Polish Journal of Political Science

Volume 1 Issue 3 (2015)

(this page is intentionally left blank)

Polish Journal of Political Science

Volume 1 Issue 3

Editorial Board

Clifford Angell Bates Jr., University of Warsaw
Stephen Brooks, University of Michigan
Michael Freeden, University of Nottingham, University of Oxford
Shpresa Kureta, Her Excellency Ambassador of Albania to Poland
Paolo Pombeni, University of Bologna
Bohdan Szlachta, Jagiellonian University in Krakow
Tomasz Żyro, University of Warsaw

Editor:
Jarosław Szczepański

Associate Editors
Przemysław Biskup
Aneta Marcinkowska (Statistics)
Stanisław Matsumoto
Iwona Miedzińska
Krystian Pałyska
Maciej Sadowski
Łukasz Smalec
Marta de Zuniga

eISSN 2391-3991
Original version: e-book
Visit our site: www.pjps.pl
Submit your paper: submit@pjps.pl

(this page is intentionally left blank)

Table of Contents

Articles

Piotr Kozłowski

Safeguarding Primacy: Redefining the American Global Leadershipduring Barack Obama's Presidency p. 6

Abdulrahman Mnawar

Corruption and the "Arab spring": As one of the main elements leading to revolutions p. 36

Diana Stelowska

Culture in International Relations: Defining Cultural Diplomacy p. 50

Reports

Jarosław Szczepański, Łukasz Zamęcki

Report: Zhuhai-Macau (China) Extramural Invited Presentations, November 11-12, 2015 p. 74

Diana Stelowska
University of Warsaw

Culture in International Relations
Defining Cultural Diplomacy

Abstract

Culture in International Relations has been a neglected issue, it has only been recently that it gained on importance in the practice and theory of politics. The article aims at defining terms and concepts associated with culture and International Politics: Cultural Diplomacy, Soft power, Public Diplomacy, Nation branding etc. Also two case studies of Cultural Diplomacy activities are presented in order to illustrate the theoretical background.

Keywords: *international relations, culture, cultural diplomacy*

Culture in international relations has always been a neglected issue. Military and economic powers were the ones attracting attention not only of the professionals and politicians, but of the scholars alike. Even International Relations (IR) theories have been focused on power and resources in terms of winning the wars (realism), economy in international cooperation (liberalism) and class struggle (marxism). Constructivism as a theory explaining IR with the aid of ideas, norms and culture came into being in the late 1980s and was popularized by Alexander Wendt in 1999 with his book "Social Theory of International Politics". Constructivists view international relations through the lenses of norms and ideas, they believe that international structure leads its actors to redefine their identities in the process of coexistence.

Culture was also usually associated with the arts – a subject of little importance to the great politics. However, when we look at the past, exchange of gifts by diplomats can be traced back to the antiquity. Cultural Diplomacy seems to have been forgotten for a long time. It has only been recently that it started to make its big 'come back' to the international stage. Public Diplomacy in general is today a crucial ability, as means of communication has made the people and nations stronger, what revolutions in Libya and Egypt have shown us.

In today's world of internet and social media a government needs to speak directly to foreign audiences in order to achieve its foreign policy goals. This is why taking care of country's image and organizing cultural events for foreign audiences gained so much attention in the last couple of years.

But how do we describe all those activities - Cultural Diplomacy, Public Diplomacy or propaganda? In the globalized world of instant culture exchange via the internet the definitions repeat themselves, the terms mix.

In this article the author wishes to present a short background of culture in international relations and then try to define the confusing notions which have lately gained on importance and are widely used in the discipline of International Relations, Communications and Politics:

- Intercultural Studies
- International Cultural Relations

- Foreign Cultural Policy
- Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy
- Soft Power
- Propaganda
- Country image
- Nation branding (country promotion)

On this basis the author will try to define the term *Cultural Diplomacy* and present two examples –one from the past – the *Family of Man* exhibition touring Europe in the late 1950s, and one contemporary - UEA *Past Forward* exhibition touring the United States (US) in the years 2014-2015.

The main research method of the article is a mixed approach of literature analysis and comparative method in order to clarify the definitions of terms associated with culture in the field of International Relations. Also two case studies are presented to illustrate the theoretic deliberations.

Definition of the term *culture* is crucial to even just begin the discussion on its presence and role in International Relations. Oxford English Dictionary defines culture as a 'refinement of mind, taste, and manners; artistic and intellectual development. Hence: the arts and other manifestations of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively'[1] or 'the distinctive ideas, customs, social behavior, products, or way of life of a particular nation, society, people, or period. Hence: a society or group characterized by such customs, etc.'[2]

Although those definitions may seem quite broad, so is the term culture. It is our language, art, ways of behavior, priority systems and customs passed on by the consecutive generations. In the area of International Relations, dominated by the European scholars in the 19th and 20th centuries, often a narrower, so called 'German approach' has been used which limits culture

[1] Oxford English Dictionary, to be fund online: http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45746?rskey=cUcHhr&result=1#eid, retrieved on January 29th, 2015
[2] Ibidem

only to the human intellectual achievements – the arts. This is what we may call today the 'high culture' – opera, classical music, visual arts, literature.

For the purpose of this article the author will adopt a broad definition by Stefan Czarnowski, a Polish culture historian, who describes culture as 'the shared heritage, the fruit of the creative and processed effort of countless generations'[3].

Culture has begun to travel as the earliest relations between countries/states/regions appeared, thus when porto-states where created in the ancient Greece. Culture traveled with trade, with conquest and migrations.[4] Diplomats in those times 'carried messages and the best of them also brought back learning'[5]. They also delivered their own culture to foreign lands and brought back the foreign one. This was often done with the help of a traditional exchange of gifts - a widely renown custom dating back to the ancient times, which was aimed at establishing mutual trust and understanding.

Western religious missions traveling to China bared gifts of European decent. 'Jesuit Mateo Ricci (...) opened China to the West'[6], he brought prism to teach the Chinese about the optics and the portrait of a Virgin to discuss European perspective in painting.

In the medieval period local culture was cultivated and praised, it wasn't until the 15th century when a clash of two great civilizations and the discovery of the New World evoked new ideas, technologies and political forms, which created the need for modern day diplomats - representatives of nation states. At the same time, in Medieval and Early Modern periods art was usually harnessed to power – firstly art was funded by the church, afterwards by the powerful courts. Artists were seen as trained craftsmen and fought for their position and employment by the clergy or the court, which ensured

[3] Stefan Czarnowski, *Kultura*, Warsaw 2005, p.34
[4] Nicholas Cull, lecture given to Cultural Diplomacy class, University of Southern California, January 20th, 2015
[5] Richard Arndt, *First Resort of Kings, American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005)p. 16
[6] Ibidem, p. 20

regular orders on their artwork. Diplomats where able to carry pieces of art as gifts and were presented with magnificent artworks at the courts they visited - as proof of power and wealth.

The home of modern day Cultural Diplomacy is France. The French have always been obsessed with their heritage, language especially. In 1635 *Academy Francaise* was created by Cardinal Richelieu in order to look after the beloved tongue. It was a marking point in the institutionalization of cultural activities of the state. However it was not until the XIX century that the nation state has been brought into perspective and further institutionalization of cultural societies followed – Alliance Fracaise was established in 1883 with the aim of teaching and promoting of the French language. United Kingdom established British Council in 1934 and Germany - the Goethe Institut in 1951. These institutions have been successfully promoting their countries and languages abroad for nearly a century.

Cultural relations as a term was introduced also by the French when a first separate cultural office was created in the Foreign Affairs Ministry in 1923.[7] This was the beginning of liaison between culture and politics, or culture in international relations, as Americans would call it. Cultural Diplomacy in the XX century has developed rapidly due to both the World War II and Cold War.

In the early 1900s private foundations were created in the US which provided scholarships for scientist and artists - Rockefeller and Rhodes among them. In the 1930s the Germans decided to use culture as propaganda when Hitler came to power, mainly towards Latin America. Those efforts evoked a response from the US and a Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations was approved in 1936 in Buenos Aires. Second ignition for propaganda and harnessing culture in the battle was the World War II and especially its aftermath - the Cold War. Till this day American and Soviet activities undertaken at that time are the best examples of Cultural Diplomacy

[7] Richard Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005), p. xvii

- Jazz concerts in Eastern Block and Russian Ballet performances in New York. Both parties had an enemy, which motivated further engagement in the 'idealogical war'. Culture was used as weapon, thus Cultural Diplomacy was institutionalized in the US - Fulbright exchange program came into being and United States Information Agency was created in 1953. Also the Central Intelligence Agency was engaged in organizing the Advancing American Art exhibition in 1946, which however turned out not be a fortunate liaison. After the Cold War has ended motivation for Cultural Diplomacy has fallen rapidly - there was no ideological enemy, thus funding was eventually cut both in the US and in Russia, after the fall of Soviet Union. USIA ceased to exist in 1999 and it was not until the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, that United States started to turn its thoughts back to culture as means of politics.

Let us look closely at different terms concerning culture and the International Relations environment.

Intercultural Relations (Studies)

This term lies on the border of Political Science and Anthropology. Intercultural studies examine the cultural differences and similarities of nations, civilizations and people. A nation, in a word, is a "cultural system," and thus international relations are interactions among cultural systems[8].

These studies focus on cultural differences between peoples and nations, and try to show how can they be overcome or even made use of in relations among states.

International Cultural Relations

A term derived from the British tradition, it has become popular among Polish scholars of International Relations, especially studied by Radoslaw Zenderowski, Grazyna Michalowska and Ewa Zietek. It is a term rooted in anthropological studies applied into the IR research area.

The discipline of International Relations has parted itself from the Political Sciences in Poland, thus in order to situate the cultural activities of the

[8] Akira Iriye, Culture and Power: *International Relations as Intercultural Relations*, in: Diplomatic History, Volume 3, Issue 2, p. 115-128

government in the IR sphere the term International Cultural Relations was adopted. It is also used, though not so frequently, by French scholars such as Frank Robert (*Les relations culturelles internationales).*

The term International Cultural Relations describes all the relations between nations and its people in regard to their cultural characteristics as also to the cultural heritage and all activities related to culture. 'The term covers processes involved in educational exchanges (formerly called "cultural relations" by the US government) and information, propaganda, and psychological warfare activities'[9].

Thus the term is quite broad and may be used to describe all the notions of Cultural Diplomacy and Intercultural Relations in the American perspective. Richard Arndt sees Cultural Relations as 'literally the relations between national cultures, those aspects of intellect and education lodged in any society that tend to cross borders and connect with foreign institutions'[10]. What is more, Arndt points out, that Cultural Relations do happen even if no government action is taken.

International Cultural Relations in the multilateral sense focus on organizations such as UNESCO, where multiple countries cooperate in order to achieve mutual understanding and promote culture and national heritage of different regions.

German scholars use the term **Foreign Cultural Policy** (*Außenkulturpolitik*) - which narrowly describes the activities undertaken in the area of culture or the use of culture by the government towards other international actors[11]. Cultural Policy is a term avoided in the United States, as any liaison between the state and cultural/artistic world may seem to evoke connotations with corruption or propaganda. In Europe however, culture is

[9] Byron L. Fox, *International Cultural Relations*, [in:] American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Aug., 1950), pp. 489

[10] Richard Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005), p. 43

[11] Patrick Schreiner, *Außenkulturpolitik. Internationale Beziehungen und kultureller Austausch,* introduction accessible online: https://leseprobe.buch.de/images-adb/64/ce/64ced1c8-457d-4bdd-8125-52491175eb1a.pdf retrieved on February 20th 2015

widely funded by governments not only in international politics, but also internally and the term has no pejorative notions.

The first two presented terms are broad studies disciplines, the following terms are considered to be tools/methods of Foreign Policy and International Relations.

Diplomacy has a history as old as any political activity ever undertaken. Adam Watson simply calls diplomacy 'The dialogue between the states'. The word is derived from a Greek word 'δίπλωμα' literally meaning 'double' or folded paper, which was used to describe the letters of recommendations used by the travelers in the ancient times - they were the first diplomats.

'In times and places where there are several separate states and their actions affect one another, they cannot function in a vacuum of isolation, with each community considering only how to manage its internal affairs[12]' so diplomacy is needed - the interactions between state's messengers.

Of course there is a number of definitions describing diplomacy as 'the manner in which international relations are conducted'[13] or actions 'concerned with the management of relations between states and between states and other actors.'[14] 'From a state perspective diplomacy is concerned with advising, shaping and implementing foreign policy'[15]. We commonly use the word to describe the conduct of any negotiations between representatives of states or states and other actors. Diplomacy 'may be regarded as a science or an art, as a craft, a practice, an institution, or a process'[16]. Richard Arndt, the author of *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century (*2005) sees diplomacy as 'a process, a technique, (...) a culture'[17].

[12] Adam Watson, Diplomacy: The Dialogue between states, 2004, on: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.usc.edu/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzExMTM2Ml9fQU41?sid=73f29320-fbf5-4d41-8d14-2144460b783e@sessionmgr4003&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_1&rid=0, retrieved on February 13th, 2015

[13] Encyclopeadia Brittanica

[14] R.P. Barston, Modern Diplomacy, (London and New York, 1997), p.1

[15] Ibidem, p.1

[16] Elmer Pilgre, Modern Diplomacy. The art and the artisans, (Washington D.C. 1979), p. xi

[17] Richard Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005), p. xix

A very simple, yet broad definition is proposed by Nicholas Cull, who defines diplomacy 'as the mechanisms short of war deployed by an international actor to manage the international environment'[18].

Public Diplomacy is a diplomacy aimed at a foreign public, that is, it describes a government's activity designed to influence foreign audiences.

The term was first coined by Dean Edmund Guillon in 1965 at Tufts University. He expressed his belief that public diplomacy 'encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy'.[19] Hans Tuch defines Public Diplomacy as 'a government's process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies'[20]. Evan H. Potter calls Public Diplomacy 'an instrument of statecraft in which one government is trying to influence the public, and therefore, the political environment in a foreign jurisdiction'[21]. What is more Potter emphasizes the solemn role of a government or a state institution in conducting the Public Diplomacy - a political purpose is the key element of such activities[22].

A concise definition is offered by the U.S. Department of State Dictionary of International Relations Terms: 'Public Diplomacy refers to government-sponsored programs intended to inform or influence public opinion in other countries; its chief instruments are publications, motion pictures, cultural exchanges, radio and television'[23].

Nicholas Cull has listed five components of Public Diplomacy:

- Listening
- Advocacy

[18] Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*, [in:] CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, Los Angeles 2009, p. 12

[19] *About U.S. Public Diplomacy* on Public Diplomacy Portal to be found online http://pdaa.publicdiplomacy.org/?page_id=6, retrieved April 2nd, 2015

[20] Hans N. Tuch, Communicating with the world: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990), p.3

[21] Evan H. Potter, *Branding Canada: Projecting Canada's Soft Power through Public Diplomacy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), p. 33

[22] Ibidem, p.33

[23] *U.S. Department of State Dictionary of International Relations Terms*, 1987, p.85

- Cultural Diplomacy
- Exchange
- International Broadcasting

Each of them is crucial in order to establish a strong Public Diplomacy towards foreign countries. In this paper we are discussing mainly the third element - Cultural Diplomacy, which however makes use of all other four components.

Nicholas Cull, as many other scholars, notes the emergence of New Diplomacy opposed to the traditional Public Diplomacy. The main characteristics of New Diplomacy are the new media, rising involvement of the non-state actors, blurring of domestic and international news sphere and horizontal structure aiming at relationship building instead of just influencing foreign audiences[24].

Soft Power is term created by the American scholar Joseph S. Nye in 1990 in his book: *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. He developed this concept five years later in *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (2004).

Nye defines Soft Power as 'the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment.'[25] The main three elements of a country's Soft Power are its culture, values and policies.[26] Soft power can also be described as being opposed to Hard Power - that is military threats and economic sanctions used in order to achieve the desired outcome on the international stage.

The term Soft Power became very popular in the sphere of politics and international relations, basically encompassing all the ideological and cultural assets of the country which may be appealing to foreign audiences. Great

[24] Nicholas Cull, Public Diplomacy..., op cit., p. 14
[25] Joseph Nye, *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 616, Public Diplomacy in a Changing World (Mar., 2008), p. 94
[26] Ibidem, p.94

examples of Soft Power are Hollywood movies, desired and accessible around the world.

As Soft Power gained on popularity and importance after the 9/11 attacks actions were taken in order to somehow measure its reach and influence. Different institutions prepare various reports and rankings (for example EY - a consulting company), the most popular of which is the annual *Soft Power Survey* conveyed by a British media company Monocle. The ranking is based on nearly 50 factors, standard of government, diplomatic infrastructure, cultural output, capacity for education and appeal to business among them. The survey for 2014/15 points to the United States of America as the country having the most soft power, followed by Germany and United Kingdom.

Lately a new term has emerged in Joseph Nye's studies - Smart Power which is a combination of Hard Power and Soft Power.

Joseph Nye explains that with Soft Power, 'the best propaganda is not propaganda [and] credibility is the scarcest resource'[27]. However during the World War II and Cold War it was a popular tool. **Propaganda** is the culture being produced for or used by the government. It is a term with negative connotations, even if by definition it may seem close to public diplomacy. L. John Martin sees propaganda as 'a persuasive communicative act of a government directed at a foreign audience'[28]. The adjective *persuasive* may be of crucial importance - propaganda is aimed at achieving strictly designed results in favor of the country which does use the method, often making use of the target audience vulnerabilities.

An example of domestic propaganda are the films and posters created on US government's orders promoting support for the American involvement in the World War II or bubble gum comics depicting the 'horrible' communism. International propaganda was broadly used in the Cold War period by both

[27] Joseph Nye, *China's Soft Power Deficit To catch up, its politics must unleash the many talents of its civil society*, The Wall Street Journal, May 8th, 2008 on:http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304451104577389923098678842, retrieved on March 15th 2015.

[28] L. John Martin, *Effectiveness of International Propaganda*, in: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 398, Propaganda in International Affairs (Nov., 1971), pp. 61-70

the Soviet Union and the United States of America, each menacing the opponent's political system: capitalism and communism. All the possible media were harnessed in order to achieve more effective results - film, radio, posters and comics as the most popular.

Country image is simply how other nations view the given state. This is why country image is based on stereotypes and it does exists even if we do not take any actions toward its creation and shaping. Country image is defined as a representation of collective identities that refer to a set of narratives describing a nation (Evans, 1999, pp. 1-8). States produce country-images for domestic and international consumption[29].

If a country decides to strengthen the image or to change it - **nation branding** (also called simply country promotion) comes into the picture. Nation branding are the actions undertaken by the government or its agencies in order to influence nation's image domestically and abroad. Melissa Aronczyk defines Nation branding as 'a result of the interpretation of commercial and public sector interests to communicate national priorities among domestic and international populations for a variety of interrelated purposes'.[30] She also identifies the aim of nation branding as helping 'the nation-state [to] successfully compete for international capital in areas such as tourism, foreign direct investment, import-export trade, higher education, and skilled labour'.[31]

Culture plays an important role in nation branding. As S. Anholt notes, 'treating the promotion of culture as a must means that one can not understand its role in the process of informing about the real spirit and essence of a country. In essence culture plays the main role in the process of enhancing the reputation of a country as it directs the perception of a country by its recipients to areas that will enable a better understanding of it and its values.'[32]

[29] Cesar Villanueva Rivas, The rise and fall of Mexico's international image: Stereotypical identities, media strategies and diplomacy dilemmas, in: Place branding and Public Diplomacy, 2011, p. 24
[30] Melissa Aronczyk, *Branding the nation: The Global Business of National Identity*, Oxford 2013, p.16
[31] Ibidem, p. 16
[32] Anholt Simon, Tożsamość konkurencyjna. Nowe spojrzenie na marke,Warsaw 2007, p. 137.

One of the first examples of nation branding was adopting the orange color as the symbol of the Royal Dutch Family by the founder of the now ruling Orange-Nassau dynasty - William the Silent, known also as William of Orange, in 1544. Principality of Orange was a small state in the southern France, but it gave name to an enormously strong symbol branding today Netherlands. Other examples of nation branding are the big country campaigns adopting marketing-like slogans: 'Cool Britannia', 'Incredible India', 'Discover America' or 'SLOVEnia'.

Similarly to Soft Power, Nation branding is also being measured. Simon Anholt is the founder of several indexes: *Good Country Index, City Brands Index, State Brands Index and Nation Brands Index*. The leading three countries in the *Nation Brands Index* are the same ones as in the *Soft Power Survey* (Germany, US, UK), however top countries in the *Good Country Index* are totally different with Ireland on the top followed by Finland and Switzerland. United States of America are left far behind on the 21st position. Those discrepancies have roots in various variables taken into account while conducting the surveys - *Nation Brands Index* is more focused on prestige, economy strength and possibilities for development, as the *Good Country Index* regards what can a particular country bring to the world's common good. *The Good Country Index* is also divided into a few versions, which take different variables into account: Culture, International Peace and Security, Science and Technology[33].

Cultural Diplomacy is a term pinned down in 1954 by an art critic Aline B. Saarinen in *The New York Times* magazine. It was first used in political terms by Robert H. Thayer, special assistant to the secretary of state in 1959.

But what exactly is Cultural Diplomacy? Many scholars treat it as a part of Public Diplomacy or one of its tools, Freeman M. Tovell puts even an equation mark between Cultural Diplomacy and Foreign Cultural Policy. The

[33] The Good Country Index website: http://www.goodcountry.org/index_intro

most oft-cited definition[34] is the one proposed by Milton Cummings: 'Cultural diplomacy is the exchange of ideas, information, art and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples to foster mutual understanding'[35].

Cultural Diplomacy definition is being tackled from many angles - many scholars, P.M. Taylor among them, apply the perspective of the media and feel that it is an invention of the French from the end of the XIX century. G. Szondi adopts the public relations viewpoint, concluding Cultural Diplomacy to be an element of the 'pantheon of reputation management', alongside creating the brand of a place, the brand of a country, the brand of perception and public diplomacy itself.[36] However the most common opinion is for the Cultural Diplomacy to be a tool, method of the Public Diplomacy or one of its types.

The basic aim of Cultural Diplomacy is mutual understanding, it is not a one-way information channel, but communication between a government and an audience. As Cultural Diplomacy is most often treated as a type of Public Diplomacy we can conclude it is aimed at a public of a foreign country.

Nicholas Cull describes four forms which Cultural Diplomacy can take: a) a form of a cultural gift b) cultural information - presenting something less popular to foreign audiences c) cultural dialogue, which leads to deepening mutual understanding and cooperation d) cultural capacity building - teaching cultural skills to promote understanding.[37] Practical examples of Cultural Diplomacy are the foreign exhibitions (form a and b), concerts (form a and b), publications (form b and d), exchange of scholars and artists (c and d) and workshops (c and d).

Current scholar debate focuses on Cultural Diplomacy actors – as International Relations have gained new, non-governmental subjects, can

[34] Patricia M. Goff, Cultural Diplomacy, in: Cooper A., Heine J., Thakur R., (ed.) The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy, Oxford 2013, p. 420
[35] Milton Cummings, Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey, Center for Arts and Culture, 2003, p.1
[36] Szondi Gyorgy, *Filary zarządzania reputacją: dyplomacja publiczna w Europie Wschodniej z perspektywy public relations*, [in:] Beata Ociepka (ed.) *Dyplomacja publiczna*, Wrocław 2008, p. 72.
[37] Nicholas Cull, an opening speech given at the *Harmony or Discord: Exploring the Impact of Music Diplomacy?* Conference organized by APDS at the University of Southern California on February 13th, 2015

Cultural Diplomacy be also conducted by a non-governmental party? Evan H. Potter (2008) argues, that absolutely not. Cultural Diplomacy, as any other diplomacy, needs a political purpose. Any activities aimed at promoting national culture, but without any government input (either financial or ideological) may not be called Cultural Diplomacy. Also Simon Mark in his doctoral thesis *A Comparative Study of the Cultural Diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India* states that cultural diplomacy is a practice 'usually involving directly or indirectly the government's foreign ministry'[38]. Richard Arndt notes that 'cultural relations grow naturally and organically, without government intervention...If that is correct, Cultural Diplomacy can only be said to take place when formal diplomats, serving national governments, try to shape and channel this natural flow to advance national interests'[39].

On the other hand, most scholars tend to broaden the definition, as the world is changing and other actors are involved in cultural exchanges. Even if we decide to be strict and use the narrow definition, there will still be discrepancies. Let us look at the case of museums. If a National Museum in Warsaw, Poland, lends its work to be shown abroad it is an example of Cultural Diplomacy (the museum in state funded), but if New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art does the same thing – it is not (this museum is funded privately).

Another question which has aroused around the Cultural Diplomacy definition is its measurement. Should a Cultural Diplomacy Index be applied? If so, which measurements, how different from the *Nation Brand Index* should be taken into consideration? Inability to measure Cultural Diplomacy effectiveness is one of its main sources of critique.

All the presented terms are used interchangeably, often by politicians and journalist not connected to the scholarly discussion. Let us compare the terms associated with culture in International Relations.

[38] Simon Mark, *A Comparative Study of the Cultural Diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India, on:* https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/2943/02whole.pdf, retrieved on March 10th 2015, *p.3*

[39] Richard Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005), p. 43

Table 1. Author's comparison of different terms associated with culture in International Relations

	Involvement of the state	Target audience	Aim	Culture forms	Example
Diplomacy	crucial	foreign governments and peoples	Maintaining diplomatic relations	exchange of gifts, performances	Congress of Vienna in 1815 with music and opera performances
Public Diplomacy	crucial	foreign audiences in general	Prestige and support among foreign audiences	all forms of 'higher culture', education and information	Exchange of scientists and scholars eg. Fulbright Comission
Cultural Diplomacy	crucial (not necessary according to some scholars)	foreign audiences - mainly elites	Prestige and support among foreign audiences	Mostly 'high culture' - art, classical music	An art exhibition in a foreign country organized with the state support eg. *The Family of Man*
Soft Power	not necessary	foreign governments and peoples - mass audience	Measurable effects: postive public opinion, country awerness and image	All forms of culture, mainly popular culture	Hollywood movies popular all over the world
Propaganda	crucial	foreign and domestic audiences - mass	Carefully planned outcomes - usually support	Popular culture	War posters prepared for US and USSR governments

	Involvement of the state	Target audience	Aim	Culture forms	Example
		audience	for a particular government action		during the WWII and Cold War
Country image/ Nation branding	not necessary	foreign mass audiences	Encouragement of tourism, foreign investment	Popular culture	"Incerdible India" campaign

The first main characteristic of Cultural Diplomacy is the state involvement, either ideological of financial. Second is the use of 'high culture', a little neglected in other activities, as they are more goal oriented, thus aiming at mass audiences. Cultural Diplomacy still focuses more on prestige and establishing personal contacts and mutual understanding via exchanges, art and music events than on scale results as tourism attraction (one of the aims of Nation branding).

One of the first examples of Cultural Diplomacy is the *Family of Man* exhibition which toured the world in the years 1956-1963. The collection of '503 photographs grouped thematically around subjects pertinent to all cultures, such as love, children, and death'[40] was chosen by Edward Steichen, an artist and photographer himself. At the time he was the Director of the Museum of Modern Art Department of Photography, thus the exhibition was put together to be shown in MoMA. The exhibit was planned not to be historical, but to show life and its colors: births, childhood, work and also agony and death. It conveyed a universal message of American values and humanism.

[40] MoMA Archive highlights on: http://www.moma.org/learn/resources/archives/archives_highlights_06_1955, retrieved on March 29th 2015

This is why it was a perfect Cultural Diplomacy 'product' - already created beforehand and successful right from the begging - *The Family of Man* opened on January 24th 1955 in New York and attracted thousands of people to visit.

United States Information Agency decided to fund the international tour of the exhibition under the auspices of the The Museum of Modern Art International Program. *Family of Man* has toured the world for over seven years. 'The collection of photographs responded so well to both local circumstances and demands from Washington that reports from Berlin to Beirut were uniformly positive'[41]. It was a great success for the American culture, but also for the agency itself: the exhibition 'appeared in thirty-eight countries and was seen by over 9 million people'[42]. However, the cost was not low, two full-size versions and two of reduced scale reached the price of $180,000. Afterwards two smaller exhibitions 'graduated to full replicas as the success'[43] spread and one more version was sent out to Japan.

Family of Men exhibition is an example of a huge project adopted by the Cultural Diplomacy agency (USIA) to fit the tour in US, Europe and around the world in the times of Cold War and propaganda war between US and USSR.

The second example the author wishes to present is a project undertaken by a small country and fitted for the tour around the United States of America. The exhibition *Past Forward - Contemporary Art from the Emirates* has been organized by the United Arab Emirates (UAE) Embassy in Washington D.C. along with the Meridian Foundation.

The exhibit started its 18-month tour in Washington D.C. in May 2014 and travelled to Fort Worth/Dallas in Texas, Los Angeles in California and Spokane in Washington. Exhibition comprises 50 works of 25 young Emirati artists chosen by two curators: Noor Al Suwaidi, an expert on Emirati art and

[41] Eric J. Sandeen, Picturing an Exhibition. The Family of Man and 1950s America, Albuquerque 1995, p. 97
[42] Ibidem, p. 95
[43] Ibidem, p.95

Dr. Curtis Sandberg, Senior Vice President for Arts and Cultural Programs at the Meridian International Center.

Past Forward is a carefully planned and exercised Cultural Diplomacy project. Its idea was developed within the UAE Embassy in Washington and the exhibition itself co-created with the Merdian Foundation - and organization active in the sphere of Public and Cultural Diplomacy. Both curators and other team members were aware of the target audience and specific aims of the tour. Exhibitions title, artists, even the exhibition design was well planned and prepared. Additional events dedicated for schools have broaden the target audience so it also included children.

As Noor Al Suwaidi, one of the curators, states, the aim of the exhibition was to show how contemporary Emirati artists connect the present and the past, how their heritage influences their life and art works today[44]. The works were chosen carefully with the aid of American partners, so everyone would feel included, they would be able to relate to the art in some way. Also different media were chosen to present the broad spectrum of contemporary art scene in UAE.

Both exhibitions were/are a success. Surely comparing the numbers is pointless, as *The Family of Man* toured the whole world, but the *Past Forward* exhibition was much more targeted and cut especially for American audience.

Family of Man was adopted to form a Cultural Diplomacy project, while Past Forward was created as such from the very beginning. Both ways are popular in today's world Cultural Diplomacy activities, the first one presenting an American approach and latter the Euro/Asian. The direct connection between art and government was always a controversial subject in the US, whereas it is a common example of Cultural Diplomacy in European and Asian countries. Both exhibitions fulfill the Cultural Diplomacy description presented

[44] A speech given by Noor Al Suwaidi to Nicholas Cull's Cultural Diplomacy class at the University of Southern California on February 24th, 2015

in the table: they were state funded, aimed at foreign audiences in order to gain prestige for the organizing states.

What differs the two projects is the art itself. *Family of Man* was a blockbuster exhibition aimed at mass audiences, thus using photography as a new, powerful medium, which would be easily understandable for all. *Past Forward* on the other hand is a quite small contemporary art exhibit aiming at elites, students and children (thanks to the educational program).

These two examples show the possible diversity of Cultural Diplomacy. Art, music or performance may be used from the popular or high culture sphere. Also methods of organizing such an event vary - US would adopt an already existing project or hire another institution to carry it out, in other countries such activities are directly steered and supervised by special government agencies.

Cultural Diplomacy has gained on importance in the last decade. Soft Power became more and more important. This is why all the notions deriving from use of culture in International Relations should be researched deeper in order to provide a wider understanding and practical usage of this terms.

The main critique of Cultural Diplomacy is its inconsistence and lack of measurement tools. Military and economic powers can be easily compared, prestige and positive image can be measured via surveys and opinion polls, but there is never proof of given Cultural Diplomacy activity having influenced particular results.

Non the less, importance of Cultural Diplomacy seems evident, as contemporary world is ruled more by peoples than by governments themselves. Appropriately communicated activities from the Cultural Diplomacy sphere influence the country image, its status on the international stage. Also it does foster mutual understanding leading to less causes for conflicts. This alone should be a crucial argument for applying Cultural Diplomacy into broader Foreign Policy strategies. It seems that P. van Ham's

prediction from 2001 that the world of geopolitics and power is being replaced by a post-modernist world of images and influence[45] is coming into being.

[45] P. Ham, The Rise of the Brand State. The Postmodern Politcs of Image and Reputation. Foreign Affairs, September-October 2001, Vol. 80, No.5, p. 4

References

Books

Anholt Simon, Tozsamość konkurencyjna. Nowe spojrzenie na marke,Warsaw 2007

Arndt Richard, *The First Resort of Kings. American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century,* (Washington D.C., 2005),

Aronczyk Melissa, *Branding the nation: The Global Business of National Identity*, Oxford 2013

Barston Ronald Peter, *Modern Diplomacy*, (London and New York, 1997)

Cooper Andrew F., Heine Jorge, Thakur Ramesh, (ed.) The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy, Oxford 2013

Czarnowski Stefan, *Kultura*, (Warsaw 2005)

Ociepka Beata (ed.) *Dyplomacja publiczna*, (Wroclaw 2008)

Plischke Elmer., *Modern Diplomacy. The art and the artisans*, (Washington D.C. 1979)

Potter Evan H., *Branding Canada: Projecting Canada's Soft Power through Public Diplomacy* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008)

Sandeen Eric J., *Picturing an Exhibition. The Family of Man and 1950s America*, Albuquerque 1995

Schreiner Patrick, *Außenkulturpolitik. Internationale Beziehungen und kultureller Austausch,* (introduction accessible online: https://leseprobe.buch.de/images-adb/64/ce/64ced1c8-457d-4bdd-8125-52491175eb1a.pdf,retrieved on February 20th 2015)

Tuch Hans, Communicating with the world: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas (New York 1990)

U.S. Department of State Dictionary of International Relations Terms, 1987

Articles

Cull Nicholas, *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*, [in:] CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, Los Angeles 2009, p. 12

Fox Byron L., *International Cultural Relations*, American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Aug., 1950),

Iriye Akira, *Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations*, Diplomatic History, Volume 3, Issue 2

Martin L. John, *Effectiveness of International Propaganda*, in: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 398, Propaganda in International Affairs (Nov., 1971)

Nye Joseph, *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 616, Public Diplomacy in a Changing World (Mar., 2008)

Van Ham Peter, *The Rise of the Brand State. The Postmodern Politcs of Image and Reputation,* Foreign Affairs, September-October 2001, Vol. 80, No.5

Villanueva Rivas Cesar, *The rise and fall of Mexico's international image: Stereotypical identities, media strategies and diplomacy dilemmas*, in: Place branding and Public Diplomacy, 2011

Other publications

Cummings Milton, Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey, Center for Arts and Culture, 2003

Articles on-line

Mark Simon, *A Comparative Study of the Cultural Diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India,* on: https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/2943/02whole.pdf, retrieved on March 10th 2015

Nye Joseph, *China's Soft Power Deficit To catch up, its politics must unleash the many talents of its civil society*, The Wall Street Journal, May 8th, 2008 on: http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304451104577389923098678842, retrieved on March 15th 2015.

Watson Adam, *Diplomacy: The Dialogue between states,* 2004 retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.libproxy.usc.edu/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzExMTM2Ml9fQU41?sid=73f29320-fbf5-4d41-8d14-2144460b783e@sessionmgr4003&vid=0&format=EB&lpid=lp_1&rid=0 on February 13th, 2015

Internet resources:

About U.S. Public Diplomacy on Public Diplomacy Portal to be found online http://pdaa.publicdiplomacy.org/?page_id=6, retrieved April 2nd, 2015

Encyclopeadia Brittanica

Oxford English Dictionary, to be fund online: http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45746?rskey=cUcHhr&result=1#eid, retrieved on January 29th, 2015

The Good Country Index website: http://www.goodcountry.org/index_intro

MoMA Archive highlights on: http://www.moma.org/learn/resources/archives/archives_highlights_06_1955, retrieved on March 29th 2015

Speeches:

Cull Nicholas, *Music Diplomacy*, an opening speech given at the Music Diplomacy Conference organized by ASEA at the University of Southern California on February 13th, 2015

Cull Nicholas, *Super Power Cultural Diplomacy: The USA and USSR,* lecture given to Cultural Diplomacy class, University of Southern California, January 20th, 2015

Suwaidi Al Noor, *Past Forward: Contemporary Art from the Emirates*, a speech given to Nicholas Cull's Cultural Diplomacy class at the University of Southern California on February 24th, 2015