University of Zagreb

CENTER FOR POSTGRADUATE STUDIES

POSTGRADUATE SPECIALIST STUDY OF DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Barbara Lovrinić

EU's external cultural relations and the role of national cultural institutes

Final Thesis

Supervisor:

Aleksandra Uzelac, PhD

Scientific Advisor

Zagreb, March 2019

I would like to thank my mentor, Dr Aleksandra Uzelac, for her expertise, patience and guidance, as well as Dr Biserka Cvjetičanin, for her valuable advices.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

For some time now, and especially in 2017, the academic and policy literature has been preoccupied with the definitions, terms and scope of the multi-layered phenomenon of cultural diplomacy (Doeser & Nisbett, 2017; Perry, 2017; Dragićević Šešić (ed.), 2017; Helly, 2017; Kim, 2017; European Economic and Social Committee, 2017; European Parliament, 2017). Over the years, the discourse has shifted from *international cultural cooperation* to *cultural diplomacy*, which is now gaining significant attention in the international relations field. Many governments around the world support different kinds of "soft power"[1] interventions. To illustrate with an example, in 2016, the UK government set up a new £700 million soft power fund, while China plans to build 1,000 Confucius Institutes by 2020 (Smiths et al., 2016).

In 2016, the European Union (EU) announced its focus on strategies that would place culture at the very heart of international relations, while in fact culture is only a non-exclusive competence of EU and Member States hold the main competences concerning cultural policies. As the title of this thesis suggests, the EU is using the term *external cultural relations,* which includes cultural cooperation or cultural relations of the EU with the world; as such, the term is broader than the narrower term of cultural diplomacy. All acts of cultural diplomacy could be considered international cultural relations, but not vice versa, since the international cultural relations are not necessarily supported nor funded by government. The specific, state sponsored actors who are engaged in the international cultural relations are national cultural institutes.

The objective of this thesis is therefore twofold. Firstly, the intention is to unpack the concepts which associate cultural action with the policy field in Europe, and review the recent policy developments envisaged to enhance Europe's cultural relations with the world. EU's external cultural relations are considered as part of cultural policy or foreign policy, but there is no department responsible for external cultural relations, which makes this concept even more complex. Secondly, within the given EU framework, the

---

[1] In contrast to hard power, "soft power", defined by Nye (2008: 94), is "the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment". According to Nye (ibid.), the soft power of one country rests on three pillars – its resources of culture, values, and policies.

aim is to question the today's role of the important actors of EU's external cultural relations, national cultural institutes, which have been promoting their national cultures abroad as early as the 19 century. Taking into account the long tradition of national cultural institutes on one side, and the EU's focus on strategies that place culture at the heart of EU policies on other side, the aim of the thesis is to find out whether the goals of national cultural institutes nowadays are nation-centred, or aimed at fostering the European integration processes and international cultural relations. When it comes to the establishment of partnership for perusing joint projects and carrying out joint actions of national cultural institutes, EUNIC – the European Union National Institutes for Culture, as the cultural institutes' umbrella network, has a key role in fostering EU international cultural relations. For this reason, I will try to determine to what degree the national cultural institutes cooperate with EUNIC and does this cooperation really represents move from bilateral to multilateral approach.

The establishment of national cultural institutes abroad during the 20th century represents one aspect of cultural diplomacy in Europe. The KEA's "Study on European cultural institutes abroad" shows that little research has been undertaken on the *impact* of cultural diplomacy or the *activities* of the cultural institutes. Furthermore, the cultural institutes themselves spend minimal sums on research and development and almost none at all on collaborative research projects (Smits et al., 2016: 45). However, this thesis has not been inspired by finding the gap in the literature – on the contrary – the proliferation of literature dealing with cultural diplomacy in particular, together with my personal interest and curiosity in the subject, has encouraged me to do a research in the field which branches out in new directions.

1. 1. Methodology and conceptual background

Due to the impact of globalization, diplomacy, in general, is a rapidly evolving field (L'Etang, 2009). The extension of the concept of diplomacy beyond activities carried out by government diplomats resulted in creation of "new"[2] forms of *public diplomacy* and its various subsets (gastrodiplomacy, knowledge diplomacy, sports diplomacy, etc.), which makes it a multidisciplinary discipline explored in the fields of international

---

[2] For some authors, like Melissen (2005: 3), in most cases we are talking about "old wines in new bottles".

relations, marketing, foreign policy analysis, diplomatic studies, etc. In recent scholarly debates, public diplomacy is seen as a tool for building soft power (Melissen, 2005), which makes cultural diplomacy a subset of public diplomacy. The concept of cultural diplomacy is not new. Ever since the renaissance, cultural diplomacy has been present in the practice of diplomacy, and was mostly examined by the historians and political scientists as an instrument with which governments obtain their goals. Consequently, there is a lack of theoretical ground coming from the cultural disciplines. After all, cultural diplomacy, in its core, unites political theory with cultural studies.

Rather than drawing from traditional international relations theories and the concept of *power* in international relations[3] where public diplomacy has its roots and which puts cultural diplomacy in direct relation with soft power of one state, the theoretical framework of this thesis builds upon the recent academic papers written by cultural professionals and cultural managers, whose research work is more focused on the trans-national cultural practices as well as the cultural content of the particular policy. In other words, cultural diplomacy is here seen from the standpoint of contemporary cultural policy studies. Since this thesis is dealing with EU's external cultural relations, apart from studying relevant academic papers, I have also consulted various policy documents published by the EU to determine the extent to which the EU has the competence to act on cultural issues, and how it understands and conceptualises the concepts we are analysing here. Thus, as the main sources for the theoretical section and first part of the thesis, the main EU documents and reports have been analysed, such as: "European agenda for culture in a globalising world" (European Commission, 2007) and "A New European Agenda for Culture" (European Commission, 2018a) which are two most important documents when the role of culture in European external relations is concerned; then European Parliament's "Resolution of 5 July 2017 on Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations" and Joint Declaration of the Ministers of Culture of G7 (2017); and other existing documentary sources, such as, the final report "Engaging the World: Towards Global Cultural Citizenship" of the preparatory action for Culture in EU External Relations (European Commission, 2014),

---

[3] The emphasis on power derives from the *realist* conception of international relations.

as well as existing studies and academic literature such as the special issue of the International Journal of Cultural Policy (Volume 21, Issue 4, 2015).

To analyse the role of the national cultural institutes in Europe, the main document which has been consulted is the KEA's "Study on European cultural institutes abroad" (Smits et al., 2016) focusing on 29 cultural institutes from 22 EU Member States. Since I wanted to take a more in-depth approach to find out whether the national cultural institutes foster the EU's external cultural relations, the survey of the available literature and studies for this thesis was complemented with the semi-structured interviews conducted with the cultural professionals working in the national cultural institutes that operate in Zagreb, Croatia.

The e-mail request for information regarding the scope of work of cultural institutes and their role in the European strategy for culture in the EU's external relations was directed to all cultural institutes of the EU Member States operating in Zagreb. The e-mail was accompanied with the research questionnaire, defined for the purpose of this thesis (available in the annex of the thesis).

The directors, cultural attachés, and project managers of five national cultural institutes operating in Zagreb have been interviewed in person or over the email. In addition, two diplomatic representatives, one from the Embassy of Belgium and one from the Embassy of Sweden in Zagreb gave their thoughts on the topic of cultural diplomacy. In parallel to the data obtained from the interviews, information on cultural institutes and their activity was collected from their official web sites and reports published in 2016 and / or 2017. I have also sent the same research questionnaire to the cultural institutes and embassies of the EU Member States operating in Ljubljana (Slovenia), Belgrade (Serbia) and Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina) but without success.

An important source of information for the research on EUNIC's role (the European Union National Institutes for Culture) in and outside Europe are EUNIC's annual activity reports and yearbooks. The feedback has also been sought from Ms. Aída Salamanca, director of the *British Council* in Zagreb and president of the EUNIC Croatia cluster, for which a special research questionnaire has been made (available in the annex of the

thesis); however, the interview was not conduced due to the busy schedule of the director.

1. 2. Structure

The introductory chapters of the thesis define the scope of the term "EU's external cultural relations" in relation to terms "(new) public diplomacy", "cultural diplomacy", "international cultural relations" and "cultural cooperation". The subsequent chapters deal with the concept of cultural policy and the role of culture in international relations, after which the focus is put on the development of European cultural policy, which evolved during several decades. The overall aim of the first part of the thesis is to identify how the EU's cultural policy was formalised and determine the main EU mechanisms for supporting European external cultural relations.

The second part of the thesis focuses on the important actor of EU's external cultural relations – namely national cultural institutes. After the brief presentation of their historical development, subsequent chapters give an insight to the current state of the national cultural institutes in Europe that serve as evidence of the diversity of their structures and practices. The fifth chapter presents the results of the research conducted with regard to the objectives of the cultural institutes and their role in the European strategy for culture in the EU's external relations. This data is accompanied with the information collected from the official web sites of the cultural institutes. The last chapter analyses the networks national cultural institutes have established in Europe, in particular, EUNIC and MORE EUROPE.

2. Defining terms: (new) public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, international cultural relations or cultural cooperation?

When speaking about the various ways of cultural practices in the international relations, it is important to avoid terminological or conceptual mix-ups. Thus, this chapter will examine different concepts used by European and American academics and practitioners, which have entered common parlance.

Even though both the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the European Commission (EC) currently use the term cultural diplomacy in their official documents and discourses, this term is not without ambiguity (Nisbett, 2017; Smits et al., 2016; Ang et al., 2015). Not only that, but the terms *cultural diplomacy* and *international cultural relations* or *cultural cooperation[4]* are often used as synonyms. However, the main difference between cultural diplomacy and (international) cultural relations / cooperation is that the latter naturally seek for the engagement in dialogue with a much broader public and is not limited to governmental actors' initiatives. In other words, acts of international cultural relations may or may not be considered as acts of cultural diplomacy, whereas all acts of cultural diplomacy are international cultural relations. The reason for today's blurry conceptual boundaries between the two terms can be found in the paradigm shift arising from the information age in which, in the framework of the *new public diplomacy*, political scientists and specialists in international relations have attributed a broader meaning not only to cultural diplomacy but to diplomatic practice in general.

In this regard, the glossary of terms of the Commission's Preparatory Action for Culture in the EU's External Relations (2014) defines *international cultural relations* as "an umbrella term referring to the fostering of understanding between countries and especially their peoples." The same document (ibid., 134-135) states that *cultural diplomacy* "refers in its original sense to the projection by governmental agents, i.e. diplomats, of their countries' cultural value and achievements to the rest of the world. Nowadays, civil society and private sector agencies also consider the cultural relations

---

[4] Term *cultural cooperation* is used by Delphine Borione, EUNIC 2011 Yearbook, in Helly (2012: 5); Third Plenary Session of the First World Cultural Conference held in Zagreb was called "Cultural Policies and *International Cultural Cooperation*" (Cvjetičanin, 1996).

they develop and promote to be a form of cultural diplomacy. The term [cultural diplomacy] is now increasingly used as a synonym for international cultural relations (…).” According to Cultural Diplomacy Dictionary, cultural diplomacy “may best be described as the means through which countries promote their cultural and political values to the rest of the world. The essential idea is to allow people access to different cultures and perspectives, and in this way foster mutual understanding and dialogue” (de Ruiter, 2017: 10). This definition, however, gives more credit to the role of standard *corps diplomatique* in cultural diplomacy that was official and state sponsored, as opposed to today's concept which has mutated in recent years.

The common understanding of cultural diplomacy in the United States is that it is an extended part of more citizen-oriented form of diplomacy – *public diplomacy*. Since the mid -1960s, public diplomacy enters as a new addition to the political science terminology. The early brochure from the Murrow Center summarized its concept[5]: “Public diplomacy… deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications” (Cull, 2009: 19). Melissen (2005: 21) argues that in public diplomacy, like in cultural relations, the accent is put on “engaging with foreign audiences rather than selling messages, on mutuality and the establishment of stable relationships instead of mere policy-driven campaigns, on the ‘long haul’ rather than short-term needs, and on winning ‘hearts and minds’ and building trust”. In the USA, cultural diplomacy has been associated with the discourse of public diplomacy and soft power (Vickery, 2017). In the post 9/11 period, public diplomacy concept started to be accepted outside the USA and began to be debated in the international circles.[6] In the

---

[5] It is widely accepted that the term was coined by a former American diplomat and Dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Edmund Gullion, when he established the Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy in 1965.

[6] USC Center on Public Diplomacy. “What is PD?” [online] Available at: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd (Accessed July 12, 2017).

context of both European and American contemporary diplomacy, traditional diplomacy is not regarded as separate from public diplomacy. On the contrary, those two are interconnected and form what is called *new public diplomacy*. Thus, instead of just pursuing soft power, new public diplomacy is orientated towards *integrated power*, a kind of balance between soft and hard power. While it is truth that, by embracing traditional diplomacy, the new public diplomacy has assumed a broader definition, the lack of theoretical ground remains the main obstacle to relate cultural diplomacy to new public diplomacy (Kim, 2017).

Even though the concept of cultural diplomacy in the EU's institutional context is constrained to the actions of governmental agents (diplomats), Helly (2012: 5) argues that the proliferation of a variety of non-state actors has indeed extended diplomacy into private, non-governmental, track two, independent activities etc… This is reflected in Milton C. Cummings' (2005: 147) broadly accepted definition of cultural diplomacy as "the exchange of ideas, information, values, systems, traditions, beliefs, and other aspects of culture, with the intention of fostering mutual understanding" in which he does not place focus on state and its interest. On the other hand, Isar (2015: 494 – 495), states that the 'culture in EU external relations' is a far broader notion used by EU institutions in lieu of 'cultural diplomacy' practiced by nation-states. Indeed, if we take into account that the EU is a supranational organisation without proper authority (power) over national cultural policies, more appropriate term would be *external cultural relations*, since cultural diplomacy has its limitations – maybe not in theory but in practice for sure.

2. 1. EU's external cultural relations

As I previously stated, the term used in the title of this thesis, *EU's external cultural relations*, is primarily employed by the EU's institutions – notably the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the European Commission (EC). According to the glossary of the European Commission's Preparatory Action 'Culture in EU External Relations'. Engaging the World: towards global cultural citizenship (European Commission, 2014),

the term refers to the EU's cultural relations with third countries.[7] In general, it encompasses the cultural relations of the EU Member States, EU institutions and any other EU entity or agent with the outside world (Helly, 2012). On the other hand, the complexity of understanding the core concept lies in the porousness of the term, as it incorporates the EU's public diplomacy, cultural relations, cultural exchanges, cultural diplomacy and foreign cultural policy.

In her research, Lisack (2014) has pared down the term of EU's external cultural relations to its essentials: "European" describes not only the actions of the EU, but also those of European stakeholders; "external" means external to the EU (relations with non-EU Member States); "cultural" is understood in a broader sense, including other policy areas such as education, media, etc. While it may sound clear at first, it is difficult to define the boundaries of each concept – *European, external* and *cultural* in the EU foreign policy framework. When *European* is concerned, experts on European external cultural relations who participated in the workshop held in Brussels in 2014 under the name "New cooperation models for European external cultural relations"[8] have particularly stressed the importance of creating synergies between the various stakeholders inside Europe. While the role of the EU as a public rule-maker is dominant on the supranational level, diverse national cultural actors, NGOs, civil society and other important stakeholders should not be disregarded. As a result of such *European* cooperation, the models of "cultural fair trade" could be created with an aim to empower "co-creation and coproduction with non-European partners"; however, such models should not be based on power relations (Lisack, 2014). The very mention of trade suggests the idea of including culture within different projects and areas. With regard to *cultural*, European external cultural relations mean providing support to cultural exchanges but also including the cultural dimension in other aspects of external and development policy. Lastly, *external* would imply that the EU mechanisms for supporting external cultural relations are coherent, which is not the case, as we will see later on. Besides, as Helly (2012: 8) argues, it is especially due to porosity of borders as

---

[7] The term 'third countries' "refers to all non-Member State countries, and as such, they can be European or non-European countries" (European Commission, 2014). See also Lisac (2014: 11).

[8] The results of the study are presented by Lisack (2014).

well as multicultural and multinational nature of cultural productions that it became hard to distinguish what is "internal" and what is "external" in cultural policy.

According to Lisac (2014), EU's external cultural relations could be considered as part of cultural policy or foreign policy; however, no particular department is responsible for external cultural relations. Different programmes and instruments, which fall under the responsibility of different entities, are supporting the EU's external cultural relations. Thus, the support comes from the areas such as development, education, neighbourhood policy, etc. The activities of many Directorates-General (DGs) in the EU include cultural dimension, but it is not their responsibility to develop external cultural relations. In this sense, Lisac (2014) argues that this kind of a structure is due to the fact that the national competence in the cultural field still prevails and that the EU gained this competence much later than it was the case with other fields.[9] Having observed the development of EU's cultural policy, Valtysson (2018) highlights the "discursive shifts" related to the four generations EU cultural programmes. By analysing official legal documents that constitute the EU's culture and media programmes, the author has detected that the dominant discourse of the EU's cultural policy has only changed from political to economic instrumentalism and that the culture has always been a means and not an end in itself. Ever since the Commission first intervened in the cultural sector in 1977, the culture has been "camouflaged", and the intrinsic values of culture, cultural diversity, common values, human rights etc., have been pushed aside (ibid.)

It is also important to note here that not all Member States are using the same terms as the EU official language, e.g. "foreign cultural policy" has been used in Germany which "appears to be close to the idea of cultural diplomacy" (European Commission, 2014: 19). Such practice is allowed due to relevant policy framework defined at European level, leaving cultural policy to be a core competency of Member States. If we would insist upon the notion of cultural diplomacy, a definition of cultural diplomacy with an aim of "fostering mutual understanding" given by Cummings[10] happens to be the most appropriate to the EU's own idea of European cultural practice.

---

[9] The question of EU competence in culture and the principle of subsidiarity will be discussed later on in the thesis.
[10] See page 8.

To avoid further misunderstandings and, with regard to the established practice of most academics today, in this thesis I will use the term *cultural diplomacy* interchangeably with the notion of *cultural relations* depending on the context and consulted literature. On the other hand, as the title of the thesis suggests, I will use the term *EU's external cultural relations* when speaking about cultural relations between EU and countries outside the EU.

3. Culture as a tool of EU's international relations

Without doubt, culture is an important part of international relations, even though the relation between culture and policy-making is often difficult to perceive among politicians or even researchers, since the policy-making requires a certain "evidence of effectiveness" (Nisbett, 2017: 109). Nonetheless, the culture remains to be the basic conceptual tool in linking events, issues and problems at the international level, and because, after all, "otherness in politics is inevitable" (Kim, 2017: 309). The idea of culture is embedded in several kinds of narratives which link the events in international relations; however, they all derive from either the humanist or anthropological concepts (Reeves, 2004: 10). With notions of cultural internationalism, cultural diplomacy, cultural policy, cultural studies, etc. – according to Reeves (ibid., 62), there are plenty of culture around us: "We seem to have, and have had, more 'culture' than we know what to do with". This is especially true in the case of the EU, where the challenge remains not only to address non-European publics through external cultural relations, but to harmonise cultural cooperation among the Member States.

3. 1. The concepts of culture and cultural policies

Regardless of the fact that culture forms a basis of our everyday lives, for most people, the term *culture* is hard to define. The truth is, its definitions come in many different shapes and sizes; still, they contain the same message – culture is about everything. The culture "is the houses we wake up in, the food that we eat, the news we see, and the music we listen, to on whatever type of transportation takes us from home to school or work. Culture is the television or movies we watch with friends, the art museums we attend, and the drinks we have in celebration" (Perry, 2017: 5). It seems that the culture really is "more than the sum of its definitions" (Rothman, 2014).

The UNESCO Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001), for example, reaffirms old UNESCO's definition of culture as "the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group, and that it encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs." In the view of the European Commission's Communication "An agenda for culture in a globalizing world" (2007: 242), "culture lies at the heart of human

development and civilization. Culture is what makes people hope and dream, by stimulating our senses and offering new ways of looking at reality. It is what brings people together, by stirring dialogue and arousing passions, in a way that unites rather than divides. Culture should be regarded as a set of distinctive spiritual and material traits that characterize a society and social group. It embraces literature and arts as well as ways of life, value systems, traditions and beliefs." Moreover, the same Communication brings its own, broader definition of culture: "Culture is generally recognised as complex to define. It can refer to the fine arts, including a variety of works of art, cultural goods and services. 'Culture' also has an anthropological meaning. It is the basis for a symbolic world of meanings, beliefs, values, traditions which are expressed in language, art, religion and myths. As such, it plays a fundamental role in human development and in the complex fabric of the identities and habits of individuals and communities." The New European Agenda for Culture (European Commission: 2018) focuses more on the social and economic aspect of culture, and the crisis which we are currently experiencing: *"Culture promotes active citizenship, common values, inclusion and intercultural dialogue within Europe and across the globe. It brings people together, including newly arrived refugees and other migrants, and helps us feel part of communities. Culture and creative industries also have the power to improve lives, transform communities, generate jobs and growth, and create spill over effects in other economic sectors."*

From the above it follows that the culture is always a 'hybrid' and presents a set of different features. The culture is, however, a real system, employed in either anthropological or humanistic guise (Reeves, 2004: 10). The difficulty of defining culture as a concept transcends into the established (and rigid) political system on the state level.

According to Miller and Yudice (2002: 1-3), the term *cultural policy* "refers to the institutional supports that channel both aesthetic creativity and collective ways of life – a bridge between the two registers". Furthermore, such policy "is embodied in systematic, regulatory guides to action that are adopted by organizations to achieve their goals". As is the case with any other policy, it is the duty of the cultural policies to be the bridge builders between citizens and state – but not only that. In this regard, Isar

(2015) argues that there is an undeniable "polyvocality" in an agenda setting process driven by non-state actors. In the support of Isar's observation of different layers of cultural policy, Ang. et al. (2015: 378) point out that the *policy process* itself is of great importance. In the context of the European Union, this will be evident in the chapters that follow.

At the international level, UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, is one relevant stakeholder in internationalizing cultural policies. By adopting the Declaration on cultural policies in 1982 on the occasion of the World conference on cultural policies held in Mexico City, UNESCO defined new paths for cultural cooperation, highlighting some important issues such as cultural identity, cultural dimension of development, etc.[11]

3. 2. Evolution of European cultural policy

Cultural policy at the European level evolved during several decades. It was during 1970s when the first steps towards European cultural policy were made through the introduction of the European identity discourse. Taking into account the "dynamic nature of the construction of a United Europe", nine Member States of the European Economic Community have gathered at the Copenhagen European Summit of 14 and 15 December 1973, in order to sign a "Declaration on the European Identity". The document (European Union, 1973) stated that: "The Nine member countries of the European Communities have decided that the time has come to draw up a document on the European Identity. This will enable them to achieve a better definition of the relations with other countries and of their responsibilities and the place which they occupy in world affairs". Triandafyllidou and Gropas (2015) in their paper "European Identity: What kind of diversity into what form of unity?" argue that this Declaration marks one of the critical phases of the European unification project.

The fact is that, with all the focus on political and economic integration, the European Community simply did not focus on culture until several decades after its foundation.[12]

---

[11] UNESCO's Declaration on cultural policies is available online at:
http://www.culturalrights.net/descargas/drets_culturals401.pdf

[12] Speech by Andras Bozoki, Minister of Culture of Hungary from 2005 to 2006, "Cultural Policy and Politics in the European Union."

One of the European Union's foundation fathers, Jean Monnet, allegedly said: "If I had to do it again, I would begin with culture."[13] Certainly, the challenge put on the European Commission was to find a way to transform the *technocrats Europe* into a *people's Europe* (Shore, 2000: 19). As Triandafyllidou and Gropas pointed out (2015), with the development of regional cultural policies of the European Economic Community and European Union in the 1980s and the 1990s, the diversity of Europe was finally recognized and celebrated, which is still evidenced in the EU's official slogan of "Unity in diversity" created in the late 1990s.[14]

The EU's legitimacy to act in the cultural field was for the first time enabled by the Treaty of Maastricht (formally, the Treaty on European Union or TEU) which was signed in 1992. After a longer period of time, the European primary law included a paragraph on cultural policy. The Treaty (European Union, 1992) then stated: "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 cultural heritage to the fore." The EU-level cultural policy is limited to encouraging cooperation between Member States, and "if necessary supporting and supplementing their action." What was then Article 128 (TEU), later became Article 151 (TEC), and finally evolved in Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). The Article establishes the principles with regard to EU's policy on culture by stating the following:

"1. The Union 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 cultural heritage to the fore. 2. Action by the Union shall be aimed at encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action in the following areas: improvement of the knowledge and

---

[13] This quotation of Jean Monnet was never confirmed by the historians. However, Monnet's words are often cited in the European official discourses. See, for example, the website of the Jean Monnet Chair "The Culture of European Integration": http://www.jmc-santiago.org/presentation/

[14] Not all authors, however, share such opinion. Eurosceptics such as Cris Shore (2000: 15-40) claim that the cultural diplomacy is a new 'occupied field of governance' used by the 'supranational' EU institutions led by elites, trying to "forge an ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe". Shore claims that EU's will to enlarge the scope power is now successfully fulfilled through the invention of different cultural 'programmes', while the political identification of the Europeans is still missing. In his point of view and related to the previously mentioned quotation, Monnet never had a vision of culture to be that binding force; rather he claims that the story was simply invented by EU elites to support the argument for increased intervention in the cultural field (Isar, 2015: 499).

dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples; conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance; non-commercial cultural exchanges; artistic and literary creation, including in the audio-visual sector. 3. The Union and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organisations in the sphere of culture, in particular the Council of Europe. 4. The Union shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of the Treaties, in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures. 5. In order to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article: the European Parliament and the Council acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure and after consulting the Committee of the Regions, shall adopt incentive measures, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States; the Council, on a proposal from the Commission, shall adopt recommendations" (European Union, 2007).

Therefore, the first paragraph gives importance to the common European culture at the same time calling for respect to diversity. The second paragraph invites the Member States to foster mutual cooperation, while the following paragraph encourages the cooperation with third countries. The fourth paragraph highlights the transversal character of culture with regard to other EU's actions. Finally, the procedure for decision-making is described in the last paragraph of the Article 167 TFEU. While it is evident that the common European cultural policy is absent, the Article 6 of the same Treaty on the Functioning of the EU is defining its actions on cultural issues as *supportive*.[15] In this way, the EU has the competence to carry out actions to support, coordinate or supplement the actions of the Member States. Namely, culture is one of the areas which do not fall within the exclusive nor shared competence of the EU, rather it enters as a *non-exclusive competence*. This is also visible from the official EU policy documents related to culture, for example Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Creative Europe programme (2021 to 2027) (European Commission, 2018b). This Proposal, under the Legal basis,

---

[15] Supporting competence of the EU relate to the following areas: protection and improvement of human health; industry; culture; tourism; education, vocational training, youth and sport; civil protection; administrative cooperation. See Article 6 of the TFEU (European Union, 2007).

subsidiarity and Proportionality, states that the Creative Europe programme, whose nature is multilateral and transnational, is based on Articles 167 and 173 of TFEU:

"Article 167 TFEU specifies the Union's competences in the cultural field and calls for action by the European Union to 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 cultural heritage to the fore and, if necessary, to support and supplement Member State action in the area listed by this provision. Article 173 TFEU states that the Union and the Member States shall ensure that the conditions necessary for the competitiveness of the Union's industry exist, including taking action to encourage an environment favourable to initiative and to the development of undertakings" (European Commission, 2018b).

In the same document (European Commission, 2018b), under the section Subsidiarity (for non-exclusive competence), it is highlighted that the objectives of the Creative Europe programme will be complementary with those of national policies and programmes, respecting the *principle of subsidiarity*.[16] Thus, the principle of subsidiarity, ingrained in the Article 167 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, establishes principles and framework of the cultural policy on the European level. In this regard, it is generally perceived among cultural policy experts[17] that the principle of subsidiarity puts culture primarily in the competence of the Member States.

While the EU Member States are the key stakeholders of this process, their budgets are often limited and unstable, especially considering that the funding for culture tends to be cut first in times of crisis. This in particular opens up the question of formulating an explicit EU cultural policy which would potentially contribute more strongly to the development of the cultural sector in Europe (Primorac et al., 2017: 9).

---

[16] In areas in which the Union does not have the competence, the *principle of subsidiarity* applies, which guarantees that the Union's intervention is ruled out if the Member States can efficiently deal with an issue, whereas it gives power to the Union when the Member States are not able to achieve the objectives of a proposed action. In this way the principle of subsidiarity defines the circumstances in which the action is preferably taken by the Union rather than by the Member States.

[17] See Primorac (2017); Isar (2015).

On the other hand, the UNESCO, in its Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions [18] adopted in 2005, considers both the EU and EU's individual Member States are its Parties. The Convention underlined the need for Europe to strengthen relationship with other countries also when dealing with cultural matters, and to increase the autonomy of the cultural sector. However, there is a degree to which international cultural politics are just a question of symbolic meanings. To be more precise, the Convention aims to recall that "cultural diversity, flourishing within a framework of democracy, tolerance, social justice and mutual respect between peoples and cultures, is indispensable for *peace and security* at the local, national and international levels" (UNESCO, 2005). This approach has been criticised by Raj Isar (2017) in the article "Cultural Diplomacy: An Overplayed Hand?", arguing that UNESCO's main intention to spread liberal democracy is also reflected on its view on culture and cultural relations as means of peace-building operations, and thus, UNESCO's discourse "privileges a kind of ideal Kantian internationalism".[19] Either way, a broader research of this topic needs to be conducted to allow us to properly judge the transformations in the European cultural space.[20]

Even though they are providing an important legislative framework, official EU documents such as the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and its Article 167 are *not* focusing on the means of implementation and the objectives of external cultural relations, nor do they mention different actors involved. This has been provided in the corresponding agendas, strategies and preparatory actions[21], most of which I will analyse in the next subsection of this chapter.

---

[18] UNESCO, *Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,* (Paris: UNESCO, 2005).

[19] Kantian or liberal internationalism is an approach to international relations where, following the principles of German philosopher Immanuel Kant, the value is placed on the autonomy of states and non-interventionism. More on this topic can be found in Andrew Hurrell, "Kant and the Kantian Paradigm in International Relations", *Review of International Studies* 16, 3 (1990): 183-205.

[20] In this regard, see Monica Sassatelli's book *Becoming Europeans: Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies,* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

[21] For more information on policy documents, agreements and protocols related to culture in EU's external relations, see the webpage of the Cultural Diplomacy Platform: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/category/resources/eu-documents-publications/

3. 3. Recent cultural policy developments in the EU

The question of maximizing the impact of culture in foreign policy has become a central theme of many recent discussions among the EU's commissioners. The strategic use of soft power in EU's external relations has been taken more seriously into account over the last few years and the 'culture in EU's external relations' became a new buzzword (Isar, 2015: 495). As repeatedly stated in different EU documents, the culture has been recognized as integral part of EU's external relations. But – what does it really mean? What should be its priorities? From the anthropological point of view, Shore (2000: 22) formulates another central question to the cultural politics in the EU: "How are concepts of 'Europe', 'citizenship', the 'European idea', and the 'peoples of Europe' represented in official EU discourses and what implications does European integration have for the future of the nation-state and nationalism in Europe?" These are some of the questions which are important to bear while analysing the most recent official EU documents.

A point in which the culture became an integral part of the EU's international relations was in 2007, when the European Commission put forward a "Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world". Previously I have stated that culture, i.e. cultural policies, are the non-exclusive competence of the EU. According to the Agenda, which was later that year endorsed by the European Council, the EU must seek to become "an example of a 'soft power'". The Commission (2007: 8) defined three sets of objectives in the Agenda to be the guide for future action: "1. promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue; 2. promotion of culture as a catalyst for creativity in the framework of the Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs; 3. promotion of culture as a vital element in the Union's international relations." These three objectives are the cornerstone for the emerging European cultural policy. In order to attain the 3rd objective, the Commission proposed to follow a 'twin-track' approach which consists of "the systematic integration of the cultural dimension and different components of culture in all external and development policies, projects and programmes [...] and support for specific cultural actions and events" (European Commission, 2007: 10). This twin-track approach would provide a way to include cultural dimension into other areas of international relations, without disregarding its economic aspect.

The next important step happened on 12 May 2011 when the European Parliament adopted the *Resolution on the cultural dimensions of the EU's external actions*. By the Resolution, European Parliament "emphasizes the importance of cultural diplomacy and cultural cooperation in advancing and communicating throughout the world the EU's and the Member States' interests and the values that make up European culture", and "stresses the need for the EU to act as a (world) player with a global perspective and global responsibility". [22] Nonetheless, the Parliament "is concerned at the fragmentation of external EU cultural policy and projects, which is hampering the strategic and efficient use of cultural resources and the development of a visible common EU strategy on the cultural aspects of the EU's external relations". [9]

This concern resulted in an allocated budget of €500,000 for a *Preparatory action on culture in external relations*, a document prepared by the European Commission and carried out by the *Goethe-Institut* in 2014. A report (European Commission, 2014: 132) which covered 54 countries (the 28 EU Member States, the 16 Neighbouring countries of the EU and the 10 Strategic Partnership countries) "has confirmed that cultural stakeholders in the third countries surveyed are strongly interested in broadening and deepening cultural relations with their European counterparts". The document focused on the role of the EU in enforcing 'global cultural citizenship' and outlined the enhanced role of private sector actors. Helly (2017) also argues that the conclusions of the Preparatory action show "an appetite among countries and civil societies outside of the EU for more cultural relations with Europeans", but also "fatigue (…) with EU bureaucracy".

In June 2016, the Joint Communication towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations was presented by the European Commission – this happened just two weeks before the UK voted to leave the EU, and three weeks before commissioner Mogherini delivered "Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy".[22] Regardless of the shadows these events might have casted,[23] the Communication builds on three important pillars: "1. supporting culture as

---

[22] The full report is available online at:
http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf

[23] See Higgott & Van Langenhove (2016).

an engine for sustainable social and economic development; 2. promoting culture and intercultural dialogue for peaceful inter-community relations; 3. reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage" (European Commission, 2016). Furthermore, it introduced new elements of coordination such as cultural focal points and 139 EU delegations and offices operating around the world.

The Council of the EU adopted the conclusions on culture in EU's external relations on 23rd of May 2017. The related published press release underlined: "…such an approach should be bottom-up and should respect the independence of the cultural sector. [EU Ministers] recognise that international cultural relations can only develop by encouraging cultural diversity within the EU, and they call for consistency and coherence of effort. In order to take forward this work, the Council has agreed as a next step that a working group will be established to assist in drawing up a comprehensive EU strategic approach to international cultural relations".[24] On the other hand, the European Parliament, the Committees on Foreign Affairs (AFET) and on Culture and Education (CULT) to be more precise, presented an own-initiative report "Resolution of 5 July 2017 on Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations (2016/2240(INI))". The Parliament finds the intention good, but the EU strategy for international cultural relations, however, lacks clearly defined action programme, and a separate budget line: the Parliament "calls on the Commission and the VP/HR to present annual and multiannual action plans in this field, which should include actions, strategic thematic and geographical priorities and common objectives, and for a periodic review of the implementation of the joint communication, the outcome of which should be reported to Parliament;" [17] and "urges the Commission, in the next multiannual financial framework, to provide for a budget line dedicated to supporting international cultural relations in existing programmes and future calls, especially in the next generation of programmes on culture and education, so that these can develop their international action in a proper way;" [19] In addition, the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) (2017) argues that the culture is crucial for economic growth and sustainable development, and calls for "the adoption and subsequent

---

[24] "'Culture is an essential part of the EU's international relations': Council adopts Conclusions". [online] Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/05/23/conclusions-culture/ (Accessed October 5, 2017).

implementation of a clear strategy and action plan". These critical points of "Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations" have also come under the spotlight in recent debates of European researchers in the field of culture.[25]

Even though it is a bit early to talk about the implementation, the Council of EU ministers of culture held a meeting in November 2016, with the aim of identifying implementation priorities. In July 2017, the European Commission has put forward new regulation on the import and illicit trafficking of cultural goods, and 2018 was designated as the 'European Year of Cultural Heritage'. The protection of cultural heritage in the areas of crisis and the fight against illicit trafficking of artworks were also set as priorities of the G7 Ministerial meeting on Culture, held on 30 and 31 March 2017 in Florence, Italy. The representatives of first ever ministerial meeting on culture together with Irina Bokova, UNESCO Director-General, signed the *Joint declaration of the ministers of culture of G7* on the occasion of the meeting "Culture as an instrument for dialogue among peoples". This Joint declaration was adopted only few days after the UN Security Council unanimously approved the Resolution 2347/2017 on the protection of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict.

Eleven years after "Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world" (European Commission, 2007), a "New European Agenda for Culture" (European Commission, 2018a) has been adopted on 22 May 2018. The New Agenda has three objectives with three dimensions (social, economic and external), which are now described as "strategic":

- Social dimension – harnessing the power of culture and cultural diversity for social cohesion and well-being
- Economic dimension – supporting culture-based creativity in education and innovation, and for jobs and growth
- External dimension – strengthening international cultural relations

In addition, two important areas of policy actions at EU level are included and envisaged to serve all three objectives: *cultural heritage* and *digital*.

These objectives are not new (in fact, they are the same as in 2007 European agenda for culture), but they are more thoroughly described since they specify concrete actions

---

[25] See, for example, Higgott & Van Langenhove (2016).

such as the launch of the project on "Cultural and creative spaces and cities", implementation of Preparatory Action "Music Moves Europe", etc. As expected, the most attention was given to the economic dimension, with focus on three specific "eco-systems": education and training, cities and regions, and cultural and creative industries. In supporting the New agenda, a direct role is assigned to "Creative Europe", a EU programme which supports the European cultural and creative sectors from 2014 to 2020 (European Commission, 2017).

3. 4. EU as "cultural superpower"

By examining different communications and documents of the official EU, one thing stands out from the rest: the European understanding of its own identity. In the context of EU's external cultural relations, it is a top-down project with an intention to present the European Union as a whole in order to make it greater in achieving political goals. This task is difficult to undertake since the Member States have their traditions of cultural diplomacies established long time ago.

The 2007 European Agenda for Culture has marked a new beginning for international cooperation in the field of culture. Yet, the Union's position on the local and especially on the global level was not sufficiently precise: "Awareness is growing that the EU has a unique role to play in promoting its cultural richness and diversity, both within Europe and world-wide." This 'unique role' of the EU was rather presented through a range of internal programmes and policies such as MEDIA, Europe for Citizens (2007 – 2013) etc. (European Commission, 2007: 4).

On the other hand, the EU's ambition to become a 'global actor' was clearly stated in the European Parliament's "Resolution of 12 May 2011 on the cultural dimensions of the EU's external actions": (European Parliament) "stresses the need for the EU to act as a (world) player with a global perspective and global responsibility. [22] Nothing less is envisaged by the Joint Communication "Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations" (2016) which elaborates a little bit more on this topic. Right from the beginning, the Communication frames the EU's international cultural relations in this context:

"The EU is strongly committed to promoting a global order based on peace, the rule of law, freedom of expression, mutual understanding and respect for fundamental rights. Accordingly, promoting diversity through international cultural relations is an important part of the EU's role as a global actor."

In addition, in an interview held in June 2016, Mogherini stated: "Our Europe is a cultural superpower, even though sometimes we do not recognise it: our culture is fascinating for the entire world, we are a reference point at global level. This power needs to be used, we need to turn it into a tool of peace and growth".[26] Megalomaniac and self-interested though it may sound, it is essential to highlight such approach because it will most certainly affect the EU's cultural policy in the future. Valtysson (2018) notes how the culture has been "camouflaged" through diverse EU culture programmes, and how, especially with the Creative Europe programme, the discourse has shifted from political "people's Europe" instrumentalism towards economic growth, creating jobs, etc. Economic instrumentalism is certainly a strong EU's driving force and a complementary domain of its current political agenda.

On the other hand, Ang et al. (2015: 378) argue that the dynamics of the EU's culture policy settings may result in "adoption of more cosmopolitan ideals in cultural diplomacy". This would imply that the question is not about defining EU's culture (political, legal and administrative as opposed to European culture) or related concepts as Shore (2000) proposes, but about inciting synergies between the Member States and the countries around the world, as Helly (2017) sees it. In his words, "(…) it is about finding the most optimal ways to manage, in contemporary exchange flows, the variety of constantly moving European cultures and cultural systems (in the plural) interacting amongst themselves and with the rest of the world with which they often share a common history and heritage (…)".

It is obvious that there is a considerable difference between being a 'cultural superpower' and cultural facilitator. In any case, the notion of (Western) superiority should not be the EU's argument for improving the international cultural relations.

---

[26] "Mogherini: Europe is a cultural superpower. We need to use its force". EU News. [online] Available at: http://www.eunews.it/2016/06/10/mogherini-europe-cultural-superpower-need-use-force/61145 (Accessed October 20, 2017).

Besides, one cannot disregard the fact that the EU as the global actor is troubled by a serious crisis of confidence and identity. Yet this interpretation of EU's external cultural relations is connected with the general understanding of *cultural diplomacy* seen as a post-imperial/colonial legacy (Higgott & Van Langenhove, 2016: 5). This kind of colonial legacy is particularly rooted in the origins of cultural institutes in Europe.

Before I continue with an overview of European cultural institutes and with my own findings based on the conducted research designed for this thesis, I will first look at the different types of European external cultural governance, as well as the principal actors in culture in external relations.

4. Types of European external cultural governance

Since the national cultural institutes are one of the key actors of the existing EU frameworks for external cultural relations, my goal is to question their role in today's society and see to which degree the Europeanisation of national has influenced external cultural policies of the Member States. Having in mind that the EU is defining its actions on cultural issues only as supportive, it is essential to look at the kinds of relationship national cultural institutes have with their country's government.

Although the Member States' models of management of cultural relations are as diverse as their use of terms related to this management, there are some variables which can be identified and used to determine different models of management of external cultural relations. Helly (2012: 23) gives a typology of European external cultural actions based on a few important variables such as degree of government's participation, nature of agenda setters, potential partners, nature of funding, and the type of implementers. According to this typology, there are five different types of European external cultural governance: 1. national (state-centered); 2. decentralized; 3. EU-centered (to include culture into EU policies); 4. one which is empowering cultural networks and private actors; 5. one organized around coalitions of the groups of states.

Perhaps more simplified typology can be found in the Commission's Preparatory Action "Culture in EU External Relations. Engaging the World: towards global cultural citizenship"[27], where just two models are specified, based on governments' implementations of strategies and actions for culture in external relations. In this way, other variables such as implementers, funding source, agenda setters and potential partners do not play a key role. Based on the criteria of government's participation, about two-thirds of the EU Member States have a decentralized model (so called *arm's length* model) while one-third of them employ a centralized model. To illustrate with an example, France, Germany and the United Kingdom are undoubtedly the most successful countries in Europe and worldwide when it comes to cultural diplomacy.[28]

---

[27] The same models can be found in the *Research for Cult Committee - European Cultural Institutes Abroad* (Smits et al., 2016: 27).

[28] According to the report *The Soft Power 30* on global ranking based on a country's soft power in 2017 (available online at https://softpower30.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/The-Soft-Power-30-Report-

The fact that France is having centralized model and its Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) acts as a supervisor of all cultural activities conducted by French agencies or cultural institutes and offices such as *Alliance française*, *Institut français* etc., also means that the *Institut français* in Paris is not responsible for the numerous *Instituts français* abroad – they are directly under the supervision of the MFA. On the other hand, both Germany and the UK have decentralized model in which the implementation of cultural and educational policies is performed independently by e.g. *Goethe-Institut* or the British Council. Despite their autonomy, they naturally operate within the general scope of priorities defined by their governments. In addition, the principal actors engaged in cultural relations in most EU Member States are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Ministry of Culture (MoC) which act abroad through their embassies or / and cultural institutes and centers (European Commission, 2014: 30-31).

The same model of management (centralized – decentralized) is outlined in the KEA's Study on European cultural institutes abroad. According to this study (Smits et al., 2016: 30), more than half of the cultural institutes (16 out of 29 institutes from 22 EU Member States) fall within the government's scope (e.g. Austrian *Kulturforen*, the Czech Centres, the *Institut français* and the Polish Institute). On the other hand, one third (10 out of 29 cultural institutes) are independent in their performances. The examples of such institutes are the British Council, the Danish Cultural Institute, the *Goethe-Institut* and the Hellenic Foundation for Culture. Nonetheless, the Study also notes that the both centralized and decentralized models are very flexible when it comes to the operational (in)dependence. For example, Austrian *Kulturforen* enjoys a certain freedom in adapting its activities, whereas certain independent legal entities (NGOs or Non-Profit Organisations (NPOs)) have inflexible, centralized models which define their actions and priorities. Continuing on this line, a very important factor in the successful managing of external cultural relations, especially when it comes to the cultural institutes is, of course, their financial dimension. All the large, as well as, some medium-sized cultural institutes largely rely on private funding. As previously stated, both the British Council and the *Goethe-Institut* perform independently; however, the British

2017-Web-1.pdf), France has secured the top spot for the year 2017, while the UK has maintained its second position two years running. In comparison to 2016, the US fell to third place, Germany slid down one place to fourth, and Canada finished at fifth.

Council receives only 19% of its budget from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whereas the *Goethe-Institut* enjoys larger freedom and receives 72% of its budget from German MFA. Also, an independent NGO such as Dutch Culture receives 97.5% of its budget from the state (European Commission, 2014: 31).

Of course, each of governance models is faced with different strength and weaknesses, but they do complement each other. While the good thing is that the debates about culture and cultural policies have finally shifted to the implementation strategies, yet such diversity of models cannot easily satisfy current objectives of the European external cultural relations. What is certainly missing is more communication and focus on action-oriented strategic thinking between the European expert communities. In this regard, Helly (2012: 38) concludes: "The challenge lies in a) the way cultural professionals communicate with non-culture-related external relations professionals; b) the ways synergies will be found between all stakeholders involved in existing external cultural policy models". It is becoming more obvious that new forms of European cultural representation in the world (aided by new technologies) are sought in order to overcome these challenges and match the diversity of European external cultural action.

5. National cultural institutes: traditional actors of foreign cultural policy

The cultural institutes have been the places of the promotion of culture for a very long time. Through various activities of cultural institutes many people around the world have learned new languages, discovered new movies, actors, musicians, writers, or even received scholarships to study abroad. Paschalidis (2009: 277) thus claims that the British Council or the *Goethe-Institut* are the places which have defined our "common cultural landscape" long before we were familiarized with Hollywood movies, Music Television (MTV) or McDonalds.

Cultural diplomacy has been traditionally institutionalized by governments. In their efforts to obtain influence over other countries, the great European powers "exported" their culture. In this regard, Paschalidis (2009) has identified four main phases of the evolutionary path of cultural institutes, which present historically related periods: cultural nationalism (1870-1914) in which their activities were orientated towards diasporic communities; cultural propaganda (1914-1945) during which the institutes became a standard feature of great powers' official external cultural policies and were used as the sources for spreading Nazi and fascist ideas; cultural diplomacy (1945-1989), period in which UNESCO largely contributed to the reconceptualization of culture towards society so that the concept of cultural diplomacy became less aggressive in practice; and cultural capitalism (1989-present), characterised by the enlargement of the European Union, creation of EUNIC – a partnership of cultural institutes, etc.

However, a long history of cultural institutes is often being perceived in public only through the eyes of so-called "civilizing mission" or the westernization of indigenous people during colonialism. Contrary to the widespread opinion, the spread of civilization has little to do with the origins of these institutions. The proof to that is the geographical spread of first cultural institutions which is focused on tracing ethnic diasporas around the world – notably from Germany and Italy.

The first traces of national cultural institutes can be found back in the 1880s. The main reason for the creation of the organizations *All-German School Association for the Preservation of Germanhood Abroad* (Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein zur Erhaltung

des Deutschtums im Auslande) in Germany in 1881, and the *Società Dante Alighieri* in Italy in 1889, was to preserve the language and identity of ethnic diasporas who lived outside Germany and Italy (Paschalidis, 2009: 278). Only Dante Alighieri Society in 1909 established 60 committees abroad, and in 1929 even 150 of them. [29] In both cases, a group of intellectuals wanted to revitalize the ties of compatriots abroad with their homeland. Even in the time of Weimar Republic, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD, 1925), and the precursor of Goethe Institute, the Deutsche Akademie (1923) did not focus on foreign audiences.

In 1946, a German historian, Friedrich Meinecke, proposed that "the therapy for the spiritual rebirth of Germany should be the creation of a nationwide network of 'Goethe communities', consisting of 'like-minded friends of high culture', whose purpose would be to convey 'into the heart of the listeners … the most vital elements of the great German spirit'" (Paschalidis, 2009: 280 – 282). The Goethe Institute was founded in 1951 as a DAAD successor with an aim to provide further training for foreign German teachers in Germany. Exactly 25 years later, the Foreign Office and the Goethe Institute signed a general agreement according to which the Goethe Institute was declared as an independent cultural organisation. Their website also reports the period 1989-1990 and the fall of the Berlin Wall as a turning point for the Institute, as numerous activities were centred on Eastern Europe, and, as a result, many new institutes were set up.[30]

When it comes to the Italian turning point which followed after the period of "cultural nationalism", the Italian law from 1926 enabled the spread of national institutes abroad. The same year the state-controlled *Istituti italiani di cultura* was founded, which took over the functions of the Dante Alighieri Societies in order to support the fascist propaganda. As Mussolini stated in his speech in 1926, it was the time to spread "spiritual imperialism" (Paschalidis, 2009: 281).

The story is somewhat different, more to say specific in the case of France, and the reason to it was the strong belief in the French cultural universalism. Eventually, French

---

[29] Dante Alighieri Society. [online] Available at: http://ladante.it/chi-siamo/la-societa-dante-alighieri.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

[30] Goethe-Institut. "History of Goethe Institute". [online] Available at: https://www.goethe.de/en/uun/org/ges.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

developed their own cultural strategy as a role model. Allegedly, Napoleon's chief diplomat, Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, used to say to his ambassadors: "Make people to love France".[31] Indeed, France played a great role when it comes to international cultural politics especially at the beginning of the 20th century because it was the first country in the world which had developed a serious number of cultural institutions such as national cultural institutes, schools and gymnasiums. The first university exchanges of students and professors were also established between France and England in 1905 (Chaubet & Lautent, 2014: 137). In the next few years before the outbreak of the First World War, the first French cultural institutes arose in Florence, Madrid, Saint Petersburg and London. In the 1920s a serious competition was run between the cultural institutes over the territory of South America in which French and German institutes were first established in Rio and Buenos Aires. Three years later, in 1923, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs set up the first office for cultural diplomacy in history (Paschalidis, 2009: 280). On the other hand, the foundation of the *Alliance Française* back in 1883 was strictly connected to the promotion of the French culture and language in the times of intensive colonization of Africa. The *Alliance* was founded as a non-governmental institution but its directors were always closely related to the government (Chaubet & Lautent, 2014: 162). Florence and London were the cities in which the very first French Institutes were established in 1910, after which, by 1936, about thirty institutes were set up in the main European cities. The Institutes were mainly dedicated to the promotion of French art cinema and literature. However, it all came to a peak in 1970 when the International Organisation of La Francophonie (OIF) was established in order to spread the teaching of the French language which became "the absolute priority".[32]

For comparison, United States and UK were resistant to the idea of making a structure of cultural diplomacy. However, Chaubet & Lautent (2014) confirm that in 1920 the model of French *Alliance* for "cultural projection" was encouraged to be used in the case of UK. On the other hand, in 1938, USA had only 8 people employed in the State Department's Bureau of educational and cultural affairs. At that time, many private

---

[31] My own translation from Chaubet & Lautent (2014: 174).

[32] "About the International Organisation of La Francophonie". [online] Available at: https://www.francophonie.org/Welcome-to-the-International.html (Accessed September 27, 2017).

organizations such as Institute of International Education or American Education Center had more money to support various cultural activities that the Bureau itself (Chaubet & Lautent, 2014: 131). Interestingly, it was the rapid growth of the German and Italian institutes (the opening up of language schools "Lektorate" by the Deutsche Akademie, and the expansion of Dante Alighieri Society) in the Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean which prompted the establishment of the British Council in 1934. Similarly, the USA launched its first official programme of external cultural policy in 1936 in response to Nazi Germany's cultural propaganda in Latin America. To counter the German interest in this region, the USA revived the idea of pan-Americanism through an extensive educational exchange programme with Latin American countries. This was a precedence in American foreign policy, as this was the first time that the formal policy of the US government incorporated a cultural dimension (Paschalidis, 2009: 280 – 281).

It is also important to note here that the administration also played a major role in the establishment of modern cultural diplomacy world-wide. For example, a systematic approach to French cultural diplomacy was recorded back in 1842 when the financial aid was given to the Lazarist school in Antoura, Lebanon. At the beginning of the 20th century, states' bureaucracies started to develop, which naturally had impact on cultural institutions as well.

To conclude, nationalistic aspirations of Italy, Germany and France towards their diasporas are related to the origins of first cultural institutes abroad, despite the fact that such institutes were formed at the period of new imperialism. What is also important is that the management of these institutions and the financial aid did not come from the government but from the private organizations and individuals. The domination of the four big powers – France, Britain, Germany and Italy in maintaining networks of cultural centres and institutes lasted for a long period of time. It is rightly said that the national cultural institutes are one of the "traditional" instruments of foreign cultural policy (Lisac, 2014: 50), or to give them credit for their active role, traditional *actors* of foreign cultural policy. The emergence of UNESCO in 1945 as the most important institution of international cultural cooperation helped cultural diplomacy to regain prominence at the level of international relations. Still, the last

phase of "cultural capitalism" as Paschalidis (2009) calls it, began with the creation of European Union and redefinition of the role of culture. Thus, with the enlargement of the European Union and the EU's instruments of cultural cooperation, the situation significantly changed, especially with the foundation of The network of the European National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) in 2006.

Regarded from the perspective of practice, the level of autonomy of national cultural institutes did not change much. The same way as the work of first cultural institutes abroad was inseparable from the work of their respective governments, the scope of activities of national cultural institutes today mostly depends on their relationship with country's government. This can additionally be seen from the current function of cultural attachés who act as national coordinators of cultural activities and have an important role in cultural diplomacy. The next chapter offers an insight to the diversity of the practices of national cultural institutes.

6. Research on national cultural institutes in Zagreb, Croatia

This section highlights some of the main findings from the conducted semi-structured interviews with cultural professionals in the selected cultural institutes in Zagreb, Croatia. Additional information is provided based on the content analysis of institutes' official web sites and desk research of relevant literature on the subject, particularly KEA's Study on European cultural institutes abroad (Smits et al., 2016).

Three directors, one cultural attaché and one project manager who participated in this research were coming from the following cultural institutes:

- *Balassi Intézet (interview held on 15 February 2018)*
- *Goethe-Institut (interview held on 2 March 2018)*
- *Instituto Camões (interview held on 3 April 2018)*
- *Institut français (interview held on 8 March 2018)*
- *Österreichische Kulturforen (email correspondence from 28 February 2018)*

Apart from these, two diplomatic representatives, one from the **Embassy of Belgium** *(interview held on 19 March 2018)* and one from the **Embassy of Sweden** *(email correspondence from 13-14 March 2018)* gave their thoughts on this topic.

In light of the discussions on models of the EU's cultural diplomacy analysed in the previous section of the thesis, the principal actors in culture in external relations are the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Culture. In general, in their work they are assisted and presented abroad through countries' embassies or a combination of embassies and cultural institutes (cultural centres) (European Commission, 2014: 30). Considering the fact that some countries of the EU did not establish their own cultural institute in Zagreb, I tried to obtain at least some information from the relevant embassies (cultural attachés if possible) regarding EU's external cultural relations. Some countries, however, have no presentation in EU Member States whatsoever so they exclusively operate as digital platforms.[33]

---

[33] See, for example, the web page of Latvian institute: http://www.li.lv/en

6. 1. Overview of activities

The KEA's Study on European cultural institutes abroad (Smits et al., 2016), is until today the most relevant document on this subject. The main findings presented in KEA's study (ibid., 27) are as follows:

- "There is a **great variety** of national cultural institutes in the EU"; This diversity among the cultural institutes in the EU is reflected in almost every aspect: their size, management model, budget, number of offices outside the EU, involvement in the EU projects, promotion of the EU values…

- The **main mission** of the cultural institutes of the EU Member States abroad is "to promote the culture and language of their respective country."

- They play part in **nation branding and visibility** of their Member States, and they enhance "the knowledge of their culture, artists and language in third countries".

- The **management model** applied is either **centralised or decentralised** (also called "arm's length" model whereby the institutes operate independently from the government). The cultural institutes mostly report to their Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

- 29 analysed cultural institutes together have "914 offices in the EU and **1 253 offices outside the EU in 156 territories**, employing approximately **30 000 people worldwide**."

- The figures from 2012 to 2015 show that the "global turnover of the selected 29 cultural institutes exceeds **2.3 billion euros per year**."

As defined above, the promotion of national culture and language is the core activity of most cultural institutes, regardless of their size. Of course, this role should be understood more broadly. To illustrate the point, Isar (2010) recounted an event which he had witnessed at a Wilton Park conference on intercultural issues in the 1990s. According to his memory, the Director of the French Cultural Institute in London then stated that "his job was not to present the culture 'of' France but cultural life 'in' France".

- Similarly, the director of the *Goethe-Institut* in Zagreb, Dr Matthias Müller-Wieferig, highlighted that the interest of the Institute is not to present "the culture *of* Germany" but "culture *from* Germany" and "artists *from* Germany". In this regard, if the Institute would organize a concert in Croatia, they would rather invite one Croatian piano player, who was educated and lived in Germany, than the Berlin Philharmonic, for example. According to him, national branding is a task of foreign offices, not cultural institutes. In the interview, he brought attention to the Institute's commitment to create spaces for cultural dialogue and the exchange of ideas between the nation states. He, as cultural expert (and not diplomat as he says)

is concerned about the European cultural *development* and interested in creating regional projects.

- The task of enriching cultural cooperation of the Institut français had fallen to Ms. Gaëlle Le Pavic, technical cooperation programme manager for EU projects. Even though she would not call herself a diplomat, she describes her job as diplomatic. Ms. Le Pavic has emphasised the importance of the EUNIC (European Union National Institutes of Culture), Franco-German Cultural Fund, More Europe advocacy campaign, and of course Alliances Françaises – all in charge of implementing cultural action of France abroad.

Having this in mind, the actions of cultural institutes are passing beyond the simple presentation of national cultures, as they nurture bilateral relations and encourage cooperation with civil societies, cultural sector and artists in the host countries. To illustrate this with another example, the Swedish Institute (SI) in its presentation on the official website states that Swedish Institute "*seeks to establish cooperation and lasting relations with other countries through strategic communication and exchange in different fields. Our work with Sweden's image abroad and our activities in international development cooperation go hand in hand. The overarching goal is to create mutual relationships with other countries around the world*".[34]

- The representative from the Embassy of Sweden in Zagreb explained how cultural diplomacy fits into their overall public diplomacy: "Our public diplomacy aims to communicate 'the Swedish brand', meaning Sweden's values and culture. In Croatia, the Swedish embassy therefore focuses its diplomatic work on innovation, sustainability and human rights. Everything we do in terms of promotion should relate to one of these areas in some way, e.g. gender equality, climate change and start-ups. Combinations of these areas are of course possible and even better (for example sustainable transport). An event relating to one of these themes can look different in many ways. E.g. we could promote gender equality through an arts exhibition which celebrates this or show Swedish films based around Swedish culture (which we do during our annual Swedish film week). Sometimes our cultural diplomacy does not necessarily relate to one of the themes mentioned above but instead promotes Swedish art and artists."

---

[34] "About the Swedish Institute". [online] Available at: https://eng.si.se/about-si/ (Accessed September 28, 2017).

When speaking about different kinds of cooperation, the question arises whether cultural relations should be discerned as possible efficient means to gain partners in political and /or economic sense.

- "The Belgian days" are a perfect example of a hybrid between cultural and economic diplomacy, says Jonas De Meyer, Deputy Head of Mission at the Embassy of Belgium. The idea of this event is to gather all important trade representatives in the region, promote gastronomic tourism, and organise diverse cultural activities. In April 2018, Rijeka and Opatija will be the hosts cities of this two-day event, packed with concerts and exhibitions, which will at the same time promote business between the two countries.

The KEA's Study on European cultural institutes abroad also highlights the role of "two-way dialogue" fostering international cultural cooperation and exchanges and collaborations of diverse artists. In this sense, cultural institutes are giving the opportunity to enrich the cultural sector but also serve as important points for opening new markets for culture and creative industries (CCIs) in Europe (Smits et al., 2016: 29).

Both *Balassi Intézet* and *Österreichische Kulturforen* are classified as *small cultural institutes* which mostly employ between 4 and 50 people, have 1 to 10 offices and their budgets are under 5 million euros (Smits et al., 2016: 28).

- Susanne Ranetzky is a director of the *Österreichische Kulturforen*. In her email, she reflected on the main goals of the institute: "The Austrian Cultural Forum is part of The Austrian Embassy in Zagreb (and we belong to the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Vienna). We are also member of the EUNIC Cluster Croatia. Our main goals: Bringing Contemporary Austrian Art and Culture to Croatia in cooperation with Austrian and Croatian partner institutions." The history began over 60 years ago, in June 1955 when the Austrian State Treaty was signed and the "Austrian Reading Hall" in Gundulićeva 3 was established. It performed a function of a cultural institute, but received its name later in 1976.

- Ms. Anna Szlanyinka, cultural attaché from the *Balassi Intézet,* pointed out the fact that the Institute in Zagreb is relatively young – it is launched only four years ago, in January 2014. The overall goal is to present Hungarian culture and identity to Croatian audiences.

6. 2. Promotion of language

For those national cultural institutes whose languages are widely spoken, giving languages courses and issuing language certificates seems to be the most prominent and profitable activity. For example, from the activities such as teaching English, organizing exams and other language-related activities, the British Council earns approximately 550 million euros a year, which represents about 46 % of the British Council's budget, while *Instituts français* generate 73 million euros from language courses, certifications and local cultural sponsorship (Smits et al., 2016: 47).

- The *Balassi Intézet* does not provide language courses nor does it issue language certificates, simply because, as Ms. Anna Szlanyinka claims, there is no need for it. Faculty of humanities and social sciences in Zagreb offers students a possibility to study Hungarian language and culture. However, there are specialized classes in one high school and a kindergarten in Zagreb where children and young adults are learning Hungarian language. Apart from formal learning, Hungarian Cultural Society "Ady Endre" in Zagreb is also very active in promoting Hungarian language.

- Ms. Maria José Homem, director of the *Instituto Camões*, works with students as a lecturer of the Portuguese language and literature at the Faculties of humanities and social sciences both in Zagreb in Zadar. This double role is appointed to her by the Foreign office in Portugal. Being located at the heart of the Faculties of humanities and social sciences in Zagreb, it is not difficult to reveal the main objective of the Institute. The *Instituto Camões* in Zagreb is a central Balkan point where the official language certificates are being issued (*Instituto Camões* in Belgrade and Ljubljana offer language courses but do not have the permission to issue certificates).

- Belgium is following the same tradition of appointing lecturers at the French language and literature departments of the Faculty(ies) of humanities and social sciences in Croatia, as noted by Jonas De Meyer, Deputy Head of Mission at the Embassy of Belgium.

6. 3. Management model

While the role of cultural institutes remains more or less the same, the European Commission's Preparatory Action for Culture in the EU's External Relations (2014: 30) identifies three main points of differentiation between cultural institutes: a) centralized vs. decentralised models; b) representations and infrastructures abroad; and c) level of national budgets. Since the budgets of the cultural institutes were not central to my

research, the questions for the interviews were conceived focusing on the first two points.

- With respect to the model of management, from all of the cultural institutes covered in this research, only the *Goethe-Institut* is independent in its work. This differential trait has been strongly stressed out by its Director; *free space* has a special significance in the work of *Goethe* – a point which will be discussed later on. This is also confirmed by the Institute's Annual Report (2018: 4), at the same time pointing out the level of commitment to Europe: "Commitment to the cultural dialogue between our European and non-European neighbours, the promotion of the concept of multilingualism and addressing and always critically illuminating our own attitudes and values remain key tasks for the Goethe-Institut and for Europe, where we are presently experiencing Central and Western Europe drifting apart."

- In the case of the *Institut français*, even the physical closeness of the Institute and the Embassy of France, divided only by the floor area, indicates the level of connection between the two. The Institute was set up in 2010 by the French Foreign Cultural Action Act and it is under direct supervision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Within the framework of French governmental policies and priorities, *Institut français* has a mission to perform "diplomacy of influence".

- According to Ms. Anna Szlanyinka, cultural attaché working at the *Balassi Intézet*, the Institute equals the Embassy of Hungary, Department for culture.

Two diplomatic representatives, one from the Embassy of Belgium and one from the Embassy of Sweden in Zagreb helped in answering the questions about their cultural representations abroad.

- Belgium does not have its single cultural institute due to the fact that this federal state comprises three communities, three regions, and four language areas. The culture is not a core competency of federal government; instead, it is handed to communities – Flemish (Dutch), French and German. Each of the communities is responsible for its cultural action plan. For example, Wallonie-Bruxelles International (WBI) acts as public administration under whose authority is the international policy for the Walloon region and the French speaking communities in Belgium.

- The only Swedish Institute abroad is situated in Paris. The Embassy of Sweden to Croatia does not have its cultural attaché, as confirmed by the Embassy's representative: "Cultural diplomacy for us is one of many ways we promote Sweden. The work we do of course differs from a cultural institute as we represent the state of Sweden, which means that cultural diplomacy is only a part of our work and is often incorporated into our other activities and is not treated as an independent section of the embassy".

6. 4. Promotion of European values

All cultural institutes (no matter the model applied) are aligned to national policies. However, the European dimension is obviously strongly present and thus cannot be neglected by the Member States. Several cultural institutes do mention a sustained effort to promote EU values in their mission statements.

The *Österreichische Kulturforen* of Austria speaks about "contributing proactively to promoting the process of European integration"; the mission of the *Institut français* is to "affirm the European dimension of cultural action outside of France" (Smits et al., 2016: 53). However, the majority of cultural institutes do not mention the promotion of the EU and its values in their statements or statutes. Thus, the level of promotion of the EU can be measured by observing and analysing their actions. In this regard, the research in the Study on European cultural institutes shows different levels of structure and activities of European cultural institutes (CIs): "1) the way CIs have added the promotion of the EU and its values to their mission statements or statutes; 2) the type of networks and offices that they have set up at European level; 3) how CIs collaborate in third countries; and 4) their level of participation in EU-funded projects and programmes" (Smits et al., 2016: 73). This logic has been followed in my own research questionnaire. However, since this is a sensitive issue and I do not have enough research material to base strong conclusions on the level of promotion of European values among the cultural institutes, I will rely on my impressions and several facts.

- Probably the most enthusiastic to talk about the European values and creating synergies between the Member States was Ms. Maria José Homem, director of the *Instituto Camões*. In her opinion, sharing European values should be openly encouraged by all cultural institutes in Europe. One could say that promoting cultural diversity has been the main guiding principle of this Institute. Ms. Homem also works with students, to whom she doesn't mind admitting that she doesn't like *Fado* at all. Petra, one of former students and assistants who until recently worked in the Institute admitted that Ms. Homem, as well as her predecessor, is not afraid to tackle the topic of Portuguese Colonial Empire, on the contrary, she encourages such debates to further talks on the issues of colonial cultural legacy.

- Director of the Austrian Cultural Forum, Susanne Ranetzky, pointed out the role of EUNIC clusters: "Within the frame of EUNIC Croatia working together with the other members on in the implementation of projects with Europe-relevant European topics (for example such as Dialogue of culture and religions, Cultural Heritage,

Migration, Rijeka 2020, etc.) In this framework, we are also involved in common EU-funded projects via general EUNIC Cluster Fund Calls".

- In this regard, Ms. Anna Szlanyinka, cultural attaché from the *Balassi Intézet,* highlighted that the Institute regularly participates in celebrating the European Day of Languages and Europe Day.

- All the interviewees in cultural institutes mentioned that they are preparing diverse activities to support the European Year of Cultural heritage 2018 and Rijeka 2020, European Capital of Culture. For most of them, Rijeka 2020 is an absolute priority in organising institute's activities.

Of course, larger institutes are more likely to promote European values and are generally more aware of the possibilities of the EU-funded projects and European programmes in third countries in which they participate.

- For *Goethe-Institut*, the crisis in Europe presents a major challenge but also an opportunity for the Institutes to act as cultural mediators. The focus is therefore put on the networking. Within the framework of the project "Freiraum" (2017 – 2019), 38 *Goethe-Instituts* throughout Europe are trying to give an answer to the question: What does freedom in Europe mean today? On the occasion of the Warsaw meeting held on 4 and 5 December 2017, it was decided which two *Goethe-Institutes* in Europe will collaborate within the project, together with the partners. The freedom of the city of Rijeka will be questioned through the #Freiraum Rijeka (European Capital of Culture 2020) which is "facing the challenge of re-defining its industrial heritage, its local perspectives and re-design of a future city" (*Goethe-Institut,* 2017-2018).

- One of the main mission of the *Institut français* is to act for cultural diversity on a European scale through European and multilateral partnerships. In 2016, the Institute has modernized its visual identity and the logo is accompanied with the slogan "*Vivre les cultures*" (Embracing cultures). According to their web site, the Institute affirms the European dimension of French cultural action abroad through continuous participation in European projects: CinEd, European Film Education for Youth (2015), C4C, Crossroads for Culture (2014-2017), One land, many faces (2014-2015), Eclectis (May 2013 – December 2014).

- Both representatives from the French and German Institute in the interview highlighted the role of Franco-German Cultural Fund in supporting European projects. The Fund was created on 22 January 2003, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Elysée Treaty, sealing the friendship between France and Germany. It enables both countries to encourage and support co-operative initiatives conducted jointly by the French and German diplomatic networks in a third country. This program illustrates the will of France and Germany to strengthen their cooperation in the cultural field, but also and above all to affirm their commitment to European integration.

- In 2016, the *Institut français* and the *Goethe-Institut* together with three more partners launched the Cultural Diplomacy Platform, aimed at developing and strengthening the European Union's external cultural relations.

In addition, this European dimension can be witnessed through the membership of the European Network of National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) and its clusters, a topic which will be discussed in this thesis later on. Apart from EUNIC, at present there are two European networks of cultural institutes – EUNIC Global and More Europe – which operate at EU headquarters level.

6. 5. Geographical outreach

The geographical outreach is of particular importance for national cultural institutes. However, the Study on European cultural institutes (Smits et al., 2016) shows that only large institutes have a wide network of offices established around the world: 13 out of 29 have less than 40 offices abroad. In total, European cultural institutes abroad constitute a network of 1 253 offices in 184 territories, with 156 offices outside the European Union. It turns out that the highest number of open offices have the oldest and largest cultural institutes in Europe – the *Alliance française* (819 offices in 137 countries), the *Società Dante Alighieri* (423 offices in 60 countries), the *Institut français* (145 offices across 37 countries), the *Istituto Italiano di Cultura* (83 offices in 45 countries) and the British Council (191 offices in 110 countries).

- The first *Goethe-Institut* was opened in Athens in 1952. To this day there are 159 Institutes in 98 countries worldwide. For comparison, under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 96 *Instituts Français* and more than 300 *Alliances Françaises* located in 161 different countries currently operate around the world.

- The Hungarian Institute has opened its doors in Serbia and Croatia practically at the same time, with only a few months of difference. In total, Hungary's culture is represented by 24 Hungarian cultural institutes in 22 countries. Outside Europe, the Institutes are based in Beijing, Istanbul, New York, New Delhi, Moscow and Cairo. The *Balassi Intézet* in Vienna, Berlin, Paris, Rome, Moscow and Belgrade functions also as a Collegium Hungaricum, an international research and science centre.

- The most interested in having its presence in the Balkans seems to be the *Österreichische Kulturforen*: "Western Balkans region is extremely important for Austria – both economically and culturally. As part of its focus on the Western Balkans, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs

has paid particular attention to this region with annual cultural favoured-country priorities", says the Director of the Institute in her recent interview (In Focus Austria, 2017). 2017 was the Croatia-Austria Year of Culture, in which both countries were represented under the motto "Experiencing culture together".

6. 6. Thematic priorities

When it comes to the thematic priorities of the national cultural institutes, they are in line with those of the European Union: migration and refugees, preventing radicalisation of young people, promotion of fundamental values related to human rights (e.g. freedom of speech, gender equality etc.), cultural diversity, interreligious dialogue, social cohesion/inclusion, conflict/crisis resolution, support for the capacity development of culture and creative sector (CCS). The new focus on cultural diplomacy can be seen in engaging cultural institutes in intercultural dialogue with civil society in third countries. For example, the Goethe-Institut provides training and educational programmes in the field of intercultural communication and integration. The Institute also encouraged a work programme on culture and crisis with artists in Ukraine, Russia and Egypt (Smits et al., 2016: 49; Senkić, 2017: 9). The need to focus more on the Eastern and Southern partnership countries was recognized and so the Institute established training courses for cultural managers from Arab countries as part of the KULTURAKADEMIE Programme.[35] In this respect, the British Council is running the "Stability and Reconciliation Programme" in Nigeria in order to encourage non-violent conflict resolution and help reduce the impact of violent conflict on the most vulnerable groups of society.

- With regard to the *Institut français*, the interviewee, Ms. Gaëlle Le Pavic, was the right person to speak with, being in the role of technical cooperation programme manager whose job is to monitor the Institute's projects. Ms. Le Pavic mentioned several examples of regional artist exchanges between the Institutes in Belgrade, Ljubljana and Sarajevo, but all of them were realised because of the proximity of the Institutes, rather than being planned in advance in order to encourage regional cooperation.

- Similar actions are undertaken by the *Balassi Intézet*. If, for example, there is a concert of a Hungarian artist in Zagreb, the organisers try to arrange a little "tour"

---

[35] More about this programme can be found on Goethe Institute's web page:
http://www.goethe.de/ges/prj/ken/qua/kum/nan/fue/en14179766.htm

and contact cultural professionals working in the Institutes in Belgrade and Ljubljana.

- As far as the *Goethe-Institut* is concerned, the project Actopolis – the Art of Action dealt with art as urban practice in Ankara / Mardin, Athens, Bucharest, Belgrade, Oberhausen, Sarajevo and Zagreb in 2016, during which seventy artists and urban developers visited each other.

Even though the regional cooperation has not been central to the interests of national cultural institutes operating in Croatia, several of the interviewees in this research confirmed some kind of cooperation.

- Migration is currently the most pressing topic on the agenda of national cultural institutes. Nearly all of the interviewees confirmed their participation in the event "Borders: Separation, Transition and Sharing" organised by the EUNIC Croatia (Austrian Cultural Forum, French Institute, Goethe Institute, Hungarian Balassi Institute, Italian Cultural Institute, Institut Cervantes, Institut Camoes, British Council) in partnership with the Institute for Migration and Ethnic studies, Rijeka 2020, the City of Rijeka, University of Rijeka, Kino Tuškanac in Zagreb, Art kin in Rijeka and Živi Atelje DK, with support from the European Commission and EUNIC global fund. From 5 to 15 June 2017, three round tables accompanied by three exhibitions, and a film programme were held in Zagreb and Rijeka.

- Even though small, the *Österreichische Kulturforen* in collaboration with partners organises up to **180 events a year supporting primarily young artists and cultural workers** from all artistic and cultural fields in Croatia.

- A special focus has lately been put on the **expansion of cultural infrastructure and digital networks**, according to the director of the *Goethe-Institut*, Dr Matthias Müller-Wieferig. For example, Dia: Forms, a collaborative project between Vizkultura.hr and *Goethe-Institut*, is a virtual hub which presents new forms of artistic expression. Dia: Forms is a sort of innovative space for dialogue between the Croatian and German art scene.

6. 7. Actions taken outside the EU

Approximately 1 250 offices and 30 000 skilled staff are registered to be operating in more than 150 countries outside the European Union. Apart from this individual approach, there is also a possibility for cultural institutes to operate through the 50 EUNIC clusters (out of total of 100) which are established in third countries. However, much of this only exists on the "paper" and cluster's real actions are subject of many debates.

- In the Activity Report for 2016, Africa is listed as key priority area of influence for French cultural diplomacy. Every year 6 000 African movies from the collection of the *Cinémathèque Afrique* are presented by the Institutes all around the world, and 60 African and Caribbean cultural operators are financially supported in the performing arts, visual arts, music and cinema sectors (*Institut français*, 2016).

- Africa is central to the interest of the *Goethe-Institut* as well. According to the last year's Activity Report (*Goethe-Institut*, 2016-2017), the Institute is working intensively to establish interregional networks there. In October 2015, the African Futures Festivals took place in Johannesburg, Lagos and Nairobi. African artists, academics and cultural professionals were brought together in order to "establish alternative view-points to conventional Western perspectives".

- Established in 1955, the *Goethe-Institut Damascus* was one of the first institutes worldwide, which was closed in 2012 due to the security reasons. Between 20 October and 5 November 2016, a symbolic place for cultural encounters was re-established in Berlin under the title *Goethe-Institut Damascus | In Exile* (*Goethe-Institut,* 2016-2017).

The Study on European cultural institutes abroad (Smits et al., 2016) recommends to take a regional approach instead of "one size fits all" action programmes for all third countries. A good example in this sense would be the Romanian Cultural Institute which recognized the importance of setting up the EUNIC cluster in Moldova, country which is a key priority for Romanian foreign policy.

While speaking about cooperation between European actors in third countries, it is important to mention the European Union Delegations. Around 140 of them are currently operating around the world, and have strong ties with both EUNIC clusters and cultural institutes. An internal survey on Cultural Activities of the 118 EU Delegations carried out by the Strategic Communications department of the EEAS in 2015, showed that 38 Delegations (35 %) have contacts with a network of cultural institutes or EUNIC clusters and 47 Delegations (44 %) also have a network of contacts with EU Member States' embassy cultural counsellors (Smits et al., 2016: 63). However, it should be noted that, in contrast to national embassies and national cultural institutes, the EU Delegations do not have a long tradition. They are young institutions yet on the right track to be recognised as trusted partners having the possibility to appoint cultural experts within civil society (Lisac, 2014: 52).

7. Cultural networks and platforms supporting EU's external cultural relations

The main business of the national cultural institutes is international cultural cooperation. In this regard, cultural networks are important tool in their work.

The concept of networking in general has become fundamental to our everyday lives, and cultural sector is not an exception to this phenomenon. In the last thirty years, cultural networks continuously support this sector in international cultural cooperation. In their core function, cultural networks are the organisational structure, which enables cultural professionals to connect with each other and influence cultural policies through their joint work (Uzelac, 2016: 5).

In the context of Europe, the importance of cultural networks lies in the fact that they are "communication infrastructure for European cultural cooperation" (DeVlieg, 2001, in Uzelac, 2016). The main reasons for their wide spread usage are the fact that they enable flexible cooperation, provide tools for overcoming concrete problems, link people of common interest, and act as a communication channel through which cultural professionals and institutions can conduct joint projects (Uzelac, 2006, 2016). In the given European circumstances, cultural networks have been an especially important aspect of EU's cultural cooperation. Despite their great number, European cultural networks are well organised and established (Steinkamp, 2016). This, however, does not mean that they are without problems.

Many cultural networks today are faced with challenges, both internal and external such as financial instability, complex coordination due to high demand for communication, scarce human resources, high workload, massive availability of information and knowledge… (Steinkamp, 2016). Amongst these, the biggest challenge for cultural networks remains financial uncertainty. Challenges are many when it comes to the European environment and the community of national cultural institutes. Even though the network of the European National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) established itself as the most important actor and strategic partner in the European external cultural relations, the network is challenged by the disproportionate strength of its members. Namely, three big countries – France, Germany and the UK – have the biggest budgets and their cultural networks are the most developed in the world (Helly,

2012). This only confirms how the governmental structure is vital for networks to operate in such complex environments. On the other hand, networks of cultural cooperation distinguish themselves from other organisational forms by the fact that they are not burdened with hierarchical or bureaucratic systems. On the contrary, they are dynamic and decentralised systems (Steinkamp, 2016). The real benefit of networked environment is in the collective action of cultural professionals rather than in simple information sharing. On the condition that they remain financially viable, perhaps the future of European cultural networks unburdened by old structures lays in the new institutional forms of collaboration working towards intersectoral and cross-disciplinary exchange.

In a similar line, networks are not the only communication infrastructure supporting EU's external cultural relations, as it includes platforms too. The need for creation of diverse structures to facilitate cultural exchanges is evidence of the importance of the engagement of multiple actors in the EU's cultural relations. Thus, in the next subsections, I will focus on three different types of European organisational structures for cultural cooperation: first is EUNIC, who acts as the main network of the European national cultural institutes; second is MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations, a public-private partnership of national cultural institutes, foundations and civil society networks; and lastly, the focus will be on Cultural Diplomacy Platform, a two-year project with a consortium of national cultural institutes, designed to help implement the EU strategy for international cultural relations.

7. 1. EUNIC - The network of the European National Institutes for Culture

The network of the European National Institutes for Culture, EUNIC, has a specific role considering the fact that this joined-up platform establishes itself as a principal actor in increasing collaboration at European level and in promoting European values. Established in 2006, the network's purpose is "to create effective partnerships and networks between the participating organisations, to improve and promote cultural diversity and understanding between European societies, and to strengthen international dialogue and co-operation with countries outside Europe". This way of cooperation is seen as giving a stronger voice to smaller EU Member States without significant international presence (EUNIC, 2016). However, EUNIC's scope of work as

defined in its Statute is not limited only to third countries – the picture often perceived in public. The network's first strategic objective is "to enhance EUNIC's capacity to participate in the design and implementation of cultural diplomacy and cultural relations projects both inside and outside the EU" (EUNIC, 2015).

The idea of networking among European cultural institutes originated in 1997 in Brussels, Belgium, when they started to cooperate, and in 1999 founded the *Consociatio Institutorum Culturalium Europaerum inter Belgas* (CICEB) with following founding members: *Alliance Française*, British Council*, Det Dansk Kulturinstitut, Goethe Institute*, *Instituto Cervantes*, *Istituto Italiano di Cultura* and *Suomen Benelux Instituutti.* The vision in the EUNIC Strategic Framework adopted on 11 December 2015 stated that "by 2025 EUNIC will be the delivery, research and training partner of choice for cultural diplomacy and cultural relations at European and international level" (EUNIC, 2015). There is no doubt that EUNIC has a global reach. With 36 cultural institutes and ministries from 28 countries, over 100 clusters and 2000 branches, EUNIC's members operate in more than 150 countries. Clusters are important collaboration platforms, as they represent joint local offices of EUNIC members who operate together. Established clusters have at least three local offices of EUNIC members which have an impact nationwide or city-wide. Moreover, there are three categories of members which can further be a part of a cluster: full members, associate members and partners.[36]

In response to the proposed enhanced cooperation put forward in the Joint Communication "Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations", in 2016 EUNIC has expanded its Board of Directors and in February 2017, new recommendations were approved related to the cluster governance process. The report of the EUNIC General Assembly, which took place in Copenhagen between 8 and 9 June 2016, highlights the key events which took place over the last twelve months.[37]

The organization, however, is faced with several problems. The research conducted in 2015 by the Centre for Cultural Relations of the University of Edinburgh has shown that the collaboration between EUNIC members is weak, the level of their activity varies, and

---

[36] "Clusters". [online] Available at: https://www.eunicglobal.eu/clusters (Accessed October 15, 2017).

[37] The full report of the EUNIC General Assembly is available online at:
http://www.eesc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/resources/docs/eunic-general-assembly-report.pdf

a different priority of larger and smaller members has been identified – larger ones tend to see the added value in EUNIC's contribution to the EU policy framework, while the smaller ones see it in sharing best practice (CCR – Centre for Cultural Relations, 2015). KEA's Study on European cultural institutes abroad marks EUNIC's members to lack a proper governance structure and a financial and technical capacity to support the EU institutions (Smits et al., 2016: 55). At the same time, Preparatory Action for Culture in the EU's External Relations (European Commission, 2014) underlines that "the prevailing pattern (…) is to aggregate national level activities rather than seek a common approach". Lisack (2014: 50) agrees by arguing that there is no consensus on the role of cultural institutions and EUNIC as "coordinators of European players in external cultural relations". The question of collaboration was dealt with in the above mentioned CCR's research and the factors which would incite cooperation identified by members are: opportunities to learn through collaboration; scope to increase project impact; and opportunities for cost savings or staff efficiencies (CCR – Centre for Cultural Relations, 2015: 9). The time will tell whether the objectives set by EUNIC are achievable and realistic.

7. 2. MORE EUROPE – External Cultural Relations

Even though slightly different from EUNIC, MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations is an EU network with the same purpose – advocacy for more strategic and concrete approach to culture in EU's external relations. Yet, compared to EUNIC, this network seems to be more active and more connected to the EU institutions (Smits et al., 2016: 55). However, MORE EUROPE is a smaller organization which is not offering different types of membership, a feature which, on the other hand, makes EUNIC more inclusive for other stakeholders such as think-tanks. Namely, MORE EUROPE is a public-private partnership of national cultural institutes, foundations and civil society networks established in December 2011 with an objective "to highlight and reinforce the role of culture in the European Union (EU)'s external relations".[38] MORE EUROPE currently counts five members (partners): the British Council, the *Goethe-Institut*, the *Institut français*, the European Cultural Foundation and the Stiftung Mercator (Germany). The

---

[38] "What is MORE EUROPE?" [online] Available at: http://www.moreeurope.org/?q=about-us/mission-statement (Accessed September 10, 2017).

organization seeks to encourage dialogue between stakeholders by organizing different meetings and high-level debates, building a "resource bank of best practices" and conducting studies and researches such as More Cultural Europe in The World (Helly, 2012) or European External Cultural Relations: Paving New Ways? (Lisack, 2014) that I have repeatedly referred on in this thesis.

7. 3. Cultural Diplomacy Platform

To help implement the EU strategy for international cultural relations, an EU Cultural Diplomacy Platform[39] was set up in February 2016. The Platform is a two-year project whose defined objectives are to "support the further development of cultural diplomacy policies, activities, methodologies, tools and training programmes, within the broader framework of EU Public Diplomacy; assist in policy dialogues and advising on cultural diplomacy issues;" and to "strengthen communities/networks of cultural diplomacy practitioners".[40] Its actions are envisaged to engage all the stakeholders from a bottom-up perspective, as well as national cultural institutes whose role is reflected in the organisational structure of this project. Namely, the Platform's consortium is led by Goethe-Institut and composed of the British Council, Centre for Fine Arts/BOZAR, EUNIC-Global, European Cultural Foundation, and the *Institut-Français*.

Through a Call for tender, national cultural institutes have been selected to constitute a consortium with an aim to "reinforce the EU's public and cultural diplomacy capacities and [will] support public diplomacy and cultural stakeholders in their networking, implementation and visibility efforts".[41] This has also been achieved through organisation of different events and activities, among which a Cultural Leadership Training Programme presents the Platform's most important programme, reinforcing the skills of future cultural leaders in an international context.

---

[39] Cultural Diplomacy Platform: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/

[40] ibid.

[41] The Call for tenders on „EU Policy and Outreach Partnership and Cultural Diplomacy Platform Location" is available online at: https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/online-services/index.cfm?ADSSChck=1473688160240&do=publi.detPUB&page=1&nbPubliList=50&searchtype=QS&orderby=upd&aoref=137304&orderbyad=Desc&userlanguage=en

8. Conclusion

Drawn on different perspectives ranging from policy papers, academic literature and empirical research, the aim of this thesis was twofold: firstly, to investigate the development of mechanisms for the EU's external cultural relations – EU's cultural relations with third countries, and secondly, to question the role of national cultural institutes in being one of the key agents for the EU's external cultural relations.

Since the idea of culture is embedded in several kinds of narratives which link the events in international relations, the EU's "strategic understanding of soft power" (Isar, 2015) stands between the terms and definitions of cultural diplomacy, public diplomacy, international cultural relations and cultural cooperation. The ambiguities mostly arise from the fact that diplomacy, even though being essentially a political activity, goes beyond the narrow politico-strategic conception given to the term. The understanding of diplomacy has been redefined due to its activities which shifted from speaking to listening, from representation to cooperation, from government to people… However, culture in EU external relations is a far broader notion used by EU institutions instead of cultural diplomacy practiced by nation-states.

The paradigm shift in international relations in which the culture is put in the heart of EU's external relations is obvious not only in terms of different narratives or in terms of various terminology, but in the fact that bilateral turned to multilateral and national became European. With the enlargement of the European Union in 2007, the EU's instruments for cultural cooperation have been redefined. After the Treaty of Maastricht which gave the EU legitimacy to act on the cultural field, the European Union strived for a common European cultural policy based on pluralism and diversity of cultures, cultural and creative industries and culture in EU's external relations – three common aspects in which the consensus of all Members States has been achieved and which are today's basis of the European cultural policy. The last and most important aspect concern the European external cultural relations, which mean providing support to cultural exchanges but also including the cultural dimension in other aspects of external and development policy. Considering that there is no department responsible for EU's external cultural relations, the eventual implementation of the joint activities of

the Member States specified in the EU's official documents becomes a much more complex issue. This also triggers the question of the EU's motivation to put culture at heart of its foreign policy in the first place. By its definition, culture has both intrinsic and instrumental value; as such, it is significant tool in bridging different perspectives, although it is important to highlight that the country's use of soft power usually bears connotations of self-interest, as in the case of the EU.

The research questionnaire related to the work of national cultural institutes operating in Zagreb has been envisaged to see whether the Europeanisation of national has influenced external cultural policies of the Member States, and if yes, to what degree. The key to understanding the national cultural institutes is to look at the kinds of relationship they have with their country's government. In this regard, national cultural institutes, being under the supervision of respective foreign affairs ministries or independent, are still aligned to national policies. Traditionally, some countries, like Germany, are more tied to their national language, values etc.

However, to evaluate the priority given to European interests and the importance of fostering the integration processes of the EU in the work of national cultural institutes was a hard task to do, mostly because there is an obvious diversity of the employees working at the institutes. They are ranging from cultural attachés, cultural experts, language professors and / or cultural activists engaged in civil society, all of whom have different perspectives on how cultural institutes (and their job) should look / looks like. Besides, there is a dichotomy between cultural attachés who claim to perform cultural diplomacy (of their country), and cultural experts whose business are international cultural relations, and not that of diplomacy. In this sense, if the cultural experts are managing national cultural institute which is independent, i.e. free in its work from the government, they are more open to multilateral relations and more likely to follow European guidelines to common and strategic approach to culture.

The overall impression is that the work of national cultural institutes is not yet adapted to the concept of cultural diplomacy which is now more broadly understood and moved away from the formal spaces (Nisbett, 2017). It seems that the cultural institutes are taken for granted when it comes to their role in being agents for EU's cultural external relations. No matter the mission statements of the cultural institutes, the work they

perform follows the traditional pattern of maintaining cultural (bilateral) relations, combined with traces of newly formed collaborations and partnerships which often involve civil society. The latter actions are usually encouraged either by the Directors of the institutes enjoying the autonomy or they are motivated by the budget received from the central European network for cultural institutes, EUNIC, or in some cases, both.

Since the EU is defining its actions on cultural issues only as supportive, EUNIC is the main cooperation platform for European external cultural relations, who, at least with its budget, can motivate the Member States for joint external cultural action. However, in its current state, the network is not capable of acting as the coordinator of European players nor can it successfully contribute to the EU policy framework. The main reason for this obstacle is that EUNIC lacks proper governance structure which has also resulted in rather weak collaboration between its members. When it comes to the link between EUNIC and cultural institutes in Zagreb, all interviewees mentioned collaboration among members in the framework of EUNIC Croatia in the implementation of projects related to relevant "European" topics. In any case, it would be interesting to see how the network will try to overcome the obvious difficulties and attain the objectives set by 2025. For further research on this topic, it is necessary to get the insights from the president of the cluster EUNIC Croatia, who unfortunately remained unavailable for the interview.

At the same time when we witness the proliferation of diverse non-state actors such as civil society and NGOs, who are engaged in external cultural relations, we witness the proliferation of the literature dealing with the actions undertaken by the EU. On one side, we are experiencing a hyperproduction of strategies and agendas coming from the "official" EU, while on the other side, there are researchers and expert communities who raise their voices against the instrumentalisation of culture. In addition, the engagement of multiple actors in the EU's cultural relations resulted in the creation of networks and platforms which facilitate cultural exchanges. This phenomenon shows that the place of Europe on the international scene is changing, but also that cultural, and any kind of external relations is not a unique phenomenon but rather a set of planned actions which take place in a much broader context. In order to tackle the

challenges brought by the new actors on the international scene, institutional framework of the EU has no other option but to provide a strong communication infrastructure for the European cultural cooperation.

Bibliography

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

Carr, E. H. (1964). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939*. New York: Harper & Row.

CCR – Centre for Cultural Relations. (2015). *Research Report: EUNIC – Crossroads for Culture.* University of Edinburgh. [online] Available at: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/cier-data/uploads/2016/08/Report5.pdf (Accessed September 15, 2017).

Chaubet, F., Lautent M. (2014). *Međunarodni kulturni odnosi: istorija i kontekst*. Beograd: Clio.

Council of the European Union. (2017). "'Culture is an essential part of the EU's international relations': Council adopts Conclusions". [online] Available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/05/23/conclusions-culture/ (Accessed October 5, 2017).

Council of the European Union. (2017). *Council conclusions on an EU strategic approach to international cultural relations (7935/17).* Brussels: Council of the European Union. [online] Available at: http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-7935-2017-INIT/en/pdf (Accessed September 11, 2017).

Cull, N. J. (2009). "Public diplomacy before Gullion. The evolution of a phrase." In Snow, Nancy and Philip M. Taylor. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*. New York: Routledge.

Cultural Diplomacy Platform. [online] Available at: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/ (Accessed August 20, 2017).

Cummings, M. C. (2005). "Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey." In *The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations* edited by Jan Melissen, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cvjetičanin, B. (ed.) (1996). *Dynamics of Communication and Cultural Change: The role of networks* (Culturelink special issue 1996). Zagreb: IMO.

Dante Alighieri Society. [online] Available at: http://ladante.it/chi-siamo/la-societa-dante-alighieri.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

de Ruiter, F. (2017) "The Real Cultural Diplomats". *Sounds in Europe*. European Music Council: 10-11. [online] Available at: https://www.emc-imc.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Sounds12web.pdf (Accessed March 11, 2018).

Doeser, J., Nisbett, M. (2017). *The Art of Soft Power: A Study of Cultural Diplomacy at the UN Office in Geneva.* London: King's College London.

Dragićević Šešić, M. (ed.) (2017). Cultural Diplomacy: Arts, Festivals and Geopolitics. Beograd: Culture Desk Serbia. [online] Available at: http://kultura.kreativnaevropa.rs/calls/CULTURAL%20DIPLOMACY%20web.pdf (Accessed January 20, 2018).

EUNIC Global. "Clusters". [online] Available at: https://www.eunicglobal.eu/clusters (Accessed October 15, 2017).

EUNIC. (2015). *EUNIC Strategic Framework.* Brussels: EUNIC.

EUNIC. (2016). *EUNIC Statute*. Brussels: EUNIC.

EUR-Lex. Glossary. "Open method of coordination". [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/open_method_coordination.html (Accessed September 10, 2017).

European Alliance for Culture and Arts. (2017). *Statement on Culture in regions and cities On the occasion of the closure of the European week of Regions and Cities.* Brussels. [online] Available at: https://newnewnewalliance.files.wordpress.com/2017/10/statement_european-week-of-regions-and-cities_12102017.pdf (Accessed October 18, 2017).

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

European Commission. (2014). *Preparatory Action 'Culture in EU External Relations'. Engaging the World: towards global cultural citizenship.* Brussels: European Commission. [online] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/publications/global-cultural-citizenship_en.pdf (Accessed August 12, 2017).

European Commission. (2016). *Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council. Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations.* Brussels: European Commission, JOIN(2016) 29 final. 8.6.2016. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52016JC0029&from=EN (Accessed August 15, 2017).

European Commission. (2017). *2018 annual work programme for the implementation of the Creative Europe Programme*. Brussels: European Commission, C(2017)6002. 6.9.2017. [online] Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/sites/creative-europe/files/c-2017-6002_en.pdf (Accessed July 10, 2018).

European Commission. (2018a). *Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The European Council, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions. A New European Agenda for Culture*. Brussels: European Commission, COM(2018) 267 final. 22.5.2018. [online] Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/culture/sites/culture/files/commission_communication_-_a_new_european_agenda_for_culture_2018.pdf (Accessed July 10, 2018).

European Commission. (2018b). *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Creative Europe programme (2021 to 2027).* Brussels: European Commission, COM(2018) 366 final. 30.5.2018. [online] Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2018%3A366%3AFIN (Accessed January 11, 2019).

European Economic and Social Committee. (2017). *Opinion on Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations*. EESC. [online] Available at: http://www.eesc.europa.eu/our-work/opinions-information-reports/opinions/towards-eu-strategy-international-cultural-relations (Accessed August 20, 2017).

European Parliament. (2011). *Resolution of 12 May 2011 on the cultural dimensions of the EU's external actions (2010/2161(INI))*. [online] Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P7-TA-2011-0239+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN (Accessed September 1st, 2017).

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

European Union National Institutes for Culture – EUNIC. [online] Available at: http://www.eunic-online.eu/ (Accessed August 20, 2017).

European Union. (1973). *Declaration on European Identity.* Copenhagen: EU. [online] Available at: https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/1999/1/1/02798dc9-9c69-4b7d-b2c9-f03a8db7da32/publishable_en.pdf (Accessed August 20, 2017).

European Union. (1992). *Treaty on European Union*. OJ C 191. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:11992M/TXT&rid=1 (Accessed August 27, 2017).

European Union. (2007). *Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.* OJ C 326. [online] Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT (Accessed August 27, 2017).

Facebook page. "If you like Latvia, Latvia likes you". (2017). Facebook. [online] Available at: https://www.facebook.com/IfYouLikeLatviaLatviaLikesYou/?hc_ref=ARRsjsQKOdkuoSN1komlqve-MtFQc27n_cBW7NfEarXJnST7--pEVmDPedt0FwlEj_k (Accessed July 20, 2017).

Goethe-Institut. (2016 / 2017). Annual Report. [online] Available at: https://www.goethe.de/resources/files/pdf155/goethe-jahrbuch-2016_2017_gute-auflsung-verschlsslt31.pdf (Accessed May 25, 2018).

Goethe-Institut. (2017 / 2018). Annual Report. [online] Available at: https://www.goethe.de/resources/files/pdf155/gi_jahrbuch_17_18_web_doppelseiten.pdf (Accessed July 22, 2018).

Goethe-Institut. "History of Goethe Institute". [online] Available at: https://www.goethe.de/en/uun/org/ges.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

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

Helly, D. (2012). *More Cultural Europe in the World.* Brussels: MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations. [online] Available at: http://moreeurope.org/sites/default/files/more_cultural_europe_in_the_world_public.pdf (Accessed July 18, 2017).

Helly, D. (2017). *Europe's enabling power: an EU strategy for international cultural relations*. Bruges: College of Europe.

Higgott, R., Van Langenhove, L. (2016). *Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations: an initial, critical but constructive analysis*. Brussels: Institute for European Studies.

Hurrell, A. (1990). "Kant and the Kantian Paradigm in International Relations". *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 3: 183-205.

In Focus. (2017). "An Intensive Friendship Shaped by Creativity and Dialogue". In Focus Austria: 28-30.

Institut Français. (2016). *Rapport d'activité*. [online] Available at:
http://www.institutfrancais.com/sites/default/files/if-bilan-annuel-170313-bd-72dpi.pdf
(Accessed May 25, 2018).

Isar, Y. R. (2010). "Cultural Diplomacy: An Overplayed Hand?" *Public Diplomacy Magazine*.
[online] Available at: http://www.publicdiplomacymagazine.com/cultural-diplomacy-an-
overplayed-hand/ (Accessed October 14, 2017).

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

*Joint Declaration of the Ministers of Culture of G7 on the Occasion of the meeting "Culture as an
Instrument for Dialogue among Peoples".* (2017). Florence. [online] Available at:
http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/multimedia/MiBAC/documents/1490881204940_DECLAR
ATION-Dichiarazione.pdf (Accessed September 12, 2017).

Kaiser, W. (1999). "Vive la France! Vive la République? The Cultural Construction of French
Identity at the World Exhibitions in Paris 1855–1900". *National Identities*, 1:3: 227-244.
[online] Available at:
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14608944.1999.9728113?needAccess=true
(Accessed September 10, 2017).

Kim, H. (2017). "Bridging the Theoretical Gap between Public Diplomacy and Cultural
Diplomacy". *The Korean Journal of International Studies*, 15-2: 293-326. [online] Available at:
http://www.kjis.org/journal/view.html?uid=203&&vmd=Full (Accessed March 15, 2018).

L'Etang, J. (2009). Public relations and diplomacy in a globalized world: an issue of public
communication. *American behavioural scientist*, 53 (4): 607-626.

La Francophonie. "About the International Organisation of La Francophonie". [online] Available
at: https://www.francophonie.org/Welcome-to-the-International.html (Accessed September
27, 2017).

Latvian institute. [online] Available at: http://www.li.lv/en (Accessed September 27, 2017).

Lisac, G. (2014). *European external cultural relations: Paving new ways?* Brussels: MORE
EUROPE – external cultural relations. [online] Available at:
http://moreeurope.org/sites/default/files/european_external_cultural_relations_paving_ne
w_ways_10.12.2014.pdf (Accessed July 2, 2017).

Mcclory, J. (2017). *The Soft Power 30. A Global Ranking of Soft Power 2017*. USC Center on
Public Diplomacy. [online] Available at: https://softpower30.com/wp-
content/uploads/2017/07/The-Soft-Power-30-Report-2017-Web-1.pdf (Accessed August 22,
2017).

Melissen, J. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations*. UK:
Palgrave Macmillan.

Miller, T., Yúdice, G. (2002).*Cultural Policy*. London Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage
Publications.

Mogherini, F. (2016). "Mogherini: Europe is a cultural superpower. We need to use its force".
EU News. [online] Available at: http://www.eunews.it/2016/06/10/mogherini-europe-
cultural-superpower-need-use-force/61145 (Accessed October 20, 2017).

MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations. "What is MORE EUROPE?" [online] Available at: http://www.moreeurope.org/?q=about-us/mission-statement (Accessed September 10, 2017).

Morgenthau, H. (1953). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Nisbett, M. (2017). "Who Holds the Power in Soft Power?" *Cultural Diplomacy: Arts, Festivals and Geopolitics*. Edited by Milena Dragićević Šešić. Beograd: Culture Desk Serbia. [online] Available at: http://kultura.kreativnaevropa.rs/calls/CULTURAL%20DIPLOMACY%20web.pdf (Accessed January 20, 2018).

Nye, J. (2008). Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616: 94-109.

Paschalidis, G. (2009). "Exporting national culture: histories of Cultural Institutes abroad." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15, 3: 275-289.

Perry, R. (2017). *Advocacy Paper. Cultural Diplomacy or Cultural Relations.* Brussels: MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations. [online] Available at: http://moreeurope.org/sites/default/files/advocacy_paper_cult_dipl_vs_cult_rel.pdf (Accessed August 2, 2017).

Primorac, J., Obuljen Koržinek, N., Uzelac, A. (2017). „Access to culture in Croatian cultural policy: Moving towards explicit policies". *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 23, No. 5.

Primorac, J. (2017). Supsidijarnost, policy, OMK? Hrvatska kulturna politika u europskom kontekstu. *CULPOL Issue Paper*. IRMO: Zagreb. [online] Available at: http://culpol.irmo.hr/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/TD1-PrimorSupsidijarnost-policy-OMK-Hrvatska-kulturna-politika-u-europskom-kontekstu-FINAL-1.pdf (Accessed January 4, 2019).

Reeves, J. (2004). *Culture and International Relations. Narratives, Natives and Tourists*. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics Series. New York: Routledge.

Reiterer, M. (2014). "The Role of Culture in EU-China Relations." *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 19 Special Issue: 135–54.

Rothman, J. (2014). "The Meaning of 'Culture'." The New Yorker. [online] Available at: http://www.newyorker.com/books/joshua-rothman/meaning-culture (Accessed May 1, 2017).

Sassatelli, M. (2009). *Becoming Europeans: Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schneider, C. P. (2006). "Cultural Diplomacy: Hard to Define, but You'd Know It If You Saw It". *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 13, No. 1: 191-203.

Senkić, M. (2017). Cultural diplomacy from the bottom-up. *CULPOL Commentary*. IRMO: Zagreb. [online] Available at: http://culpol.irmo.hr/culpol-commentary/cultural-diplomacy-from-the-bottom-up/ (Accessed October 25, 2017).

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: the cultural politics of European integration*. New York: Routledge.

Smits, Y., Daubeuf, C., Kern, P. (KEA European Affairs). (2016). *Research for Cult Committee - European Cultural Institutes Abroad*. [online] Available at:

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/563418/IPOL_STU(2016)5634 18_EN.pdf (Accessed August 12, 2017).

Sofer, S. (1988). "Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited". *Review of International Studies*, 14(3): 195-211. [online] Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20097144 (Accessed October 25, 2017).

Steinkamp, A. (2016). "How to make networks of cultural cooperation more effective and sustainable?" *D'Art Report 49. International Culture Networks*. IFFACA: 12-16. [online] Available at: http://media.ifacca.org/files/DArt49_International_Culture_Networks.pdf (Accessed July 15, 2018).

Swedish Institute. "About the Swedish Institute". [online] Available at: https://eng.si.se/about-si/ (Accessed September 28, 2017).

The Jean Monnet Chair. "The Culture of European Integration". [online] Available at: http://www.jmc-santiago.org/presentation/ (Accessed September 20, 2017).

Triandafyllidou, A., Gropas, R. (2015). "European Identity: What kind of diversity into what form of unity?" The Cultural Base social platform. [online] Available at: http://culturalbase.eu/european-identity-what-kind-of-diversity-into-what-form-of-unity/ (Accessed September 15, 2017).

UNESCO. (2001). *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.* Paris: UNESCO. [online] Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13179&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (Accessed September 1, 2017).

UNESCO. (2005). *Convention on the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.* Paris: UNESCO. [online] Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html (Accessed September 3, 2017).

USC Center on Public Diplomacy. "What is PD?" [online] Available at: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd (Accessed July 12, 2017).

Uzelac, A. (2016). "Cultural Networks in the Network Society". *D'Art Report 49. International Culture Networks*. IFFACA: 5-11. [online] Available at: http://media.ifacca.org/files/DArt49_International_Culture_Networks.pdf (Accessed July 15, 2018).

Valtysson, B. (2018). "Camouflaged Culture: The 'Discursive Journey' of the EU's Cultural Programmes". Croatian International Relations Review. Vol. 24, No. 82: 14-37. [online] Available at: https://hrcak.srce.hr/201033?lang=en (Accessed January 4, 2019).

Web sources:

Balassi Institute. Available at: http://www.balassiintezet.hu/en/ (Accessed October 20, 2017).

Cultural Diplomacy Platform. Available at: http://www.cultureinexternalrelations.eu/ (Accessed August 20, 2017).

Dante Alighieri Society. Available at: http://ladante.it/chi-siamo/la-societa-dante-alighieri.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

EUNIC Global. Available at: https://www.eunicglobal.eu/clusters (Accessed October 15, 2017).

Facebook page. "If you like Latvia, Latvia likes you". (2017). [online] Available at: https://www.facebook.com/IfYouLikeLatviaLatviaLikesYou/?hc_ref=ARRsjsQKOdkuoSN1koml qve-MtFQc27n_cBW7NfEarXJnST7--pEVmDPedt0FwlEj_k (Accessed July 20, 2017).

Goethe-Institut Kroatien. Available at: https://www.goethe.de/ins/hr/hr/index.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

Goethe-Institut. Available at: https://www.goethe.de/en/uun/org/ges.html (Accessed September 26, 2017).

Institut Français Croatie. Available at: http://institutfrancais.hr/ (Accessed October 21, 2017).

Institut Français. Available at: http://www.institutfrancais.com/fr (Accessed October 21, 2017).

Instituto Camões Zagreb. Available at: https://www.clpcamoes-zagreb.com/ (Accessed October 20, 2017).

La Francophonie. Available at: https://www.francophonie.org/Welcome-to-the-International.html (Accessed September 27, 2017).

Latvian Institute. Available at: http://www.latvia.eu/latvian-institute (Accessed September 27, 2017).

Österreichische Kulturforen Zagreb. Available at: http://www.kulturforum-zagreb.org/hr/home/ (Accessed October 20, 2017).

Swedish Institute. Available at: https://eng.si.se/about-si/ (Accessed September 28, 2017).

The Soft Power 30. Available at: https://softpower30.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/The-Soft-Power-30-Report-2017-Web-1.pdf (Accessed September 20, 2017).

USC Center on Public Diplomacy. Available at: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd (Accessed July 12, 2017).

Annex

RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH **NATIONAL CULTURAL INSTITUTES (CIs)**

The objective of this research is to provide insights into the role of the selected national cultural institutes of EU Member States in Zagreb, Croatia and EUNIC CROATIA for the purposes of the final thesis of the postgraduate study programme in Diplomacy and International Relations in Zagreb, Croatia.

CI's MAIN OBJECTIVES

1. What are the main objectives of your organisation? Are there differences among different national offices in that respect?

2. In which area is your cultural institute in Croatia the most active (please prioritise):

   a) nation branding to enhance the visibility of the country on the international scene together with other public communication activities;

   b) projects to foster cultural cooperation, artistic exchanges, mobility of cultural professionals and development of the cultural and creative sector;

   c) language teaching and educative activities.

   d) something else?

3. Do you have any geographical priorities in establishing your national offices? E.g. only Europe, EU, all continents, some areas?

ORIENTATION TOWARDS EU

4. In addition to your above stated objectives, how important is for your organisation to foster the European external cultural relations? Please explain in detail.

   a. Does your office (as part of organization as a whole) contribute to the EU's institutions in the development and implementation of a European strategy for external cultural relations? How?

   b. How relevant do you think is shaping European external cultural relations in the work of national cultural institutes in general (Goethe Institut, British Council…)?

5. How does your organisation / office actively promote European values[42] or EU policy priorities (not limited to cultural policy) in Croatia? Please give an example.

---

[42] According to the Article 3(5) and 21 of the *Treaty of the European Union* (available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A12012M%2FTXT): "(the Union) shall contribute to peace, security, the sustainable development of the Earth, solidarity and mutual respect among peoples,

6. Does your organisation (and national office) take part in EU-funded cultural relations programmes? Please give an example of successful programme(s).

COLLABORATION WITH ORGANIZATIONS

7. With which type of European organizations or networks and in which countries does your organisation have most interest in developing collaboration and why?

8. Does your office partner with other national cultural institutes in Croatia, EUNIC clusters (e.g. EUNIC Croatia) and/or other European NGOs?

9. Are the activities of your office focused only to Croatia or do you develop some regional cooperation? If so, in what way?

---

free and fair trade, eradication of poverty and the protection of human rights, in particular the rights of the child, as well as to the strict observance and the development of international law, including respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter."

RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT OF THE CLUSTER **EUNIC CROATIA**

The objective of this research is to provide insights into the role of the selected national cultural institutes of EU Member States in Zagreb, Croatia and EUNIC CROATIA for the purposes of the final thesis of the postgraduate study programme in Diplomacy and International Relations in Zagreb, Croatia.

1. How you define the main goals of EUNIC Croatia? Are they reachable and measurable?

2. What are the tasks of the cluster's members? In what concrete way do they contribute to implement the European cultural policy?

3. What was the role of *Hrvatska Kuća – Croatia House* as EUNIC's member?

4. Have you ever collaborated with cultural institutes and/or EUNIC clusters outside the EU?

5. Do you have any past or current project developed with EU Delegations (embassy-type missions)? Please give an example.

6. What role do you think EUNIC has in general in the development and implementation of the European strategy for external cultural relations?

7. What are your views on the future of EUNIC as an effective actor in European external cultural relations?