to authorities eager to stamp out unwelcome views. At last count there were 39 writers around the world who were persecuted for the peaceful expression of their views.64 In 2007, 55 writers and journalists were killed. While it is not always possible to be completely sure that the killings were directly linked to the victim’s writings, at least 18 were deliberately targeted.65 Among them was the editor Hrant Dink, assassinated in Turkey for his commentary on the Armenian genocide. International PEN has signalled that governments increasingly choose not to resort to imprisonment to harass dissident writers, but instead subject them to long and convoluted trials. Most noticeable is the case

64 http://www.pencanada.ca (accessed 22.4.2008)
of Turkey where around 60 writers, journalists and publishers are on trial.

Five international broadcasters have recently warned of rising threats to media freedom.\[^{66}\] Particularly disturbing are new efforts by some governments, through the licensing and regulatory process, to restrict or forbid local rebroadcasts of programs on radio and television through local partnerships. And more states are deliberately interfering with broadcast signals or are attempting to block or censor the Internet. These efforts violate the right to receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers (United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights). Media freedom in Russia has long been seriously compromised. The ‘Principles for organising satellite TV in the Arab world’, recently adopted by the Arab Ministers of Information in Egypt, constitute a major setback to freedom of the press and freedom of expression. The principles require satellite broadcasters, inter alia, not to offend the leaders or national and religious symbols in the Arab world, and not to damage social harmony, national unity, public order or traditional values.\[^{67}\]

Combating censorship, harassment and oppression of journalists, promoting literacy and supporting independent media must be a priority of EU foreign policy. All too often, however, the EU’s voice in addressing violations of the right to freedom of expression is weak. The EU should make it a point of honour to take up cases of persecuted writers and journalists, including those listed in International PEN’s Rapid Action Alerts. A good way of making the Union act more systematically against attacks on freedom of expression would be for EU Foreign Ministers to adopt a set of General Guidelines on Freedom of Expression, and for the European Parliament to watch over their implementation.\[^{68}\]

Defending freedom of religion equally must be among the EU's visible concerns. This means that EU Foreign Ministers must speak out

---


\[^{68}\] For the existing five sets of EU General Guidelines on Human Rights, see http://www.consilium.europa.eu/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=822&lang=en
when people, including Islamic fundamentalists, are jailed or muzzled for the peaceful expression of their views or beliefs. Care must also be taken, particularly by the Commission, to ensure complementarity and synergy between the tools for cultural diplomacy and the instruments to defend human rights, and to avoid the risk that the new funding instruments, including the financing instrument for the promotion of democracy and human rights worldwide, will be used in a disjointed fashion by different Directorates General. Translating more European books, films and websites into Arabic, for example, would be an excellent way to bolster the right to freedom of information in Arab countries as well as to promote cultural dialogue with Europe.

A particular focus on freedom of expression is warranted in the countries that are expected to join the European Union. In several of these countries there is cause for concern. According to the European Commission’s most recent progress report, in Albania legal guarantees of freedom of expression are not yet implemented fully, particularly regarding the print media and respect of journalists’ independence by media owners. Government decisions on broadcasting licencing and tax enforcement have led to accusations of bias.69 In Croatia, political interference in the media has continued, including through political pressure on the public broadcaster HRT. Both the Council for Electronic Media and the Croatian Radio and Television and its Programme Council should be able to work independently and free from political pressure.70 In Serbia, there has been no progress in the investigations of murders of journalists, some of which date back to the 1990s. Intimidation and attacks against journalists continued in 2007, involving physical threats and an assassination attempt.71 In Kosovo political will to support freedom of expression remains low.72 In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the public broadcaster and the Broadcasting Council remain

vulnerable to political interference.\footnote{European Commission, \textit{The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2007 Progress Report}, SEC (2007) 1432, p. 35} And in Turkey, the independence of the public broadcaster TRT and TRÜK remains a matter of concern, while numerous people have been convicted for the expression of non-violent opinion on, among other things, Armenian and Kurdish issues. Judicial proceedings and threats against human rights defenders, journalists, writers, publishers, academics and intellectuals have created a climate which has led to “occurrences of self-censorship”.\footnote{European Commission, \textit{Turkey 2007 Progress Report}, SEC (2007) 1436, pp. 43 and 61}

EU Foreign Ministers should make it clear to all concerned that membership of the European Union is out of the question as long as such practices continue. At the same time, EU Member States must see to it that they respect media freedom at home, as well. According to a report to be published shortly by the U.S. NGO Freedom House, a number of Central European Member States have shown a decline in media freedom in 2007.\footnote{Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, as cited in \textit{The Economist}, April 26\textsuperscript{th}, 2008, p. 44}

Preventing and managing conflicts

‘Wakenya Pamoja’ (‘Kenya Together’) has been among the most frequently played songs on Kenya radio stations during the political crisis which followed the controversial presidential elections in December 2007. It is message of peace from more than 30 musicians. Other musicians have used radio commercials to ask their fans to refrain from violence. In Burundi, the British NGO Creative Exchange and five local organizations use cultural projects as part of conflict resolution and peace-building. In Sri Lanka, Kasinathar Gnanadas and his team of Tamils, Sinhalese and Muslims are working on a conciliatory film project about the country’s civil war.\footnote{Examples derived from http://krachtvancultuur.nl. For a wide-ranging set of views, see Helmut K. Anheier and Yudhishtir Raj Isar (eds.), \textit{Conflicts and Tensions} (London: Sage, 2007)} The Macedonian TV series Nashe Maalo is a children’s programme in a country where Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish and Roma commun-
ties coexist. The central figure in the series is "Karmen", a personification of the building in which many of the young characters - who represent different ethnicities - live. Karmen uses her special powers to transport the children magically into someone else's reality. In this way, the children gain an understanding of each other's lives. An academic study has shown that after viewing many children gave less prejudiced descriptions when presented with images of people from other groups.77

Worldwide, examples abound of cultural cooperation as a mechanism to address stereotypes, prejudice, and associated 'Feindbilder'. In December 2007, the Prince Claus Fund for Culture and Development honoured 11 artists for their contributions to conflict resolution.78 The Union and the Member states have not yet devoted systematic reflection to the role of cultural diplomacy in conflict prevention and conflict resolution. Cultural cooperation as part of wider efforts to build stability has not been discussed in the Commission's recent Communication on an EU response to situations of fragility.79 The Union's own experience in overcoming enmity among its peoples may hold lessons that others would be interested to consider. Such, indeed, is the experience of the Goethe Institute and other private actors in their work in Africa and Asia. A more active European Union role to address the 'frozen conflicts' in the East (Transnistria, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh), for example, should include a cultural dimension.

To promote reconciliation and stability in Cyprus the European Commission is financing a three-year long project in the field of history teaching.80 Similar projects should be actively encouraged elsewhere, from the Middle East (Israel, Palestinian territories) to the Balkans and the Caucasus.

Since the terrorist attacks of 9/11/2001 the EU has played a growing role in crisis management and peace-keeping. It has organised more than 20 civilian and military crisis management missions so far. As part of

77 Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, ‘Culture is not a luxury. Culture in development and cooperation’ (Bern, 2003)
79 COM (2007) 643
its overall policy mix in crisis prevention and crisis management the EU needs to develop instruments of cultural dialogue. Policies to prevent and respond to the wilful destruction or looting of cultural heritage in times of war or violent conflict should also be integrated into the EU’s prevention and management of conflicts. EU governments should make sure that EU crisis management missions include heritage protection as part of their mandate and that EU peace keepers receive appropriate information and training about their obligations under international law.

Depriving ethnic or religious communities of their history and identity by targeting their cultural heritage has become an increasingly prevalent phenomenon in conflict-ridden societies. The methodical destruction of the Bosnian library of Sarajevo by Serb artillery in 1992 stands out as an example of such barbarity in recent European history. Between 1992 and 1996, in Bosnia alone, 49% of mosques, 68% of archives, 75% of Dervish lodges, 75% of Roman Catholic churches, and 100% of Islamic shrines were destroyed.81

Mutual respect for cultural heritage is a precondition of peaceful development in divided societies, and helping vulnerable groups restore or protect their heritage can increase the possibilities of reconciliation.

The UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) was a response to the large-scale destruction of cultural heritage during the Second World War. Today, 118 out of the world’s 191 states are a party to the Convention. As noted above, the United States is among the states which has not joined this important instrument. The U.S. has been criticised for acting in violation of the standards of the Convention in Iraq by failing to protect the looting of museums, libraries and archives after the initial fighting subsided in 2003, by failing to prevent the continuous looting of the archaeological sites, and by not preventing the illegal occupation by coalition forces of the archaeological site of Babylon.82 Diplomatic initiatives by EU Foreign
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Ministers to urge the U.S. to respect the international standards of the Convention are overdue.

In 1999 a Second Protocol has been added to the Convention, which obliges the signatories to work on prevention of war damage to cultural heritage during peacetime. Under this Second Protocol an International Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict has been established. The European Commission should consider extending financial support to the work of this Committee.

Four expert organizations have joined to form the International Committee of the Blue Shield. The Blue Shield is the cultural equivalent of the Red Cross. It is the symbol specified in the 1954 Hague Convention for marking cultural sites to give them protection from attack in the event of armed conflict. The European Commission and the Member States of the EU should explore ways to support the work of the ICBS, and to do so not separately, but as part of a joint initiative.

In many regions of the world, looting of cultural objects is widespread. To prevent and combat the illicit import, export, and transfer of ownership of cultural property, the relevant 1970 UNESCO Convention needs to be joined by more than the current number of 115 state parties. EU Foreign Ministers should include a plea to join this instrument in their regular diplomatic dialogues with partner countries. Both the EU and EU Member States should see to it that developing countries have the financial and technical means necessary also to implement these global standards.

Kosovo’s move to independence in February 2008 has re-ignited international concerns about stability in the Balkans. Cultural projects could a limited but meaningful role in bringing ethnic and religious communities together. Among several promising initiatives there is, for example, the proposal by the European Stability Initiative and IKS to restore and project cultural heritage in Kosovo, ‘A future for Prishtina’s past’.

---

84 http://www.iksweb.org/activities.php?ID=7&viewOnly=subActivities
Protecting Cultural heritage

Cultural heritage is a vehicle of cultural identity. It contributes to a sense of belonging, and to social cohesion, nationally as well as at European level. As a visible expression of Europe’s shared history and culture, heritage contributes to a sense of European citizenship. Heritage is also a vector of economic development. A vibrant and rich heritage sector (the built environment, museums, maritime, industrial, transport and natural heritage) is widely acknowledged as a major factor in attracting tourism. Perceptions of a country’s cultural heritage influence the international image of that country. 85

Across the world, cultural and natural heritage is subject to a multitude of threats, from neglect, warfare, and pillage to climate change. Working with foreign countries to help preserve their cultural and natural heritage is not only a way of preserving cultural diversity and the cultural heritage of mankind. It is also a powerful expression of respect for the cultural identity of the country concerned, and thus an important instrument of cultural diplomacy.

Euromed Heritage is the EU’s only regional programme to assist with heritage preservation in non-European countries.86 It is a structured attempt “to transcend cultural differences and challenge the ‘clash of civilisations’ paradigm by inviting partners from both shores of the Mediterranean to cooperate for increased openness and tolerance in the region.” 87 However, its original design was of a series of projects without well-defined objectives. Coordination with international organizations has been weak, and the programme has met with a low degree of commitment on the part of the Mediterranean countries.88

Whatever its flaws, Euromed Heritage has helped to finance a number of valuable activities, such as the virtual Museum With No Frontiers.89 More dynamic political leadership on both sides of the

85 Anholt Nation Brands Index, Special report, 2007 (2), p. 3
86 www.euromedheritage.net
88 Psychogiopoulou, op. cit
89 www.discoverislamicart.org
Mediterranean will be required, however, to have the program fulfil more of its potential, for example in developing the heritage dimension of the EU’s future maritime policy.\textsuperscript{90}

Centuries of interaction around the Mediterranean have left a rich and varied legacy of tangible and intangible cultural assets: lighthouses, sea defences, old ports, historic ships, shipwrecks, archaeological sites, dockyards, historic industrial areas, fishing villages, crafts, ways of life etc. Unfortunately, much of this unique heritage is under threat. As noted above, natural, semi-natural and cultural landscapes, underwater and coastal archaeological sites, as well as villages and towns along the Mediterranean are being transformed at a rapid pace as a result of human activity including urban development and industrialization. The European Environmental Agency estimates that approximately two thirds of Europe’s wetlands (most of which are coastal) have been lost since the beginning of the 20th century. The European heritage federation Europa Nostra has warned that local coastal cultures (traditional fisheries, salt works, traditional shipbuilding craftsmanship and skills, storytelling, customs, sailing traditional vessels), which provide an essential key to understanding our European maritime history, are being lost or are very much at risk.\textsuperscript{91}

Protection and enhancement of the cultural heritage around the Mediterranean - built and natural, movable and immovable, tangible and intangible – should be addressed in a broad, holistic, integrated and inclusive, cross-sector manner. Architectural and archaeological heritage should be conserved. Vanishing crafts and traditions should be documented, and could in certain cases also be promoted through education and vocational training schemes. Europa Nostra proposes that policies should concentrate on (1) protecting and conserving the coastal and maritime heritage; (2) encouraging and developing the multiple benefits of coastal and maritime heritage for society; (3) mitigating the adverse impacts of development on the coastal and maritime heritage;


\textsuperscript{91} Europa Nostra, ‘Europe’s coastal and maritime heritage: driving forces for sustainable development in need of urgent protection’ (June 2007), \url{http://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/contributions_post/406europa_nostra.pdf}
and (4) creating an effective policy and operational framework for coastal and maritime heritage management and conservation. 92 A programme along these lines could be one of the most promising – and urgent – responsibilities of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and/or of the Mediterranean ‘Union’ suggested by President Sarkozy.

Protecting, enhancing, and educating about cultural heritage should be central to the EU’s strategy of cultural diplomacy not only around the Mediterranean. Other priorities should include heritage preservation in South-East Europe, and worldwide protection of heritage in danger.

In their 2005 Varna Declaration Ministers of Culture of the countries of South-East Europe proposed the creation of ‘cultural corridors’ to revive the historic links in the region – the lines of interaction between cultures which have left their mark on territories, landscapes, settlements and traditions – and make them a source of new links between peoples. This excellent idea has taken a long time to come to fruition. Notwithstanding support from the Council of Europe and the EU, three years later the governments concerned have only reached the stage of a pilot project. There is a serious risk that this promising initiative to reduce distrust and strengthen ties between the peoples of South-East Europe will be smothered in bureaucracy. Governments and parliaments in the region should provide the necessary political leadership, and the European Union should put its full weight – including the necessary finances – behind the cultural corridors programme. 93

Since 2004 the Council of Europe and the EU have also worked on an integrated rehabilitation plan and a survey of the architectural and archaeological heritage in South-East Europe. This initiative has generated a list of 177 significant buildings and sites listed as priorities by the participants countries/region, from Roman theatres and baths to twentieth-century power plants and coal mines, extending through the inclusion of the latter the definition of the monumental protectable heritage beyond the traditional churches, mosques, castles and houses.

92 Europa Nostra, op. cit.
93 www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/regional/SEE/IRPPSAAH/IRPPSAAH_Activities_Corridors_en.asp#TopOfPage
The cultural and economic importance (tourism) of such an approach being obvious, it is problematic that current work is focused on preparing yet another strategic plan, which, among other things, is to envisage the creation of a regional political forum. Too great a focus on structures and bureaucratic concerns will not produce the necessary results. The more time passes, the more neglect will affect many sites and buildings. In addition to creating institutional capacity, what is needed most is money. Without the necessary funding being available, progress will remain too slow. Here, again, political leadership is of the essence. Regional and international media, too, could play a role in raising awareness among the population.

Worldwide, UNESCO in 2005 identified 35 world heritage sites in danger, most of them located in developing countries and/or politically unstable regions of the world. The World Monuments Fund has compiled a wider list of the 100 most endangered sites. European Commission representations and the embassies of EU Member States in the countries concerned should be encouraged to explore with responsible authorities how the EU and European governments can help to protect, and, where relevant, restore, these sites.

The Commission should look into the possibilities of providing support to protect vulnerable heritage sites from the effects of climate change. The option of creating a mechanism to provide European emergency response to sites affected by natural or man-made disasters should also be explored. Several financial instruments could be used, including the new Instrument for Stability. Both initiatives would be powerful indicators of Europe’s commitment to preserve global cultural diversity. They would also be highly visible as expressions of European cultural diplomacy.

People-to-people contacts

It is important to recognise that Europe has a lot to learn from other cultures and traditions, as well as a lot to offer. Our purpose should be, in the words of the British Council, to build lasting relationships based on trust, mutual understanding and respect. The Union’s focus should be on exchanging ideas, sharing knowledge and learning from each other.
To build trust, sympathy, and understanding, cultural diplomacy cannot be the preserve of governments alone. Contacts at the level of civil society are essential to its credibility and effectiveness. Establishing dialogue and cooperation between citizens of the European Union and citizens of other countries should therefore be at the heart of the Union’s cultural diplomacy. These activities could be called civil society dialogue or people-to-people contacts.

All available literature and experience suggests that cultural diplomacy - like the wider activity of public diplomacy - can succeed only when it is a two-way street, where receiving messages and listening to others are as valuable as spreading one’s own message. Indeed, the importance of listening is part of our European message. Besides, an important objective of European cultural diplomacy should be to enrich the cultural and intellectual life of the nations of Europe by bringing its people together with people from other countries.

In terms of the EU’s budgetary priorities, however, most attention has so far been directed at traditional, uni-directional aid projects, as opposed to projects in the sphere of cooperation and exchange. The latter are, admittedly, more difficult to organize. They also hold considerable more promise, including for spreading sympathy for the Union and support for its values. The direction of the EU’s foreign cultural projects, therefore, needs to be recalibrated. Their duration, too, should be reconsidered. Many projects currently financed by the Commission also are just that – projects. Whereas cultural institutes such as the British Council and the Goethe Institute have shifted the emphasis in their work to (longer-term) programmes, the Commission, for example in subsidizing cultural activities in Tunisia or Algeria, has shown a predilection for festivals and similar projects of relatively short duration. These projects are not without value – they help to raise the visibility of European culture and of the European Union – but they do fall short of meeting what must be the main objective of cultural diplomacy: building and maintaining long-lasting and mutually beneficial relationships. The European Commission as well as the Member States should therefore be encouraged to put greater emphasis on developing and financing multi-annual programmes that foster cooperation and exchange, and that aim to construct long-term ties.
In devising and implementing such programmes the Commission should make sure that the participants from the European Union reflect not only the traditional national and regional diversity of the EU, but also the new, ethnic and religious diversity. Europe is no longer a white, Christian continent. Europe’s cultural identity has been changed and enriched by numerous first and second generation immigrants: artists like Fatih Akin, the Turkish-German filmmaker, director of “Head on”, Golden Bear at the Berlin Film Festival in 2004 and “The Edge of Heaven”, prize for best scenario in Cannes in 2007, or the Moroccan-French novelist Tahar Ben Jalloun, winner of the Prix Goncourt. Their voices and images should be central to any presentation of European cultural excellence abroad, including in programmes of dialogue, cooperation, and exchange.

The importance of civil society dialogue has been recognised by the European Commission, notably in relation to the candidate countries. Cultural cooperation should be central to any such dialogue. The latest grant scheme for civil society cooperation with Turkey, for instance, includes culture. However, culture still tends to be treated by the Commission as a sectoral concern, and not as a horizontal dimension. The potential for cultural cooperation will not be fully realised until it is made an integral part of dialogue not only with artists and cultural organisations, but also with youth organisations, municipalities, universities, and private companies.

There is no reason why initiatives to promote civil society dialogue should be limited to countries with which membership negotiations have been opened. Indeed, people-to-people contacts are beginning to assume greater prominence in the EU’s external relations in general. Countries receiving Official Development Aid (ODA), for example, will be able to benefit from a thematic programme, ‘Investing in People’, which is part of the new financing instrument for development cooperation (DCI). However, no overall policy has been worked out. Consequently, identification and promotion of best practices across regional

94 Communication on Civil Society Dialogue with Candidate Countries, COM (2005) 290
directorates (and Directorates General) in the Commission still needs to be developed, as must synergies with the bilateral activities on EU Member States. Furthermore, the budget for the ‘Investing in people’ programme is very small:

€ 4.3 million from the 2007 budget. Any grant awarded must fall between € 250,000 and € 500,000 – which means that most cultural projects, which are often small-scale (in the order of € 30,000) may not receive funding. More culturally-sensitive modes of financing would have to be developed.

**Mobility**

For practical and financial reasons many artists find it difficult to participate in international exchanges. Artistic infrastructures are often weak or non-existent, and artists tend to shy away from financial support mechanisms that appear complex and bureaucratic. It is questionable, therefore, whether artists, particularly in poorer countries, will genuinely benefit from the planned increase in Community support to cross-border civil society projects.96 It is equally unlikely that efforts to create big international networks in the cultural sector will lead to meaningful exchanges. The thematic network for culture which has been created under the Euro-Mediterranean Non-Governmental Platform, for example, mainly represents bureaucratic reality.97 In all likelihood, to have an impact in terms of cultural diplomacy, a set of special measures will have to be devised that are tailored to the specific needs of artists. Management of such a new and innovative scheme to promote international mobility of artists – an Erasmus Mundus for artists – would have to be decentralised to EU representations in the countries concerned.

As a first step, a comprehensive inventory should be made of all artists-in-residence programmes in the Member States, including the opportunities offered for visits by or exchanges with artists from

---

96 European Commission Non-paper on strengthening the civil society dimension of the ENP (http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/non-paper_civil-society-dimension_en.pdf)

97 For the cultural thematic network, see http://90plan.ovh.net/~euromedp/spip/spip.php?rubrique16
non-EU-countries. Such an inventory should be made available on the Internet.

Local and regional government

A lack of appreciation for international cultural cooperation on the part of the central government can sometimes be an impediment to European diplomacy. Contacts with non-governmental organizations – a necessary dimension of cultural diplomacy in any event – can offer some compensation. In some countries, direct contacts with local communities can also provide interesting opportunities, including for direct cooperation with cities or regions in Europe. As local communities in Europe become more diverse, many of them have developed policies to manage cultural tensions. Strategies have been developed to stimulate the cultural creativity of migrant communities and their integration with the majority population, including through cross-cultural dialogue. Many local communities in Europe have developed at least informal contacts with communities in the countries of origin of their migrant populations – either on their own initiative or in response to efforts of foreign governments to maintain links with ‘their’ diaspora. Some EU governments even actively encourage the international contacts of their local authorities. The Italian Foreign Ministry, for example, works with Italy’s regions, provinces and cities to promote Italian culture abroad, often in cooperation with foreign residents of Italian extraction.

Having recognized the potential of cultural industries for local development, a number of cities have joined hands to identify good practices in the field of cultural policy. The Agenda 21 for culture is the first international policy document establishing the groundwork for local cultural development. It has been adopted by United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG), the largest association of local governments in the world.\textsuperscript{98} In Europe, EUROCITIES has embraced Agenda 21 and is working to develop cross-border cultural cooperation. The Council of Europe’s Congress of local and Regional Authorities has set

\footnote{\textsuperscript{98} See http://www.agenda21culture.net and http://www.cities-localgovernments.org}
up a Committee on Culture and Education and has issued a number of recommendations and publications on culture.

Partnerships between local communities in the EU and the countries to its East and South contribute to realizing the objectives of the Neighbourhood Policy. Twinnings between towns and regions in the EU and communities elsewhere can play a valuable part in European cultural cooperation, notably by assisting foreign partners in the elaboration of cultural policies and the building of infrastructures. The Council of European Municipalities and Regions has created a unique network consisting of over 26,000 twinning projects linking towns from all over Europe. It has published a handbook featuring examples of good practice on such issues as citizenship, social inclusion, sustainable development, and arts and culture. Subsequent editions should include best practices in international cultural cooperation.

The European Commission and Member States should consider actively supporting these decentralized international cultural contacts, including with countries outside the Union. The EU has been slow to recognize the role cities can play in international cultural cooperation. The now defunct Asia Urbs programme, for example, never included culture among its key areas of cooperation. The European Committee of the Regions rightly scolded the Commission for having omitted any reference to the large number of local and regional partnerships in its Agenda for Culture in a globalizing world. Fortunately, the recent ENPI Interregional Programme included a reference to dialogue and cooperation with local stakeholders from the countries of the neighbourhood (and Russia) – albeit without any reference to the role of culture.

The potential for cultural diplomacy of such local cross-border networks is huge. Local communities experience directly both the difficulties and the possibilities of cultural diversity, and have many

100 Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on ‘A European Agenda for Culture in a globalizing world’, 72nd Plenary Session, 28-29 November 2007, EDUC IV-014
102 For a general overview of ‘city diplomacy’, see Rogier van der Pluym with Jan Melissen, ‘City Diplomacy: The Expanding Role of Cities in International
practical lessons to share. EUROCITIES, for example, points out the potential of cultural activities and events for tackling racist behaviour and intolerance. Such potential could be utilized in city-to-city links with non-EU countries and regions, such as the Palestinian Territories and Israel. This might enable the Union to put some flesh on the bones of the commitment to jointly combat racism and xenophobia which has been included in the Action Plans with Israel and the PA.

**Education**

Educational exchange must be an integral component of cultural diplomacy, not only for reasons of principle, but also out of practical considerations. Education, first, is a very important dimension of culture. Culture itself is transmitted from generation to generation through education, and the principles and practices of education constitute some of the most prominent dimensions of a culture.

Education has also long been valued as an instrument of cultural diplomacy. Countries like the UK and the U.S. target foreign elites through education. Former U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell said: “I can think of no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of future world leaders who have been educated here.” German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier noted that many of his foreign interlocutors were familiar with the German language, “weil sie eine deutsche Schule im Ausland besucht oder an einem Goethe-Institut Deutsch gelernt haben. Dies ist ein außenpolitisches Sympathie-Kapital, das kaum überwertet werden kann.” In his ‘Lettre de mission’ to his newly appointed Minister of Culture, French President Sarkozy wrote: “(…) nous voulons que la France joue un rôle majeur dans l’accueil et
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Working with schools and universities is a way of reaching much wider populations than would be possible with a focus on the arts alone. Public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy are not only about influencing the perceptions and the behaviour of elites – they are about influencing public opinion as well.

By 2010 the British Council intends to link 10,000 schools in the UK with a similar number overseas. The Council’s ultimate aim is to connect every one of Britain’s schools – there are around 27,000 of them – with a partner school elsewhere in the world. Other Member States would be well advised to emulate this policy. EU Ministers of Education, in cooperation with Ministers responsible for Foreign Affairs, Development Policy, and Culture, could set Europe-wide targets. By 2015, Ministers could agree, all schools in the European Union should be linked to a partner school abroad, either in another EU Member State or elsewhere in the world. Working towards such international connectedness would be a powerful way of enabling European children to think of themselves as citizens of the world, who are familiar with foreign cultures and experiences. Linking educational facilities in non-EU countries with primary and secondary schools throughout the European Union would also be a practical and highly visible way to eliminate misconceptions and build long-term, mutual ties.

For similar reasons, sports and youth policy need to be integrated with arts-related policies. Youth policy, and particularly sport, can be highly effective tools of reaching out to wide sections of the population. Innovative, exiting artistic programmes and projects that capture the imagination are essential for cultural diplomacy to succeed. But quantitative criteria alone do not suffice; to gauge the effectiveness of cultural diplomacy quantitative yardsticks (including audience measurement) must be applied as well.

More than 1,2 million students have so far benefited from the Erasmus Programme, and it has been a brilliant idea to extend this flag-
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106 Lettre de mission de M. Nicolas Sarkozy, Président de la République, adressée à Mme Christine Albanel, Ministre de la Culture et de la Communication, le 1 août 2007. Note the use of the royal ‘we’
ship programme to students from outside Europe. A globalizing world needs mechanisms to enable people to link up with each other directly instead of only through the filter of the media. The Erasmus Mundus Programme can play a major role in fostering a better understanding among EU citizens and people elsewhere. However, with a total of 1,600 scholarships for all of the world combined the impact of this initiative will remain limited.

The Tempus programme funds projects between the higher education sector in the EU and its 26 partner countries in the Western Balkans, Eastern Europe, Central Asia, North Africa and the Middle East. Tempus is financed through three instruments: the Instrument for Pre-Accession, the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, and the Development and Cooperation Instrument. If this is not yet complicated enough, cooperation in the field of higher education with Latin America (Alfa; Alban) is not covered by Tempus but by a different instrument. Cooperation projects with the US, Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand are also managed and financed separately. So is educational cooperation with the ACP countries (EduLink). This disparate collection of instruments may be understood as reflecting the past development of bilateral relations. However, a wider EU concept - an integrated approach to international educational cooperation and exchange - is long overdue. This would help to avoid ad-hoc initiatives and inconsistency. It may have been appropriate for the Union to support the creation of a common education area with Latin America (Article 6 of the Financial instrument for development cooperation), for example, but why has something similar not been agreed with countries closer to home, such as the EU’s neighbours in the Balkans?

Sport

Sport is an increasingly important component of the international image of nations.107 Perceptions of a country’s sporting prowess can help raise its profile abroad. Kenian and Ethiopian runners, Belgian and Croatian

107 How the world sees the world. The Anholt Nation Brands Index, Fourth Quarter, 2005
tennis players, French and Brazilian football players all add to the image of their countries.

Sports can also play a major role in intercultural dialogue and conflict management. At the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens more than 20 post-conflict states met to debate the relevance of sport to peace, conflict prevention and resolution, post-conflict reconstruction and national dialogue. The UN Secretary-General has created an International Working Group on Sport for Development and Peace. The British Council is sponsoring ‘Football for Peace’, a sport-based co-existence project for Jewish and Arab children in the Galilee region of Northern Israel.108

Germany has used football to awaken interest in the German language. Goethe Institutes from London to Tokyo have offered special football-related German courses to prepare football fans abroad to visit the 2006 World Cup in Germany. A special photographic exhibition was prepared by the Goethe Institute: Weltsprache Fußball – Planet Football, which travelled to 98 countries. At the Goethe Institute in Rotterdam two national players from the 1974 World Cup, Bernd Hölzenbein and Johnny Rep, came together at the opening of the exhibition to revive old memories and discuss with the audience the differences and similarities between the Germans and the Dutch. This inspired several major Dutch newspapers to report on the event. One paper even bore the headline, “Peace in Rotterdam”. During the World Cup Germany also created a sculpture boulevard in Berlin (‘Walk of Ideas’) to showcase German arts and sciences.

The British Council, in its Dreams and Teams programme, uses sports to develop leadership skills. They train local tutors – usually teachers – who in turn give Young Leader training to 14-19 year olds in their schools, who have as their graduation project setting up and running a local sports festival.109

China plans to use the 2008 Olympic Games to “put Chinese civilisation on display and expand the influence of Chinese linguistic culture”. Beijing is promoting, in particular, the use of Pinyin, the
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phonetic system that uses Roman characters to spread the knowledge of Chinese across the world.\textsuperscript{110}

In view of its potential to reach millions sports should be among the priority sectors of European cultural diplomacy. The Commission has recognised that sport can play a role in the EU’s external relations. It will promote the use of sport as a tool in its development policy. In particular it will target action at improving access for girls and women to physical education and sport.\textsuperscript{111} Welcome as this new approach must be, it is still a long shot from tapping the full potential of sport to build goodwill and international cooperation. The Commission’s envisaged approach is traditional – sport to improve health and social integration in developing countries. Sport could also play a role in fostering cooperation between third countries and EU citizens. Policies need to be developed to cover this element of mutuality. Secondly, sport can improve cooperation and understanding not only with respect to developing countries, but in developed countries as well – including countries which are (potential) candidates for EU membership, such as Turkey. Support could be provided to the Council of Europe’s efforts to promote good governance of sports in Eastern European countries, and to support post-conflict reconciliation, in particular in the Balkans and former Soviet states. Thirdly, opportunities for ‘cross-pollination’ between the worlds of sports and the arts should be explored (including through film, television, radio, and the Internet), and the European Commission should take the necessary initiatives.

\textit{Youth}

The EU’s Youth in Action Programme 2007-2013 contains a component called ‘Youth of the world’ which opens up the programme to projects with non-EU countries in Southeast Europe, Eastern Europe and the Caucasus, as well as other countries that have a youth-related agreement with the Union. A separate programme has been created for the ten Mediterranean partner countries (Euromed Youth). Under the Youth in

\textsuperscript{110}http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Olympics_to_spread_Chinese_language/rssarticleshow/2775246.cms
Action programme, transnational voluntary service of young people will be supported, both within and outside the European Union (European Voluntary Service).

Developing dedicated youth policies is important, but it is also necessary to integrate a youth dimension in other policy fields affecting young people. The European Commission has rightly emphasised the need to take better account of the ‘youth’ dimension in other policy initiatives.112 Young people often stress the importance of cultural activity in their personal development and well-being, and the inclusion of a youth component in the Culture 2000 programme and the Culture 2007-2013 Programme was a welcome step. It is equally important for the Union to ensure that young people play a central role in the EU’s cultural relations with third countries. Culture is already among the areas covered by the Youth in Action and the Euromed Youth Programmes, even though implementation in the various partner countries appears to be rather uneven.113 To be fully effective, however, the relationship should be mutual: youth should also be prioritised in the EU’s cultural diplomacy. Involvement of young people should be among the criteria for project selection and performance measurement of EU-funded international cultural cooperation projects. NGO’s and public agencies in the field of culture should also be invited to work closely with the European Voluntary Service.

Of course the Commission is not the only European player in the field of international youth policy. National foundations and organisations do important work. In Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation, for example, has provided civic and political education and leadership training as part of its programme on ‘Youth as Agents for Change’. At the initiative of the FES, a Young Leaders Forum has been created in Afghanistan to help young people to contribute to conflict transformation, human rights, social development, and

113 Between the EC and Canada, for example, an agreement was reached to establish a framework for cooperation in the fields of higher education, training and youth - see Council Doc. 10924/06. In practice, however, few cultural projects appear to have been implemented.
international understanding. An impressive track record has also been achieved by publicly funded bodies such as the Koordinierungszentrum Deutsch-Israelischer Jugendaustausch, the Stiftung Deutsch-Russischer Jugendaustausch, as well as by private initiatives such as ‘Junge Wege in Europa’ from the Robert Bosch Foundation.

Over the years, national authorities, the European Commission, and non-governmental organisations have built up much expertise in operating international youth projects. Some learning across the boundaries of agencies and nationalities does take place, but on an intermittent basis rather than as part of a regular dialogue. A Europe-wide effort should be made to draw on the experience of public and private actors in the field of international youth projects. Best practices should be identified and opportunities for closer cooperation explored. A more regular dialogue should also be established between agencies specialising in youth projects and organisations working in the fields of arts and heritage.

Inter-cultural and inter-religious dialogue

“If the world is to reach the Millennium Development Goals and ultimately eradicate poverty, it must first successfully confront the challenge of how to build inclusive, culturally diverse societies,” Mark Malloch Brown wrote some years ago. This means that intercultural dialogue should be about more than the “flowering” of cultures, as EU Ministers are inclined to repeat. They should also be about managing, reducing or eliminating inequalities and injustice. And they should be about appreciation and respect for foreign cultures – including the contribution different cultures have made to Europe’s own heritage. Combating prejudice and xenophobia in Europe must be an integral part of policies to promote intercultural dialogue with non-EU countries and populations.

114 http://www.fes.org.af
Inclusive, culturally diverse societies require citizens to acquire intercultural competences, such as the capacity to communicate in foreign languages, social and civic competences, and cultural awareness and expression. These key competences have been defined in a Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council, and they should guide European efforts to work with ethnically of religiously divided countries.\footnote{OJ L394 of 30.12.2006, p.10}

As has been emphasized before, cultural diplomacy is a two-way process in which the capacity to listen to counterparts is as important as the capacity to convey one’s own message. Cultural diplomacy is about dialogue, not monologue. The capacity to listen is conditional, among other things, on the capacity to speak foreign languages. Multilingualism is not only required to build a sense of common citizenship in Europe, it is also a requirement for a strategy of cultural diplomacy that involves civil society. Multilingualism, as understood here, should involve not only the learning of European languages, but also the learning of non-European languages in Europe. This means that the political agenda for multilingualism in Europe which is currently being developed by Commissioner Orban should contain an external dimension: the contribution mastery of languages such as Arabic, Chinese and Hindi could make to European cultural diplomacy.

People-to-people contacts need to involve artists, journalists, and other cultural multipliers. They also need, as a matter of priority, to involve religious leaders. Religion is central to cultural identity. Inter-religious exchange and dialogue must therefore be part and parcel of cross-cultural exchange and dialogue. It is particularly important to reach out to mainstream Muslims, in Europe as well as abroad. Terrorism in the name of Islam will not be eradicated unless mainstream Muslims unite against it. Winning Muslim hearts and minds is critical to winning the fight against terrorism. The current Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008) offers an opportunity to start building the necessary networks, notably between Europe and its partners in Asia, North Africa and the Middle East. But the EU’s work in fostering inter-religious cooperation and dialogue will not end in 2008. These efforts will have to be maintained for many years, including in the framework of the Asia-Europe
Meeting (ASEM), which has already hosted several interfaith dialogues. Trust is not built overnight. Commitment to long-term partnership will be necessary. Multi-annual programmes offer the best chance of success - not disjointed projects.

For programmes of inter-cultural (and inter-religious) dialogue to succeed, it is essential that they involve local citizens as much as possible – and national officials as little as possible. The further removed from citizens such dialogues are, the more sterile and political they risk to become. It is regrettable, therefore, that the European Commission has removed ‘dialogue between cultures’ from the bilateral cooperation with countries such as Egypt and Morocco.\footnote{See, for example, the \textit{Country Strategy Paper for Egypt, 2007-2013}, p. 26} For reasons that it does not explain, the Commission states that such dialogues can be better approached at regional level, i.e. through the Anna Lindh Foundation in Alexandria. This is debatable. Since its creation in 2005 the Anna Lindh Foundation has not lived up to expectations. It has been conceived as a network of networks. Some of these networks have been very active, but many have not, and their independence from political interference has not always seemed secure. Perhaps the appointment of a new director and a new president will render the foundation more effective. In any case, a regional dialogue should not be pursued to the exclusion of bilateral conversations.

\textit{Capacity building}

To engage in mutually beneficial, long-term relationships with the population of third countries it is necessary to work with local partners – public authorities, but also non-governmental organizations. Many NGO’s, particularly in less developed areas, lead a precarious existence, financially and organisationally. This often complicates the establishing and maintenance of stable partnerships. It also makes for a degree of competition between European agencies that all seek to establish privileged links with a limited number of structurally sound NGO’s. This is known to be a particular difficulty in relations with cultural NGO’s.

A characteristic of cultural sectors world-wide – and in particular of the performing arts – is that the infrastructure supporting them
tends to be fairly weak. Programmes for vocational training are often not available or not readily accessible. Management of many cultural agencies is done on a shoestring budget and with very little professional and educational support. Often, relevant legislation is absent, outdated, or otherwise unhelpful. Government departments may lack familiarity with or appreciation for artists and artistic initiatives. Minority groups, indigenous groups, and women tend to experience particular difficulties. Hence, capacity building – including among the most vulnerable groups in society - must be a key component of the EU’s policies of international cultural cooperation.

Many Member States are actively involved in cultural capacity building. France, for example, supports l’École du Patrimoine Africain in Porto-Novo (Bénin), and the Program for Museum Development in Africa in Mombasa (Kenya). In the field of arts education, the European League of Institutes of the Arts has established a wide-ranging network with non-European institutes in the fields of dance, design, theatre, fine art, music, media art and architecture. Many projects in the field of capacity development, from Turkey to Russia, have been carried out under the auspices of the European Cultural Foundation. National cultural institutes such as the British Council have also established impressive track records, and there are many synergies to be explored between their work and that of the European Commission.

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

Who should be responsible for developing the EU cultural diplomacy: the European Commission or the Council of Ministers? As anyone familiar with the arcane disputes about competence between the Council and the Commission will acknowledge, this is a tricky issue. Fortunately it is also a fairly simple one. In view of the Council’s competence for foreign policy, and Member States’ competence for most of cultural policy, the Council would have to agree any strategy of cultural diplomacy. However, the Commission would have to assist in preparing and implementing it.

119 http://www.elia-artschools.org/
The Commission's expertise and experience in financing cultural cooperation projects are unique and it would be foolish to ignore this. Having the Commission contribute to a Communication would have the additional advantage of obliging different DG’s to work together. A useful starting point would be to draw up a comprehensive inventory of all cultural actions currently carried out or planned.\textsuperscript{120}

The Commission should also take steps to mainstream culture into its work on external relations.

A horizontal task force should be created consisting of the cultural relations experts in all relevant Directorates-General, and best practices in international cultural cooperation should be identified to encourage cross-regional and cross-sectoral learning within the Commission. Qualitative and quantitative indicators should be developed to measure the performance of EU-financed cultural programmes and projects, and a mid-term evaluation should be carried out in 2009 with respect to the cultural activities financed by the main financial instruments ENPI, IPA, DCI, EDF, EIHDR, and IfS.

There are several initiatives the Council and the Commission could take even before any wider statement on policy would be agreed, such as establishing a network linking the cultural attachés of the Member States in each priority third country and including their counterparts in the representations of the Commission. Training in cultural diplomacy could also be integrated into the training programmes of future national diplomats and foreign service personnel of the European Commission. Preparations for the future European External Action Service should include planning for a Directorate for Cultural Relations and for an EU Ambassador for Cultural Diplomacy.

In preparing its contribution to a joint Council-Commission policy statement on cultural diplomacy the Commission would need to consult closely with the EUNIC network of nineteen European national cultural institutes, which was established in May 2006. There are obvious and powerful synergies to be obtained through close collaboration between the Union and these national institutes. Cultural diplomacy, by its very

\textsuperscript{120} The overview of actions contained in the staff working paper accompanying the Commission Communication on a European Agenda for Action in a globalizing world (SEC (2007) 570) is incomplete.
nature, cannot be the exclusive preserve of governments. Private actors and organisations have an equally valuable role to play.

How vital a role is shown on a daily basis by many of the national cultural institutes of the Member States, and perhaps most impressively by the Goethe Institute. The Goethe Institute is, of course, the German international cultural institute. But in its official mission statement and in its daily work it also takes pride in identifying itself as a European cultural institution. "Das Goethe-Institut ist eine europäische Kulturinstitution." 121 CulturesFrance, the new French foreign cultural agency, is contractually committed to a contribution “à l’émergence d’une Europe de la culture”. France and Germany operate a fund for joint Franco-German cultural manifestations in third countries. These happen frequently: 86 projects in 61 countries in 2005-06. 122 French and German cultural institutions share the same building in several cities: Glasgow, Harare, Lahore, Luxembourg, Niteroi, Palermo, Ramallah, and Santa Cruz, and new projects are under preparation in Moscow and Turin. 123

Other national cultural institutions are less outspoken about their country being a signatory of a treaty which envisages “an ever closer union” among the peoples of Europe. The British Council, in its policy document on cultural relations in 2010, only mentions the EU as a partner in exchange programmes. 124 In its 2008 Arts Strategy the EU, similarly, is mentioned only once – as a source of funding. 125

Other national cultural agencies might follow the example of the Goethe Institute, which has included information on its website about

121 Goethe-Institut – Aufgaben und Ziele -10 Thesen zur Rolle des Goethe-Instituts (http://www.goethe.de/unn/auz/ths/deindex.htm, accessed 10.01.2007, but since removed)
123 Monique Cerisier-ben Guiga, Avis au nom de la commission des Affaires étrangère, de la défense et des forces armées, Sénat, Annexe au procès-verbal de la séance du 22 novembre 2007, p. 61
125 British Council Arts Strategy: Connecting the UK with the World through Culture (London, 2008)
European topics of debate, as well as links to the websites of EUNIC and other national cultural agencies in the Union.126

In a number of countries outside the European Union national cultural institutions have cooperated well. In India, Thailand, Canada and Tunisia, for example, EU Member States’ embassies and the representation of the Commission have carried out cultural projects jointly with institutions such as the Goethe Institute, the Alliance Française, Dante Alighieri, Instituto Cervantes and the British Council. Usually such cooperation is the fruit of local initiatives in the countries concerned. There exists, as yet, no general, common programme which commits the national cultural institutes to work together outside the Union. In view of the expertise and experience of these institutes, and taking account of their very wide networks (France alone has 149 foreign cultural centres and institutes, Germany 134 Goethe Institutes) such a programme could be highly influential in strengthening the image of Europeans as partners in cultural and intellectual exchange.

Most practical work in cultural diplomacy naturally falls to EU Member States, their cultural institutes, and the European Commission. Still, other EU institutions have a role to play as well.

The European Parliament should step up its scrutiny of the work carried out by the Council and the Commission. It could, for example, issue an annual report on the cultural aspects of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and of the Union’s external relations, and include a chapter on human rights and culture in its annual report on EU human rights policy. The Parliament should also make sure to integrate the cultural dimension is integrated fully into the work of its Delegations for relations with third countries.

The Committee of the Regions should make sure that the international cultural responsibilities of local and regional authorities are discussed regularly in the relevant committees: the Committee for Culture, Education and Research and the Committee for External relations and Decentralized Cooperation (including the Working Groups on the Western Balkans, Croatia, and Turkey). The Committee could also agree to devote an annual report to local and regional international cooperation,

126 http://www.goethe.de/ges/eur/lks/enindex.htm
and select the subject as a theme for its annual doctoral thesis competition on local and regional authorities in the European Union.

To the founding fathers of the European Communities European unity has never been about economics and politics alone. To the generation that laid the basis for the post-war, common future of Europeans, European unity first and foremost was about people. Their vision was of a Europe where citizens would no longer be motivated by prejudice and nationalism, but by a sense of common destiny. Their hope was of a Europe where people would regard other Europeans not merely as foreigners, but as fellow Europeans. Their legacy encompasses more than a range of highly imaginative common policies and adaptive political institutions. What the European Union’s founding generation bestowed on its successor generations, is above all a dream.

To dream, in politics, is an act of courage. Some may argue that courage, in today’s politics, is mostly a dream. But a Europe without dreams would no longer be Europe. The European dream is of a continent at peace with others and with itself – where people live freely and responsibly and in solidarity with others, both in Europe and in the world at large. It is this latter, global dimension which poses perhaps the greatest challenge to our generation. To build a world where freedom reigns, where poverty and iniquity have been vanquished, where human dignity is respected – this is the dream that should be at the heart of Europe’s endeavours. It is a dream about universal values – cultural values inspired by Europe’s own achievements and failures. It is these values that should be the focus of European diplomacy.
RECOMMENDATIONS

EU Member States and the European Commission have become increasingly active in identifying and promoting opportunities for cultural cooperation with non-EU countries. They have not, however, explored the potential of an integrated approach to cultural diplomacy. In the preceding pages some suggestions have been made to develop such a European strategy of cultural diplomacy. Some of these recommendations were addressed to the Council and the governments of the Member States, others concerned action by the European Commission, the European Parliament, and other actors.

To the Council of Ministers and to EU Member States

- Promote the universal ratification of the main UNESCO Conventions (World Heritage Convention, Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, Convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export and transfer of ownership of cultural property, Convention on the protection of underwater cultural heritage, Convention for the safeguarding of intangible heritage, Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions);
- promote the ratification by all members of the Council of Europe of the European convention for the protection of architectural heritage, the European convention on protection of archaeological heritage, the European landscape convention, the European convention for the protection of the audiovisual heritage, the European charter for regional or minority languages, and the Framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society;
- ensure that national officials taking part in EU civilian and military crisis management missions are aware of their obligations under the international Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict; include protection of cultural heritage sites in the mandate of EU crisis management missions;
agree that by 2015 all schools in the European Union should be linked to a partner school abroad, either in another EU Member State or elsewhere in the world;

see to it that the potential of culture to contribute to stability and security, and to sustainable development, is included in the relevant Council policy documents and Ministerial statements, and in EU policies to prevent and manage conflicts;

adopt a set of General Guidelines on the Right to Freedom of Expression as part of the EU’s international human rights policy; energetically use diplomatic instruments to defend media freedom and freedom of expression;

encourage cooperation between the EUNIC centres (national cultural institutes) in third countries.

To the European Commission

• Use the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, in combination with the Mediterranean Hot Spots Investment Programme, and the Horizon 2020 initiative, to initiate a joint strategy of maritime and coastal protection of cultural and natural heritage around the Mediterranean;

• create a programme to promote the mobility of artists between third countries and the Member States of the European Union – an Erasmus Mundus for artists;

• include policies to encourage the learning of non-European languages into proposals to promote multilingualism in Europe;

• support programmes to protect cultural and natural heritage in South-East Europe, including through the creation of cultural corridors;

• explore the potential of sport and youth exchanges to contribute to civil society contacts between the EU and other parts of the world;

• develop qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure the performance of EU-financed cultural programmes and projects;

• create a horizontal task force consisting of the cultural relations experts in all relevant Directorates-General; have best practices
in international cultural cooperation identified to encourage cross-regional and cross-sectoral learning within the Commission;

• carry out a mid-term evaluation exercise in 2009 with respect to the cultural activities financed by the main financial instruments ENPI, IPA, DCI, EDF, EIHDR, and IfS.

*To the European Commission, the Council, and EU Member states*

• Develop programmes for the exchange of ideas, preservation of heritage, development of cultural infrastructures, and international mobility and exchange as core dimensions of the EU’s international cultural policies;
• strive to subsidize projects in third countries that are
  - embedded in multi-annual programmes,
  - geared towards establishing mutually beneficial modes of cooperation,
  - properly coordinated between the Commission and EU Member States, including national cultural institutes,
  - based on analyses of best practice in the same or other regions;
• develop synergies between the external dimension of the EU’s cultural policies and the external dimension of the EU’s policies in the fields of education, multilingualism, youth, and sports;
• include a European (multi-nation) dimension in national projects and programmes to bring non-EU artists and artistic productions to an EU Member State;
• encourage and support international cultural cooperation at the level of local and regional authorities;
• strengthen EU efforts to protect and promote freedom of expression, information and communication, both within the framework of the European Union’s human rights strategy and as part of a strategy of cultural diplomacy;
• identify and promote good practices in (inter-)cultural dialogue and cooperation as elements of the European Union’s crisis-management and peace-building strategies;
• support countries outside the Union to protect cultural and natural heritage from neglect and destruction in natural and man-made disasters;
• establish a network linking the cultural attachés of the Member States in each priority third country, and include their counterparts in the representations of the Commission;
• integrate training in cultural diplomacy into the training programmes of future national diplomats and foreign service personnel of the European Commission;
• integrate a Directorate for Cultural Relations into the future European External Action Service; create the position of an EU Ambassador for Cultural Diplomacy;
• jointly prepare a European Strategy of Cultural Diplomacy.

To the European Parliament

• Charge the Committees on Culture, Foreign Affairs, and Development with the elaboration of a joint annual report on the cultural aspects of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and of the Union’s external relations;
• include a chapter on human rights and culture in the annual report on EU human rights policy;
• see to it that each Delegation for relations with third countries is fully briefed on the cultural dimension of the relationship, including through briefings by the relevant officials of the Council and the Commission (both Brussels-based and country-based).

To the Committee of the Regions

• Devote an annual report to the role of local communities and regions in cultural cooperation between the European Union and countries outside the Union.
ANNEX

International cultural conventions – state of ratifications by EU Member States

UNESCO (status as of 22.4.2008)

  - State parties: all EU Member States except Ireland, Malta, UK
  - State Parties: all EU Member States except Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands
- Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)
  - State parties: all EU Member States
  - State parties: 5 EU Member States: Bulgaria, Lithuania, Portugal, Romania, Spain
  - Not yet state parties: Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, UK
  - State parties: all EU Member States except Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Netherlands
Council of Europe (status as of 22.4.2008)

- European Cultural Convention (1954)
  - Ratified by all EU Member States
  - Not yet signed by: Poland
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: Austria, Luxembourg
  - Not yet signed by: Austria
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, Spain
- European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992)
  - Not yet signed by: Belgium, Bulgaria, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: France, Italy, Malta, Poland
- European Landscape Convention (2000)
  - Not yet signed by: Austria, Estonia, Germany
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: Greece, Malta, Sweden
- European Convention for the Protection of the Audiovisual Heritage (2001)
  - Not yet signed by: Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, UK
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: all EU Member States except Hungary, Lithuania, Slovakia
  - Not yet signed by: all EU Member States except Bulgaria, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal
  - Signed but not yet ratified by: all EU Member States except Latvia
“Reflective people often get discouraged by political propaganda, but speak about arts, literature and just about anything that captures their interest and you will gain their support.”
Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1933:92)

“I believe that things like spirit, intellect and consciousness have tremendous influence upon society. It is an influence of an often indirect, hidden kind. No statistics can capture or describe it, yet it does exist. There are cases when a single book sparks off regime change.”
Václav Havel (2008)

Abstract
Culture as an important part of identity construction as well as an identity marker plays a double role for a community: internally, it works as a bond of individuals and sub-entities of the community; externally, it has the function to represent the community towards other communities. Outside the EU, the cultural ‘products’ of the EU member states provide a combined soft power asset, as various aspects of the national cultures of EU member states continue to generate by and large positive perceptions of ‘Europe’ in the world. At the same time, as culture is traditionally a key defining feature of states in Europe,
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cultural policy and cultural promotion abroad remain carefully guarded prerogatives of national governments. The internal and the external cultural policy environments of the EU have hence been characterized both by cooperation and by competition among EU member states in the quest for the generation and maintenance of soft power. The key question is whether and how the attractiveness of Europe as a cultural entity can complement the attractiveness of individual member states as cultural entities, and vice versa. This paper assesses the possibilities of enhanced cooperation among EU member states in the area of cultural promotion with a special focus on the creation and maintenance of network partnerships and the role of EUNIC as the incubator of such partnerships both inside and outside the EU. A number of practical steps are suggested.

INTRODUCTION

The most effective way for the EU to achieve leverage in its external relations is to generate and wield soft power. Following Nye (1990, 2004), this does not mean abstention from the development or even use of military capabilities when appropriate and legitimate, but, most fundamentally, wielding soft power means nurturing own attractiveness and mutual understanding in relations to societies around the world. An area which has been central to the generation and maintenance of Europe’s soft power is the cultural sector including creative arts, film-making, classical and popular music, literature, architecture, design etc. The cultural ‘products’ of the EU member states represent a combined soft power asset, as various aspects of the national cultures of EU member states continue to generate by and large positive perceptions of ‘Europe’ in the world (Ortega 2004, Europe’s International Image 2006). However, this potential has not been sufficiently harnessed so far. This has to do with the nature of cultural promotion as practically an exclusive domain of national authorities sensitively guarding their prerogatives in this area, as well as with the nature of creative arts which are difficult to entrench in bureaucratic frameworks. Nevertheless, as recent studies show, there is not only space but also political will among the member states to
enhance cooperation and coordination in the area of external cultural promotion in third states (Fisher 2007, Grant 2008). This paper assesses the possibilities of enhanced cooperation among EU member states in the area of cultural promotion and suggests a number of practical steps towards improved coordination in this area.

NATIONAL VERSUS EUROPEAN CULTURE AND CULTURAL POLITICS

While culture is “what brings people together, by stirring dialogue and arousing passions, in a way that unites rather than divides”\(^2\), it is traditionally also a key defining feature of nation states and serves as one of the key mechanisms maintaining boundaries of national communities in Europe and elsewhere (Rokkan 1975, Bartolini 2005). These two functions are inextricably linked to each other: Especially in the context of nation states, culture has played a paramount role for the construction of collective identities.

“(…) the role of culture in human life was totally transformed by that cluster of economic and scientific changes which have transformed the world since the seventeenth century. The prime role of culture in agrarian society was to underwrite people's status and people's identity. Its role was really to embed their position in a complex, usually hierarchical and relatively stable structure. The world as it is now is one where people have no stable position or structure. They are members of ephemeral professional bureaucracies which are not deeply internalised and which are temporary. They are members of increasingly loose family associations. What really matters is their incorporation and their mastery of high culture; I mean a literate codified culture which permits context-free communication. Their membership of such a community

\(^2\) European Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. COM (2007) 242
and their acceptability in it, that is a nation. It is the consequence of the mobility and anonymity of modern society and of the semantic non-physical nature of work that mastery of such culture and acceptability in it is the most valuable possession a man has. It is a precondition of all other privileges and participation. (…). Moreover, the maintenance of the kind of high culture, the kind of medium in which society operates, is politically precarious and expensive. It is linked to the state as a protector and usually the financier or at the very least the quality controller of the educational process which makes people members of this kind of culture.” (Gellner 1995)

But to define who belongs to us, i.e. with whom we share a collective identity, always means to define at the same time, who does not belong, who is excluded. To define a collective identity always means to draw a boundary between us and them (Neumann 1996). Culture as an important part of identity construction as well as an identity marker, thus, plays a double role for a community: Internally, it works as a bond of individuals and sub-entities of the community, externally, it has the function to represent the community towards other communities.

Over the last decades, the concept of national culture and identity has been increasingly challenged (1) by theoretical approaches emphasizing that identities are always constructed and that (individual and collective) identities are multiple and overlapping, and (2) by political developments of sub- and supra-nationalisation weakening nation states. Furthermore, one has to take into account that the impact of culture on national identity building varies in the different EU Member States. Still, with regard to national cultural politics and, above all, external cultural politics, the link between national culture and national identity still plays an important role.

Due to the deepening of European integration, the question for a European identity, and, consequently, for a European culture and for European cultural politics has come to the fore. However, it is neither probable nor desirable that a European identity shall replace national identities; rather, different forms of combining these (and other) identity constructions are to be expected. EU cultural politics are, thus, devoted
to a double (and, at least potentially contradictory) aim as stated in Article 151: “The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common heritage to the fore.” The “European agenda for culture in a globalizing world”, on the other hand, claims for “the systematic integration of the cultural dimension and different components of culture in all external and development policies, projects and programmes - as a means of strengthening the quality of its diplomatic efforts, and the viability and sustainability of all EU cooperation activities.” Thus, the question arises how this claim can be operationalised while, at the same time, maintaining the claim for cultural pluralism within the EU.

EXTERNAL CULTURAL POLICIES OF EU MEMBER STATES

Cultural policy and cultural promotion abroad remain carefully guarded prerogatives of national governments. It is a common view that culture can serve as a vehicle of generating goodwill and understanding for the goals and interests of one’s own society, i.e. culture is a vehicle for generating soft power. The Swedish Institute summarizes this in the following manner:

“Cultural diplomacy is a natural and effective element of public diplomacy, where culture is in part used to increase the level of knowledge about Sweden, and is in part also used to influence target groups and cooperation partners in a particular direction. This can mean to motivate them to study in Sweden, read Swedish, participate in Swedish culture, travel to Sweden, buy Swedish products, or sympathize with Swedish values.”

Traditionally, nation states compete for attention of international cultural audiences as well as for the interest of people seeking opportunities to learn new languages and get to know foreign

---

cultures. National institutions in charge of cultural promotion attempt to capture attention for cultural products of their respective societies. *Competition for attention* is hence traditionally a key structural feature of the policy environment in which cultural promotion is conducted. As Culture Ireland points out in their Strategy paper:

“The international cultural field is increasingly competitive, as many other countries commit substantial resources, restructure their networks and develop cutting-edge promotional strategies. Not only states, but regions and nations like Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland are now serious players. Cities now also play a major role in international cultural relations – not least as European Cities of Culture.”

In the interplay with these developments, a competition driven logic has been increasingly taking root in the work of national cultural institutes as most of them strive to outperform their peers in a respective foreign capital in attracting the local cultural audience. This tendency is enhanced by the rise of the so called new public management approaches in governmental organizing, where the recent decades have seen an ideational turn towards business-like models in organizing public agencies. Although instrumentalization of such a complex, multifaceted and shifting phenomenon as ‘national culture’ remains a profound challenge, the work of national cultural institutes has been evaluated according to market-based logics and quantitative factors such as the number of clients served in their respective libraries, number of visitors at exhibitions, number of students enrolled in language courses, number of visitors to their respective web-sites and the like. This is happening in the context of continuing financial restrictions. As the British Council states in a recent strategic document:

“We constantly strive to be more efficient. We have embarked on an ambitious programme of efficiency gains, which will see us make average annual efficiency savings of 2.5 per cent on the grant we

---

receive from government. In the three years up to 2007–08 we will
deliver efficiency savings of £17 million across the whole organisa-
tion. [...] A global finance and business system will standardise our
administration and business processes across the world and enable
us to provide a better service to our customers.”

While increasing efficiency and savings on grants are always to be
strived for, the aims and goals of external cultural policies have to
be assessed in order to be able to judge the efficiency of measures. In
the quotations above, culture is mainly seen as a means to promote
national culture. However, other statements of national cultural poli-
cies also show a commitment towards the promotion of EUropean
culture:

“Acting as a mouthpiece for a Europe of diversity, efforts in this field
must concurrently aim at preventing an excessive focus on policies
promoting national identity. An open-minded approach to cultural
work implies creating interest groups above and beyond the issues
of national identity. Much rather, we are called upon to act in acc-
cordance with the words of Stefan Zweig, who once said he loved
Austria because it permitted him to be a patriot and a citizen of the
world at the same time.”

THE EUNIC NETWORK

For an individual national cultural institute to succeed in the competi-
tion for attention in such culture-intensive environments as New York,
New Delhi, Moscow, London or Paris, business-like working methods
may help, but may not be sufficient. Hence, EU member states’ organi-
zations in charge of national cultural promotion have been trying to
forge network partnerships and cooperation platforms, which would

enable them to attain mutually beneficial gains. European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) is an evolving example of such an approach. As the organization states on its home-page, the purpose of EUNIC is to create “effective partnerships and networks between the EU National Institutes for Culture in order to improve and promote cultural diversity and understanding between European societies, and to strengthen international dialogue and co-operation with countries outside Europe”. EUNIC operates at two complementary levels: a) Heads or Directors of the national cultural institutes for culture; and b) local networks of national institutes operating in particular cities inside and outside the EU.7 Clearly, not least on the rhetorical level, a network logic underpins the mission and the general approach of EUNIC. Yet what does it really mean to create ‘effective networks’?

Effective network partnerships: some basic principles

As numerous examples from the business world show, organizations transacting commodities which are not easily quantifiable or measured such as particular kinds of know-how, informational or, indeed, cultural products, often do not rely upon pure market logics, but on a different mode of organizing, namely a network-logic. As the Stanford organization theorist Walter W. Powell points out in a seminal article (Powell 1990), networks differ from markets along several dimensions. First, relationships in networks are not merely instruments to sell goods, but represent a value in themselves, which is sometimes more valuable than the goods exchanged. Second, while markets prompt actors to attempt to strike the best possible bargain based on short term contracts, networks function based on reliance over the long haul. Third, a basic assumption of a network relationship is that the parties involved are dependent on each others’ respective resources and that there are benefits to be gained by the pooling of resources. Participants in a network agree in essence to forgo the right to pursue their own interests at the expense of others in the network. Fourth, networks are sustained by reciprocity among participants. But this is not necessarily reciprocity of benefits (‘I do something for you and you do something of the same value for me’) or

7 For more information about EUNIC see www.eunic-europe.eu/
reciprocity of equivalent actions (‘good for good and bad for bad’), but more often reciprocity through mutual indebtedness. The latter is often sustained by a measure of imbalance compelling future interaction (‘I do something for you and do not expect you to return the favor immediately. I rather trust that you will return it later.’), and hence a sense of obligation is a means through which networks are maintained.

Networks are not inherently positive, though. They can be a source of conflict since by establishing enduring patterns of interaction opportunities for individual action are more limited than in a pure market environment. As Powell (ibid.) argues, “all of the parties to network forms of exchange have lost some of their ability to dictate their own future and are increasingly dependent on the activities of others.” Nevertheless, successful networks are structures which enable actors to preserve a great degree of autonomy as well as their respective identity while allowing them to work together in a more regularized and structured way than the minimalist rules of a traditional market would allow.

Arts and Culture as Instruments of European Politics

Irrespective of the political aims of cultural policies – be they nationally or supra-nationally defined – the question arises if it is legitimate and effective to use culture and the arts in order to promote political goals or if culture and the arts should be seen as values in their own right.

As numerous examples show, cultural policies and public support for culture and the arts have to be developed within an inevitable tension: On the one hand, the freedom of art is not to be limited by public interventions, on the other hand, public expanses, i.e. expenses at the cost of tax payers, have to be legitimated by general goals and values of society. While one can argue that freedom of the art is not impacted by (the lack of) public support but only by censorship this is a somehow problematic argument in countries where most finances for public and the art come from the public hand. On the other hand, it is also not possible to publicly finance every artistic and cultural activity. Thus, probably the best practical solution for this dilemma is transparency of the aims and instruments of cultural policies and the possibility of
public debates of these aims and instruments. The intention to transform external cultural policies of the EU Member States can provide an opportunity for public debates on this issue.

As mentioned above, the idea of uniform collective identities - be they national or European – does not seem adequate to contemporary societies. Thus, also the representation of such identities seems problematic. Rather, one can speak of multiple and overlapping identifications. Thus, the Communication of the European Commission on a “European Agenda for Culture in a Globalized World” formulates the following aims:

“The flowering of the cultures of the Member States in respect of their national and regional diversity is an important EU objective assigned by the EC Treaty. In order to simultaneously bring our common heritage to the fore and recognise the contribution of all cultures present in our societies, cultural diversity needs to be nurtured in a context of openness and exchanges between different cultures. As we live in increasingly multicultural societies, we need therefore to promote intercultural dialogue and intercultural competences.”

It is important to note that not only diversity between Member States but also diversity within Member States is seen as both a framing condition and an aim of European cultural policies. However, the formulations in the Communication imply that intercultural dialogue is mainly a peaceful process free of conflicts. Our everyday political experience has shown us that this is not the case. Furthermore, art has proven over the centuries its ability to make social conflicts visible and, thereby, to lay the base for their solution. For important parts of contemporary art, this is an especially important goal; thus, it seems adequate to develop cultural policies able to further this specific part of artistic and cultural activities. It might also help to promote intercultural dialogue with extra- EUropean countries when the EU does not present itself as a harmonious, pluralistic entity but as a polity struggling with problems and conflicts. Thus, commonalities as well as differences, EUropean narratives as well as other conflicting narratives have to be presented and discussed within and outside
of Europe. Not a promotion of EURopean identity and a EURopean cultural space should simply replace national narratives, but representation should focus on the co-existence of these narratives as well as of narratives of (autochthonous and immigrated) ethnic minorities, narratives of regions (within the EU or beyond EU borders, such as the Mediterranean areas or the former COMECON states), narratives of underprivileged groups etc. Such an approach could result in a very specific EURopean added value of EUNIC activities which is not a mere addendum to existing national achievements but rather a thoroughly innovative approach based on the cultural and political specifics of European integration.

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS IMPROVING COOPERATION: THE ROLE OF THE NETWORK OF NATIONAL CULTURAL INSTITUTES (EUNIC).

In order to fulfill these aims, EUNIC has to develop concrete projects (or calls for projects) which can be bilateral or multilateral and include some or all EU Member States as well as Non-Member-States. An interesting proposal is, e.g. a project on the Islamic heritage in Europe, as suggested by David Green. Also, the current EUNIC project on Migration and the Balkans can develop specific European narratives.

Different approaches and instruments have to be developed for representation within and outside of the EU. As mentioned before, EUNIC works on two levels, the level of the board and the level of clusters and individual institutions. It has rightly been pointed out by the Hungarian Cultural Institute in Brussels that it is necessary to combine these two approaches from above and below. However, a further step is necessary in order to fill the EUNIC network with life, namely the inclusion of cultural and artistic institutions as well as individual artists and cultural workers in its development. This task is, above all, to be

---


taken over by the EUNIC clusters. This seems also to be a claim by the European Commission formulated by Odile Quintin, General Director, DG Education and Culture at the launch of EUNIC:

“One of our ideas is that we wish to have more structured relations with the cultural world, but in practice this also requires the cultural world to organize itself more effectively in order to speak with a clearer and more united voice. I believe that your cultural network will be invaluable in this context.”

While the cultural world cannot be asked to speak with a united voice (as it consists of various, frequently contradictory voices), EUNIC can serve as a channel by giving broad access to information and possibilities of participation to cultural and artistic producers and by developing (maybe in co-operation with some of these producers) concrete projects and calls for proposals that can be presented to the European Commission. In what follows we list a number of further practical steps for consideration.

Creating an Inclusive European Cultural Space:

As the European cultural space is much more fluid than the political space of the EU, culture enables the overcoming of formal political divides much more easily than political frameworks such as the European Neighborhood Policy. While the latter one generates asymmetrical relations, in which policy initiatives, standards and know-how are transferred uni-directionally from the EU towards its neighboring countries, cultural relations instead enable dialogical two-way transfer of cultural experiences. With the aim of creating an inclusive European cultural space, artists from adjacent territories like Morocco and the Ukraine should be included in activities and events of EUNIC members and a forum for ideational exchange and coordination should be established between EUNIC members and the cultural institutes of adjacent territories such as Moldova and Turkey. For these exchanges, calls for
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proposals of individual artists and institutions should be launched; a first call could, e.g., deal with different and conflicting images of the EU within and outside of this polity.

Cultural relations as bridges in the integration of new and prospective EU member states:

Just as culture has played a vital part in overcoming the Cold War divide between the East and West (Busek and Brix 1986), so can culture now be used as a means of overcoming the potential sense of exclusion that emerges in neighboring societies that are currently not in the EU. This is particularly serious in societies like Serbia, where due to visa-restrictions as many as 70% of university students have never been outside of their country.11 In such an environment, cultural experiences can be a vital element in the process of “experiencing Europe” and its values of diversity and pluralism. At the same time, also artists of the Non-EU-countries should get the possibility to present their works within the EU, so that a real cultural exchange can take place. It is hence of vital importance for EUNIC clusters to work actively in countries aspiring for a closer relationship with the EU and in new member states. Thereby, the EU motto “United in Diversity” should be taken literally, thus, not only commonalities of the EU Member States but also differences and potential conflicts between them are to be articulated. As contemporary artistic forms can be used as an instrument to deal in a productive way with conflicts, e.g. the disappointment of parts of the populations of the new Member States could be a subject matter for artistic exchange. An example could be the Eurocine project at the Institute of European studies of Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia, where movies of mostly European provenience are shown to students and discussed with local academics and/or directors of cultural institutes from EU member states.

In semi-authoritarian societies, the work of EUNIC member institutions can provide a space for free exchange of ideas and access to free information be that through libraries, literary evenings or infor-

mal coffee gatherings such as that organized by the British embassy in Minsk at which Belarusian bloggers and independent journalists met on February 15, 2008.

**Cross-national cultural programs:**

EUNIC members should develop specific programs and call for proposals with regard to cultural matters of relevance for more than one EUNIC Member State. These programs can be prepared by one or more EUNIC members but should be open for participation of other members. The calls for proposals can either be directed towards the respective official representatives of cultural policy or towards cultural institutions, organizations or individual artists within the EUNIC network. E.g., the culture of Roma and Sinti in different EUNIC member states could be an interesting issue for such a programme.

**Providing national cultural events with a European dimension:**

Various member states of the EU are in the process of planning high-profile globally visible events in the coming years. The most prominent example are the 2012 Olympic games in London, for which the UK government is in the process of launching an extensive public diplomacy campaign including various cultural diplomacy elements (Bound et al. 2007). This should also be an opportunity to showcase the UK as a successful EU member and an opportunity to promote UK culture as an important part of the European heritage. EUNIC should think through a strategy of engaging actors in the UK cultural sector with the aim of staging common events in the run-up to and during the London Olympics 2012. It should also be a benefit for the UK if the 2012 Olympics were promoted by the network of EU member states’ cultural institutes.

**European gastro-diplomacy:**

Food and gastronomy are important carriers of cultural messages. Restaurants serving particular national cuisine can become important places for inter-cultural experiences. EUNIC clusters inside and outside
the EU could organize food festivals, where a number of restaurants serving various kinds of national and ethnic cuisine of Europe could co-operate in organizing thematic weeks with the inclusion of music performances etc. ”Europe Street” in Beijing featuring a festival of various European national cultures in 2007 could be an example for such activities. In order for such an event not to limit itself to pure showcasing, the festivals could be accompanied by a program of lectures, movies etc. dealing with different food cultures and the advantages and problems of encounters between these cultures, such as ethnic markets in European cities or protests of animal protectionists against traditional Islamic slaughtering.

*Introducing a European dimension in tourism-promotion:*

Tourist attractions such as historical monuments and interesting pieces of architecture in various countries around Europe arouse interest and attract foreign publics visiting Europe. Non-European tourists often do not visit only one European country, but several of them during the same trip. EUNIC clusters outside the EU should engage with national tourist boards of the EU member states in co-organizing tourist fairs and similar events, in which member states could present their tourist attractions in a co-operative manner focusing, for instance, on the relative ease of travel within Europe and/or on the relatively small distances in infrastructurally closely knit and yet quite diverse cultural regions such as for instance the area between Vienna, Bratislava, Krakow and Budapest.

*European cultural ambassadors:*

Particular personalities can draw attention to certain questions due to their visibility and status in the global information-intensive environment. Andrew Cooper (2007) called this “celebrity diplomacy”. Princess Diana played a vital role in attracting attention to the challenge of landmines; actors Angelina Jolie, Bono and George Clooney effectively raised awareness of poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. The rap-singer Wyclef Jean has been instrumental in improving the imploded state im-
age of his native Haiti by becoming its roving ambassador (Bound et al. 2007:30). In the same manner, EUNIC clusters could identify European cultural personalities resident in particular countries outside the EU, who could then serve as ‘attention-catchers’ or ‘visibility-generators’ for European cultural events. Again, this is not the claim for show-casing cultural and political achievements of the EU but rather a means to deal with the ambiguous global role of Europe in the past and in the present, thus, e.g. questions of colonialism and post-colonialism could be an interesting and important theme for debates brought forward by a cultural ambassador.

Bridging various European arrangements for the promotion of culture:

Promotion of culture is organized in different ways depending on different traditions in this policy area in different member states. While some member states have cultural institutes as direct parts of the governmental administration (e.g. Austria, Italy, Poland, Slovakia), a number of other member states have “arms length organizations” managing their cultural relations abroad (e.g. Denmark, Germany, the UK). Obviously, while the area of activity is similar, procedures, practices and routines may differ between the institutes, sometimes significantly. Such divergence can, on the one hand, prove problematic with regard to the organization of co-operations. On the other hand, it can also be a positive factor. Some member states find it easier to work in particular foreign countries than others due to historical or linguistic affiliation, and/or due to extensive and well-established presence on the ground. These factors should be taken into consideration, when local EUNIC clusters are constituted in third countries. Furthermore, both forms of organization have their respective advantages. Cultural institutes working within government can easier influence governmental policies, while arm’s-length-organizations have more leeway for their own programs and, at least in some cases, closer connections to artistic and cultural institutions and individual artists. These factors should be taken into account in the organization of concrete projects. When governmental engagement is called for, governmental institutions could be the leading participants of joined EUNIC projects, while one or several arm’s-length
organizations could launch calls for proposals when direct participation of arts’ institutions is aimed at.

However, cooperation between EUNIC partner institutions would be more effective if certain shared organizing standards could be established. The so called ‘open method of coordination’ (OMC) could here serve as a vehicle for the gradual establishment of basic standards. Although the OMC remains a rather ambiguous term, it denotes coordination which “draws on a spirit of mutual learning, benchmarking, best practice and peer pressure” (Hodson and Maher 2001:723). OMC mechanisms have been used in the work of EUNIC including the sharing of methods of best practice: already now, all EUNIC members have committed to sharing at least two examples of their best practice with other members of the EUNIC network per year. This can be done via a dedicated Intra-net web-site or at EUNIC meetings.

**Personnel exchanges between EUNIC member institutions:**

Coordination between EUNIC member institutions could be fostered by personnel exchanges. This would enable mutual understanding, networking and facilitate shared working methods. The first meeting of junior officers from EUNIC member institutions is planned to be held in Berlin in June 2008. The meeting is organized as a training workshop and further meetings of this kind are planned on to be held on an annual basis. Temporary assignments of junior officers from EUNIC institutions in other EUNIC institutions are also envisioned.

**EUNIC-Brussels as mediator in relations with the Commission:**

EUNIC-Brussels could enhance its role as the mediator in the relations between EUNIC member institutions and the European Commission. This should be helpful for individual national cultural institutes seeking advice in approaching the complex Brussels bureaucracy.

**EUNIC-clusters as mediators in relations to foreign authorities:**
In recent years, there is an increase in incidents in which individual national cultural institutes run into difficulties in relations to a specific host government in a third country. The most recent example was the pressure by Russian authorities on British Council to close down its two offices outside Moscow in December 2007, which resulted in the suspension of British Council operations in St. Petersburg and Yekaterinburg. Similarly, the Swedish Institute in Minsk had been put under increasing pressure from Belarusian authorities, albeit no direct request to instill activities was issued.12 In situations such as these, representatives of the respective local EUNIC-cluster could serve as mediators of relations, which hence might have greater leverage than the efforts of the respective individual government concerned.

Supporting research on the EU’s cultural diplomacy:

Cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy have been increasingly important in the conduct of foreign affairs in recent years. Nevertheless, as this report shows, there are numerous challenges in improving effectiveness in the conduct of cultural diplomacy in and by the EU and its member states. EUNIC should support studies and research related to cultural promotion and cultural diplomacy.

EUNIC web-site:

Contacts with cultural and artistic producers can be made and developed via a variety of means, not least by using existing contacts of national cultural institutes, clusters etc. An important medium of communication is the website, which increases visibility and transparency of cultural events organized by the EUNIC members. A sub-section of this website is organized as an ‘Electronic Bulletin’ (password-protected with access only to EUNIC members) where all planned cultural activities of the EU MS inside and outside the EU are announced months in advance so as to create awareness among the EUNIC members. Syner-

---

gies can hence emerge in organizing events – this can a) decrease costs (rents for venues could be co-financed or shared); b) increase the value of each individual EUNIC member institute as an information-provider for its own network of contacts in the domestic cultural community; c) potentially increase the value of cultural events.

CONCLUSION: EUNIC AS A NETWORKER, NARRATOR AND ENLARGEMENT VANGUARD

Cultural policies of member states represent a combined soft power asset, which can enhance the EU’s overall external policy leverage. EUNIC plays a vital role in bringing about European cooperation and coordination in cultural relations inside and outside the EU in a threefold manner:

EUNIC as a networker forging a European approach in external cultural relations

While national cultural institutes of EU member states continue to promote their individual agenda in their individual ways, all of them also strive for effective intercultural dialogue between the EU and third countries. EUNIC with its networking logic is a vital link in connecting these two levels. This does not mean a single external cultural policy of the EU, but rather the emergence of a European approach in external cultural relations. This means maintenance of national cultural arrangements and policies, and their greater coordination towards shared goals. In this way, EUNIC is an effective partner for European governments as well as for the RELEX family and the Council Secretariat in efforts to generate a cultural dimension in the EU’s external relations.

EUNIC as a mediator of European narratives:

By moving beyond national cultural relations, EUNIC also provides the possibility to present shared representations and narratives of the EU as a community with diverse cultural and democratic traditions. In
this way, the EU can, first, be presented as an open polity with numerous connections with the human collectives inside and outside of its borders. Second, by connecting their promotion to a broader ‘Europe’ narrative, some national cultural institutes can increase the visibility and attractiveness of their cultural events. Third, still others eventually carrying the burden of colonial past or other historical burdens can embed their cultural relations in European narratives and thereby increase legitimacy and attractiveness of their cultural events in particular societies.

**EUNIC as a vanguard of EU enlargement.**

The EU’s relations with countries in its neighborhood are often dependent on complex decision-making procedures and cumbersome administrative processes within the frameworks such as the ENP, Association Agreements, and/or politically conditioned unwillingness among member states’ governments to start or continue accession negotiations. In a number of neighboring societies this asymmetry in relations often leads to skepticism and alienation from the EU in the broad strata of the local populations. Cultural relations provide here a far more flexible and pervasive platform for the engagement of public audiences than traditional external relations. Through cultural relations a European intercultural space can be forged, which is more inclusive than the EU’s political space delimited by external policy frameworks. Through the work of its local clusters in the wider European neighborhood, EUNIC decreases the sense of exclusion from the EU’s political space and opens doors for further enlargements of that space.
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