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The EU is privileged to serve as one of the most successful example of multilateral cooperation between Nation-States and multilateral cultural diplomacy, and therefore has a unique opportunity to create, implement and provide models for cultural diplomacy based strategies that strengthen cross-cultural relationships. Serving as an excellent example for successful economic and political cooperation, the EU can use its economic and political success as a resource to improve international relations with other countries and regions around the world. Indeed, cultural diplomacy has played a pivotal role in EU Foreign Policy, demonstrated by examples such as the founding of the ERASMUS academic exchange program and the founding of the Leonardo da Vinci program for vocational education and training. Through its comprehensive and multi-lateral practice of cultural exchange and dialogue the EU has proven itself to be one of the most pioneering region of cultural diplomacy in the world.

Introduction

The International Symposium on Cultural Diplomacy in the EU presented the importance of building cultural bridges for the benefits of EU economy, and well-being of EU citizens, and illustrated the cost-effective advantages of such programs compared to other policy alternatives. The Symposium brought together EU legislators, representatives of the private sector and civil society as well as representatives from the international community to initiate joint-programs that will increase the volume of EU engagement in cultural diplomacy both within the EU and outside it. The Symposium campaigned for new programs, increased budgets and greater governmental attention of the unique opportunities the practice of cultural diplomacy could bring. The Symposium published a report based on the speeches and suggestions from all speakers and participants, that was delivered to the EU Parliament, EU policy and decision-makers as well as to the international community.
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"Welcome Speech"
A Speech by H.E. Dr. Andrej Lepavcov, Ambassador of the Republic of Macedonia to the EU

(Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

It's a great pleasure to see in this room so many young people from all over the world. And it's also a pleasure for Mister Donfried to have brought you for the fourth time already, we are hosting the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy from Berlin, it's a pleasure for us.

I won't say anything about cultural diplomacy; I think you know more about that from listening to lectures yesterday and today from my dear colleague from Korea. As a country it is a great example of cultural diplomacy, one which I have recently witnessed when I visited their cultural centre, but you would prefer it if I talked about Macedonians.

We as Macedonians understand the importance of cultural diplomacy since a long time ago one of our famous fighters for liberation said he understood the world as a field of cultural competition among the world's nations.

Now with international and global TV stations you can notice that we as a country are making a very nice mix of cultural and economic efforts to promote our country, which is very small with a population of only two million. We are investing a lot in the promotion of our country, watch CNN or Euro news and you will probably see some add about Macedonia. About our cities, about our wine, our food etc.

So we as a country, I think, have understood the importance of this aspect of modern diplomacy and its relationship with digital diplomacy. Our cultural diplomacy was integrated very early into this sphere. So yes I am very pleased that we are doing this as a government and you will, as I said, witness and be able to check some of these things by taking some of the materials that we have provided for you.

So once more I welcome you to our premises here, I wish you a good working day listening to the very good lectures by lecturers starting with my Korean colleague and the others that Mr. Donfried has provided for you. So have a nice day, enjoy your stay and I hope that we as a country have gained, with your presence here, another friend.

Thank you.

Biography
H.E. Dr. Andrej Lepavcov
Ambassador of the Republic of Macedonia to the EU

Born in 1972 in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia, Andrej Lepavcov is the Ambassador and Head of Mission of the Republic of Macedonia to the European Union in Brussels, Belgium. He entered a diplomatic career as the Spokesman of the late President of Republic of Macedonia, H.E. Boris Trajkovski, in 2003. This was followed by posts as the Deputy Director of the International Republican Institute’s branch in Skopje and as the Foreign Policy Adviser for the Office of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Macedonia. His academic career began with a BSc in civil engineering from the University of St. Kiril and Metodij in Skopje, followed by a PhD from the University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy in Sofia, Bulgaria. He has also taught at the School of Architecture and Design at the University American College-Skopje and at the School of Natural and Technical Sciences at Goce Delcev University in Stip. He has written over 15 scientific articles and publications and is the married father of three children.
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The Role of the EP in Shaping the Foreign Policy Agenda
A Lecture by MEP George Sabin Cutas, Member of the European Parliament

( Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

MEP George Sabin Cutas: Thank you, thank you very much and once again, welcome, all of you, to the european parliament. I hope that you will have a nice experience these few days. I mean, Mark was putting on the table so many topics so we can stay here to speak, I don’t know, more than this weekend probably or even for a month if we were to debate everything. I am starting with a question: I would like to know if you know the motto of the European Union? If somebody knows... Unity in Diversity. So, this is very important I think not just for the future of the European Union but also for the world and I think that understanding each other, understanding the other cultures are very important to maintain peace in the world and have a very prosperous world.

Today, I would like to discuss a very small topic regarding the EU parliament to understand more about what we are doing here in terms of foreign policy and I will also try to cover a little bit on commercial policy because commercial policy is also an attribute of foreign policy. With commercial policy, we can shape and influence in many areas and we can help other countries to adopt democracy and also to change mentalities.

Firstly, this may be a surprise but I will say that many European citizens do not realize that the European Parliament has an impact on every citizen’s life but the European parliament, being directly elected by the citizens, and this direct election gives the European Parliament democratic legitimacy for decision-making. [2:33 to 2:40] Actually, it is the only one institution elected democratically, you know the other european institutions. We are dealing here with a big amount of funds covering different EU policies from agriculture to foreign policy.

I must say that in the EU parliament, there are no opposition or power groups. There are only political groups which, in the campaign for elections, as it is, now, the period of elections – could be rivals or against one another during the campaign but once they become members of the parliament, they can find common ground on different files so you do not have to think even if, say, I am a socialist or a conservative or a Christian Democrat hence I cannot find a common ground with somebody from the Greens or somebody from the Communist Party. You have to understand that this kind of association depends on the interests and the political agenda of each group and what is important. Thus, what is important for you to note as the Institute of Cultural Diplomacy, the word here in the European Parliament is ‘compromise’.

‘Compromise’ is the most important word in the European Parliament. Trying to find a solution, trying to understand another side’s position are important but if it is impossible to reach a solution, despite having a majority, you can go to plenary to have a final vote. This happens in the European Parliament. (4:48 to 5:25) One of the most important aspects of the European Parliament’s role in foreign policy is giving a mandate to high representatives of foreign policy and also, to member states of the council because, as I have mentioned, the legitimacy of what we have here and always, commission, the council’s have to wait after the Lisbon treaty and have to wait for our confirmation. Despite the procedure in the council where you need unanimity to reach a conclusion, here in the European Parliament, it is more simple.

The democracy is enough to make decisions and implement decisions. Evidently, the European Parliament could help in many situations in taking the straight road in direct decision-making. After the Lisbon treaty came into force, the EU policy had the instruments for a more effective EU foreign policy and we had enhanced powers with political and budgetary authority and legislation in these fields. Formerly, I could say that the members of the European Parliament were given the power to veto any international agreements in policy areas in which they have the authority.

The most prominent agreement that the European Parliament rejected was in February 2010, it was called SWIFT. It was an agreement with the US – which gave the US counter-terrorist body access to european banks messaging data. We rejected that in its first phase but after a debate and after we had put in some conditions, SWIFT was approved and there was a negotiation which took account the Parliament’s concerns. As you can see, our influence helps other European institutions in finding other solutions, better solutions, for the EU.

In external trade policies, or better known as common commercial policies, after the Lisbon treaty, we have a more important role. Now, we can reject and shape the negotiations. Being in the foreign trade committee in the european parliament, I would like to share some of my experiences as a reporter. I will start by giving the example, because all of you are dealing with computers and the Internet, of the famous file, ACTA. I do not remember those times well but I must tell you that my email was blocked because many citizens in Europe took action and even put forth a petition of 2.5 million signatures calling for ACTA to be scrapped. We had to find a solution and in the end, the solution was to reject ACTA. Despite being very conscious of its legal implications and copyright laws, I had to agree.

The problem was the risk of punishment for this disobedience, for the citizens from all of the EU who have an access to Internet, who could be punished by cable operators because they downloaded illegally. It was thus decided that it was better to reject this than to wait for another proposal from the commission, which would have probably been in the next mandate. I must say, that we discussed with the commissioner for trade at that time, who felt somewhat defeated but in the end although he understood our concern regarding freedom of choice, the many liberties guaranteed by the EU hence I thought that it would be better to rethink than to come up with another proposal.

Another example which I would like to mention, when I was also a reporter, there was the cotton trade with Uzbekistan – you probably do not know where this country is in the world but it is one of the biggest consumers of cotton in the world. At that time, when we discussed the first time, there were many concerns regarding child labor in the cotton fields. I must say that I was very positive and tried to find a solution. And I discussed, at that time, with the ambassador of Uzbekistan to the EU, if we could postpone the file a little later if it was fine with him unless it was really important for him. We, as the EU parliament, were in no capacity to monetize their country during the harvesting time.

My proposal was to introduce an ILO supervisory mission during the harvest time and if the ILO were to give us a positive report, we would pass the agreement without any problem. Unfortunately, the authorities from Uzbekistan did not accept our proposal and I was forced, together with my colleagues in the commercial committee, to have an interim report, which was voted on with a big majority in the plenary. Then
postponed the acceptance for textile trade in Uzbekistan until the country would accept an ILO mission and prove real, positive results. I must say that I am quite proud that last year, in autumn, they accepted the ILO mission during harvest time. In conclusion, however, they did not respond to these labor violation allegations although, the informal information I received was that Uzbekistan did not renounced them completely. Of course, the quantity of the children used diminished. And, I think it is an important attitude we could have here in the EU parliament to shape and influence the world.

The last example I would like to give you is the TTIP, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which I think is very important for the future of this world and could be a benchmark for all trade relations in the world. Two blocks, big important blocks – the EU and the US – if they were to find a solution if these blocks were in disagreement, you will understand that everything will later be shaped after this disagreement. In this negotiation, however, the EU tried exert some some in this negotiation. There was a big debate regarding the Investors State Dispute Settlement Mécanisme, which has become one of the hot topics discussed in the EU parliament. This could allow, powerful multinational companies to sue governments and to make changes to public policies in their interests. Thus, from the side of the EU parliament, it is a concern. Looking at Australia, we see the alarming case of Philip Morris, who is suing the government for introducing plain cigarette packaging. This was a ruling which could not only endanger public health and cost taxpayers millions but also limit the democratically-elected government’s ability to freely decide policies.

To give you another example, the EU parliament had a resolution before starting negotiations with TTIP to have audio-visuals as an exception in this negotiation. I do not know what the outcome will be at the end of these negotiations although the commission should find a solution in line with the desires of the EU.

Summing up, the EU parliament has gained more responsibility after the ratification of the Lisbon treaty especially in common commercial policies and during this current mandate, it boiled down to citizens’ concerns for ACTA, TTIP etc.. We also to protect and promote fundamental rights outside the EU, as I demonstrated in the example of Uzbekistan.

In conclusion, I think it is very important for you to keep in mind that dialogue is more important in finding resolutions. Accepting dialogue then, finding a compromise – the analogy of a family where arguments occur and it is not easy all the time but you have dialogues to reach a compromise in order to find solutions for the future. So, wishing you good luck and I am now ready to answer your questions. Thank you and good luck!
Thank you very much indeed, and a very good morning to all of you. In fact, I would like to start by remembering one curious detail. It is a joke, I would say, it is something like a professional joke among sociologists that culture becomes important when sociologists and political science professors fail to explain the world. When no theory works with regards to politics, then the cultural dimension becomes vital. I can say that culture as a dimension is pivotal in modern politics and it’s been so since the Renaissance. Since the Renaissance, we know that humanists in Europe in Italy and France entered politics. This indicated a very important change.

For instance, if you remember Thomas More in England, that was a time of trouble and a very difficult time for England and Europe. And yet we know that the relations among Humanists transcended the boundaries of state. Erasmus of Rotterdam becomes a friend of Thomas More and this extended to the French department of Oxford where Erasmus was invited to give lectures. They made friends in Paris, translating Lucian from Greek into Latin. Then, they included their honorable companion, Peter Giles, a Flemish thinker, humanist and the secretary of the city of Antwerp. And we know that in fact that was the time when humanists allow another dimension – the voice of culture, European legacy, classical antiquity, the Renaissance. All these things, they go hand in hand with very difficult issues in politics and this is how the cultural dimension becomes possible.

I have to say that, in fact, culture and cultural diplomacy becomes sometimes elusive and almost invisible, but very important during the time of war and the time of political trouble. This is related to what I would describe as the elective of war and peace in Europe and let me give you several examples.

In 1588 – that’s the year when the great Spanish fleet crashed near England and we know that one of the Spanish warriors barely saved his life and that was Lope de Vega, a great dramatist and Spanish playwright. Yes, Spain was a foe of England but Lope de Vega was widely admired in England as a playwright. Spanish literature was far and away the most widespread and widely admired literature in England. Lope de Vega, Pedro Calderón, Miguel Cervantes were translated, admired and appreciated. That is how politics clash with culture. In terms of culture, Spanish literature was second to none. Tirso de Molina and Lope de Vega were heroes in England. We know that William Shakespeare was able to read in Spanish and he used Spanish sources. A translation of Don Quixote to read Don Quixote which he admired very much. He even wrote a play ‘Cardenio’ based on Don Quixote. He wrote that play with John Fletcher, his friend, but it didn’t survive – his manuscript was lost but it tells a lot about the admiration and great appreciation of Spanish literature in England.

Another example would be Peter Paul Rubens. I think it is quite appropriate in Brussels to remember Peter Paul Rubens and his city of Antwerp. A great Flemish painter and diplomat, I would say, one of the founding fathers of cultural diplomacy in Europe. Not only was he the central leading figure in Baroque painting, he was a diplomat. He was the ambassador of the city of Antwerp to Spain and to England. The Spanish Netherlands at the time was represented by Rubens in Spain and elsewhere. And we know that Spain was an enemy to Flanders (4:31 mark) at the time. Yet, he made friends with a Spanish elite. He was widely admired as a diplomat and a painter. He was on very friendly terms with Diego Velázquez. They were very closely related to one another. This is how cultural ties and relations far transcended the hostilities and animosities of states. It was a joke when he was stationed in England. Rubens was approached by English diplomats who asked once, ‘Are you, by any chance, a diplomat who practices in painting?’ and the answer was ‘No, I am a painter who occasionally practices diplomacy’. In fact, Rubens was a great diplomat, a great artist and a great politician. It was deeply symbolic that it was exactly in those areas that the state had no accord. It was the time of discord and yet, culture allows some ties and some forms of dialogue; dialogue which are pivotal.

One more example of how culture becomes pivotal in the time of political discord and how countries would never part or bid farewell to one another in terms of their mutual admiration (although they could be at war). The case would be France and Russia in the 19th century or France and Germany. In 1806, after the Jena battle, many German philosophers and writers felt humiliated by Napoleon and the Napoleonic invasion, we know that Fichte wrote his very angry lines about France, urging Germans to unite but we know that all of them admired French culture. Fichte, like any other German philosophers of the time, used to raise a glass of champagne to France and to the Republic every 14th of July. We know their incredible admiration for the enlightenment, for French philosophy and literature. This is how political hostility was not supported by cultural animosity. Quite the contrary, culture allowed admiration and mutual recognition. Whereas in politics, they were foes. They were enemies.

It was the same with Russia. Leo Tolstoy in his novel, ‘War and Peace’ allows us to remember how Russian aristocracy found themselves very unhappy to go to war with France. They admired France, they spoke French easily – they were fluent speakers of French and they were practitioners and users of French culture which they admired and held second to none. But remember the night Andrey Bolkonsky finds himself in a preposterous situation – he doesn’t want to go to war with France and this is the tragic absurdity of politics – that you have to wage war against a country whose culture you love and admire. This sort of dialectic in ‘War and Peace’ tells something important about what happens in the 20th century, the most troubled century thus far as we know.

Let me remind you some curious details and let me switch to my country. It’s a small country in Europe and it’s one of the Baltic states – Lithuania which is an EU member and a NATO member. The country has a very rich and troubled history; once having been a huge state, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; once having part of a joint state with Poland, the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania; once having extended from the Baltic to Black Sea. Then, Lithuania becomes a small political actor, or so to say. After the partition of the Polish-Lithuanian state in 1795, part of the state went to the Austrian-Hungarian empire that included Ukraine, and another part went to the Russian empire. In 1918, Lithuania made a comeback to history, becoming an independent republic again in 1918, together with other Baltic states, Finland and Poland. Let me remind you one curious thing, those countries – they strongly felt the priority of literature, arts and culture in diplomacy because a small country had a unique chance to raise its voice or to receive more attention due to literature and European presence. That’s why in Paris, Lithuania had charge d’affaires who then became the ambassador that was Oscar Milosz, a French poet of Polish background who very strongly felt his Lithuanian background. Even without being capable to speak Lithuanian properly, he accepted
and embraced his new political identity, describing himself as a Lithuanian. He became passionate about Lithuania. He delivered a series of lectures about Lithuania at the Collège de France and finally, he became the ambassador. Well, what else can you say? Lithuania was barely known to the French or the British diplomats and cultural personalities. But Oscar Milosz was a French poet who was admired by European writers and literary critics.

It’s a curious detail that when I engaged in correspondence with Milan Kundera, Kundera wrote to me that “I know your country due to Milosz’s dynasty. I admire Oscar Milosz and his poetry and I always love Czeslaw Milosz, his distant cousin”. So this is how cultural diplomacy, literature and European presence in terms of culture helped a lot to acquire higher political profile for a small country.

Another unique example: we know that Russia and Lithuania were countries that could best exemplify political hostility. This is because Russia always threatened small countries like the Baltic states. But there were very deep cultural ties, very profound I would say, forms of mutual admiration and cultural dialogue.

There were Russians who worked in Lithuania until the second World War. For instance some prominent Russian thinkers became professors in Lithuania. Among them Lev Karsavin who once lived in Berlin, then in Paris. Finally he accepted the call from the Vytautas Magnus University, becoming professor of cultural history. He became a fluent speaker of Lithuanian. He wrote a five-volume study on the history of European culture. He became one of the central figures in Lithuanian philosophy and culture, one of the heroes of the humanities where he shared the fate of the Lithuanians when the Red Army and the Soviet Union occupied and annexed the Baltic States. After the war, he was exiled to Siberia where he died.

In addition to people like Karsavin, there was a Lithuanian in Moscow who was a diplomat. Finally he became the ambassador of Lithuania to Russia. His name was Juris Baltrušaitis and those of you who are from France probably know the name of Jurgis Baltrušaitis, his son, Jurgis Baltrušaitis Jr. is a worldwide famous art historian from Sorbonne. His father was a Lithuanian diplomat in Moscow and he was a Russian poet. He wrote his poetry in Lithuanian and in Russian. He was in very friendly terms with Russian symbolists, with Russian poets – Bryusov, Bedny, Blok, Bely. He was regarded as the fifth B – Baltrušaitis. With all due respect, I would say that the four Russian poets were greater and more prominent than him but in any case, that was quite something when political forms of dialogue were very poor. Culture helps a lot. Culture started serving as a great reservoir of political imagination.

One more important example would be other diplomats who were instrumental in diplomatic life and they were writers and culture personalities. Ignas Šeinius was a Lithuanian writer who became the ambassador to Sweden or Jurgis Savickis. Sorry to engage in name-dropping, those Lithuanian names are not telling to you but in any case, he is a prominent figure. He was a wonderful Lithuanian writer who worked in Denmark. He married a Danish woman. Then, he was appointed charge d'affair to Finland. He established the Finnish-Lithuanian society. Finally, he moved to Geneva where he served in the League of Nations for Lithuania.

When the tragedy came to Europe, when the second World War broke out, he found himself in Geneva and described everything in his political memoir, “the soil is burning”. So, writers were instrumental.

Of course, there were some opposite examples. People of culture did disserve in politics, becoming admirers of Mussolini or Hitler or ______(14:03 mark) or Gabriele D’Annunzio or Umberto Boccioni in Italy.

Of course, people may misuse cultural diplomacy or cultural tools, becoming admirers of fascism or other dictatorial regimes. But by and large, I would say, the voice of culture was important when politics was violent, when it was not about mutual recognition and respect. It was about how to grab someone else’s land, how to establish someone’s rule based on tyranny, despotism and disrespect for international law.

We know that before the second World War, Lithuania was described by French or British diplomats as a troublemaker, raising its voice and claiming Vilnius. Big states suggesting them to “calm down, be quiet, Poland is a big and important country. For the sake of stability, just be quiet”. This was a tragic conflict between two countries. The real tragedy came when Vilnius was returned to Lithuania, by guess who? Stalin. This is because the Red Army clearly felt that to occupy the Baltic states, it was better to have a larger piece of Lithuania than Vilnius, which was donated graciously from Stalin to Lithuania. So, what I'm saying is it was the time of hostility. All those centuries of friendship, common history and shared culture disappeared overnight. It was a very strong sense of revenge and hatred. After the second World War, although both countries shared the dramatic fate of two inmates within the same prison of the Soviet Union, although Poland was a state and Lithuania was just part of the empire like a colony, in any case, those relations were poisoned and now I'm getting to the point. The relations were saved by culture personalities, by cultural people.

First and foremost by Czeslaw Milosz, the nobel prize winner born in Lithuania who no matter where he lived in France, the United States, finally returned to Poland before his death. Czeslaw Milosz advocated very passionately the necessity to come to terms for both countries. The same applied to Jerzy Giedroyc, a great Polish journalist, essayist and a culture personality who lived in Paris editing 'Kultura', the Polish magazine. They were powerful voices of Poland, speaking in favour of reconciliation of Lithuania and Poland. On the Lithuanian side, it was Tomas Venclova, a Lithuanian poet, translator and Soviet dissident who supported Milosz and Giedroyc very powerfully. They anticipated the political accord and solidarity, and collaboration of both countries.
In 1994, Poland and Lithuania reached a historic agreement about partnership, collaboration and friendship with recognition of Vilnius as capital of Lithuania. But I do believe that the soil was cultivated by cultural people. Politics was non-existent at the time. There was no policy that said Lithuania and Poland are two countries that should be partners. Of course, culture helped a lot.

Culture in terms of cultural diplomacy and I can tell you why. I’m not saying that cultural diplomacy is identical to culture. Cultural diplomacy is a diplomacy which allows a powerful dimension – an awareness of history and culture. But when Polish and Lithuanian diplomats started using cultural and historical arguments, it was obvious that cultural diplomacy started working. I think it’s still a powerful argument when it comes to some other regions. It suffices to remember some symbolic figures who come to unite countries. Adam Mickiewicz for Poland, Lithuania and Belarus – each country regards him to have been one of their own poet, Polish, Belarusian, Lithuanian. The same applies to Czeslaw Milosz who is equally precious for Poland and Lithuania. In Caucasian region, in Caucasus, it’s very important to remember Sayat-Nova, a poet who was born in Georgia who was of Armenian background, spending much of his time in Azeri lands. He spoke and wrote in Azeri Turkish, Georgian, and Armenian.

These were symbolic figures. That’s why it is very important to remember them as early anticipations of European forms of solidarity and relationship. On a very final note, I would say that the cultural becomes the political; the political may become the cultural. These are two forms of existences that supply and support one another, and what is very important is that when the time of trouble comes, when we have a very terrible situation, culture may become a form of rescue. That is why cultural diplomacy is not only a great reservoir for forms of modern political imagination. It is an instrument, a tool or a policy when politics is in deep crisis.

Thank you.
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because of Europe. It would be difficult I guess for us to compare the institutional old diplomacies in Britain or in Spain, in France, in Germany. This is an opportunity essentially for eastern countries.

This is also a mean to unify Europe in a social way. I was very shocked in this conference because these social aspects were not examined. We make it sound as if it would be just a matter for educated elites. This is a crucial mistake and I guess this unifying tool should also be used in a social way. What I mean by social now of course is to promote an inclusive society especially towards minorities, so questions of minorities are very important and maybe of affirmative action also at this stage could be interesting by selecting some cultural ambassadors. Of course I’m not supposed to represent for example some Moroccan immigrants. Morocco, let’s say, but precisely is a common culture between both sides of the Mediterranean sea, and this would be an interesting direction I guess nowadays and a vital one for migrants in Europe. Then it has to promote diversity of course but it is quite easy, many people say that this is not the problem, the problem is a question of attitude. It is interesting to see the attitude of speakers, that Europe doesn’t have to tell anymore a story but to listen to the others. I agree somewhat because for a long time some diplomats especially in France, but in other embassies also, tended to listen to themselves and to tell another story and there is a risk here, of course, to be taken and considered as new colonialists. That’s true but on the other hand I guess we have also to trust the content of European history. What I mean by trust is also self-confidence. Self-confidence doesn’t mean being too affiliated, too assertive when we speak about culture as a tool to convince that there is something like the European civilization. Especially when it is compared to other civilization nowadays with globalization. This diplomacy should be balanced between quite a humble attitude, quite soft power but also positive speech to unify people. I guess it is not only a question of humility but also an affirmation or really a definition. That’s another aspect of this dealing with others partners to keep and maintain peace.

And finally maybe on the definition of European values I would like to insist on one that was completely forgotten, which is of course fundamental and now a priority, a top priority, of the commission which is strategy. I mean, cultural diplomacy is really strategy to face true political competition. Since the end of the cold war now cultural diplomacy is clearly a way to level Europe. So a lot of cultural professionals all come on culture as something specific it is not a global product. Yes of course, but at the same time it’s true that we have a trend, a global trend to build blocks, to build regional areas that promote themselves this way, that sell themselves this way. This is the case of Japan, South Korea, Asia, well China of course. Okay for a long time of course the United State and nowadays maybe of Brazil this year and not only this year.

Well, Europe really has to have a strategy and this is a very interesting debate on the next treaty with the United States because we understand here that it is not a question of business, of products, of norms but of culture. At the moment we only agree on some values, I guess, it is urgent to agree on a more complete series of values.

What is the content of a global European cultural diplomacy? I think there are two main options here. Many people say that there is a low cost cultural option, so low cost option is already something, it’s just about coordination. Coordination is already something, because it could save money and that’s the main argument. The global total amount of all the cultural institute in Europe is above 2.5 billion, I guess you haven’t heard about this initiatives taken by these 29 Institute maybe it’s really an issue to convince people and European national policy makers that here is a means of coordination to gain visibility and have more of an impact on global cultural debates. At the moment we have a lot of isolated initiatives and this is fundamental so even the low coast option is meant to save money and to really have a common cultural diplomacy. It addresses not only an issue of culture but also policies that are addressed by this and like of course exchanging business commerce and trade it offers new job opportunities but also of course it better education. You are all young people, why not enlarge the process of Erasmus to high school with
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Thank you so much. First of all I would like to welcome all of you here today and express my gratitude towards the ICD. It is a great pleasure for me to have a presentation here. Frankly speaking, when I saw the audience— such a young generation— I totally changed my mind about speaking formally as an ambassador— a lot but nothing. I will try to speak sincerely with you about our approach towards cultural diplomacy, intercultural dialogue problems and perspectives on the current situation.

Let's start from the question, why Azerbaijan? Why am I presenting here right now? First of all: location. Azerbaijan is located on the crossroad of civilizations. On the north we have Russia— Orthodox Slavic Russia, partly Northern Caucasus, with a huge range of different ethnic groups and religions. On the south we have the Shia Muslims — Iran on the west, our neighbors from the Southern Caucasus, Georgia and Armenia. On the east is the Caspian Sea, which divides the Eurasian continent between Europe and Asia. So it's a real crossroads of civilizations, and Azerbaijan is located at its center.

Secondly, Azerbaijan is a country with a Muslim population and with an absolutely European attitude. It's very interesting because Azerbaijan is on one hand a member of the Organization of Slavic Cooperation; on the other hand we are members of different European institutions. On the one hand we are Europeans, but culturally we are part of the Muslim world.

Thirdly, Azerbaijan is a multinational, ethnic and religious country. In some cases this is a real danger for newly independent countries. Right now everybody can see how this element in the political landscape could be used to threaten the sovereignty and independence of countries. In the case of our country, we are really proud that we're multi-national, ethnic and religious. It's not a challenge or threat to us. We're very keen to develop this attitude.

Fourth, when we're talking about contributing to intercultural dialogue and cultural diplomacy, we should keep in mind that only economically independent and sufficient countries can be contributors to cultural diplomacy. That is very important for understanding Azerbaijan, who is an economically booming country. A few months ago, one of the biggest contracts of the century was signed in Baku. 45 billion dollars for gas pipe project. For us it is not just a commercial project. At its core it has political and cultural dimensions.
regarding our participation in Europe. Unlike our friends in Georgia or the Ukraine, who mainly aim to be members, our best option is to be close to Europe but without any membership. Maybe it is close to the position of Norway.

Economic independence could be used for cultural diversity, for intercultural dialogue. This may be one of the most important elements. We have so many examples of terrible ongoing processes in countries with Muslim populations all over the world. In the case of Azerbaijan, the situation is absolutely different. A country which is a member of the Council of Europe, on the other hand is a country with a Muslim population. I think this model of success could be relayed by our European friends and Western partners, to show the countries with Muslim populations that they can be successful in their activities and policies. I think the world needs this kind of example. I would also like to stress another issue. In the case of Azerbaijan, we started a very interesting long term process, which we call the Baku process, an intercultural dialogue process. Every year, starting from 2008, we’re organizing, together with OECD, UNESCO, important events. For example, in 2008 we had the Minister of Culture of Council of Europe, in 2009 the meeting of the Minister of Culture and Information of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. In 2010 the World Summit of Religious Leaders. In 2011 the first forum on Inter-cultural Dialogue took place. In 2012 we had the Eurovision song contest in Azerbaijan for the first time.

In 2013 we hosted the second Forum on Inter-cultural Dialogue. And just a few weeks ago my President signed a Decree on the Establishment for a Centre for multicultural dialogue in Baku. Just imagine, in the last ten years, dozens of churches, synagogues were reconstructed and renovated, sponsored by the Azerbaijani government. It happened not only in Azerbaijan, it happened in other countries as well – such as the renovation of Saint Maria Church in Strasbourg. During his last visit, Hollande, the President of France, expressed his gratitude towards Azerbaijan for contributing towards the cultural heritage of Europe. Imagine, the country with a Muslim population is participating in the financial contribution for the renovation of one of the most beautiful churches in Europe! It is a real contribution to the country and to intercultural dialogue. We have so many examples of absolutely different approaches. I agree with the view that yes, we do have some coalitions of extremist forces all over Europe, which might be reflected in the European Parliament elections. Of course it will not be the main voice of the European continent. Instead of using such dramatic methods, why can’t we use other options?
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Good day and thank you, Mark, for the nice introduction like last year. We are seeing each other for the second time you with your available NGO organization. Thank you for inviting me; of course it will be my pleasure to speak in front of so many people from different parts of the world, of the globe which is of course becoming smaller and smaller every day as the technological revolution is advancing in bigger and bigger speed. So I will speak like maybe some kind of continuation of the last year speech on the two pillars, first generally about social cultural diplomacy and of course I will try to do some cultural diplomacy concerning my country, Republic of Macedonia and speak some details, some interesting facts which I hope will have also some short debate after this. I don’t know how much time we have, not for the speech of course, in total...

I think we are all aware of the traditional meaning of diplomacy; what it’s been in the many, many centuries in the past. In a general sense, diplomacy has been a mainly state-based instrument for promotion of nations’ interests and of course promotion of values. Today, speaking about 21st century diplomacy, or even more specifically about cultural diplomacy, we can see the environment has changed dramatically. It has changed like I have always said because of the process mainly of globalization, process of technological revolution which changes the total environment, multinational environment and international environment so we can speak today of course about state actors. They have still a dominant role but in the international system there are a lot of non-state actors who are part of the new mosaic of the international system and they give additional value to the diplomacy, so to do cultural diplomacy we can say we live in a multipolar world which is widely interconnected between itself, we can say that all those actors, have increasingly grown in modification of diplomacy, or modification of cultural diplomacy.

So speaking in that sense we can say there is no more, when we speak about cultural diplomacy, some passive promotion of the country but the non-state actors are building strong bridges for maintaining relationships and of course behaviors and even maintaining and building the new values of the mankind in general. Because they can do it in this field, in this international globalized environment, and I would like just to mention one example which can bring us closer to some sense that I want you to perceive as the value of cultural diplomacy today.

So the process of globalization makes it clear that there are strong elements of individualization of the processes and of the new produce that for example one person can make. If, for example, we all know Facebook has made by one or two people and there are a lot of new tools that have been invented and applications that have delivered the values to the mankind, because one person or a few persons or a small group have invented them so really the process of individualization in business, in diplomacy, in innovation, is gained.

So even for building some values considering how the future international system can be changed for example small groups, or non-state actors can make some very big values. For example I just want to underline that it’s great that a few NGOs like Oxfam, Amnesty International, or Care Control Arms’ work for 10 years ended in acceptance by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Arms Trade Treaty should be regarded as the first historic step of mankind to control conventional weapons and this is a new big value to us, the international system and this achievement for all of the international community and in general for the whole of mankind so only a few NGOs who are now globalized can use the tools and force them to do this.

They can be very effective to put the point of the new value on the international field and really on the United Nations which is the center of international system even to push and to make some promotion towards the state actors and after 10 years this treaty was elected. And this is a kind of cultural diplomacy which says that today cultural diplomacy has no borders, like many other things has no borders, this is good because the world is connected.

You don’t need today those meetings, or you don’t need some events as these concerts that can be made online, five artists on different instruments, in five continents can make one nice, beautiful concert on the internet or can be seen as a much more effective concert.

I think I am approaching the perspective which I want to give you; that cultural diplomacy has changed so much; changing its basic definition and it’s given a new additional value to the general sense of the means of diplomacy but of course the diplomacy is also very much changing. Because today I’m involved in diplomacy, I’m working in diplomacy, diplomacy today is very, very different even the professional diplomacy is very different from how it was 20 or 30 years ago, if I can imagine my work in a decade, it is less politics, much more all the other exchanges in many different fields, like in business, in the health system, education of course, which brings small countries as Macedonia to be in position to be more and more open and transparent and of course, one thing to be part of this world talking in diplomatic sense.

Let me just mention a few words, as I start, about Macedonia and after I hope we have some debate. Macedonia is a small country with 2 million people from the Balkans Peninsula. It’s a multi-ethnic country, multi-confession, multi-religious, so we have few nationalities or ethnic communities, we have a few religious communities of course and with the centuries they have been living together, they have been understanding each other’s culture and they have at the end created a country which is trying to be part of the European Union and other Euro-Atlantic structures.

So Macedonia was proclaimed independent in 1991, in 2008 we fulfilled the criteria to be a member of NATO, in 2009 we fulfill criteria to start the negotiation process for European integration... so in fact, it means that we have done our job, we have fulfilled all the criteria, all the duties, done our homework. Unfortunately, there is one big issue concerning Macedonia integration and this is – I think maybe you all know the named issue – that we have this really strange issue with our southern neighbor, the Republic of Greece. I say strange because how many years are passing and there is almost 20 years of this dispute,
really it is more and more and harder and harder for me to explain what are we really discussing and what is the dispute about and what is the problem, because especially here in Brussels or living in Belgium. We can find one very good similar example to what is now Republic of Macedonia and its neighboring province in Greece with the same name, Macedonia.

You have here in Belgium one province of Luxembourg and next to the province is the country of Luxembourg. Since I’m ambassador to Luxembourg, when I go there and I start to come back to Luxembourg as you enter Belgium from Luxembourg you see just the sign, you are entering Belgium-Luxembourg but it should not be a problem because someone, or two people or two groups or two nations consider themselves for example as Macedonians like we wanted to say. We have been always very open and fair and I say whoever wants to call himself a Macedonian, we don’t have anything against that, but in the 21st century in Europe our right is to choose our name like we want to choose and this is a historic name of our nation.

So we are confronting now the attitude and the position of the Republic of Greece to not agree because of some territorial pretensions, claims or I don’t know what else because they are a much bigger country and they have a much more powerful army. We use the name of Macedonia like we have used many, many centuries ago; but some people, especially in politics in Greece believe that they only have the right to use this name, unfortunately.

And today in the 21st century you cannot say you only have the right to use this name, if someone else wants to use this name, it is very normal, very democratic. So say about that.

So we are unfortunately blocked by the position of our neighbor who is a member of the European Union and NATO in our advancing towards the Euro-Atlantic structures, which are strategic for us which are structures or a group, which is part of us, naturally we consider ourselves Europeans not only because we think just like that but because we share the same values, like most of the European nations, and do we think that our natural position is to be part of the big united Europe, and a state of European Union.

I would just try to provoke you maybe some directions, consider that we have this dispute which is also problem of the cultural diplomacy. I think that we are starting from different angles but anyhow the different angles who are not based on like we want to see European Union values or criteria so unfortunately instead to Europeanize the Balkans I think this is a concrete issue of Balkanizing the Europe, I say already mention.

So the dispute continues of course in the conflict of cultural misunderstanding for using the name for example of some historical persons as Alexander the Great, for example unfortunately Greece want to keep this provocation when we named the airport in Skopje, Alexander the Great.

They have also named many other capacities as Alexander the Great but I think there is not a problem since for example we share also one very important, even nowadays, historic figure like Mother Teresa.

I think it is very well known to you who is Mother Teresa. She was born in Skopje but by origin she was Albanian and today for example in Skopje, in Macedonia, we have the north-west highway named Mother Teresa but Albanians in Albania they have named their airport in the capital, Tyrana, “Mother Teresa” and nobody is frustrated because of that and nobody have seen provocation of that, neither we or Albanians.

So for the same example you see very different types of behaving and I think that cultural diplomacy must go in a direction which is one goal to unite people, to unite the cultures and to make the things much more easier because there is nothing that we cannot understand between each other, except if we want to still keep some stereotypes. Thank you very much and for any questions or comments. Thank you.
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So in this circumstances culture as an instrument for building bridges and bringing people together has increased, to my mind. That is why the fact that you are dealing with that, I find it encouraging, and I wish you – since I understand you are students – success in your studies and indeed a commitment to culture. Because you can hear from politicians, from people like me as well, not being a politician but still really linked to political affairs, you hear a lot of prayers being sang to culture. But culture very often tends to be the orphan, the peripheral concern, being pushed aside by “more pressing concerns.”

Having said these rather gloomy thoughts, I would say that there is light, perhaps not at the end of the tunnel but closer, and it is not the oncoming train. And I think that there is gradual realization or growing awareness that investing in culture, putting the emphasis on culture, making it a priority, is not only a noble goal, but also a very important tool to tackle the challenges that out societies are facing today. This was actually confirmed yesterday. The ministers of culture of the EU were setting in Brussels, not just setting but working, and one of the conclusions they came up with is that, indeed, culture is not simply a strong factor for building and consolidating identity, identity at the national level and identity at the European level, but also it has a great potential to work as an incentive, as a driver, for economic growth, and they put it down in paper, which is important. That is why I said there is a glimmer of hope and light, things could be changing, there is greater awareness of the role of culture in general.

For me, culture is definitely something that needs nurturing, working for it, and promoting it. I have a favourite TV program on Bulgarian national TV, very accurately named The Day Starts With Culture. So early in the morning, after the current affairs programs, which are depressing in the most instances – but informative of course – you have this wonderful show, for about an hour or so, where you get to know about young artists, what is happening around the world, you have cultural exchange pupils as guest interviewees, and it is a wonderful thing. This is a case where you can say that TV is being very educational. I remember a quote by one of the Marx brothers – not Karl Marx but the comedians – who used to say “I find TV very educational, whenever somebody turns the TV set on, I go the next room and read a book.” But in this case TV is serving the purpose, maybe it is educating and putting the focus on something meaningful.

Here we are talking about the European Union and culture. One has to be aware and keep somewhere in one’s head, in order to reach out and bring this thought out when he needs it, that without culture, any social project, particularly a more sophisticated one, such as the EU project, cannot proceed without a cultural component, particularly after a certain stage, and it is my belief, and it is not my original sort of conclusion and belief, is that the European integration process as such as reached a level where you come across, you stumble across the need for a greater cultural component to the process. Of course cultural policy is prerogative of the member state, let’s not confuse the two things, but there is careful move towards encouraging, spurring if you wish, greater cooperation among the European countries at the European level. And they do it in a number of ways, there are programs, the programs for instance if you are to benefit from certain funds you have to join up with at least two more European countries, otherwise there is no money.

And this has worked, I can tell you from first-hand experience, well sort of first-hand, but my sister is a film producer in Bulgaria, and she has been quite successful in organizing and setting up joint projects with people from Germany, France, Netherlands, now they were in Sweden... so it works. It works, and I am glad to see that it is gaining ground; this was also discussed by the Ministers of Culture yesterday. So it is important that this carries on, not only for the sake of the EU, of course being cultural cooperation, and the cultural component, being a factor for society and the sustainability of the project. But also it is vital for the EU in its relations with the outside world. The world is very globalized, as you know, everything becomes
If you look at some of the chronicles of the crusades, I bought a book at one of the antique shops here, a book by a French historian, and he describes and he quotes travellers who went along with the crusaders, and when they get to Serbia and Bulgaria what they saw was basically what the lady said, “Yes, they are Christians but there’s something suspicious about the whole thing,” and the description of the people is not one of open hearts and minds, let’s say it like that. So this is something that has to be also dealt with. I was about to ask the lady whether from now on I had to refer to the requirement that we should consolidate the rule of law in Bulgaria, is that a Catholic rule of law or it’s an Orthodox rule of law, because our understanding is that we’re joining something that has a common criteria, common values and with talent – something that people appreciate and seek. And I do believe, honestly, that our cultural heritage is a very good contribution to the larger bouquet of European culture. One small example, we have brought the Cyrillic alphabet in the EU, and now if you take a 5 Euro note you see three alphabets, the Latin, the Greek and the Bulgarian or Cyrillic alphabet. And it’s important, because it raises questions, people say, “What is this which is written on the 5 Euro note?” If some has a 5 Euro note you’ll notice it, and that provokes interest. People ask, people start enquiring and then they learn more and more and perhaps they understand better and better. Again, that is the intrinsic value of culture.

I will share with you something that struck me, I don’t know what word to use, but it happened the other day. I regret that my colleague Lazar, the Macedonian ambassador left, because it happened to him and our Montenegrin colleague. There was a seminar, a colloquium, on the Euro-Atlantic integration of the Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro, with the two ambassadors, a couple of American professors, a representative of NATO, etc. and during the questions and answers part a lady got up – middle aged lady – who said that she had graduated in Philosophy, she had studied Slavonic languages, and what she said was basically – I’ll try to simplify and shorten it – basically she said, “Where do you think you’re going?” to the Montenegrins and the Macedonians, “Do you believe that you are basically welcome, more or less, that they will accept you in these clubs, and that you fit in these clubs?” Now, I’ve read quite a few pages on these issues ever since we started our road to the EU and NATO in the early 90s, and I have seen it that you’re being identified in a negative way, that you’re Slavic, because she said it, “You’re Slavs and be orthodox,” which frankly speaking, in 2004 and an educated person... maybe she was aiming for a provocative sort of question which was crudely formulated, basically, but that was the gist of what she said, and I think, I have to admit, my deep feeling is that this kind of thinking, of perception, is there, regardless of the fact in you now you have a number of Slavic countries, you have a number of orthodox countries, you have orthodox and Slav, non-Slav orthodox, still it is the Catholic and Protestant western Europe, and eastern Slavic orthodox are those.

national and international, you are in contact with the world all the time, and the EU, for whatever it is worth, and I believe it is worth a lot, it is being looked up to, it is being sought, the European cultural product has a good renown, in general. It is interesting, it is innovative, etc., etc. Well, you can criticise it here and there, but in general European culture and art are fairly popular and I believe they will stay so.

Culture as a factor for economic growth and job creation: as I said yesterday this was highlighted, and that is the very truth. For instance, in Bulgaria, the creative sector and the cultural sector as such, they notched a higher growth rate in the last couple of years than the average for the country, the economic growth in general. There is appetite for culture, after the 90s and the early 2000s when there was, let’s say a mild state of chaos in many fields, now that is slowly being overcome and culture starts to be quite prominent in the daily lives of Bulgarians. Yes, there is a big discrepancy which needs to be dealt with between capital and country side, and smaller cities, but I think that’s a general issue, how do you make life in the countryside, in the smaller cities more attractive, more enriching, etc., etc. But all in all I’d say that culture is having an overall positive effect, both with tangible and less tangible or intangible effect.
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we see no problem seeing ourselves both as Bulgarian and European, we don’t see any tension between these two, national and European identities. If we were outside the EU I’d imagine our national identity would be more fragile, more fragile and vulnerable. The bottom line there therefore is that with the EU the chances of preserving it and enhancing it are much greater.

I come to the part where I speak of what we do in the cultural field, having said that it is so important. Culture and cultural activities make up most of my work. I have a simple explanation, even when I speak with ministers and others in Bulgaria, they say, “What are you doing for the economic and trade relations?” Well, my answer is I am doing what is necessary, but I do feel that now that we are in the EU, you have the framework, you have the legislature and everything. We have been in the free market economy world since 1989 or 1990. If the companies in Bulgaria cannot find their way around and they have not managed to establish the necessary ties, to have the necessary partnerships in place, and so on, they will probably never succeed, with or without my help. And there, to help them, should they show interest and enthusiasm, but they are OK and they have the money, I would rather put the emphasis on culture and cultural diplomacy. A, because I believe it goes deeper into things, that’s why I salute once again the Institute because culture indeed is a strategic concept, so I would rather deal with that, and promote and show my country’s cultural heritage to those who are interested in it, and when more people on the side of Bulgaria and its people.

So we are busy organizing all sorts of events at different levels, with different target groups. For instance, we have an event with school children, which is a yearly thing. This year they have just invited us, asking us very insistently to be there again for the third year in a row. It’s a wonderful initiative again, basically they invite countries to a school fair, a big school fair. I think three high schools are there, in Bologna, in the southern part of French-speaking part of Belgium, and these countries have a room, a stage to show their countries costumes, natural beauty, and wine – not for the kids, for the professor – and dancers. So in Belgium you have a couple of groups, some of mixed Bulgarian and Belgium composition, but others are purely Belgian who have fallen in love with Bulgarian dances, they practise, they spread the word and show Bulgarian dances. So, with them we combine, we go there and we tell them about our country, about the Cyrillic alphabet, which is great joy for them, because we try to teach the little kids to write in Cyrillic, they are proud when they get right, they enjoy it very much, so it’s a wonderful event.

Then we move higher, to more sophisticated levels. We are often part of festivals of choirs, we are fairly good in choral singing, the last instance was in early May, there is a youth music festival in the city of Neerpelt, this is in the Flemish speaking part of Belgium, where there were choirs from, I don’t know, 15 or 20 European, not only EU but other European countries: many choirs from Russia and from Ukraine, which again shows that culture can help, it’s not a panacea, it’s not a guarantee that you can bring people together, that you can cure problems, that you can tackle challenges, that you can stop fighting, that you can help reconciliation and so on, but I think there is a fairly good chance that you succeed through culture, through all of that you have a fairly good chance. Yesterday we celebrated the hundred anniversary of one of our great opera singers, Boris Christoff, there was a very large crowd. He’s a bass, one of the big basses of the second half of the 20th century. With a very mixed CV, born in Bulgaria, lived in Italy, then tried to move back to Bulgaria, the regime didn’t allow him. He tried to go to the US, they didn’t allow him because he was a national of Bulgaria, which was a communist state, and you could imagine, poor guy, how he felt, but he always stayed Bulgarian and he was proud of it until his last days in 1993. So that was a big event last month.

And, by the way, since you’re in Brussels, Brussels has evolved a lot. The capital of the EU, so on and so forth, before it was considered — some years ago — more of a technical city, where technocrats lived, where technocrats ruled the day, where you were there for business basically. There is NATO, EU, all sorts of institutions, everybody is here and lobbies, you do business. But this has changed, and Brussels has, I would say, managed to carve out its own area, its own place on the cultural map, not just of Europe but in general. It’s a very cultural scene, a lot of events, the competition is pretty tough, many events, many of them are sort of overlapping, it’s difficult to see them all, but it’s very interesting at the same time, and indeed the whole world comes to Brussels. And that’s why many of the member states in general countries. I imagine you’ll be listening to the Korean ambassador. Well, they recently opened a cultural institute,
and that’s a trend, people open cultural institutes or centres in Brussels because it’s very handy, you have space, you have the institution to back your cultural effort, your effort in cultural diplomacy, and cultural diplomacy is indeed becoming a more solid component of diplomacy as such.

I think I will conclude here, I don’t know whether there are any colleagues from the Macedonian embassy but anyway, we are in the Macedonian embassy and mission, I would like to say that they are close brothers and friends of us, and we wish them well on their way. I listened to Lazar while he was explaining about the name issue and others, we have our issues to deal with, but I’m sure we’ll deal with them and the overarching priority and interest is to have the Republic of Macedonia in the EU as soon as possible and I think they will be counting and receiving our support in that direction. And the good thing we have problems again which are similar perhaps to the Greek one, but it’s not such as prominent issue as perhaps the one with Greece and the one he talked, but the more important thing is that cultural exchange between Bulgaria and the Macedonia side is very busy, very active, people to people, wonderful, so that is something that bodes well for the future and I am sure that things will be getting better and better, and we will be enjoying the company of Macedonia in the Euro-Atlantic organizations.

I thank you very much for your attention; I don’t know how long I have spoken for, but longer than probably necessary, thank you.
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It is not something that we acquire and then we can live peacefully ever after. I think this is also a lesson that Europe learned and keeps learning. The extreme situation we are confronted with at the moment for example in Nigeria or in first legislation against homosexuals in Uganda or other countries in Africa, also show again how intolerance and discrimination is increasing in some areas and some continent, some countries or some population. All of this to me, even if we have the impression sometimes there’s evolution in the right direction and institutions and legislation in the right direction, this clash is very often rooted in a very inherently feeling that some people feel and think they are superior above others and that can be race, gender, culture, identity and range of identities. Now I think is important, I have also experienced personally in range of experiences I’ve been working in Africa I worked for example in Mozambique where there was a real attempt to create a real multicultural respect for different races, ethnicities, tribes and so on. At the same time next door there was South Africa where there was a legislation to legislative discrimination with the apartheid regime. And they were just neighbors. But you can see how, I mean I lived also how the extreme differences were created among these populations in a way that there were very close neighbors and could have lived well together. I’ve seen people brutally killed in Mozambique because they were hiding or getting away from the apartheid regime in Africa. I’ve also lived through genocide in Rwanda which is again an example of extreme rejection of the other and incapacity of protecting the other in a way under these brutal situations. I’ve also had a funny experience, I was introduced the 9th of may the day Europe in China in Shanghai exhibition and there was standing looking at the parade of European member state presenting their different culture and representations and the mere of shanghai was standing next to me and he said: “Well is very interesting to look at you minorities in Europe like this”. I’ve never heard member states being referred to as minorities actually but that’s how the Chinese look at all of this countries representatives. Finally also at the personal level I was married to an Afro-American jazz musician and I’m sharing that with you because my beloved husband died in the meantime, that’s why I said that I was married, but for 30 years I really lived in a way through the discrimination in a different way. When I was alone travelling as a woman, very often I was treated very differently from travelling with him. Although he expected this experience to be much easier because he was born black anyway, I didn’t except very easily because I saw the difference to such an extreme. We were refused to book into hotels in Egypt and in New York and that was only in the 80s. In the meantime the positive side of this is of course that in the mean time in America we have Obama as president, something that the civil right movement and my husband included would have never believed that it would have happened in their lifetime. So in a way for me the positive side of the story is that there is hope and things can change actually and sometimes faster than we believe if the right efforts are being put in the direction. So I have lived as a cultural diplomat in a way, my personal experience but also in a professional experience, I have practiced Jewish politics and institutional organized diplomacy in a multicultural way. Of course working in the EU union for more than 20 years you work all the time with different culture, attitude identities and personally I always seen as a richness, I would have never wanted something else but you also see the difficulties you see in one way I see young generation are really embracing diversity in Europe and globally. On the other hand I also see still a lot of rejection of the other, including on what you referred to about the Roma population, Bulgarian, this old discussion is going way beyond the pure economic situations and what they called the benefit tourism and so on.

There’s still a lot of that and I have the impression that really more need to be done to create peace and citizenship also in Europe. There’s no real European citizenship, there’s no real European identity being developed. When I was working on cultural diplomacy when I was the director of representations in Europe we developed a lot, for example for the elections coming up in a few days and some of the problems
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developed where really offensives for some countries and not for other. And that sensitivity is not really being developed very well within the institutions and within the cultural worked is being done or even the political work has been done. One good example for the moment is that there was a Danish video, I don’t know if some of you have seen the Danish video for the elections to try to mobilize to go to the election. It went quite viral but there was seen by most of the other countries, France and the UK, as very offensive, and so it was taken off. And there again the sensitivity and the perception is so different sometimes.

I want to share also with you, I see we have some paper from the Netherlands, but I recently read a very interesting report I found about that discusses the political debate surrounding the national identity in the Netherlands. I mean it is against the bankruptcy of a growing public anxiety about immigrants and I'm taking this because this is a report really very well studied but I don't want to pinpoint the Netherlands as separate of any other country because a lot of that is also happening in my own country in Belgium. But the report finds that new integration strategies that were advanced by the Dutch government since the official rejection of multiculturalism in 2004 pushes the notion of cultural citizenships. The idea that being Dutch means adhering to certain sets of cultural and social norms and places the owner on the minority to fit in the existing majority. The turn away from multiculturalism is reflected in policies that deny admission to prospective immigrants who fail in compulsory civic integration: exams and limit social system to non-Dutch speakers. We see this also in several other countries. It’s an interesting choice that it has been made, maybe is a necessary choice for while but I question but also the writer question in the report that choice had been made. It also shows very clearly in the report how the anti-immigrant political retreating in Dutch society is very polarized and you have also ruled part of the society that sees the multiculturalism as a very positive gain for the society. So you have both views very much. The choice that it has been made by national government is sometimes very difficult to change at a certain stage but the author comes to conclusion basically that it could also choose a more open notion of a national identity based on a shared interest and experiences rather than the minority have to adapt to majority. There are choices there are very interesting to have debate on.

There’s another report or book that I’ve recently read about migration and how much is enough of the migration. And there also the debate are interesting to see these reports, a debate should also taken up much more I believe in the public domain to really make the debate evolve because for the moment we have quite a lot of division. Sometimes obscure decisions that had been taken. I believe that the EU is really placed in a very privileged position with the experience of integration political and economically also to look further into the cultural integration with a wild still respecting the diversity as the ambassador was speaking about. It is not about harmonizing cultures or making everybody the same but it is how do we create an identity that respects the other and integrate without harmonizing necessarily. I see this as a real challenge for Europe but also for the world. Trough the cultural diplomacy experiences Europe has worked a lot on Erasmus Leonardo Da Vinci exchanging programs for academics young people, exchanging vocationally education extended now also to Africa, Asia. These programs are very positive I think by now extremely young people benefit from Erasmus program. But all of this, maybe some of you here, it is interesting, but is not enough to really create the citizen, European identity I believe. So I’m going to cut a few things short here.

In my personal opinion I really think that cultural public diplomacy in general can become a very much stronger part of Europe. Some of us fathers creating Europe thought that culture should have been the beginning. I think that culture and the development of cultural diplomacy identity is very critical, but important but very slow process so I don’t think we would have been where we are if we had started with culture probably. So this was a bit of opportunist choice I believe but that doesn’t mean that it is not important. For the moment what I hear very often as cultural diplomacy by the member states also very interesting even in my own country we have plenty of cultural diplomacy. I still don’t seem very much what the European identity is that we bring abroad and the values that are going with this. There is a lot of work to be done in that area beyond what we see since centuries.

I think when I was invited to come here I was a little bit surprised but on the other hand I really looked forward to had some further exchange and to learn also from what this institute and you are doing because I strongly believe in this as the personal level but also in my professional task for the moment I’m in charge of social policy. For the moment we focus very much on the changes needed in the social welfare state within very aging society and the crisis situation of course. But on the other end I believe that there is also in that context also much more cultural exchange and diplomacy could be done also on the context internally in member state also for integration inclusion while still respecting other people dignity and identities.

I want to finish with something that always keeps me focusing on the dilemma that we confronted with from the philosopher Popper, there are a lot of people that don't like this philosopher very much but I think on the cultural aspect and identity he has written something that keeps me on track. He says we have to live in part in a specific culture or cultures with their local restrictions which serve to give us a specific character and identity while in part we live in this wider liberal culture of an open society, this no mean task to construct self a social identity which can handle this issue, but this is the task we should be able to accomplish and in which it is important that we get as much assistance as possible from the culture in which we are socialized. So all of this is to highlight one of the most important tasks I believe we are confronted with worldwide but is I hope Europe will further be able to lead on, and that to reconstruct our institutions, culture and indeed are selves so that we can thrive within an open society. I believe that for culture is something very important very close to identity but it is not fixed it can move be created into something even more conducive for a civil society and a peace society.
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“The Universal Scale of all Things”
A Lecture

(Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

Ladies and Gentlemen, friends of the ICD, my name is Koen de Decker, I am an artist from Belgium. This is truly a big honor for me to speak to you today, to you all. Many times, the public vision of culture and art is limited for example to mere entertainment or to stimulate local tourism. However, an international approach to culture is only made credible if it is conducted with the most respect for the work, for the substance of the work and for the artist. On that note, I would like to thank Mister Donfried and his team for the genuine interest in my work. I would like to give you some inside information about the way my work came about and what it is today. This is my studio. Most of the time I work onsite of specific situations, but a studio and a place to work is absolutely necessary.

In this reading, I would like to show you where and how my work was developed. Most of the time I work in seclusion. This particular solitude and independence is absolutely vital for me, to be able to focus on my work. Nevertheless, this particular freedom is relative, because there are lots of unwritten rules or historical contexts to work with. The art world is organic and constantly in motion. It is a social network of constant changing individuals and positions. On top of that, I think, as an artist, you carry a lot of responsibilities towards society. As to communicate, you try to develop your own language. My work and the visual language that I speak, renews itself during the process of its own invention. As an artist, I strive for enhancement as well as renewal. The purpose of this language is to communicate the viewer’s interpretation. No, I am sorry; the purpose of this language is to communicate. The viewer’s interpretation will be based on his or her own knowledge, references and viewing experiences. Charlotte (surname) writes about my work “the body of work of Koen de Decker. It’s just the beginning of a bigger and uncontrollable work that fluctuates or swings in memory and thoughts, so I see my work as generated ideas.” Another illustration: “The whole body of the work is thinkable”. I try to approach space and form from different angles. In my sculptural work, I always attempt to let the shape communicate with the space, its environment and also the viewer’s skill in this is very important. So first I would like to show you some sculptures and later I will try to tell you where everything comes from. The sculpture I almost let communicate with its environment and with the viewer of course. Sometimes keeping the sculpture transparent, you get to see forms from all different angles, you see the form and its structure at the same time, like a special drawing.
From my work I try to talk once through form and space. I am not only interested in the form of things, but most of all in how they are made. Besides the researches, property, skills, I am also interested in the material and how they behave. Purely technically, I like the basis of forms and structures. For example, forms that come out from a mole or objects that are blown out or were made by purging and negative forms with different materials, all material bends and its warm.

I can look at materials, how they behave and just show this property is as pure as possible, such as those that develop by hanging chain. By for example, attaching equal size bamboo sticks I could create an endless culture which can be performed by a different person in a performance or in one occasion even by the public. Another of my special works is now in the collection of the smoking ... I made this temporary installation allegedly for a country location. It is a large Reds movement culture, the X on the confrontation with the landscape by creating score for this culture as well and scores and with scores I mean like a partitute, you know what a partitute is? Yes?

By creating scores for this sculpture as well, the museum can adapt the size of it depending on the size of the remit exposed on it. So I have already told you that skills like this are very important like also about rescaling, about rescaling. On photographs, all artworks are equal in size. We collect them by remining to archive them in our personal knowledge of artistry images. Several works of mine are exposed on different scales depending on the room they are in or on the ergonomical skill towards the viewer.

An ideal does not have a performance shaped color or a material. It exists on a sketch plan or score. We should consider this video as a moving image. So several works of mine can be exposed on different scales depending on the room they are in or on the ergonomical skills towards the viewer, an idea that does not have a format shape color or material. It can exist as a sketch plan or score.

The physical properties of the production of such an idea depend on the location, the strength of the material and the skill of this idea should become real. Run exposition, at a library I made a work in a viewing tank. It was a glass case of fifty centimeters by 2 meters and only 20 centimeters deep. I divided the tank in small spaces and suggest that museum exhibit it in different rooms.

I hereby made an exhibition catalogue on one single copy which is now available in the library for the students. The pictures in this catalogue are photographed in such a way that they look like they are large objects in the museum, but as you can see they are quite small. Real work does not only consist of the shape but also defines the negative form in the area around it. Sometimes this surrounding space becomes a part of the installation.

Another one of my work consists of three cubes that I divided into eight smaller cubes on which I installed technical supplies and advice from other artists and curators from around the world. Besides working space, you have different project rooms to present and to try out new installations. So this was not my studio, this was a project room.

This is one of the works I made. It was flying bat. One day an artist from the US came along as an advisor and he was so tired from the jetlag that he asked to sleep in this work. He asked me “Do you want to film me when I’m sleeping?” So I have a video of him sleeping in my project room. This is probably his way of giving his advice to the work. Another project I did there was the drawing line, where I drew the sketches out of this video. Another project I did there was the drawing line, where I drew the sketches out of this video. Another project I did there was the drawing line, where I drew the sketches out of this video. Another project I did there was the drawing line, where I drew the sketches out of this video.
material. During the open studies in 1999, I created a sculpture while showing my collection on a long iron shelf. I called it my Memory Archive. These objects helped me to remember ideas. This was one of the ideas... called the Endless Sculpture.

The other residence I did was in Belgium. It was a workplace for visual artists. Here I realized the universal scale of all things, with the objects I just showed you. I used to call this collection of objects my Memory Archive. Each object holds its own significance in color, shape and material. By ordering these objects, their properties interfere with each other. I tried to order them by color, material or meanings. And I looked at them from different angles. I assembled a wide range of shapes, sizes and forms, and at first I made two groups. These closed shapes were classified together, such as bottles, geometrical balls etc. Opposite those was the second collection of growing shapes—construction, networks etc. soon enough I realized that every possible ordering started showing illogical overlaps. Everything seemed to be interconnected. Other dichotomies such as natural vs artificial just did not add up. Each object holds its own significance.

There I had a chance to develop a digital archive. Only when I started to photograph them against a black background did I notice that they all became equal in size. Initially I chose objects based on their assembly. This was a point of interest for me as an artist. My rearranging and confronting them I obtained an array of meanings and interconnections. Here I started an interesting research project which was about much more about just ordering their physical properties.

The true meaning between these objects developed as a result. You can compare these properties with the resonance between two sounds which become a new sound, which in this case is a new meaning. This is when these invisible properties become my goal and subject of research. By placing random objects next to each other I suggested a new meaning.

By looking at things from this topographic way, we start to look at things from a different perspective. You can look at things in very different ways; you can, for example, look at the world through a window like a painter or photographer would, or you could look at things by walking around an object. By folding it open, you can reach an object like a doctor or an engineer. I wanted to order them randomly from a topographic point of view, still in doubt as to what to do with them. But I knew this collection could become endless. A question to me was, I wondered if artists stand still in the world that surrounds them, or do they operate in the frontlines of innovation, where they turn things inside out. By thinking about this, I realized I could put everything into this project. First of all, I tried to put some documentation images I found on Google into the same logic of the universal scale project. But in fact, I can also put all my sculptural work you saw before in the same frame. So this project is not finished yet, in fact, it is just beginning. Universal Scale of All Things is the origin, and maybe also the whole work. Each and every of my works can be categorized within this topographical plan in which you can discover many secret hallways. Thank you for your kind attention.
“Creativity, a Tool for Change in a World in Need of a New Paradigm”  
A Lecture by Viviane Cangeloni, Visual Artist

Both my parents were born in Italy and they were immigrants in France, in Marseille where I was born myself. So, I am French and very soon, I was attracted to another country. This was quite some years ago because I’m not born yesterday. I was in England, a country where I travelled and lived in a bit. I was, for many years, with an English nationality. To say that the language, the other language as a culture was important for me. Finally, I settled in Brussels. I’m not working in the European institution. I’m not in Brussels for that but I remain in Brussels because it seems to me to be a laboratory for globalization and different identities coming together. For me, that is very inspiring as an artist. I don’t know that many cultures and yet it is very comfortable for me also because I can speak French. So I feel a bit – a foot in France, but still, I’m not in France. And that is interesting about identity and an enlargement of your identity, nationality, and territory. I feel that Brussels is very interesting for that. And when I was invited to give a talk, I was surprised, I thought “well I don’t even know this thing” and I thought about what I was going to say. I didn’t feel like showing my work. My work is a question mark at the moment. I don’t feel that strongly or that positively about my work and I felt, “no that is not a good idea”.

The other part of my work is that I am a therapist in the self development. This two were beside each other in my evolution. Well, identity is very merged with territory, the territory is your own parents and whether you have them or you don’t have them, whether you are adopted or not, and the place where you are born and how you enlarge that. You go to school, you make friends, you travel and you enlarge that. Then it becomes a problem when you put in the limits and the self work is: how much do you confirm your identity while you remain open to the other one or are you engulfed and vampirized by the other one? And are you afraid of the family or the nationalists?

But going back to that, I thought it well to speak about that as it is too much for me at the moment. There is too much art for artist and the public is interested in art and if you’re not an artist and not interesting, then you’re out. So what is behind art? And what is something that in therapy or everyday life is art as well? To me, what is the creative process? And then we have to make a link between the individual and the society and find new things, in a world that is in crisis. I was thinking, “What is creativity, as an impact in everyone?” It can be that some people are more creative than others, but can it be in everyone? And can creativity as an impact find new paradigm in the world that is in crisis? I’m not going to repeat some of the things that have been told before me by the ambassador of Bulgaria and this lady who I appreciate very much. We spoke about not only opening aspects of Europe but all the defense against Europe because when your identity is too spread out then you become in danger. Again, the frontier comes.

Nowadays it is creativity that is very important because what is creativity? Creativity, well if you take the word ‘create’, who created the world? In every civilization, there is God. Whether you believe or you don’t believe in it, create is God. He created the world, and He created people. And so, before, there was nothing and then you make a creation, and there is something, something that wasn’t before, and that is really the first meaning of creation. Whether you do something that has no value or something that has value, it is an act of creation. And to create that, you have got to have intuition, imagination, intelligence, awareness, solitude, silence and yet there is something around you. And all the creators that have left a mark on society, that their work remained, they are people who went beyond something. This is why they are well aware of what is around them. A person that makes something new is a person that awakes the dormant seed that is there. Like this pair of glasses are a dormant seed. When it is dormant, it can be dormant for three centuries and then they will find this fossil and “oh this pair of glasses are three centuries ago”. If you are aware of this dormant seed that is a person who should grow something – a flower or whatever – then this person becomes creative. So creativity is not something out of nothing, it is creating something – seeing links where there is something but making a relationship through it, to give meaning.

And I think in our world, where the politicians try their best and do their best, it’s difficult nowadays to find solutions. With the financial sector, we know that it is not that secure than it used to be. And so we have got to find somewhere in ourselves not just in the politician, the financial, in the institution but everyone of us as a citizen, we have got to find somewhere, this impulse of creativity, and maybe to make art and to make something – to have something, to have a way to relate and make an understanding. And to go back to the point here on culture, especially in Brussels where I live and where I like very much, you find so much that your culture is like a passport that you’ve got to transport with you because well of course, you can still remain in your village and die there with your children, grandchildren and never move from this village. But still, there is television and internet now.

And so, multiculturalism and the move towards it – well you go to the grocer and my grocer is Turkish. You go to a restaurant and everyone speaks different languages and so on and so on. So, identity – before, it was linked to a territory and now, the identity is not linked anymore to territory. It’s like you have got to your territory with your case, you move it and you are in Belgium. Of course you will show or not show where you come from. Then comes the question of identity and identification like: to integrate and lose your identity; to integrate different aspects within yourself and grow and not have your identity fit into the national identity. Or you keep the identity and there is a mish-mash with the other one that is our country and we were there before. So, how do we do that? Because we are in Europe, we are trying to have this new vision and we gain the creativity impulse. It’s very interesting, if we speak of this creativity impulse with an artist or in the field or art because it’s larger than that. The artist is alone. He has learnt somewhere normally and he knows rules, he knows his ancestors, his family of artists, he has got his story of course but at one stage, he has got to do a reset of that and this reset is not easy because you cannot just, you know if you’re in the south of France where I am, when there is something, they show you Van Gogh. I’ve got nothing against Van Gogh, I think he’s marvellous but I mean we are in the 21st century, you cannot always be in the past.

And so, an artist at one stage, has to be at his own time and his own time – for many people – his own time, is in fact a tomorrow that is not visible yet. So this impulse should show this vision. And I think that this creative impulse shows a vision that is possible but not yet there. It’s not just something to do with the
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Of course, we have our desires for power, the competition, the money and so forth. But it is not just that, there is the desire to develop something – to go beyond, to accomplish and to evolve hence this is specific to humans. Then where do we see these results?

We see them in many things. We not only see them in the arts but in culture too. And I would place science in the same field as culture here, really. Of course, science is not an art like painting or writing. But it is an art in a way. A research. Before you have science, you have research. In science, you have dissidents – like with artists, you have academics and dissident artists. It is this movement of the creative process and this creative process is with the scientists who discover something. The last prize of the discovery in Belgium was by someone who researched. He would have never found what he had found if he had not done his research.

So, you need to trust this creative process, the movement or process, where you walk on a road and you do not its destination except that you would like to reach that. So, there is a risk. But, this creativity can touch everyone and we badly need this today. I think that amongst politicians, maybe we should create a team of creativity because we need this. Politicians, of course, need to be creative but citizens themselves need it too. Creativity is something that leads to autonomy which I think is very important today. I think that autonomy is very important nowadays. I am not against a state of providence that helps you with everything. Of course, we fought a lot for this right and I think that it is very nice to have a state that helps you.

But at the same time, I still think it is very important to develop our own autonomy in thinking and an autonomy of value as citizens. That will, of course, lead to action and action can be a part of being charismatic. But not just that, it is through thinking that may lead to an impact on the world because thinking ‘normally’ leads to more open-mindedness. I say ‘normally’ because, of course, there can never be a guarantee.

And, also, this creativity process is a tremendous strength you can have in your pocket. There have been people in prisons, in camps, tortured, starved, experienced drastic things from a social point of view, they all knew about art and culture and creativity and about using their creativity. And there have been others who could not do it – they can do it better, you could have been better if you were more creative and used your creativity. That is the risk. Now we need to use our creativity.

So, the artist is faced with doubts and question marks as he accepts to lose his attitude as if we applied these creative interrogations to crises. What could he mean by that? First of all, I believe you know this, the word ‘crisis’ comes from Greek, from the word ‘Krisis’ and it means ‘the opportunity for change’. But, when we have a crisis, we have the opportunity for fear so instead of moving forward, we regress. So, it is this opportunity for change that is there and in order to not regress, it is necessary to have a creative movement or creative impulse which has curiosity and an open-mind. And, especially in this globalizing world, as I would say, a culture is not limited by frontiers anymore. These frontiers shift with this movement.

This creative process touches something deep in us. This, however, is specific to humans. If we look at animals, I have a cat and I like my cat very much. It has a lot of emotions and I can almost understand and connect with my cat. Like humans, cats need sleep, security and eat and it needs many things we need as well but it does not have, at least I do not think it does, a creative process. A creative process is specific to human beings. After all, if we saw animals in the past, they were more or less the same then as they are now. If they are not the same, it is probably because we disturbed them.

But, seeing people, at their physical level, we are more or less the same. For the moment, we are still in this ‘homo-actual’. There were many but we are still in this ‘homo-actual’ since many centuries ago. But, we are thinking, our technologies and our accomplishments, we are completely different. What made us this way?
lost their jobs, their children, they lost many things. Yet, they survived. And after they survive, they create a work of art. Most of the time, they write because language is accessible to you. Even, when you do not know how to write, they know how to speak. And you do not have to be an artist to put words on how you feel. If you are an artist, of course, it is better as you can express yourself more wonderfully. But they, of course, need a testimony. How do they say that? They talk about how they survived in those different and difficult conditions.

And when you read those books or when you are in contact with work like that – although you did not go through that, you feel enlarged by that, you feel like you received something from these people who speak of their losses or who lost themselves. There is an enlargement. That means that it can really touch something that is beyond identity because I can read a book of a Jew who experienced a torture camp. Though, I was born in France, neither German nor Jewish, I am still touched by it. What touches me? The book is, after all, beyond my roots, my nationality or my time. And I was not confronted with these things during my time.

If we would like to find a link, we need to find a common denominator. We dissect the layers to find the base from which touches us universally. I find that art, as I know art better than the other fields, or at least I hope so, through this creative process, as artists are always using this creative process, does this. I mean, while I am working, I listen and I write. When I write, I write all the time, I do not write everything from all the conferences. I am not interested in all the conferences. Sometimes I do not understand them. At one stage though, if there is one word a man or woman at the conference says, it clicks in me. It means that the person stage though, if there is one word a man or woman at the conference says, it clicks in me. It means that the person

impulse. Of course, if you are shut in your atelier, you may have a creative impulse in another way that is more complicated with a lot of details.

Going back to creativity, there is also a point I would like to emphasize. Creativity, when it leads to art, may then lead to something called ‘beauty’. Beauty – well, I had a little reaction before. I would like to say beauty with meaning but it is a difficult concept to grasp. But, let us take an experience of all of us may be able to relate to – you are in a beautiful landscape and you do not feel well due to something which happened between you and your boyfriend or girlfriend, whatsoever, your job or your boss. And there is beauty. Then all of a sudden, you do not feel alone anymore as this beauty is going into you. Your ego is not there anymore. You feel fulfilled, joy, enlargement and gratitude. You feel one as if you are in a different state. I think when you are in love, at the beginning, you feel as if you have been enlightened – this is something you can have after a creative process. Just like a scientist, who feels that way once he has found his formula.

This enlightenment is something, from the conference here, someone said that it is nice being with artists as with our jobs it is sometimes dull. Do not think that artists always feel this excitement. Sometimes, things feel as dull just like in other jobs done by other people. There is this search for a this movement as it becomes a search for truth. This is in contact with reality – believe it, artists pay their taxes and sometimes at exhibitions, things do not work. It can get really technical. It is not just a world of dreams.

This beauty, I think, is something very different. And, I thought when I wrote that, well, sometime ago, there was an event or project where we asked people, for one second, if we could switch off all the electricity as an ecological gesture. And I thought, well, let us make a project where everyone feels great as if it were a completely natural moment, you feel fulfilled, full of joy, you have something that explodes in you. You become so beautiful inside that you shine outside even if you are not beautiful to start with. Let us think, for one second, if everyone felt that way. It will be great, no? And maybe it will change something as we become contact with that as when we are in contact with that, you feel within the self and within the collective, within the private and within the universal, with the past and with the future. There is no time and there is no space. There is no difference and at the same time, you are not lost, you are full. And that experiment of beauty is one of the cherries on the cake of a creative impulse.

To end, I would like to quote an artist. He is a painter and his name is Lucian Freud, maybe you know him, who happens to be the grandson of Sigmund Freud. When he was in charge of choosing work for the collection of the National Gallery in London for a collection he had to make, he made this comment when someone asked him why he selected those art pieces and what art meant to him. Lucien Freud was someone who mainly painted and did not really speak a lot.

“So what do I ask of a painting? I ask it to astonish, disturb, seduce, convince.” Nothing nice. You know, when you are seduced, you feel taken by something. “One quality that these paintings share is that they all make me want to go back to work.” For an artist, this is very important. I mean that the art at that level made him go back to what was him, not something that was made out of him or the country, it goes back deep into his very identity. It is thus interesting that maybe, culture instead of going back to separate your, when you experience a different culture, you discover yourself and understand more of your own culture. It is not something that deprives, negates or makes a danger to you. It roots you to your country because you can see those lines. Then he said something marvelous to me, “A burglar collector breaks into the National Gallery to steal his favorite pictures. Will he then leave any of them behind for fear that he may not be able to displace them to reveal their full splendor.”

And with that, I am ready to answer any of your questions if you have any.
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“Enhancing Copyright Balance to Promote Cultural Diplomacy”
A Lecture by Prof. Dr. Séverine Dusollier, Professor of Law, University of Namur

When I was invited here I did not know exactly what the center was about, and what cultural diplomacy was. Listening to the previous speakers has helped to enlighten me in this regard though the focus of my speech is slightly different from theirs. So my topic will be a bit different and I don’t know if any of you have any idea about what copyright is.

Alright, it is something completely new to you. I wouldn’t want you to include details of copyright but actually the field of copyright is on copyright research. I have been doing copyright for almost twenty years now and I’m really trying to work to reform copyright into a balanced regime for protecting culture and protecting creators but also for allowing culture to develop and flourish. My proposal was just to show the relationship between balancing copyright and cultural diplomacy.

I would like to explain to you what for me would be the role in such cultural diplomacy efforts and how the current European landscape is dealing with these issues. I know that some of you are not from Europe but you will see that actually what happens in Europe is happening everywhere in the world, and I would like then to focus on some of these issues to give you some examples of my point.

Copyright is that field of Law that grants property rights to creators and to allow industries of creation to protect their works against use without authorization. It was created in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and now it’s really all over the world with some level of protection everywhere in the world.

Actually copyright might be explained by different reasons, they are certainly cultural reasons, because copyright is there to protect creators, to protect creations and I think it should be also there to protect the dissemination of culture. Not only to protect the creators, the artists, but also to protect them in a way that they feel safe in disseminating their work because this way their work will be protected. But copyright should be also an engine for further dissemination of culture. Of course that cultural objective is rather forgotten right now because the academic objective is regularly taken over and because copyright is also a part of the economic sector. It’s very big, and it is not only about creativity. Copyright will also protect software for instance, and software can be creative of course but it is slightly removed from culture and it is also protected by copyright. So you have a larger economic sector that relies on copyright for its economic survival. Copyright is also used to incentivize innovation and creativity to sustain creativity from an economic point of view. But I have the opinion that there is another motive in copyright that is regularly overlooked. It is a sort of democratic objective. As I said, copyright was created in the eighteenth century and that is not a coincidence because I think that it was at this time when the public sphere emerged...
in Europe. The public sphere is described by Jürgen Habermas as a sort of society where people could discuss, could for the first time in history intellectually engage with each other, politically engage with each other, and not only through a framework of hierarchy in society but people could take to the streets. Also take the theatre, take the cafés and meetings and discussions. So copyright was there to disenfranchise creativity in culture from the control of the kings. But to just put copyright in the market, in the public fields so the people could read, could discuss and things like that. The public sphere dimension to me is very important in copyright. Those justifications you can find them for instance in the many legislative taxes around copyright and I’m not going into detail because this is the boring part of my presentation. But just in a few words, in the European charter of fundamental rights it is said that Intellectual property shall be protected, it’s a very strong affirmation and maybe it’s a too strong an affirmation. Copyright should not be protected as a means in itself. It should be protected because it has some objective and those objectives you can find in different texts in Europe so I will not go into details here.

You have cultural aspects too; there is one directive in Europe that says the copyright has great importance from the cultural standpoint. But it is not really at the forefront of the objectives. It’s always repeating the protection of innovation, investments with an economic focus that is given to copyright. The need for balanced protection is also repeated by a number of lawmakers in Europe but also internationally. And it’s always a balance between the protection of creators but also the access to works, the freedom of expression, the free movement of information and you can also find those in many texts.

But actually, for instance in Europe, despite this declaration, Copyright is really very protected and it is always repeated that copyright should provide creators a high level of protection. It means that actually nowadays, the picture of copyright we have in Europe, the US and in many other countries is also the level of copyright protection that we tend to force in the developing world too. So it could be a sort of a big tree with really heavy branches, with no breathing space of any kind but really the tree has grown rather in an anarchistic way, with no real control. This is a big tree, very strong but also very weak because it is suffering under its own weight and I think this is a very big problem in copyright today and this is lying in copyright to overprotection. For instance can be illustrated by some points. Here I will go very briefly but to give you some examples even if you are not familiar with copyright, in copyright nowadays you can almost protect anything, the subject matter is not limited to cultural creation, we can protect software but also really little pieces of design, of instruments etc. it can be protected by copyright for instance, has not to be a significant work. Actually copyright has been cut for cultural protection of creation, the rights that are given to creators are also sometimes overreaching and everything should not be protected, shouldn’t be private. You have exceptions in copyright, cases where the Lawmakers say it’s allowed, it’s not prohibited by copyright, and it’s for instance exceptions for education, access for information, freedom of expression, but those exceptions are really limited and it tends to be even more limited by some legal mechanisms.

The duration of copyright is seventy years after the death of the author, almost everywhere in the world. You have even longer duration in some countries and this duration is regularly lengthened because at some point, authors will say it’s too short, for instance.

The duration of Copyright was extended because a design company suddenly realized that it will come out to public domain and will not be protected anymore. And the design company was one of the strongest front races of Clinton. Clinton was the president at the time so that was allowed in the US the lengthen of the duration of copyright, so will not come out and fall into the public domain yet.

There are a lot of things that happen in copyright, there is a strong economic focus to develop.
Or we could give this material to private entrepreneurs such as Google but are we sure that we want to give our cultural heritage which has been collected over the ages to a private body like Google, under what conditions would this transfer occur?

To give another example of a potential limitation of the public domain, during the 100th anniversary of the First World War a lot of public libraries have been attempting to put their relevant content into the European digital library. But if their mandate is to comply with copyright so they only put material that is certainly in the public domain. For example here at the Royal Library in Belgium the project leader believed that this selective uploading of information distorted the historical image of that war available on the digital library. For things to be in the public domain the author has to have been dead since at least 1943 and so that means that the works available online were mostly written by individuals who were quite old during the first world war and therefore would have a different perspective from younger writers whose writings are still covered by copyright. Thus only one version of the war will appear on the online library. This is a clear restriction on effectively digitising cultural heritage.

The last issue is what I call the digital public lending, it’s still about public libraries. I’m sure that you all borrowed books when you were younger and I’m sure that this helped and indeed is still helping your education. This is allowed in copyright actually, libraries don’t have to ask permission to lend material to their patrons but this is restricted to physical items. So what about E-Books for instance? There are a lot of books that are only sold in a digital format and copyright doesn’t allow for these e-books to be lent to people visiting libraries. So some publishers have made some agreements with libraries to lend these books, this is a private initiative that doesn’t involve lawmakers and this means that the collections available will be limited by the preferences of the publisher. This limits the cultural diversity available to library patrons.

I think that this a problem because a lot of young people rely on public libraries to get education, culture and enjoyment and this might be threatened if we don’t extend to public lending to e-books and other digital formats. So there are some examples of somewhere copyright is at a crossroads between protecting creators and the digital possibility of extending access to all, it is our job to find some balance between these two goals.
And they are all from different nationalities. The first one is of African nationality then you have a Belgian guy, then you have a Danish guy, then you have an Indonesian guy, then you have again a Belgian, a Spanish, an Italian, a Moroccan, a Japanese, a French, a Greek, a Dutch, an Arabic guy, French again, Kurdish and Antillean and the other one I forgot, but you see, this was the company and we worked together for eight months. We lived together and we worked together for eight months. They were between 18 and 35 years old. They have all different techniques and educations so we had ballet dancers, another is a hip hop dancer, the other is a break dancer, so it is all different techniques and I brought all these people together in red, yellow and blue, because I wanted to speak about the world. I started my piece with movies about how unsustainable the world is at this moment and the only thing in which we can change something is that people connect again on a lower level together, and for me lower level means directly with bodies, souls, music, dance, and art, so for me it’s an intuition instinct work but I always see something like you could think, or you could think, and you just create something, but it took so much impact that we have an audience of fifty thousand people and this year I could create a new project and we go more and further so I was like wow, you know, I started just as a little girl at eight years just classical ballad and I grew up and I lived my life, I see the world, I listen, I read, I paint, I do everything I can and at a certain point I became older and I wanted to express myself in what I feel and what I see and I am so happy that the fact that I just do instinctively my things it is just touching so many people and people come from Portugal and they come from Spain to look at the piece and I was saying, “Wow…nothing is impossible,” this is what I wanted to say. I think that dance and music are necessary, I think it is in our nature and we need that. If we take this way from the world I think it is going to be a strange life.

I will give an example: When you go out people and you hear music, what do you do? Pardon? You stop and listen? You sing, you smile, you dance and when you drink a glass of wine extra. Yes, why is that? You feel free. But why are we not always free? Yes but may I ask from which origins you are? Senegal? When somebody dies you have a ritual you are dancing, no? Yes in a lot of African cultures. Pardon? No, but in a lot of African tribes when somebody dies or when somebody gets married or is happy it does not matter. When Nelson Mandela died people where dancing, people were dancing, but why? Because people were suffering or they want to claim something or they wanted to express something and they wanted to dance.

I started my piece with movies about how unsustainable the world is at this moment and the only thing in which we can change something is that people connect again on a lower level together, and for me lower level means directly with bodies, souls, music, dance, and art, so for me it’s an intuition instinct work but I always see something like you could think, or you could think, and you just create something, but it took so much impact that we have an audience of fifty thousand people and this year I could create a new project and we go more and further so I was like wow, you know, I started just as a little girl at eight years just classical ballad and I grew up and I lived my life, I see the world, I listen, I read, I paint, I do everything I can and at a certain point I became older and I wanted to express myself in what I feel and what I see and I am so happy that the fact that I just do instinctively my things it is just touching so many people and people come from Portugal and they come from Spain to look at the piece and I was saying, “Wow…nothing is impossible,” this is what I wanted to say. I think that dance and music are necessary, I think it is in our nature and we need that. If we take this way from the world I think it is going to be a strange life.

I will give an example: When you go out people and you hear music, what do you do? Pardon? You stop and listen? You sing, you smile, you dance and when you drink a glass of wine extra. Yes, why is that? You feel free. But why are we not always free? Yes but may I ask from which origins you are? Senegal? When somebody dies you have a ritual you are dancing, no? Yes in a lot of African cultures. Pardon? No, but in a lot of African tribes when somebody dies or when somebody gets married or is happy it does not matter. When Nelson Mandela died people where dancing, people were dancing, but why? Because people were suffering or they want to claim something or they wanted to express something and they wanted to dance.

I started my piece with movies about how unsustainable the world is at this moment and the only thing in which we can change something is that people connect again on a lower level together, and for me lower level means directly with bodies, souls, music, dance, and art, so for me it’s an intuition instinct work but I always see something like you could think, or you could think, and you just create something, but it took so much impact that we have an audience of fifty thousand people and this year I could create a new project and we go more and further so I was like wow, you know, I started just as a little girl at eight years just classical ballad and I grew up and I lived my life, I see the world, I listen, I read, I paint, I do everything I can and at a certain point I became older and I wanted to express myself in what I feel and what I see and I am so happy that the fact that I just do instinctively my things it is just touching so many people and people come from Portugal and they come from Spain to look at the piece and I was saying, “Wow…nothing is impossible,” this is what I wanted to say. I think that dance and music are necessary, I think it is in our nature and we need that. If we take this way from the world I think it is going to be a strange life.

I will give an example: When you go out people and you hear music, what do you do? Pardon? You stop and listen? You sing, you smile, you dance and when you drink a glass of wine extra. Yes, why is that? You feel free. But why are we not always free? Yes but may I ask from which origins you are? Senegal? When somebody dies you have a ritual you are dancing, no? Yes in a lot of African cultures. Pardon? No, but in a lot of African tribes when somebody dies or when somebody gets married or is happy it does not matter. When Nelson Mandela died people where dancing, people were dancing, but why? Because people were suffering or they want to claim something or they wanted to express something and they wanted to dance.

Why is that? Because you want to express something and I come back to when we drink some glasses and we feel more free and I think that it should not be necessary.

If we realize that if we educate our children and young people more music and more with movement in general and dance, and with art, then they will feel more free and it is not that education and structure and everything is bad but I think that for a lot of new generations is like a prison, it is like a prison because I give a lot of workshops everywhere and it is terrible how the young people – you feel they are empty because they have layers of they have to do this and be like this and they cannot do that you know they are like stuck in their bodies and I think that is necessary that we realize that we go to theatre we go to dance go to music and give this as much as possible for young people and it will free the imagination and they will have another way of view to live. I speak about education now because I know that in a lot of school they take off sport and they take off every art education and that is a pity. So I think that is really necessary that it comes back much more, okay? I will show – this is just my vision – I will show red, yellow and blue.

I am working for television and I am the choreographer of “So You Think You Can Dance.” I don’t know if you know it, but more than one million people look at this TV show and now this year they are will maybe stop the program or make it later and I heard that so many people are sad and are really really sad because this program is not coming on Sunday again in September and only that those one million people they will miss something and I tell you this because there you feel the need also the need to freedom in that certain ways.

By producing these pieces I connected with a lot of people and the dancers also connected with each other. All other Europe by social media we have interactions and this brings a lot of people together and a lot of people together. That is the only thing that I have to tell you is just…dance your life.
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Thank you so much Mark,
It is a wonderful occasion for me to be invited to this international symposium on cultural diplomacy and I want to express my gratitude to Mark and his staff for organizing this event and also, special thanks goes to the staff, the Macedonian mission to the European Union and my dear friend, Andy Reyes.

I think you heard lots of good things throughout the yesterday’s whole session and also today’s first session. I will try to be as brief as possible and I will try to get some feedback and some exchange of ideas and questions.

My first experience with one of the European languages was in my freshman year of University when I was, I think, eighteen years old. It started with my application for my French language course or beginner course at Alliance Francaise. It was around 1978 and do you know why I choose French instead of German or Spanish? Well, there were more students who were taking some languages lessons than others so I think it was quite reasonable for me to choose the French language which had so many good looking Korean female students and perhaps this was another kind of confirmation. Also, I think that I made a good choice in coming to this wonderful event because there are so many good looking females represented here in this room.

So let me just call for the topic, starting on how we understand cultural diplomacy. I will then talk about Korea and give different perspectives – a kind of assessment of what Korea can do, what Korea should do then I will move on to what kind of practices the Korean government has been undertaking in promoting cultural diplomacy and finally, offer some suggestions.

You saw, as Mark briefly introduced, this kind of ‘Gangnam style’, a typical Korean song that has taken the world by storm. And recently, there was a Chinese panda jet that was brought into Brussels when President Xi Jiping was making a State visit to Belgium. This is the year of vocal music, and area competitions were held and out of twelve finalists, four Korean singers were able to proceed to the next round. Next week, there will be the finals.

This is the kind of cultural diplomacy that we are talking about.

Well, Cultural diplomacy as you have been hearing throughout the day. Yesterday I think, it was about the promotion of national interest through the exchange of ideas, traditions and all the cultural activities, you know, in order to foster mutual understanding and not to fight each other. Nowadays, we are increasingly...
witnessing more and more participation of citizens at home and abroad – expatriate communities at home and foreign companies abroad. Then of course, there is a Professor, Joseph Nye, that initiated the idea of soft power in 1990. This sort of approach is now resurfacing in our policy direction of undertaking cultural diplomacy. So in a nutshell, it is about how to reach the hearts and the minds of the people. This is the objective of cultural diplomacy.

Well, I briefly explained this paradigm shift that happened; so in the past with the so-called ‘hard power experts’, diplomacy was emphasized and undertaken but not fully fulfilling its objective – that is the reason cultural diplomacy, within the context of Soft power, is being re-emphasized. Of course, cultural diplomacy has existed for many centuries, such as when Peter Rubens, a great artist, painter and diplomat from Antwerp travelled to Madrid. But now cultural diplomacy is gaining more momentum and more importance and it has also become more diverse.

As Joseph Nye modified his concept of public diplomacy, he was trying to point out that neither hard nor soft power alone can perfect diplomacy. So, a hybrid of hard power and soft power, the so-called ‘smart power concept’, has been re-introduced. So as he said, the age of hard power and soft power has fused into smart power, which is a usable diplomacy tool.

Within this smart power concept, cultural diplomacy lies at its centre. Now there is the chart which shows that in the past, traditional diplomacy only dealt with governmental actors and did not fully incorporate the citizens, or non-state actors, but with cultural diplomacy and, in a broader sense public diplomacy, these actors have been incorporated. Governmental actors have been connected with the people, NGOs, not only in the private sector but also in municipal governments, which is becoming another key player, regional governments, municipal governments, local communities are linked not only to the country but also interconnected with the country and amongst themselves.

People are being connected to other people beyond national boundaries. Cultural diplomacy has been promoted through citizen to citizen’s diplomacy and people to people’s diplomacy and also crosses over these exchanges. Foreign governments are now directly communicating with people inside and outside their own countries.

By social network services and all the communication tools we have, these are the new environments in which we are living in, when we are talking about cultural diplomacy. How is Korea practising cultural diplomacy? Well as you have noticed, Korea is one of the unique examples of modern history. Korea was affected greatly by the war; from 1950 to 1953 we were devastated by the Korean War. Korea is still linked to North Korea because North Korea is not only a chronic and constant problem but it is also a security threat. Korea was a poor country and the per capita income in the 1950s was a little less than Kenya’s at that time. But now it has transformed itself from the Korea ‘discount’ to the so-called ‘Korea premium economic resurgence’ —where it sits amongst the world’s top ten trading powers.

Korean-pop, Korean dramas, Korean films and Korean classical music. Korea was in a disadvantaged position when you look at the past, from the early part of the 20th century up until 1970’s 1980’s. But Korea today is much better off in presenting a positive image of itself both in and out of Korea. There was a survey taken by a Korean trade investment promotion agency last year. It was a survey that asked European citizens – what comes to your mind, what kind of images come to your mind when you think of Korea? When asked about they felt about Korea, Japan and China, for Korea, Samsung was most associated with Korea. North Korea, of course, is inseparable, Korean-pop, Korean music, Seoul and technology; these were some other concepts the images that people have of Korea. For Japan, it was sushi, technology and animation.

China, of course, is always evolving but the Great Wall, the image of the Great Wall, Communism, mega cities, mega markets and population; those are the images that people, especially in Europe, associated with China. This survey suggests that Korea, with the exception of North Korea, is a country that looks and is oriented to the future. In Korean cultural diplomacy, we focus on future efforts rather than the past.

Of course, we focus on the past when we are promoting our traditional music, our traditions and our traditional art. But we have more priorities that deal with the future than the past, because the past was rather grim.

What kind of resources do we have? Rapid economic development, advanced scientific technology and innovation. These might have been presented to our colleagues in developing countries as one of their benchmarks, together with internet infrastructure and hi-speed broadband and networks – 29 million people are now using SNS in Korea; out of 50 million population, 29 million people are using SNS. It is quite impressive and extensive and the usage of SNS services in Korea reflect the modern Korean culture. Governmental actors are also trying to make as many citizen partnerships – out of the 50 million of Koreans, there are 7.2 million Koreans living overseas. We have quite a large diaspora of Koreans all over the globe. We are paying particular attention to civil society, NGOs and the cyber community. Let’s get down to the practical tools and policy elements that we are taking advantage of while performing cultural diplomacy. The Korean Cultural Centre is a physical presence of culture in the whole globe, a window into Korea’s inter-changeable network base and also, a showcase of Korean art and culture. We have established 27 Korean cultural centres, 8 of which are in Europe, in 8 cities – Brussels, Madrid, London, Warsaw, Paris, Budapest, Berlin and Moscow. The Korean Cultural Centre in Brussels was opened last year, in November. It is relatively new thus, incapable of succeeding on its own hence, we are trying to make an effort to introduce ourselves to people of Brussels.

So we are organizing Korean language classes, about 150, at the Centre and every Friday night. We would also like to invite you to the Korean Culture Centre to watch Korean movies, Friday evenings at 8 o’clock.
We are also organizing Korean cooking classes every two weeks, cultural workshops, concerts and exhibitions. We have standing exhibitions every day. It is also open on Saturdays, so if you are busy on weekdays, you are cordially invited to come to the centre on a Saturday.

The government is also organizing the K-pop World Festival with the Korean Broadcasting System, which is Korea’s number 1 TV station. There are sixty regions where preliminary contests are conducted and the finalists will be invited to Korea to compete with foreign K-pop lovers. In Brussels as well, when we organized a K-pop festival during the Made in Asia exposition in March at the Brussels Expo, about two thousand audience members showed up where about 40 contestants competed in the K-pop contest. We also have a global Korean-food festival where we feature traditional cuisines with an international competition amongst chefs who are interested in Korean cuisine.

We are also appoint goodwill ambassadors for cultural diplomacy. For example, an Indonesian actress and a Romanian actress were named as goodwill ambassadors. Currently we have about seven. This year another five will join them. They will perform as ambassadors for the culture of Korea.

There is a unique TV program in Korea, a children’s show, where the contestants compete by answering questions related to Korea. The preliminary rounds have been held in 30 countries and their finalists are invited to Korea to compete. The competition is aired by the Korean Broadcasting System. Two ladies from Uzbekistan won the grand prize. Moroccan, Israeli and Greek contestants were amongst some of the participants.

The ‘I Love Korea’ contest is another unique tool. It is a video contest hosted on YouTube. Last year, we received 1400 self-made three-minute videos, around the theme of ‘why I love Korea’. People presented their personal stories and views. The finalist videos were selected and disseminated by SNS. This was funded by the Korea Foundation.

These are some of the tools that have mainly been used to disseminate Korea-related information and some culture-related items. With the participation of foreign so-called Korean-lovers, or those who are interested in Korean culture, what kind of lessons can we learn from these practices?

In the case of Korea, we were aware of the need to establish our own national brand, as Macedonia demonstrated through their effective example. This is usually done through commercials, documentary films etc. We are now selling our national image as ‘dynamic and global’. I think every country’s foreign affairs ministry, even those of European institutions, should present a positive and future-oriented image. How can you portray yourselves to people outside Brussels? As you can see, there are more actors, and consequently more tools available to make communication more effective. Actors include, nowadays, local governments and local NGOs. Even ordinary people are posting on YouTube, Facebook and Twitter. Another important element is to embrace foreign communities residing inside your country. In the case of Korea, we have about 2 million foreigners residing in Korea. They are the messengers. They are the facilitators. They are the direct link in making the bridge between Korea and their home countries. 2 million is not a small number – around 3 or 4 out of 100 in Korea are foreigners. This is another important point that we should keep in mind as we are constructing cultural diplomacy networks.

The last point, and the most important one, is to develop joint and co-operation programs and not just disseminating one-sided information. You have to improve things with the slogan of ‘Together’. How to, for example, in our case of Korean Cultural Centre in Brussels, we should be aware of the need to cooperate, and incorporate Belgian elements. For example, when we are hosting a concert, we will try to invite both Korean and Belgian musicians. It is not only about presenting ourselves, or exposing ourselves. That is not the best way of communication.

Lastly, the task that we are faced with regard building cultural bridge, I think the EU and Korea have fared relatively well in this regard. We have been holding cultural cooperation committees, which is rare, in view of Korea’s standing on the global stage. We also organized an EU-Korea Youth Dialogue, a dialogue amongst the younger generation, mostly university students. We are also cooperating with EU centres, which are funded by the European Commission, and we have five EU centres in Korea. EU centres are located in each of the five leading Korean universities and research institutes. They act as a hub for EU-related data and activities to be channelled into Korea society. We also opened the Korean Innovation Centre in Brussels, which is more focused on technology and scientific research. That was the outcome of an agreement that was made by both the EU and Korea when the First Lady of Korea made a visit to Brussels last November. Innovation is, of course, not purely cultural, but nowadays, culture has no boundaries. So it might play a role in enhancing potential for joint programmes.

What we are also sharing is the promotion of cultural elements through inter-regional cooperation. For example, the ASEAN’s Asia-Europe meeting, the largest inter-regional entity which encompasses Asia and Europe, educational elements, such as scholarship programs, joint cultural event are examples of they do in ASEAN. Within North East Asia, such as with China and Japan, we can have more frequent and systematic interactions between cultural communities and educational exchanges. For example, in the case of China, Japan and Korea, trilateral cooperation was started through a small pilot project, called the Campus Asia Program. It was mainly modelled after the Erasmus Program of the EU. It offers joint degree programs and exchange programs, just like Erasmus.

Those are some lessons and tasks and I will stop here. I will be delighted to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.
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"Japan's Perspective and Practices in Cultural Diplomacy"
A Lecture by Bart Gits, President, Japanese Cultural Center

(Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

Thank you very much for all these nice words. Thank you also for this invitation, Mr. Donfried, so that I could be here to talk about Japanese culture and its diplomacy. Well, perhaps not as much about its diplomacy – you have to see me, you have to regard me as one of the users of cultural diplomacy. So actually I am standing in the field and I am not going to give you a big lecture on the possibilities and the activities of the Japanese diplomacy on culture. But I will give you another kind of point of view and perhaps it could be interesting for the future: how to organize the effects of the cultural diplomacy.

Yes, I worked in the industry for 17 years as a manager. That means that you work with people and I am afraid that today a lot of managers forget that they are working with people. If you see the phrase "people manager," you know that this company has a problem because that is twice the same thing that you’re saying there. And working with people means that you are working actually with a lot of different cultures, not only the native origins of the people. And luckily, today we have a lot of different cultures in our companies to deal with. It makes a company richer, but, well, actually our world, our planet has a kind of a culture, if you compare it to an extraterrestrial that we have not discovered yet, but surely it will come. What I mean is perhaps our culture is different from the one in Japan, but also my culture is different from the one of my neighbor, although we are born in the same country. So “culture” is a very diverse word and a very, well, global word. If I am blind to the culture of my neighbor, I will never understand my neighbor, so it is very important to have this openness to the culture. Of course, we are all aware of that, but in fact it is perhaps understood not so very much.

While I was working in the industry and meeting all these cultures, taking into account what the necessities of people are, what their beliefs are, I could always find a solution that is based on respect. And this should be the key word for every activity, every initiative taking place; certainly when we are talking about cultural diplomacy.

When I saw this first concert of Japanese percussion named Taiko, something happened to me. Yes, I am an engineer but my heart was hit and something changed within me. Or was it a recognition? I do not know – I have said to myself, “Should I not take something from my own region?” –but I see Taiko as a medium. It is open to everyone and gives you enormous opportunity to meet other people and in this case it was Japanese people, of course.

Now, out of this interest in this Japanese percussion story – three organizations grew from this little seed. First of all, the Japanese Cultural Center, which is an NPO and a private organization. And this is quite
special in this case that we work together a lot with the cultural and information center of the Embassy of Japan. But as a private organization, actually our hands are completely free. We can do what we want and quite often the Embassy asks us to realize a certain task which they cannot do, because they are a little bit tied due to authority. So we are completely free, but we are actually to a certain extent a helping hand for other organizations.

The second organization is an art one. It is a commercial company that only organizes Japanese events. And we try to make quality events. That means that a lot of the time you see culture used in company events but, may I say, completely in the wrong way. Of course, the Chinese heritage is very interesting, it is enormous, but when a commercial event is organized and it should be a Japanese event most of the time it is a Chinese event. So you have to respect the culture. Therefore, we have a constructive company to preserve the quality.

The third organization is the Belgian Taiko Federation and this federation has been directed to have close contact with the Nippon Taiko Foundation. So in that way we are organizing a little bit of our own diplomacy, but it is a private diplomacy. But private diplomacy is fairly limited, of course, because we have to operate and be self-sustainable. That means that due to our activity we can sustain ourselves. We do not get any subvention at all and I think that is a good thing because without this subvention we are completely independent. But what we actually are asking from cultural diplomacy and, for instance, the European cultural diplomacy is to help, because your level of diplomacy is a lot higher and it could make things a lot easier.

Now let us say that why we have the Japanese Cultural Center is to really get to the large public, the big audience there, because we saw that it was very difficult for people to get to know about Japanese disciplines. It can be quite a closed organization or a closed situation and we tried to break through these barriers. Like the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea mentioned Made in Asia – a very big fair about Asian cultural aspects – we also were there to present a Japanese village and really to show the disciplines, the traditional culture of Japan to this, actually very young public who was very interested in the anime and J-pop, K-pop. And so they discovered other things. We did a village of 1000 square kilometers or 2000 square kilometers even, so it is quite on a big scale what we are trying to do.

In our activities we worked a lot together with cities like the city of Hasselt – they have a Japanese garden in Hasselt – and we organized a lot of events for them. Again, for them it is quite difficult to organize all these events and it is some kind of a, well, commercial, professional attitude to really organize it. But even though our activities are not merely commercial, the culture is the top priority to bring to the big public. We also work together with other organizations like Youth and Music – it is an international organization, but it has departments all over the world, also in Flanders and Valonie. And we do a lot of adult education.

Now, as for Japan's diplomacy, there is a very big foundation called the Nippon Foundation and from there a lot of activities start. Now, mainly the activities are focused on education. And that perhaps, I am not only sitting here to talk about the positive things, but also a bit about the problems that we encounter, because if you focus on education, of course, education is very, very important. But that leaves out information. That means that people who do not want to get educated just want to get informed – and there we try to give this information to this large public. And I believe that the help of the EU and the Japanese diplomacy would make things a lot easier.

If we invite an artist from Japan to Belgium or to the EU, that costs a lot of money and I guess that the Nippon Taiko Foundation, they try to help us – to pay for the travel from Japan to here – and then we take it further. But I think this is very important to bring in the culture of a foreign country into the EU and that is what we are trying to do. Most of the time it is said, well, this is an activity that should be organized by the Embassy or the Departments of the Embassy, but I do not believe so. I think in this case the Japanese Cultural Center brings in the culture from a foreign country and we try to translate it to the local people, and so the threshold becomes very much lower. Companies like Sony – they asked us to organize a company event for their employees and they were a little bit ashamed that, while being in Belgium for several decades now, they had not done anything for Japanese culture for their employees, because it was a little bit difficult for them. Because it seems a little bit like pushing the Japanese culture and see, well, how good we are, or what nice things we do. Asking us to organize this was very stressful for us, but the stress became lower and so we could organize this and people were informed. We also gave the cross-cultural communication seminars in Japanese companies to try to understand what the effects of different cultures can be and to understand in a better way your colleagues, for instance.

These are all activities that we do ourselves and it is also always to bring cultures closer to each other. Why? To understand each other, of course. The reactions of the people following these seminars is that, “If I knew this before, I would have had much less frustration about why my colleague is reacting like this or that.” We cannot emphasize enough the difference of cultures and to really look at it and not to close our eyes to it. This Nippon Foundation I talked about established a new project in 2014. It is the OA project and it concerns the Asian community. The OA project means Like Japanese and the title of this project is about fusion and harmony. It is all about what it should be when you bring cultures together to find this fusion, because out of this fusion comes, of course, new ideas, perhaps new cultures. Every culture is the effect of some other cultures. And harmony, trying to look at this harmony. We need those kinds of projects, because a lot of the time different cultures are often regarded as threats.

So the Nippon Foundation has 22 offices in the world and six offices in the EU. Actually, you could say that is not so very much, because the influence of Japan in the world and also the cultural influence is, well, very big, as you all know. Now, this Japanese heritage is very big – only the fact that you could subscribe to study Japan’s studies like in several universities in Belgium, well, it is very remarkable that you can only study Japanology as it is said. So it teaches its richness and, well, as talking to Japanese people who are, well, trying to preserve the Japanese culture, they are quite afraid that the heritage of the Japanese culture is going to fade out, well, the traditional heritage. And they see nowadays the people abroad are interested in the Japanese culture and they are also the people who are going to preserve this heritage, and hopefully one day this heritage will come back to Japan. This is actually the case and the way they feel.

OK, now, very practically talking about my situation: what could cultural diplomacy mean for me? Should I ask for help to bring out culture to the large public? Should I ask this nationally or to the EU? Well, culture is a global thing. I think that it is really worth for it to be organized in a European way, with European diplomacy, but we have to find a closer contact between the European diplomacy, the Japanese diplomacy and then its participants as in our situation, so that we could really benefit from it and really bring this culture to the large public. This organization, this NPO is based on passion, and very often passion has been going away because of economic problems you encounter when organizing cultural events for the larger public. With the help of this diplomacy it should keep the passion alive in our country.
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“The EU Regional Policy – Economic Policy and Cultural Diplomacy”

A Lecture by Dr. Wolfgang Streitenberger, Senior Advisor, Directorate-General for Regional Policy and Urban Development, European Commission

Thank you very much. Good afternoon ladies and gentleman, thank you for the very warm welcome, I’m impressed about myself and that’s already a good start for this afternoon.

It’s not only an interesting conference because of its subject matter, it’s interesting and challenging for me because I intentionally wanted to check whether there are links between what I’m responsible for, EU regional policy, and the general topic of today, cultural diplomacy.

Usually I think that like me you would say what the heck is the connection between regional policy and cultural policy or cultural diplomacy, well this is exactly this that I wanted to tackle. I chose regional policy because it is an important policy, not only in political but also in monetary terms.

Around 35 percent of the annual budget of the European Union is devoted and spent for those subject matters, regional policy. The second block equally large, about 34-35 percent, is spent for agricultural diplomacy and rural development so we can say that this is an important European policy. I mean if I speak of 35 percent of the EU budget is in cash terms 330 billion euros for the next seven years and that’s about 147 billion a year.

What I have to say at the beginning as Mr Donfried has already indicated, I’m here as an official of the European commission, yes indeed, and I will try and explain to you regional policy which is my field of responsibility but I couldn’t find any documents or references to show what our bosses say on that, the commissioners, the council, the parliament, nothing.

So there is no official document I can refer to, never the less I want to speak from 20-25 minutes on it so I have to say that I am doing it on my private behalf I’ll express my private opinion. As there is no official opinion on it if some of my bosses said can you please prove what you have said I would say no, it’s my own ideas and my own speculations. But I have the feeling that I am not so far off from what other senior officials would think about the subject matter.

So I can give you the answer to the questions about links between regional policy and cultural policy right away, yes I think that there are aspects of our regional policy not all the regional policy but aspects of the regional policy that can be interpreted as cultural policy and cultural diplomacy. Some aspects of our regional policy request for its preparation and implementation a certain amount of cultural diplomacy, you do not want to just throw away on the heads of the states or the citizens.

But before I start to deal with this rather exotic topic I think that it would be helpful if I recall a little bit of what the EU regional policy is before I will dare to elaborate on how I came to the conclusion that it
is not only an economic policy but also a cultural and diplomatic policy. That the disparities of economic and social development of the European regions should be reduced was already written into the founding treaties in 1957 but it was only 1973 when the first oil shock brutally stopped the years of economic miracle, the boom years that the EU set up a budget for its regional policy, so 73. It’s interesting to note that this coincided with the enlargement of the UK, Ireland and Denmark in the same year. Some say that it even was caused by this enlargement particularly the deep economic transformation crisis in Britain in the 70’s when all the traditional industries broke down. In Britain the 70’s gave the regional policy a strong push in the course of the year several principles which still are valid have been developed for this policy.

First the EU regional policy subsidised financially concrete projects in a wide variety of fields of activities that contribute to the positive development of the region. Secondly the form of subsidy almost entirely is grants, a gift. Thirdly according to the principles conditionality the EU never completely finances a project, there always has to exist a national public or private co-financing tool. Fourth the selection of projects and its concrete implementation is done by the authorities of the member states. Not pass but they have to fulfil selection criteria policy priorities and rules for the implementation which are set up by us the European Commission and accepted by the member states. This way to realise our regional policy on the ground we call shared management. The fifth principle, the focus of spending from our structural funds the monetary endowment of our regional policy is on the less developed regions of the EU but projects contributing to certain regional disparities also in advanced regions can be funded, thus our regional policy is not a simple form of redistribution from the rich to the poor or a social policy, no it is an investment policy which is based on a solidarity.

Clearly the net payer countries receive less from the regional policy than what they pay for it and vice versa. For many years’ projects in the fields of infrastructure, roads, highways, railways, airports, ports, pipelines were predominant as a result of the EU enlargement think of the 80’s Spain and Portugal and the 2000’s in central and Eastern European countries where you had a huge gap compared to the level of development and infrastructure in the old member states. So naturally regional policy spending focus on helping them catch up with their infrastructures but projects in many other fields where and are still eligible too.

But before I go into that in more detail, let me hold on here a moment and draw your attention to some important aspects in relation to our conferences topic. The goal of our regional policy is the reduction of differences in the social economic development of our regions in that way it is an economic policy, but strengthening the weaker regions and helping them to catch up to the advanced regions is not the sole purpose. The ultimate goal is to increase the cohesion between Europe’s regions. Cohesion is a value in its own and therefore even the old wording of two treaties to the Lisbon treaty confirm our obligation to territorial cohesion.

In my understanding this is a value, and this is a cultural value if you allow me to use culture in its wider meaning and there seems to be a typical European cultural value. We find considerable differences of social economic development in other parts of the world too but they do not have anything similar to the regional policy to reduce them. Not because they would not be able to do so but because they do not want to do so they follow other values, take the United States of America, Russia, China, Brasil and India to name large territories without anything comparable with our regional policy. In many countries outside of Europe our regional policy therefore finds considerable interest and we are in dialogue with a number of them about our experiences and our philosophy which is behind this regional policy.
Another element of the philosophy behind our regional policy is the value of solidarity, all EU member states have agreed that for financing more projects in less developed regions then in already advanced ones we need the readiness of net payer countries to finance more than they themselves get out of this policy. What is behind it? It is solidarity, we can count on their understanding and acceptance of solidarity as a cultural value which is underlining this net payer position and justifying it to respective populations which are taxpayers and have to pay for it.

Another cultural value namely territorial cohesion of all people, regions and states of the EU sometimes I think that even behind this value of cohesion hidden another cultural value namely the idea of living in harmony and peace, lasting peace. Harmony and peace which could be heavily in danger, please imagine if the cohesion of the EU is weakened, if difference in social and economic development gets too large. It sounds probably strange to you that I have introduced the value harmony when living together as one of the ultimate goals of regional policy but please just think on the other big political entities like the United States.

There if a certain area the economic development falls back it is expected that people will leave from where they have lived and move to other places where they can work, where they can find work. Whether somebody has lived in this place for 25 or his family has been there for three generations is not regarded as relevant. Also of no relevance in the United States are the difficulties somebody faces when being forced to move from one corner of the United States to the opposite one. In Europe clearly we follow another approach which is not only respected but even enhanced by the regional policy, it is the respect of the fact that in Europe people are rooted in their regions, rooted to the cultural identity of their regions and they regard themselves as being members contributing to the regional identities they are coming from.

Let me now leave this field of philosophical considerations and once more provide private thoughts and go back to our concrete regional policy. I have mentioned that not so long ago it was focused on investments to improve the different infrastructures and thus increase cohesion but since some years regional development projects in a wide variety of activities can be funded if they are, and now I quote, ‘strengthening research and innovation, enhancing access to and use of ICT, fostering the competitiveness of SME’s, supporting a shift towards a low carbon economy, promoting climate change adaption, promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and discrimination, investing in training and education for skills, preserving and protecting the environment. Within this last mentioned priority there is a sub priority which is worded conserving, protecting, promoting and developing cultural and natural heritage.

This allows us to financially support projects of the classic cultural policy and diplomacy as for instance the renovation of historical buildings, the modernisation of construction of museums, theatres, libraries and the maintenance of archaeological sites, probably you have heard about our efforts to help the Italians to renovate the archaeological site of Pompeii and the renovation of historic city centres can also be supported within the so called urban dimension of our regional policy.

With these few examples I hope I could illustrate what we mean when we are ready to projects which protect or develop the cultural heritage. Naturally these frequently have had a very positive impact on the development of a regions tourism and anyway it will contribute to the cultural identity and the identity of all such regions.

Another point is that a certain amount of cultural diplomacy is needed to implement or regional policy efficiently and to have it implemented efficiently by our member states. You remember that we have left the implementation of regional policy to the member states administrations according to the principle of shared management.

What is needed to realise this, well first and above all adequate administrative structures, capacities and skills have to exist before anything else can be started and this frequently is not the case to a sufficient extent and in sufficient quality, especially in new member states problems in that regard and still can be found frequently as a result of the administrative structures comparable to the ones which exist in the old member states.

This is not the fault of one of the new member states it is the result of 50 years of communist dictatorships which eradicated western administrative traditions and adequate structures and as a consequence of that we had to and still do support the build-up and the improvement of institutional capacities of partner authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administrations.

This runs under the name of technical assistance our support measures in that regard request a lot of public diplomacy on both sides, from us and from the receivers from the countries concerned because what we do want to bring about is a cultural change, a change in administrative cultures which means at the end a change of behaviour and a change of minds of administrators, of people responsible for implementing regional development programs. Naturally a lot of our support money goes into investments of physical nature, administrative buildings but probably even more goes into consultancy of administrations, analysis and studies which are necessary, training of staff to obtain the necessary skills. To give some examples, technical assistance as part of our regional policy support measures and therefore in my eyes is based and connected to cultural diplomacy.

To come to the last part of our regional policy which at the same time is an economic policy and cultural diplomacy namely the European territorial cooperation, under this title we support financially the core operation between partners from different regions who want to implement a joint project which is positive for the development of these regions participating.

Why do we support such co-operations? Because we want to reduce regional disparities and to increase cohesion between regions, cohesion is a cultural value as I have mentioned before because we could state that co-operations doesn’t exist across borders, frequently we can state in Europe a certain tendency of self-isolation of regions, an inward looking tendency, each region wants to do it alone, like Frank Sinatra and do it my way. As a result we face the danger that the wheel will be reinvented in the same regions at the same time which are unaware of what each other are doing.

What is lacking obviously is the readiness and the ability to learn from each other’s best practises and results and even problems and under the European territorial co-operation it is our goal to increase this readiness and the ability to cooperate by realising joint development projects, by offering financial support we try and give an incentive to.

We can offer this form of support to three types of operation, first the cross border cooperation between partners coming from regions separated by a national border, in the last 7 years we have had 53 such cross border cooperation programs with examples found between France and Italy, Hungary and Romania, Denmark and Germany. The budget available was 5.6 billion euros, to compare to the overall policy not so much but 5.6 billion euros for such a specialized program is quite a good budget.

Secondly the transnational cooperation in 2007-2013 we had 13 such transnational programs with a budget of 1.8 billion euros this is cooperation between actors which are located in regions forming larger geographical areas but which are based on historic links and cultural identity like the Alpine area. There is
something in common between an Austrian and a gentleman from northern Italy and another from eastern France, the alpine identity, the Mediterranean space, the Atlantic coast area, and the south European space to name some of these 13 transnational programs.

The third form of cooperation of regions which we support is exchanging experience between regional and local bodies in different countries wherever in the EU they are located, we even support between a region in southern Portugal and Eastern Poland.

Naturally these three ways of cooperation between regions which form our European Territorial Cooperation will be continued in the current new programming period from 2014 to 2020. Also because it’s probably one of our most European programs, after all we support the coming closer of actors from different regions and different member states which in itself is furthering European integration. That people from both sides of a national border work together in order to strengthen cohesion between European people is a cultural value to and in that way European Territorial cooperation policies is not only and economic but cultural diplomacy too.

My closing remark because I do not want to waste time is that I indicate that you should not think I’ve forgotten that of macro regional strategies, that Europe and the European Union use promoting the cooperation of concrete projects dealing with common challenges, common to a certain macro region. What is a macro region? It is based on the historic cultural definition the members give themselves and I pick out one which is closest to me myself which is the Danube space. Macro regional strategy targets the geographic area by the river that is also heavily defined by cultural factors if I may remember if I remember that 10 of its 16 members states up until 1918 formed the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in that way you have a very strong cultural and political basis of something which is very new namely to support macro regional cooperation.

Ladies and Gentleman, with that I want to stop and I hope that my theories are not out of this world and that you can at least share these ideas that even a strong economic policy has hidden cultural elements.
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of that, the presence of Mexican culture in the region, not governents, not officials, not institutions, but the connection that exists between peoples and the mexican people is just absolutely remarkable and phenomenal. So it is in this sense that I use the term we are still profiting from cultural diplomacy.

Now if we move to the North, another very interesting phenomenon is occurring. One of the characteristics of Mexico apart from its size, we are a very large country from whatever angle you want to look at it, is that we are a country of multiple belongings, multiple personalities and not many countries in the world have these characterisitcs and I can only find one or two more. This is the fact that Mexico is a latin american country, in Latin America, of course, that is geographically set in North America, that has one of its sides facing the Atlantic, the other the Paciftic, that we are a developing country and in that sense you could say a very southern country. But we are in the North, and we have been a member of the OCDE for 20 years. So it is a country of multiple realities, multiple faces at the same time this has allowed us to develop and to operate in multiple areas, being always more or less in the center because we have genuine cultural affinities with the West, because Latin America is a western region, but we also have genuine cultural affinities with other regions in the world.

The North and the US.

The first interesting thing that you have to know is that we share a border with the United States of America, that is 3000 kilometers long. It’s a border that has 20 or 30 twin cities, the difference between the two sides of these cities is just the border but in fact they are the same city (Nogal is in Mexico, Nogal is in Arizona...) This border that has more than 1.5 million human border crossings per day, meaning over 400 million human border crossings occur per year both ways, not only mexicans jumping to the US, but people moving on both sides: tourism, business, food, dinners, friends, families that are living on both sides of the border. Furthermore, though not with any kind of negative connotation, but an observation of reality, that many southern parts of the US: California, Texas, Arizona, were Mexico one day, which means that they grew and developed under mexican culture.

So the first fascinating phenomena that I want to share with you on this is the fact that all of this region, the north part of Mexico, the border area, the southern part of US and its the border area, have over the years been developing a third culture, which is a border culture. Across the border they are closer to each other than to the other side or their own country, and that also teaches us so many lessons in terms of the strength and power of human contact and thats what we see: the real exchange of human culture.

Of course we can do a lot of things and I can tell you as an institution a lot about exchanges with every part of the world but these are phenomenally interesting cases of real culture not being exchanged, but being jointly developed, jointly created by societies that despite borders and despite institutions and laws are together and are developing their own way of life.

On the same case of North America, the US and Mexico, the other interesting phenomenon is that Mexico has a diaspora. We use the term diaspora, it is probably not the most appropriate because diaspora normally means that is dispersed, but in the case of Mexico, the diaspora is focused in the US. This diaspora is today more or less in the region of 32 or 33 million people, which means that 10% of the US is either mexican in origin or mexican american. The impact of this 32, 33 million people togethether, with some 50 million more from other spanish speaking countries, is that is has had, much to the dislike of Hunttingdon, a real effect and impact on US culture, though Mexican culture is the main influence. One good thing is that this obviously happens in California, or in Texas of course, but if you go to the very north of the US, everywhere nationwide you will see a massive filtering through of spanish and mexican culture.
What are we doing there, and I would stop this item of culture with these two comments.

We have, first of all, 51 consulates in the US plus a very interesting institution in Mexico that was built 20 years ago which is called “Institute for Mexicans Abroad”, in other words a diaspora institution.

Together with our 51 consulates and this diaspora institution we are trying to foster Mexican culture not only through traditional cultural activities which we do a lot nationwide and a lot worldwide but also, because of the nature of this phenomenon in North America very much addressed in Mexican themselves to foster there capacity to integrate but also to remain mexican or maintain their mexican background.

There is a fantastic case, a very interesting case of cultural work. Now let me go quickly to the second issue which has to do with these new challenges of diplomacy, and it comes to the case that fits well here because the use of culture as diplomacy reflects already the need of adaptation and the need to be far smarter in the way we conduct diplomacy.

One of the challenges that we are facing today, not only in diplomacy but in public and private life is that reality tends to change faster than mindsets, reality changes faster than institutions, reality changes faster than burocracies and laws etc.

In the past I think we were normally trying to cope with the pace of change but now change has drastically increased its speed. I was just reading an article written by an individual with a very different mindset from my own who used to be an ambassador in Washington who was talking similar issues who claimed: “only babys like change”. Other than babys no one likes to change.

And its true: institutions dont like to change, burocracies dont like to change, and diplomats like myself dont like to change. Because we all feel safe in the comfort of a static status quo and static realities but that is not the reality. We have these changes, because is very easy to say we are just changing fast but where, how and why are we changing?

The first change that we are facing is that unlike the 18th and 19th centuries, early 20th century diplomacy was first of all predictible and rational, it was a chess game, you could predict what the other was going to do.

Today the reality of the world has become the opposite, unpredictable with sweeping events in an instant that can change not only much of the political reality in a dramatic way but also destroy in seconds strategies and plans so we need a greater capacity to react, adapt and operate.

Another very interesting and very real change has to do with the actors doing diplomacy.

In the good old days, as some would say, diplomats were the soul or almost the soul players in international affairs. International affairs were completely monopolized by governments.

Now the space of control that is in the hands of governments and diplomats is shrinking rapidly. Why is it shrinking? well because there are many other actors that are seriously influencing global life. Whether you want to call them companies that have serious and legitime interests. So if you see some statistics you will find that at least 50 or 60 global companies have similar economic capacities to some countries. It really is very impressive and very real. Civil society, NGOs, that are representing different kinds of interests to make sure that life develops in certain way and they have a real capacity to influence that and to influence what countries can and cannot do.

Criminals, organized crime, terrorists, climate change, trade unions, mega-individuals as someone calls the extremely wealthy, extremely powerful individual people, that can influence decision making processes everywhere, globally; and I am not saying this in order to criticize this reality. All the control I think is a fascinating one I believe is completely legitimate that in this more global an more democratic world and more transparent world where governments are also more accountable as it should be there are many stakeholders legitimate interested in public policy making, international policy making and they have the means to do it, and its correct.

Now, what are the challenges posed because of that? Well there are very serious challenges. Meaning that we have to learn to do diplomacy in a plural way, and this notion of plurality or pluralism in diplomacy is still complex to grasp, because the change is complex and because mindedness takes far more time and the reality to move.

There is one third challenge or new phenomenon that is forcing us to adapt quickly which is technology. Normally we have this unpredictable factor that decreases the predictability of events, incredibly fast technology, incredible fast communication and more importantly it is absolutely impossible to hide information. Everything now happens in the open, real time, globally.

So, how do we cope with that as diplomats when we are so comfortable writing very elegant diplomat notes, notifying the host country what my government wishes to do, and waiting for a reply, or meeting comfortably in the corridors of the UN.

We still do that, is very important, but how can we cope with events that are just overtaking us everywhere? Well what we need to do is to be clear that diplomacy, foreign policy that is well-designed, strategic and well planned in Ministries of Foreign affairs remains paramount. Otherwise no one can act and we need to know what we want as countries, what is our place in the world, what are our global national and regional interests, and how are we going to represent them.

We need to know how are we going to use all this enorousse arrive of tools, incoming culture to trade or to represent our interests, we also need to understand something else by the way, which is that today unlike in the past, probably, foreign policy and diplomacy cannot longer be a zero zone game in which is either your interest or mine, is your interest versus mine.
And this cannot longer happens not because we are better people than we were before, not because we are more moral or more ethical than before, all that maybe implicit this, no. The reason is very simple, is that the so-called globalization and interdependence in the countries is very real which means that for us to build our own prosperity for us individual countries to solve all our own problems we need to have the others to do exactly the same.

I want to create prosperity for Mexico, we want to create prosperity for Mexico and we do understand that the only way that Mexico can create prosperity for itself is by creating prosperity for others as well. Is this moral? Is this because we are nice? We are, but we also understand that there is no other way. How are we going to create prosperity for us at the expense of others? Simply because it would not work we would fail in creating our own prosperity, and that very simple concept still needs to take a stronger hold in diplomatic mentality and in foreign policy mentality.

Once we have these very clear principles in our heads as policy makers, as diplomats, then we enter a fascinating case of flexibility and capacity to react. In more traditional diplomatic circles we were used to operating always after we received proper instructions: dont say this, dont say that, accept this, dont accept that... diplomatic cables go back... but today twitter is faster, events are known faster. So now we have to very seriously, very institutionality and systematically combine the policy making systems of our overarching foreign policy, with the flexibility and freedom to operate and react that diplomats acquire on the ground. Because I will have to react in 3 seconds, and you cannot call Mexico city to ask for instructions, when I see a note, or I mean the news or a tweet, or facebook or whatever, so all these challenges, or all these realities, are creating very interesting challenges for diplomacy. Its not very easy, it means that we need to learn to be truly innovative, to really learn to think out of the box so we all can tackle these complex realities and we can do it in a proper manner with our country’s interests in mind.

I think that we are obviously moving in the right direction. Obviously this adaptation is taking place but I insist as I began: no one likes change least of all institutions. Institutions were not built to change themselves, at least not easily.

So we all have to be incredibly smart in public life, in reading into the latest developments, in adapting to them, in understanding the nature of uncertainty, in understanding the nature of a more global democratic environment, with others stakeholders that have a legitimate right to be involved and to participate in public policy making who will make themselves heard.

So diplomacy today is not about governments talking to governments, diplomacy today is about governments to governments, but also governments talking to private sector and government to civil society, civil society to private sector, working together to try and achieve bigger global goals.

And one last comment: the European Union, because at the end we are in Brussels and I was supposed to say something about the European Union too.

One of the most complex interesting realities between Mexico and European Union. Mexico is one of the 12 strategic partners of the European Union, for obvious reasons, but one of the main reasons is, apart our size, our global reach, our capacity, our influence, etc. is precisely culture. And in this sense almost no other country in the world can be found to possess something similar, that has the level of affinity, cultural affinity with the European Union, and this cultural affinity beyond the cultural exchanges and things that we do, this real culture affinity, allows us to be far more effective together in facing all the challenges I have mentioned.

Well, thank you so much.
I will start my presentation with an admission: as a philosopher, the notion of cultural diplomacy was not familiar to me, but when I started to search for its meaning on the internet, I, of course, found the dictionary published by the ICD and read the definition. I directly understood that it came back in line with my research in political philosophy regarding the management of cultural diversity and the opposition between a model of diversity management built on the idea of state neutrality and a model of managing cultural diversity built around the idea of interculturalism.

So in particular, what struck me in the notion of cultural diplomacy is, if I take this definition: “all voluntary means by which countries promote their cultural and political values to the rest of the world.” It is the phrase “promotion of their cultural and political values” that interest me and I particularly insist on the word “promotion” and also on “their.” The idea of “promotion”, what does it mean? Most of my remarks will focus on a reflection on the meaning and the impact of promotion. Also, we say “values”, “cultural and political values” and how do we identify what these values are, values from who, in societies that are multicultural, that are diverse, it is likely that the political and cultural values that are going to be promoted in the rest of the world by, which will interest me, public authorities, are not everyone’s values: it will probably be the values of a majority or a set of inconsistent values. Posing the question of whether the concept of cultural diplomacy is likely to be discriminatory against cultural minorities and so I will develop this question one hand under the liberal requirement of State neutrality and other units within a republican framework built around the idea of interculturalism.

So I am starting with the first question, linked to the liberal framework of the issue of state neutrality: the conditions under which cultural diplomacy can be compatible with the requirement of the neutrality of the state, then I will focus more specifically on the issue of interculturalism from the white report of the Council of Europe on intercultural dialogue which will lead me to consider that cultural diplomacy can be redefined as the art of intercultural dialogue.

On the first point, I am dealing with the issue of cultural diplomacy by on one hand, a restriction with respect to the possible use of cultural diplomacy since I will focus only on the issue of cultural diplomacy adopted by the state and not by the private sector especially since the issue of neutrality is the question of the neutrality of the state arises; private agent do not have to be neutral so the question does not arise. The question of compatibility requirements to the liberal neutrality arise if there are, if we understand the idea of promoting with a stronger sense, and so, to build support for them. So there was the impression that it is immediately in contradiction with the idea of the neutrality of the state because the state has to be neutral so it does not have support the cause of a set of values, and less to impose its value to others. Finally, cultural diplomacy, could be presented as a euphemism for a form of cultural imperialism.

Then it would be too fast to make this conclusion, we are talking about cultural and political values in the definition. However, the question of the neutrality of the state arises only around cultural values. There is in political liberalism, which is the dominant thought in political philosophy, a basic distinction, a fundamental distinction, which is the distinction between the right and the good life that roughly speaking here is a distinction between the political values and cultural values.

The fair, the principles of justice, the values of justice we can say, are the values that define how to guarantee the coexistence of equal liberty of individuals and communities within the same political space. The good, it is more about cultures, conceptions of good life, the component values of the right way of living that can develop each of these individuals from resources that are guaranteed by the right.

To express this more metaphorically, and it may be dangerous to do that in this hour of the day, but a picture of the cake is actually the easiest way to distinguish the issue of fairness and questions of property. Well, a philosopher would find it a bit too caricatured, but I still think it helps to ask the question, the question of justice and the question of the division of the cake, the cake that is considered not only as an economic resource but also as a social and cultural one can have a broader understanding of the term “resource” but then, how to guarantee everyone has a fair share of these resources. There are full of theory of the just, it does not necessarily mean distribute the cake equally for everyone, maybe we will have to consider the needs of everyone, like me, who is tall, I would need a larger piece of cake than others, especially if it’s chocolate; also, it could be a question of merit: the person who made the cake would deserve a larger peace and therefore the question of what is just does not mean consensus or the idea of equality but means the sharing of resources among members of a political community.

The question of the good is rather about what everyone is going to do with the cake. Should we gracefully eat the cake or should some people sacrifice themselves for the benefit of someone who has more important needs.

To sum up, the question of the right is about how should be shared the resources, and the question of good, what to do of this share.

The distinction is clear enough conceptually, but it is much more difficult to put it into practice, to distinguish: when are we in the right or in the good?
However, the neutrality of the state is only required in relation to the good, in a liberal framework. If I take, for example, the issue of the headscarf, debated in most of western societies now: for some it is a matter of gender equality therefore the principle of justice to provide everyone equal rights and therefore it should be banned, while others on the contrary believes that all forms of prohibition are a judgment on other types of cultural values, a different way of living and a different interpretation of gender equality.

We see here that the factual judgment on controversial issues, such as the headscarf, is problematic to see the distinction. Knowing if it is an issue of the fair or the good is one of the main issues underlying such political debates and thus the first aspect of the controversy. Cultural diplomacy is problematic in a liberal framework if it is a promotion in the sense of adhesion or if the content of values is not only political but also cultural values.

The second part of my speech relates rather to the question of reconsideration of this neutrality is that despite everything must be limited to the fact that cultural diplomacy would be problematic if it relates to cultural values or fate be part of the Liberal and then cannot we think more positively cultural diplomacy.

Going away from this liberal framework in a manner similar to the Council of Europe when it promotes a model of diversity management not just on the neutrality of the state but also the establishment of an intercultural dialogue. In doing so, it seeks to avoid two pitfalls: the first one, communitarian that requires the assimilation of cultural minorities in the dominant model. The second one, the ghettosization of the society in a multiplicity of community without construction, without seeking to define common values.

I will now focus on the main definition founded in the White Book about intercultural dialogue

First, a definition as an open exchange of views based on mutual understanding between individuals and groups who have different backgrounds and ethnicities, cultures, languages, religions. In the centre of this definition is the idea of mutual understanding. We could even say after reading this definition that cultural diplomacy could be presented as a condition for successful intercultural dialogue. The feasibility of this open exchange of views implies that the various participants in intercultural dialogue have an attitude of cultural diplomacy, at least in an intuitive understanding of what cultural diplomacy is as the ability to behave knowing how these behaviours will be received by others.

How I would naively defined cultural diplomacy in a first intention would have been by the ability to consider how our behaviour is received by the other and thus the goal of integrating the framework cultural side and anticipate how our behaviour is expected.

It is not a question of promoting values: if we are in the question of the promotion of values, we are going beyond the simple question of mutual understanding for having an intercultural dialogue that seems to have a cultural purpose, more ambitious than the mutual understanding but the agreement on common values. If these people in this intercultural dialogue try to promote something, it means that they try persuade. So either they seek to impose rhetoric etc. If I have a more positive vision that is the underlying principle of intercultural dialogue at stake is not simply understanding, the issue is the agreement on common values.

From this definition, which seems more open, of the intercultural dialogue and richer than the first one that was given, then we will clearly go beyond the simple question of understanding dialogue, each term deserves to be commented and according to me intercultural dialogue seems to be based on three prerequisites: respect for individual dignity, common humanity and a common destiny. These three prerequisites seem to be coherent but also to avoid obstacle.

By emphasizing individual dignity it aims to focus on the idea of the individual in relation to a more communitarian position that would insist on the community, which would subject the individual to the community and there will be a compliance due to the individual, due to its differences therefore also its culture to its own values when they are in tension with those of the community.

This individual dignity, the respect for the individual should not lead to a radical relativism where the values are specific to each individual without a possible discussion on these values. No, the individual belongs to a common humanity and from the moment it belongs to a common humanity there is room for reflection on values that are common to this humanity.

What establishes the need for this intercultural dialogue to the agreement on shared values is the fact that we exist within the same world and this implies, consider the crisis economic or global warming, this implies a common destiny. The management of this common humanity implies that individual dignity is somewhere transcended in the definition of a common project.

But a common project is another term that seems to me particularly important in the definition: the intercultural dialogue is open to the future. We will try to build an identity that is defined by a proposed project in the future, which we oppose another conception of identity that is a legacy of a historical dimension, traditional identity that would be that we come from the past: identities are defined by intercultural dialogue.

This identity that we try to build through intercultural dialogue has to be respectful of the common legacy. The, collective appears in the French definition but not in the English one, and it seems to me significant, that is why I will stay on the French version.

Cette identité que l’on cherche à construire à travers le dialogue interculturel doit être respectueuse de notre patrimoine commun. Alors le « notre » apparaît dans la définition française mais il n’apparaîtrait pas dans la définition anglaise qui a été donné, ça me paraît être significatif. Je vais rester sur le texte français parce que le « notre » me parait important à souligner.

In the English definition, it is not telling us to whom this common heritage and in the French, it is written as « our » so it is a manner to ask a more precise question: who is “us”? I think it is important to speak about an “us” because the point is to have an identity that emerges from intercultural dialogue, with values that are shared by everyone. It must accept shared cultures in order to allow for further enrichment, but it means that we should be ready to change.

For that to be possible, there is one element that is for me necessary: it must have a narration. We can think about evolution and changes, but this evolution has to be coherent with the past, for me to explain what were our values and why now they have changed.

If this transition is perceived as a destruction of my values from the past, it will be really difficult for the people to change their values. It implies that we should take care of the minorities and give them importance, but also, and we often forget that, we should take care as well of the majority that is destabilised by this intercultural dialogue. Indeed, the society they were living in was built on common traditions, values and the resistance of the minorities (without being negative) changed that.

If we are not capable of recognizing the destabilization of the majority and the discrimination of minorities we will have resistance and tensions. I think, for instance, of the issue of same sex marriage in France that has generated an understandable feeling in the majority which saw its world changing. The respect for the
The respect for cultural diversity is a subset of intercultural dialogue and its aim to have an agreement on shared values, this agreement says something about the direction in which we are going but we would never reach. We will be in a system of partially shared values and the “our” will never fully be “our”.

Thus, the cultural diversity stays at the end of the dialogue: there is no end to it. We are all the time, in this dialogue, in this process of evolving our values that we could consider as dominants values of a political community that will be always crossed by minorities that will contest this shared values and so, activate the intercultural dialogue.

The intercultural dialogue does not end the duality between the majority and the minority, the sign of success is when they are moving together. The traditional majority is, to some extent, open to the minority and the one who was before in this minority are now part of the majority. For instance, the Italian immigration to Belgium 50 years ago: the Italians were see as the minority in a country that did not recognize itself as having a relationship with the Italian culture.

Today, the Italian culture is part of our daily life, for instance with the food, the pastas, but also in politics: our first minister, Elio Di Rupo is from this Italian immigration and no one thinks about the fact that he is from a minority that is now part of the majority: that shows the fact that the majority is open to the minority.

This intercultural dialogue allows us to put back into perspective cultural diplomacy, and particularly what it means for a State to make use of cultural diplomacy. I believe that the State has a triple mission when it comes to cultural diplomacy:

- to make possible an intercultural dialogue inside the political community.
- to reflect at public forums about the values that partially emanate from intercultural dialogue and that are still partially contested.
- regarding the participation of the State in an intercultural dialogue, not anymore at the political community level but at a global scale, engaging with other States, NGOs, multinational companies, etc.

While the State participates in a global intercultural dialogue, it will reflect a certain type of values, and “the values” that it wants to promote must be the values that originate from the intercultural dialogue that has developed at the political community. I finish with an example of a controversy, originating from a Canadian debate, from Quebec to be precise, which is a place where scholars have strongly reflected about the opposition between a multicultural model of societal diversity and an intercultural model. This example I’m talking about is the presence or the absence of a big cross at the heart of the public park of Montreal, Mont Royal Park, and the controversies are clear: is it legitimate to have in a public park a cross, which is a sign of a particular heritage, the catholic heritage of Quebec Society, but which is extremely contested within this society, not only because the new cultural minorities originated due to immigration don’t see themselves reflected by this cross, but also because even the French society of Quebec has strongly opposed and secularised the catholic church. I am, however, going to quote two of the main Quebec philosophers, Joslain Maclure and Charles Taylor, that defend the maintenance of this cross at the Mont Royal park on the basis of a double agreement, something that I think pictures very well which we have pointed out in our analysis of the intercultural dialogue.

The second element on which they insist is that even when there is an authority that still holds a symbol with a religious connotation, this does not mean it is imposing it on the cultural minorities, it does not mean to impose a certain number of values about live, a conception of “good” onto the others.

This absence of imposition, which links us to the idea of soft power, which is usually related to cultural diplomacy and which has been mentioned on the previous interventions, is particularly important from my perspective. However, in order to put it back into the work frame of intercultural dialogue it is necessary to expand on it, because behind the issue of the absence of imposition it is necessary to take into account the affability, understanding by affability the fact that in an intercultural dialogue it is essential that the participants that try to promote their values are aware that they might be wrong, they might be wrong about which are the values that are really intrinsic of “good”. This condition is absolutely necessary in an intercultural dialogue because if the intercultural dialogue is not seen as a form of negotiation of a balance of power, but as deliberation, it is necessary for the participants of this intercultural dialogue to be into a situation where they are obliged to have something to learn from each other: I have the possibility of being enriched by the culture of the other because I don’t have the absolute truth. However, this is not a relativistic position where all the values are valuable and where there is no truth. Intercultural dialogue seeks the truth about the values that would constitute the good life and whether they say that something exists or not is not that important: the important thing is that we seek to go beyond our differences in...
Thank you very much.

To make tangible use of intercultural diplomacy in the relations between countries, it is necessary to balance the idealism of a philosophical idea with the realism of a description of intercultural rapport, and of the deliberation. That is the ideal model, of course, and I don’t doubt that the political sciences could oppose something that is also essential is that the intercultural dialogue must be understood as a deliberation and that, and I will finish here, this is where the idea of promoting cultural and political values comes from.

Something that is also essential is that the intercultural dialogue must also be understood as a deliberation and that, and I will finish here, this is where the idea of promoting cultural and political values comes from. This promotion must not be a promotion by which we seek to impose under the guise of balance of power or by the strength of conviction, by any other means you would like to think. What we do, however, is to seek to find understanding based on an argumentative justification about which of the values of our culture are the core values of the good life. We must therefore practice an exercise of collective intelligence, of deliberation. That is the ideal model, of course, and I don’t doubt that the political sciences could oppose the idealism of a philosophical idea with the realism of a description of intercultural rapport, and of the effective use of intercultural diplomacy in the relations between countries.

Thank you very much.
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“Competition Policy and Cultural Identities”

Prof. Dr. Jacques Steenbergen, President, Belgian Competition Authority

You will not be surprised to hear from me that competition policy contributes to “the sustainable development of Europe based on balanced economic growth and price stability, a highly competitive social market economy, aiming at full employment and social progress, and a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment”. But when you listen e.g. to publishers asking for a fixed price for books, and more generally to many who see globalisation as the all invading threat to our cultural identities that is given free play by the enforcement of the rules of competition, you may well be inclined to think that competition and cultural policies are at opposite ends of the governance spectrum.

Given the fact that the EU tends to see competition law as the ‘default’ regulation of markets in the EU, the issue of its acceptance if not legitimacy is at least as important to competition authorities as to stakeholders in the cultural sectors.

In view of the present climate and time constraints I will focus on the question whether competition policy constitutes a threat to the cultural identities or a facilitator for cultural exchange in the Union, without entering into the discussion whether there is or should be a European cultural identity. I will also look at the issues primarily from the perspective of the enforcement of the rules of competition applicable to undertakings (prohibition of cartels and abuse of dominance and merger control) and not on the rules for state aid.

The risks of globalisation

I can ensure you that a competition authority is not blind for the threats of a globalisation in which people risk to lose their bearings along with their cultural identity. While globalisation initially facilitated the acceptance of European integration, globalisation has increasingly turned into a challenge to the EU institutions and their political legitimacy.

The pressure of imports and the risk of dislocation is now genuinely global. And enlargement of the Union has not only opened welcome new markets, it has also fuelled intra-European relocation. Enlargement has thus increased the tendency to see the European institutions and the opening of markets as one of the driving forces of globalisation, rather than as a European response.

All who are more easily impressed by threats than motivated by opportunities can therefore be expected to see the European construction as a cause of their problems and not as a solution. They usually tend to have more vocal advocates than the optimists. And the fact that studies generally confirm that globalisation indeed increases tendencies towards inequality, is not easy to make them change their mind.
Loss of employment is the most visible damage caused by globalisation. Other types of damage caused by globalisation can be even more significant than the loss of employment itself. The confrontation with successive rationalisation and restructuring schemes in enterprises, repeated changes in management and management objectives, the fear for the unknown in multicultural societies, all make that people lose their benchmarks. And when people lose the confidence that problems can be solved by rational interaction in existing frameworks, they risk losing their ability to respond constructively to challenges, and to cope with change as well as loss.

Reactions in the recent economic crisis illustrate that concerns about the reactions against globalisation are not only shared by competition authorities as general concerns of today’s societies, but that they realise that a loss of confidence in markets and the ability to regulate them jeopardises their own place and role even in the more market oriented societies.

Autarky is no alternative
But whatever the risks of globalisation, we should not forget that great cultures were seldom great because they were closed to others, and that closed economies invariably imposed hardship on their citizens4.

Competition policy as part of the response5
Although one can discuss assessment methods and figures, an active enforcement of competition policy contributes to the sustainable development of economies6 and may thus help to offset whatever negative consequences of globalisation. When discussing the financial crisis, the OECD Competition Committee stressed more specifically with references to the experiences of Japan and Korea as well as to an impact study of the US “New Deal” policies in the thirties, that recoveries from past financial crises were delayed when competition enforcement was relaxed. The impact study indicated that policies that reduced competition resulted in a reduction of investments and consumption by approximately 15% relative to competitive levels.7

Competition policy is moreover in the EU not developed in a vacuum as a self-sufficient goal. It is related to a more comprehensive set of socio-economic objectives. Article 9 TFEU states that “in defining and implementing its policies and activities” (i.e. including its competition policy) “the Union shall take into account requirements linked to the promotion of a high level of employment, the guarantee of adequate social protection, the fight against social exclusion, and a high level of education, training and protection of human health”. This provision is not new. It was introduced by the Treaty of Amsterdam as article 127 (2) EC8 and should be read together with the above mentioned article 3 (3) TEU and protocol nr 27 on the internal market and competition.9

The challenges of globalisation to government v. market forces
It is in the first place important to see the pressures of global markets in their proper perspective. I think, it is correct to assume that a society cannot disregard the competitiveness of its industries without risking not only a drain of brains, entrepreneurial ability and capital, but also the ability to fund its welfare and cultural policies. But given policies (and therefore state action) fostering or at least allowing for a reasonable degree of competitiveness, it is up to the governments (and therefore not necessarily to market forces) to decide which services and policies will be funded by taxpayers via the public budget, and which left to private initiative. Government cannot escape from this responsibility by hiding behind globalisation as if it were a headless monster.

And for the same reasons, the discussions on the impact of recent EU policies with regard to Greece, Ireland and Portugal not only illustrate that there are limits to the divergences a monetary union can absorb (and globalisation implies no obligation to be part of a monetary union). They should also not make us forget that the Euro zone unites societies as different as e.g. Finland and France or Estonia and Germany. All are subject to external pressures, but if there is a serious threat to their cultural identity its source is far more likely to be internal demographic change than external market pressures.

The assessment of the impact of globalisation is complicated by the fact that it is difficult to know to what extent the ‘foreign influences’ allegedly threatening cultural identities are ‘imposed’ on our societies, and to what extent they respond to genuine customer and citizen demands. Even though parts of society may object, members (often younger members) may well genuinely want a cultural identity to evolve and that wish may by itself be a non-insignificant component of such identity.

If foreign films, music, books and other products are preferred because they are better, it is up to a society to improve the quality of its own offerings. There is, at least in Europe a broad consensus that government should be allowed to support its cultural sector – but not by closing off their market. If they are preferred because they are foreign, a society is facing much more confronting issues. But I believe that it is in that case not the role of competition authorities to shelter societies from such issues.

By this I admittedly start from the assumption that markets are open unless you close them, and not the other way round. But even regardless of the legal environment resulting from the applicability of EU and WTO law (of which the acceptance by stakeholders cannot or no longer be taken for granted), this assumption seems to me to be realistic at a time of internet and social networks.

A competition culture and cultural identity
Competition authorities also realise that they deal in infringement cases with the pathology of market behaviour. Just like the opening of markets does not guarantee that markets will develop, the absence of infringements does not mean that markets are competitive. Competition can only deliver what competition authorities promise stakeholders when market actors have a competition culture driving their market behaviour. In this contribution we must therefore see how the development of this culture, which needs to be at least EU wide, impacts on cultural identities.10

Frankly, I cannot see that price fixing between companies, output restrictions and market partitioning agreements are anywhere in the Union a key element of the local cultural identity.

If this impression is correct, it illustrates that societies can change significantly without people questioning whether this affected their cultural identity.10 Several European societies, and among them the cities of Italy and the Low Countries that were the first to develop financial and commodity markets and were among the main 5 centres of growth in the Middle Ages, did so in the framework of corporatist systems that might now be qualified as bundles of single and continued infringements.11 These corporations were abolished during the French Revolution by the Décret d’Allarde which remained applicable in Belgium till the entry into force of the new Code of Economic Law provisions in December 2012. And although they were not reinstated after the Vienna Treaty, corporatist tendencies remained a recurrent characteristic as shown by developments as diverse as the developments in the thirties and the way the welfare state was organised in these regions since WWII.
Conclusion
The role and perceived role of competition authorities in the interplay between market forces and policy driven developments is inevitably ambiguous. By supporting an open market, they facilitate cultural as well as other exchanges, while they are not the blind bulldozers they are sometimes thought to be. Competition law is moreover a governance tool designed by government, not imposed by market forces. In some cases competition authorities limit the exercise of market power, in other cases they ensure that market forces get a fair chance, but always by the exercise of a public mandate.
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“Europe As - in the First Place - a Cultural Project through its Citizens”
A Lecture by Prof. Dr. Frans de Ruiter, Director Academy of Creative and Performing Arts, Leiden University

( Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

Je vais commencer ma présentation par un aveu, en tant que philosophe la notion de diplomatie culturelle ne m’était pas familière, mais par contre, dès que j’ai commencé à rechercher la définition sur internet, je suis tombé bien entendu sur le dictionnaire développé par l’institut, que j’ai regardé la définition donnée, j’ai tout de suite compris que ça rentrait tout à fait en phase avec mes centres de recherches en philosophie politique qui concerne la gestion de la diversité culturelle et l’opposition entre un model de gestion de la diversité construite sur l’idée de la neutralité de l’État et un model de gestion de la diversité culturelle construite autour de l’idée d’inter-culturalité.

Alors en particulier ce qui m’a frappé dans la notion de la diplomatie culturelle c’est, « ensemble des moyens non contraints par lesquels des pays font la promotion de leurs valeurs culturelles et politiques dans le reste du monde ». C’est les mots « promotions de leurs valeurs culturelles et politiques » qui m’intéressent particulièrement et j’insisterai encore plus sur deux mots « promotion » et par ailleurs sur « leurs » parce que donc dans l’idée de promotion, il y a l’idée de qué est ce que cela peut signifier ?

L’essentiel de ma réflexion portera sur que signifie cet impact de promotion et d’autres parts on dit « leurs valeurs », « leurs valeurs culturelles et politiques » et donc comment est-ce que l’on identifie quelles sont leurs valeurs, les valeurs de qui, dans des sociétés qui sont multiculturelles qui sont diverses, il est fort à parier que les valeurs culturelles et politiques qui seront promues dans le reste du monde par, ce qui va m’intéresser moi, des autorités publiques, ne soient pas les valeurs de tout le monde. Ce sera sans doute les valeurs d’une majorité ou alors un set de valeurs incohérent. Se pose du coup la question de savoir si la notion de diplomatie culturelle ne risque pas d’être discriminatoire envers les minorités culturelles et donc et je vais développer cette interaction d’une part dans le cadre de l’exigence libéral de neutralité de l’État et d’autres parts dans un cadre plus républicain construit autour de l’idée d’inter-culturalité.

Donc je commence par la première question, liée au cadre plutôt libéral de la neutralité de l’État : dans quelles conditions la diplomatie culturelle peut être compatible avec cette exigence de la neutralité de l’État, puis je m’intéresserai plus spécifiquement à la question de l’inter-culturalité à partir du livre blanc du Conseil de l’Europe sur le dialogue interculturel ce qui m’amènera à considérer que la diplomatie culturelle peut être redéfinie comme étant finalement l’art de l’utilisation du dialogue interculturel.

Sur le premier point, j’aborde la question de la diplomatie culturelle en faisant d’une part une restriction par rapport à l’usage possible de la diplomatie culturelle puisque je vais m’intéresser uniquement à la question de la diplomatie culturelle organisée par l’État et pas par le secteur privé en particulier puisque la question de la neutralité c’est la question de la neutralité de l’État qui se pose ; un agent privé n’a
La distinction est assez claire conceptuellement mais elle est beaucoup plus difficile à distinguer quand est-ce que l'on est dans l'ordre du juste que quand est-ce que l'on est dans l'ordre du bien, ou la neutralité de l'État et exigée uniquement dans le cadre du bien par la philosophie libérale. Si je prends par exemple la question du port du foulard qui fait débat dans la plupart des sociétés occidentales actuellement. Pour d'aucun, c'est la question d'égalité hommes-femmes, du principe de justice, d'assurer à chacun des droits égaux et donc il faudrait l'interdire tandis que d'autres au contraire considèrent que toute forme d'interdiction est un jugement sur des types de valeurs culturelles, des manières différentes de vivre cette égalité hommes-femmes, et donc là on voit que le jugement fait sur des questions aussi controversées que le port du foulard, finalement la distinction est problématique en elle-même ; en tout cas, savoir si c'est un enjeu qui relève du juste ou du bien est un des débats sous-jacents aux enjeux politiques.

Premier aspect de la question, la diplomatie culturelle n'est problématique dans un cadre libéral que s'il s'agit d'une promotion au sens d'adhésion et que si le contenu des valeurs n'est pas seulement des valeurs politiques mais aussi des valeurs culturelles. La deuxième partie de mon intervention porte plutôt sur la remise en cause de cette neutralité : est-ce que malgré tout on doit se limiter au constat que la diplomatie culturelle ne serait problématique que si elle porte sur des valeurs culturelles ou bien, sort-on du cadre libéral et ne pouvons-nous pas alors penser de manière plus positive la diplomatie culturelle. Sortir de ce cadre libéral c'est justement ce que tente de faire le conseil de l'Europe lorsqu'il promeut comme modèle de gestion de la diversité non pas la simple neutralité de l'État mais la mise en place d'un dialogue interculturel. Ce faisant, il entend éviter un double écueil : l'écueil communautariste d'exigence d'assimilation des minorités culturelles au modèle dominant mais d'autre part l'écueil d'une ghettoïsation de la société en une multiplicité de communauté sans construction, sans recherche de définition d'un projet commun et de valeurs communes. Alors ça paraît me sembler-lui lorsque l'on analyse de plus près ce livre blanc et je vais me limiter à porter cette analyse sur les principales définitions trouvées de ce dialogue interculturel dans le livre blanc.

Premièrement, une définition comme un échange de vues ou ouvert et respectueux et basé sur la compréhension mutuelle entre des individus d'un groupe ayant des origines, patrimoine ethnique, culturel, religieux et linguistique différent. Là, au centre de cette définition, on trouve l'idée de compréhension mutuelle. On pourrait même dire, à la lecture de ce dialogue interculturel, que la diplomatie culturelle pourrait être présentée comme une des conditions de la réussite du dialogue interculturel. Cette possibilité de réaliser cet échange de vues ouvert implique que les différents participants au dialogue interculturel aient une attitude de diplomatie culturelle au moins dans une compréhension intuitive de ce qu'est la diplomatie culturelle comme étant la capacité de prendre en compte dans un comportement la manière dont ces comportements seront reçus par les autres. La manière dont moi j'aurai naivelement défini la diplomatie culturelle n'aurait pas été dans une première attention avec cette capacité de prendre en compte la manière dont nos comportements sont reçus par les autres et de parvenir à intégrer le cadre culturel de l'autre et anticiper la manière dont nos comportements seront anticipés.

Si l'on en est là, on en est pas à la question de la promotion des valeurs : si on est dans la question de promotion des valeurs, on dépasse le cadre de la compréhension mutuelle pour avoir un dialogue interculturel qui semble avoir une finalité plus ambitieuse que la simple compréhension mutuelle mais l'entente sur des valeurs communes. Si les intervenants dans ce dialogue interculturel cherchent à promouvoir, ils cherchent à convaincre, et donc soit ils cherchent à imposer, soit ils cherchent à s'entendre sur des valeurs communes. De cette définition, qui me paraît bien plus large, du dialogue interculturel, qui est plus riche que la première qui a été donnée puisque là on va clairement dépasser la simple question de la compréhension mutuelle. En m'étant en évidence que le dialogue interculturel semble reposer sur trois préalables : le
respect de la dignité individuelle, d’unehumanité commune et d’un destin commun. Ces trois préalables semblent former un ensemble assez cohérent mais faire signe chaque fois à des volontés d’éviter des écueils différents: en insistant sur la dignité individuelle il s’agit bien de mettre au cœur l’idée d’individu par rapport à une position plus communautaria qui insisterait d’abord sur la communauté, qui soumettrait l’individu à la communauté, il va y avoir un respect dus à l’individu, à ses différences et aussi à sa culture et ses valeurs propres lorsqu’elles sont en tension avec celles de la communauté. Ce respect dus à l’individu ne doit pas conduire à un relativisme radical ou des valeurs seraient propres à chaque individu sans qu’il puisse y avoir de discussions sur ses valeurs puisque ce serait les goûts et les couleurs qui ne se discuteraient pas. L’individu appartient à unehumanité commune et à partir du moment où il appartient à unehumanité commune il y a place pour une réflexion sur des valeurs qui seraient communes à cettehumanité. Et ce qui fonde cette nécessité d’avoir se dialogue interculturel en vue de l’entente sur des valeurs partagées c’est le fait que nous coexistan au sein d’un même monde avec les enjeux que cela implique, comme la crise économique ou le réchauffement climatique, cela implique un destin commun. La gestion de cette même humanité implique que la dignité individuelle soit quelque part transcendée la définition d’un projet commun.

Projet commun est un autre terme qui me paraît particulièrement important : dans la définition, le dialogue interculturel est ouvert sur l’avenir. On va chercher à construire une identité qui soit une identité qui se définit par le projet qui sera projeté dans l’avenir, ce qui nous oppose à une autre conception de l’identité qui serait une identité héritée de la dimension historique, une identité traditionnelle une identité qui serait celle qui nous proviendrait d’un passé. Non, l’identité européenne par exemple pour ce qui concerne le livre blanc sur le dialogue interculturel : l’identité se définit par le résultat du dialogue interculturel entre des personnes qui cherchent à définir des valeurs partagées qui seraient constitutives de se projet commun.

Cette identité que l’on cherche à construire dans le cadre du dialogue interculturel, elle doit, on rappelle trois notion de respect, renvoie quelque part au projet mais avec un déploiement de termes qui paraît être assez significatif construire une identité qui soit respectueuse de notre patrimoine commun. Le notre apparait dans la définition française mais il n’apparaissait pas dans la définition anglaise, ça me paraît être significatif. Je vais rester sur le texte français parce que ce notre me paraît important à souligner. Dans la définition anglaise, je ne sais pas à qui se patrimoine est commun, si on dit « notre », qui est une manière significatif. Je vais rester sur le texte français parce que ce notre me paraît important à souligner. Dans la définition, le dialogue interculturel vise l’entente sur des valeurs partagées, cette entente reste un horizon, quelque chose vers lequel on tend, mais que l’on n’atteindra jamais. On va se retrouver systématiquement dans un facteur de résistance. Si l’on est pas capable de rendre compte et d’avoir un discours qui permet de reconnaître le fait de la déstabilisation qui est quelque part une forme de symétrie à la discrimination que subissent les minorités on risque plutôt de créer des phénomènes réactionnaires, des phénomènes de tensions, des phénomènes de rejets. Je pense par exemple à la controverse en France générée par le mariage pour tous, c’est particulièrement illustratif de l’incompréhension d’une majorité qui voit son monde s’effondrer. Je dis pas que ce n’est pas une bonne chose que son monde s’effondre mais que si on veut parvenir à penser une évolution de ces valeurs ou pas que si on prend en compte le caractère déstabilisant pour la majorité de ce type de changement et que l’on fait preuve de quelque chose qui ressemble quand même à une diplomatie culturelle à l’égard de la majorité. Le respect pour le patrimoine commun c’est aussi le respect pour le fait qu’il y a eu une identité qui vient de l’histoire et qui ne doit pas être l’identité de demain et il faut parvenir à penser cette unité narrative qui fait le lien entre comment faire en sorte que la majorité puisse accrocher l’identité que l’on construit aujourd’hui à son passé.

La définition termine d’ailleurs, je le reprends deux secondes, si on poursuit la phrase, le respect dus à la diversité culturelle à l’égard de la majorité. Le respect de la diversité culturelle semble rappeler que si le dialogue interculturel vise l’entente sur des valeurs partagées, cette entente reste un horizon, quelque chose vers lequel on tend, mais que l’on n’atteindra jamais. On va se retrouver systématiquement dans une forme de valeur partiellement partagée par le « notre » de nos valeurs ne serait toujours que le respect dus aux minorités discriminées mais aussi à quelque chose que l’on oublie, c’est la reconnaissance qui est dus au fait que les majorités sont déstabilisées par ce dialogue interculturel. Elles sont déstabilisées par le fait qu'elles vivaient dans des sociétés qui étaient construites sur un ensemble de certitudes, une tradition, des valeurs très claires, et elles ont été déstabilisées, sans que cela soit négatif, ce qui a créé un facteur de résistance. Si l'on est pas capable de rendre compte et d'avoir un discours qui permet de reconnaître le fait de la déstabilisation qui est quelque part une forme de symétrie à la discrimination que subissent les minorités on risque plutôt de créer des phénomènes réactionnaires, des phénomènes de tensions, des phénomènes de rejets. Je pense par exemple à la controverse en France générée par le mariage pour tous, c’est particulièrement illustratif de l’incompréhension d’une majorité qui voit son monde s’effondrer. Je dis pas que ce n’est pas une bonne chose que son monde s’effondre mais que si on veut parvenir à penser une évolution de ces valeurs ou pas que si on prend en compte le caractère déstabilisant pour la majorité de ce type de changement et que l’on fait preuve de quelque chose qui ressemble quand même à une diplomatie culturelle à l’égard de la majorité. Le respect pour le patrimoine commun c’est aussi le respect pour le fait qu’il y a eu une identité qui vient de l’histoire et qui ne doit pas être l’identité de demain et il faut parvenir à penser cette unité narrative qui fait le lien entre comment faire en sorte que la majorité puisse accrocher l’identité que l’on construit aujourd’hui à son passé.
pourrait considérer comme les valeurs majoritaires de l’identité d’une communauté politique mais cette communauté politique sera toujours traversée par des minorités qui vont continuer à partager ces valeurs partagées et ainsi relancer continuellement le dialogue mais si cette diversité culturelle persiste, le respect de la dignité individuelle, on fait bien de le rappeler, puisqu’il était là en préalable, il est là au cours et au terme de ce dialogue. En fait, le dialogue interculturel ne met pas fin à une forme de dualité majorité / minorité, il y a toujours une dualité majorité / minorité, mais le signe empirique d’une réussite du dialogue interculturel seraient que les minorités et majorités bougent, évoluent au sein de la société, que la majorité traditionnelle se je peux le dire ainsi, soit poreuse aux abords des minorités culturelles et que ceux qui hier étaient représentants des minorités s’identifie aujourd’hui à un élément essentiel de la majorité. Je pense par exemple au résultat de l’immigration italienne en Belgique ; il y a 50 ans était vu comme une minorité italienne au sein d’un pays qui ne se reconnaissait pas dans l’apport de la culture italienne ; aujourd’hui, ça fait pratiquement parti de notre mode de vie à la fois sur le plan alimentaire si je prends de l’anecdotique, l’usage commun des pâtes dans notre culture comme sur le plan de qui est notre premier ministre, Elio di Rupo, c’est un nom qui est issu de l’immigration italienne et personne ne se dit que c’est quelqu’un qui est oui issu de l’immigration mais d’une immigration lointaine, c’est vu comme quelqu’un qui appartient à la majorité à part entière. Cela reflète la porosité, mais aussi la dualité majorité / minorité qui persiste et est indispensable.

Ce détour par le dialogue interculturel permet de remettre en perspective la diplomatie culturelle et spécifiquement ce que signifie faire preuve de diplomatie culturelle pour un État. L’État à une triple mission en terme de diplomatie culturelle me semble-t-il :

- rendre possible le dialogue interculturel au sein de la communauté politique
- refléter dans ces dispositifs publics les valeurs qui sont toujours partiellement issues du dialogue interculturel et toujours partiellement contestées également
- en tant qu’État il participe au dialogue interculturel, non plus à l’échelle de la communauté politique mais à l’échelle globale face à d’autres États, face à des ONG, des multinationales etc

Lorsqu’il participe au dialogue interculturel global, là aussi il va refléter un certain type de valeurs et le « leurs valeurs » qu’il entend promouvoir ça doit être les valeurs qui sont issues du dialogue interculturel et non plus à l’échelle globale face à d’autres États, face à des ONG, des multinationales etc

Premièrement, il n’y aurait pas de problème de discrimination envers les minorités parce que cette croix serait présente comme un rappel du passé. C’est un respect du à notre héritage commun, à notre patrimoine commun et que le maintien pourrait être vu comme un geste de diplomatie culturelle à l’égard de cette majorité déstabilisé en disant « même si ce n’est plus notre identité aujourd’hui, même si aujourd’hui la religion n’a plus la place qu’elle avait hier en reconnaît que l’on est une société québécoise dont le passé est marqué par cette héritage catholique et cette croix nous rappelle cela, nous rappelle non pas peut être notre identité d’aujourd’hui, certainement pas notre identité de demain mais quand même d’où nous venons en tant que société québécoise et le fait que ce soit un élément marquant pour énormément de personnes.

Le deuxième élément sur lequel ils insistent c’est que même s’il y a là une autorité qui retient un signe qui a une connotation religieuse cela n’implique pas d’être contraignant par rapport aux minorités culturelles, cela n’implique pas d’imposer un certain nombre de conceptions de la vie, une conception du bien à l’ensemble des autres.

Cela est, d’une contrainte qui fait le lien avec le soft power, souvent lié à la diplomatie culturelle qui a été rappelé dans les exposés précédemment, me semble être particulièrement important mais pour la resituer dans le cadre du dialogue interculturel il faut l’élargir me semble-t-il parce que derrière la question de l’absence de contrainte, il faut en prendre compte l’affabilité, et ce que je veux dire par affabilité c’est le fait que dans un dialogue interculturel, il est essentiel que les participants au dialogue interculturel, s’il cherche à promouvoir leurs valeurs, aient considérations qu’ils peuvent se tromper. Ils peuvent se tromper sur quelles sont les valeurs réellement constitutives du bien, c’est une condition absolument nécessaire au dialogue interculturel parce que si le dialogue interculturel ne se veut pas comme une forme de négociation d’un rapport de force mais comme une délibération, il faut que les participants de se dialogue interculturel soient dans une situation où ils sont obligés d’avoir quelque chose à apprendre de l’autre : j’ai la possibilité d’être enrichit par la culture de l’autre parce que je ne détiens pas la vérité. Ce n’est pas non plus une position relativiste où toutes les valeurs se valent et où il n’y a pas de vérité non, le dialogue interculturel cherche la vérité sur les valeurs qui seraient constitutives de la vie bonne et qu’ils disent que ça existe ou pas ou pas tellement important, l’important c’est que l’on cherche à dépasser nos différences pour reconstituer ce qui ensemble paraît être la meilleure approximation de ce que serait les valeurs constitutives de la vie bonne mais ce n’est possible qu’à condition que l’on soit conscience que jusqu’ici on est pu se tromper dans la définition du bien et que au contraire l’emprisonnement personnel rendu possible par le dialogue interculturel peut nous rapprocher du bien. C’est aussi important car c’est cela qui va pouvoir garantir une idée narrative, l’histoire d’une tradition, l’histoire d’une évolution d’une culture peut être alors prévu comme la recherche tout le temps approfondis de ce qu’est cette recherche, de ce qu’est bien. De la même manière qu’en science, les sciences sont une histoire de remise en question et de progrès constants, ça permet alors de comprendre l’histoire des communautés, l’histoire des cultures et l’histoire des traditions mais aussi l’histoire d’une personne comme étant une recherche perpétuelle du bien où je vis l’emprisonnement personnel non pas comme une remise en cause de ce que je suis mais comme un approfondissement de ma réflexion sur ce qu’est la bonne manière de vivre.

Ce qui est essentiel aussi c’est que le dialogue interculturel soit aussi compris comme une délibération et que dès lors, je terminerai par là, vient l’idée de promotion des valeurs culturelles et politiques, cette promotion ne doit pas être la promotion par laquelle on cherche à imposer sous forme de rapport de force ou par la conviction, par tous les moyens que vous souhaitez mais on cherche à susciter l’adhésion fondé sur une justification argumentative de en quoi les valeurs de notre culture sont les valeurs constitutives de la vie bonne, on doit être donc dans un exercice d’intelligence collective, de délibération. C’est là, le modèle idéal bien sûr et je ne doute pas qu’à l’idéalisme d’une idée philosophique les politologues pourraient opposer le réalisme d’une description des rapports interculturels et de l’usage effectif de la diplomatie interculturelle dans les rapports entre États, je vous remercie.
Thank you very much for your introduction, it’s a pleasure to be with you, see so many young people and before, I start I want to give another answer on the question of Afghanistan. I have another answer on your question you just post on Afghanistan. I have been the President of the International Music Council, which is a NGO in affiliation with UNESCO, and in Kabul there is the National Institute for Musical Theater, working with young children to make music-- traditional and classical-- and the International Music Council and European Council have supported this institute by inviting children, musicians, and the leadership to come to Europe and present our music and to be taken serious on the international platform, fundraise for instruments to be bought in Kabul, and also to make it possible that teachers from the European hemisphere could go to Kabul to teach, and also to work in an archive in traditional and Afghanistan folk music, and there are ways in doing this, and to answer your question, international networks can do enormous, tremendous important works for these regions which are basically in trouble, but that is just an answer from a question before.

Audience: Can I conclude the question, the question was quite different?

FdR: Yah if the EU can help... I don’t know...the EU has a lot of problems, as I will show in my speech, but international non-governmental organizations can do a lot. I cannot solve that for you, you know Mr. Sharmast, yah that is what I am talking about. Well let’s start, we come back to that later. It’s a happy and unhappy coincidence that this all takes place in the middle of the elections for the European Parliament. There are a lot of worries on the outcome of these elections and the Euroskeptics will play a more important role unfortunately then in the past, and we are also at the moment shortly after that they will elect new high ranking officials likes the successors to Barroso, Rompuy and Schultz. There will be a new Commission and the whole picture will change, and the general discussion we see now is not so much the discussion about cultural, cultural programs, or cultural diplomacy; but it., one cannot escape that there is a lot of talks about power structures and the stupid simple simplification “more Europe, less Europe,” and those who speak very loudly in this respect ignore, and now I’m quoting a document The Cultural Coalition for a Citizens of Europe, I advise anyone to take this book at hand which is about my subject: “They ignore that Europe cannot be but a mere political framework for the convenience of government, it must be made clear that the purpose of European integration is primarily to enhance quality of life for its citizens, the active involvement of citizens’ is unthinkable without participation that is taken seriously. The citizens Europe implies participation beyond the dry confines of bureaucratic revelation and job creation problems. It involves all the activity necessary for real social justice and dialogue. It requires the political structures to provide citizens with a mobility, freedom, and resources to make the most of the opportunities of our time.” I could go on but I will cut it short. This comes from a document Cultural Coalition for a Citizens Europe, and I like to continue with another citation from Raymond Weber, who is the Chairman of the Marcel Hicter Association for Cultural Democracy:

The essential paradox of Europe is to be a large internal market, trying too belatedly to evolve to a ‘citizens Europe’, and even though Europe of states, and the European of offices, remain widely dominating to the Europe of the citizens, as called so by the Luke Vilmadery, advisor to Van Rompuy, European citizenship despite it primitive state is also a real destiny and a big project. It shapes a modern and instrumental citizenship with more rights then explicit duties, but also a more multicultural citizenship beyond the national framework. The principles of this citizenship, according to the philosopher Kathryn Deventer are citizenship based upon living together, citizenship based on the social contract, rights, and responsibilities are reciprocal, and of quote: “It is a citizenship that is superposing national citizenship, it is an additional legal identity next to the national identity. Dual citizenship is not citizenship of two nations, it is a cit of national citizenship; a citizenship of the union. And the union is in the words of Van Rompuy, the President, and the Union is something original, unique, the largest area of democracy, freedom, prosperity and social justice in the world, basically. It is something else then a supranational intergovernmental multilateral international organization. There is no other existing, comparable form of state. It is the application of the concept of the democratic constitutional state to an international organization. But it is new, it is unfamiliar entities largely unknown; and things that are unknown are risky and dangerous. Like for example the position of the arts. Speaking about citizenship, the phenomenon of European citizenship begun in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 and it was strengthened in Amsterdam, The Treaty of Amsterdam, in 1997, Nice 2001 and Lisbon 2007. It was meant, coming back to the text to create amongst the citizen a sense of belonging to the EU, reflecting the core values, the common principles as freedom, human dignity, democracy, human rights, equality, and rule of law; who could be against that? There was something more in The Maastricht Treaty, it also said to EU Commission should take account of the cultural component in everyone of its measures to guarantee the cultural diversity of Europe. Who could be against, but did it happen, I think no. Especially when we put the spotlight on the cultural aspects of citizenships, traditions and beliefs, and ways of life and creation of meaning, I would like to come to a text made by the General Valencia, Valencia in Spain, who says:

“Human beings are the creators of culture and at the same time culture is what makes us human. Our citizenship is therefore cultural. Culture shapes are common value system and the same time helps to
establish a sense of self in an increasingly fast paced and fragmented world. Culture and the arts can simultaneously strengthen social bonds, enable communication, and stimulate out of the box thinking (you heard that this morning). The Mexican ambassador, thinking across European borders in a unique and avant guard way. Then citizens have common cultural aims even if the cultures themselves are different; cross fertilization of ideas becomes a way for active citizens to develop a common Europe while keeping their own sense of who they are in tact. To wonder now kind of citizenship you want is to wonder what kind of relationship we should establish with culture.”

Why stress the cultural components of citizenship? Lamont Revbear who says this in order to differentiate the contradiction between ethical and religious diversity. It is in order to create a multicultural citizenship based in human rights. It is in order to make the citizenship different only then in a legal concept, and is in order to let cultural democracy work especially for the empowerment of the weakest. On the other side, the arts should play a role in and make herself responsible for society. See the report by the The Dutch Arts Council in 2007, speaking about the arts; they call for more attention to be pay to the role of the individual, the relationship between past, present and future, meaning and death, and calls upon the art world to operate in an inter-disciplinary and international way that transcends sector boundaries, this is suppose to lead to a more alliances with other social partners in the fields of education, science, the world of industry and commerce and social organizations.

The council apparently assumes that the art world is part of civil society and is therefor not only responsible for a generation of art productions but can also be held accountable for the links that the art institution enters into with its’ surroundings. Arts, art institutions, should and could play an intermediary role between different citizens, citizens on one side, citizens on the other side, citizens abroad and at large; and between civil society and the political class. The trouble with the arts is that they bring you in contact with the unknown, like the dual citizenship as I just mentioned. And to bring you in contact with the unknown is risky and especially in the arts which are the victims of budget cuts decided by populist parties which one wants to avoid that we come into contact with the unknown let alone to appreciate that these parties are against the arts because it relates to the unknown and against cultural citizenship and against the EU because it brings you in contact with the unknown.

Now back from the arts to culture in a broader sense. There was a time that was even a European agenda for culture; culture as a set of distinctive spiritual and material traits that characterize society and social group. The philosopher Isabelle Henning says in various conventions, charters and treaties you find that there is a right to culture which is the right of individuals to enjoy culture in all its dimensions to play an active role in protecting, promoting and also creating new treats of culture.

I come to an Italian important figure in this debate, Pier Luigi Sacco, he pleas for something not different, but additional. He speaks about active cultural participation; with that we mean a situation which individuals do not simply consume but actively shape the cultural stimuli, but are motivated to put their skills at work, not simply hearing music but playing, not simply reading texts but writing, and so on. By doing so individuals challenge themselves to expend the capacity of expression to renegotiate the expectation and beliefs and to re-shape their own social identity and cohesiveness. Interesting aspect of active participation is that individuals are not simply exposed to culture experience but take a dive into the roles generate them. They have to learn to play with the source code behind the generation of cultural meaning.

Active participation on the other hand fosters further interest and curiosity towards exploring cultural experiences and goods produced by others. A classical positive feedback dynamics where each components reinforces the other. And also he talks about spillover effects of culture, he did this during the European Cultural Forum three years ago in Brussels in Flagey where he speaks about five spillover effects. One of them being social cohesion; development of a sense of citizenship which contribute to a juvenile crime prevention possibility, conflict resolution, overcoming of self-stereotyping and others stereotyping.

Welfare is the second one, life expectation, psychological well being, reduction of rates of hospitalization and resort treatments which will save a lot of public money. He had to plea there to introduce the arts and the culture in a much higher degree in all societal realms saying that it would save an enormous amount of hospitalization cost. It has been stated by listening to music in the first place, it creates a much higher well being in both a physical and psychological sense. Second one goes to the theatre, there was only one thing and the whole room laughed at him, that the negative affect, so the other side of the coin was that people who read poetry have more physical problems and more psychological problems through reading poetry; but he said my investigation is not yet ready and I have to find how it comes.

There is a third aspect which is sustainability. Cultural participation may have an important indirect role in fostering social mobilization and awareness. There is a third aspect which has to deal with sustainability, cultural participation may have an important indirect role in fostering social mobilization and awareness about the social consequences of individual behaviors related to environmentally critical resources; and I want to point out also to the UNESCO Hangzhou Declaration 2013. Hangzhou in China is a conference organized by the Chinese where it established a document of three or four pages [is also online in the UNESCO at the UN], Culture as a Keep Pillar for the Sustainable Development, very important document which is now being on the accepted travel within the UN.

Fourth aspect of this spillover effect is innovation, as a driver for and endogenous economic and social growth, and as last, on the effect in favor of local identity for global visibility of one specific urban milieu redefining the social symbolic foundation of the place and stimulating new dynamics of production of cultural content and new modes of access by local communities. So this spillover effect of culture are extremely important. Now is the moment drowning in the debate around the election; against Europe, pro Europe, more Europe, less Europe, non sensical as Europe exist. There is confusion about not making differences between Europe and the EU, but even the EU exist. The problem of this is the EU dominates the debate, especially the organs of the EU. I come back to, I quotes François Mitterrand in the past in biology, it’s the functionality which creates the organ, the EU it starts the creation sometimes or quite of few time disfunctionality. Opinions about this organ of the EU come from three sides and we have to make that very clear in discussing and thinking about it. There is noise and arguments talking from the inside; what is the inside? Those who are in the system: civil service, politicians, MP’s, managers, executives.

The second group in the involved outside, outside but involved, which are the national civil service, politicians, MP’s. And the third grouping, is the real outside, which is the citizens. It’s very difficult to underline to see, to make distinctions between who saying what at what moment, and it seems as if these three layers with different points of departures are not willing to listen, to understand, to internalize, to appreciate the position and the arguments of each of the two other layers; there is a lack of sensitivity.

An image once created can hardly be corrected, changed or adjusted. On top of the information society, despite the information society, many facts and figures are not known or not noticed. And in this vacuum, it seems that the contact between EU leadership and all kind of responsible members, and the citizens on the other side has gone astray. Of course I’m generalizing a bit, talk in general terms and of course the actual and present company is totally excluded, but these three groupings in fact are part of a tragedy of errors. The whole system is, with a beautiful German word by those errors. The inner circle has failed to
make sufficiently known what is the function of the EU and what were the achievements, if not successes in the past. They miss the courage to say where they are part of and the fear to be punished due to Europositivism. Brusselsian bureaucrats believe in their own logics and do not insufficiently explain. The national organs, and their representatives are in general the worst. Ideally against everything, without any nuance, or they are maneuvering by trial or error in order to counter the against voices, or without hesitation they are pro, full of exaggeration and in the fork of a kind of sheer optimism. As a consequence, of the behavior of these two groupings, inside and outside involved, there is a nearly complete confusion among a large part of the citizens. In this respect, 2013 the European year of the citizens has not brought the expected results.

The biggest failure which makes the whole construct unreliable and causes disbelief among citizens is that national executives - again listing governments, individuals, groupings , fractions, MP’s especially - say A in Brussels and B at home. The story at home is “we defend the national position”. The situation in Brussels is “we agree in unanimity and allow ourselves to accept substantial compromises”. Even to worsen the situation, just before the elections, political parties move from one point of view to another. One week we were in favor of the European army, now we are against. One month ago we were in favor of further negotiating with Turkey, now we are against. Political leaders apologize for slogans about promises they have not realized or they could not realize. Parties, leaders, delegations in the European Parliament promise to achieve results. However, they did not achieve them. The outcomes of the procedure were different from the promises and now they defend the outcomes which creates enormous amount of disbelief and makes parties and leaders unreliable. Voters, voting citizens do not know what an elected MEP is going to do to vote in the European Parliament in the greater unit of Christian democrats, liberals, labor, green and even right-wing populist parties.

Often the voters in these sub-groupings, fractions, delegations represent something else than what their colleagues in national Parliaments vote for. From substantial nuances to the complete opposite. It is the battle: who is the strongest in telling the people, the citizens, what the think the people want to hear. At least Angela Merkel dares to say economical cooperation has to be followed by political cooperation, which is very courageous. On top, the whole construct of the EU, the construct of decisions so far is at least a co-responsibility if not a full responsibility of the leaders of the member states. So complaining that this has gone too far is inadequate and makes them totally unreliable. Non sense is: “These elections are about unemployment quotas”. “One of our Spitzenkandidats (front runner) will lead you” makes legally no sense. There is no treaty which obliges the leaders of governments to choose one of the Spitzenkandidats.

There is, on the other side, insufficient explanation of the raison d’être of the EU. Also from historical point of view, in history you’ve seen it is a guarantee for peace, freedom, welfare and well being. But it is not enough, it is not a discussion nor a well-supported proposal for the real core matters which are at stake in European policy making: the environment, energy (think of gas, Russia, Ukraine), water, food, foreign policy and defense, migration, the terrible problems of refugees. Knowledge development or innovation. There is a little bit of success with in the Union of the Banks in order to solve and to prevent new financial economic crisis. The main common program is still agriculture. Many billions are spent there in the EU of the 20th century. We should aim at an EU of the 21st century which should concentrate on the atom dimension and aspects like research, education, knowledge, education, innovation. A lot of these core issues are unfortunately not popular enough.

What can be the role here of cultural diplomacy? International cooperation should not be confined to forms of national presentations outside the national border lines. It’s time for a new form of cultural diplomacy.
The International Symposium on Cultural Diplomacy in the EU
(Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)
Thank you very much for the invitation. The subject is a little bit different from the much broader subject that you are discussing. I am focusing more on the scientific aspect of diplomacy. I think it’s quite interesting and politically speaking it is at least as important as the broader aspects.

Researchers like to work together and to participate in exchange. In particular, with colleagues beyond their own national borders. Being part of an international network is, for a researcher, an element of his or her reputation, as well as imperative towards doing substantial and good quality research. As a consequence, EU researchers are in this respect an interesting cohort for researchers and research institutions outside of the EU. This is not surprising because the EU is the world leader in research and innovation. Together, it accounts for 24% of the world’s expenditure on research, 32% of high impact publications, and 32% of patent applications. At the same time it represents only 7% of the global population.

Of course, over the last decade, the landscape has evolved quite a lot. 15, 20 years ago, international research was mainly dominated by the EU, US and Japan. Since then new players have emerged, such as Brazil, India, China, South Korea, and they are exercising more and more influence. Therefore, the capacity of the EU in this respect has diminished, to a certain extent. Of course, the EU still has an interest to stay at a leading position and to integrate its neighboring countries to help stabilize the continent. The number of internationally co-authored scientific publications and the mobility of researchers are increasing. We also see that research organizations are establishing offices abroad, and companies are investing more and more outside their home countries, particularly in the emerging countries— not only in manufacturing, but also in research and innovation. In addition to this, we see that global challenges are also important drivers for research and innovation. I don’t need to stress that natural challenges go beyond national borders. That means we need, from a research point of view, to look at these problems from a global perspective. As more and more research and innovation are performed in other countries, European countries need to have access to this knowledge. As a consequence, Europe has to promote itself as an effective location for research and innovation. I don’t need to stress that natural challenges go beyond national borders. Being part of an international network is, for a researcher, an element of his or her reputation, as well as imperative towards doing substantial and good quality research. As a consequence, EU researchers are in this respect an interesting cohort for researchers and research institutions outside of the EU. This is not surprising because the EU is the world leader in research and innovation. Together, it accounts for 24% of the world’s expenditure on research, 32% of high impact publications, and 32% of patent applications. At the same time it represents only 7% of the global population.

Thirty years ago the old treaties have explicitly identified cooperation with other countries as a key activity of the Union’s research and innovation policy. This has been developed over the years. For example, we have seen that 6% of FP7 came from other countries, which is a huge success. Just to give you a few impressive examples of our international cooperation—from a development policy perspective, the most important is the cooperation between European and developing countries through clinical trials partnership, which is a partnership between 14 member states, including Switzerland, Norway and Sub-Saharan African countries. It is aimed at tackling HIV, AIDS, TB and malaria. We have the famous ITER project for fusion energy in France, where EURATOM, China, India, South Korea and the US have joined forces to demonstrate that nuclear fusion is a viable energy source of the future. We have seen the Marie Curie Actions which have very strong international participants from 80 different countries. The Commission’s Joint Research Centre cooperates with international partners around the globe. In a broader sense, there is the Human Frontier science program, where the EU cooperates with 13 different countries in basic research. We also have GEOSS, the Global Earth Observation System of Systems, where the EU plays an active role, which is particularly important from a scientific perspective, not only because we are doing science together with our partners, but also because this is probably the first time that the partners have introduced the principle of open access to data to all participants and beyond. This is a principle that you wouldn’t expect to see between countries like the US and China. So you see that internationally done research can be some kind of a door opener for many other things. This is also one of the reasons why I normally say that the current era of European research is from an extra-European perspective. As this example demonstrates, we as Europeans are able to provide strategy and talent. This was in the past, frankly, not completely clear.

So last September we decided to have a more concise and holistic research cooperation, focusing on partners outside of Europe on equal terms, and programs and activities of high mutual interest. We want to use this international cooperation as a means to contribute to the broader policy objectives of the EU, such as the 2020 strategy. This follows three main objectives. The first is of course the strengthening of the Union’s excellence and attractiveness in research, as well as its economic and industrial competitiveness, by creating win-win situations and cooperating on the basis of mutual benefit. The second big objective is to tackle global societal challenges. To pool resources, deploy effective solutions rapidly, and optimize the use of research infrastructures which today have become very expensive. If you think about the telescopes in Chile or in South Africa, you can easily spend billions of Euros. This is also true for individual regions. Thirdly, we want to support the EU’s external policy by bringing research innovation activity together with enlargement, trade, foreign policy and humanitarian and development policies.

To conclude, the challenge is to integrate research innovation activities better in this broader policy context. The use of international cooperation in research is an instrument of soft power and a mechanism for improving relations with key countries and regions. Of course, good international relations may in turn facilitate good quality research and innovation. To close with an anecdote— the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which is the world’s largest scientific society, has a center dealing with science diplomacy, and also publishes a quarterly review on this subject titled Science Diplomacy. The irony is that our American friends, while having a platform for this topic, in contrast with us Europeans, are sometimes jealous of our international activities, because we have the chance to pay for other countries’ participation, and they do not.
“Talking Pork: Relativism, Toleration and Intercultural Dialogue”
Prof. Dr. Glen Newey

Glen Newey, Professor, Political Theory at the Université Libre de Bruxelles

(Brussels; May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

Thank you very much to Mark Donfried and the organising team for inviting me to this talk. I have about twenty minutes, it’s a half an hour slot. OK, trying to get through this in 20 minutes then.

I’m a political philosopher. I’m sorry about that, I work with theory rather than practice, so you might find this all a bit upright, so I try to make it a bit more concrete than it might otherwise be. I picked on one particular area of intercultural dialogue, namely pork. Ok, so there you’ve got a pig, curved up, according to sort of American cuts, at least that’s what it told me on the file when I looked on the internet. I must say, it’s probably illegal to have it there, but I’m relying on you not to tell on me to whoever owns the image right. So I start by talking about pork and then I try and draw out some more general morals about relativism and toleration and how we all live together satisfactorily.

Ok, so there is a picture of pig, a random pig, again, culture of the internet. Right, there is a dead pig and so the first point I’d make, is that pork is actually a kind of cultural crossroad. Until you think about it, you might think “pork, what is there to say”. But fairly obviously I know there are Muslims in the room for example there may be Jews as well. One of the significations that pork can have as a meat which is unclean, not Kosher, not Halal and so forth and these are some of the cultural responses that we make towards pork: one response to pork of course is just to eat it. A lot of people do that. I do that, so I’m coming out as a pork eater. Doesn’t mean I look for scalps of people who don’t eat pork. I’m very liberal about that sort of thing; I think people have a human right not to eat pork if they don’t want to eat pork. My mother doesn’t eat pork for example, I have friends who don’t eat it, but that’s one response to it. Bacon sandwich is one example, we have various dishes here: sweet and sour pork, andouillette and the gammon steak. So, those are different kind of cultural representations of pork and its ordinary or gastronomic significance, I think I have more graphic representations. The andouillette is a particular interesting example. Anybody French here? Bonjour. I never had it, is it nice? Some people think it tastes a bit faecal, because it’s from the lower intestine or whatever of the pig, but I have seen people eating it. That’s a gammon steak and a bacon sandwich. So, that’s the gastronomic meaning of the pork, playing central role in some cultures, the US for example. Hogs are in the common discourse, but as I’ve already indicated, there are other ways in which people engage with pork, less favourably disposed towards it, more favourably disposed towards the providers of pork, because obviously part of the deal with pork is basically they’re afraid, as the old English saying goes: with a full English breakfast (which is eggs and bacon), the hen makes a contribution, but the pig is fully committed. And you know, you don’t really get bacon without sadly a pig dying. So I’ve just given you a list of groups who are not so keen on...
pork for one reason or another. One is just vegetarians, or vegans or fruitarians or nuntarians, you know all sorts of people. If you say you are vegetarian and eat pork, it kind of reduces the force of saying that you’re a vegetarian. I mean some vegetarian they eat fish, but really if it’s pork that you’re rooting in bacon sandwich, you can’t positively claim that you’re vegetarian. Okay, so religious groups: seventh day Adventists, orthodox Jews, Muslims, Rastafarians that’s a selection of people, different kind of religious faiths where people don’t eat pork, sometimes there are different rotations of strictness or of orthodoxy, but certainly core members of those groups, the four bottom groups on the list, the non-secular ones, they tend not to like the idea of eating pork.

Okay, on the phase that you’ve got different attitudes already towards pork and there is a question about how we negotiate those. What do we do about the fact that people have different views on eating dead pigs? Here is a more scriptural prohibition coming up. Here we go, graphic of a pig. That is from the Bible, the Old Testament, a holy book for Jews and Christians, I think that one is from Leviticus, that is to say the third book of Moses, later on the second book “and the swine, because it divides the hoof, and cheweth the cud it is unclean to you, ye shall not eat their flesh nor touch their dead carcass.” So the basis for the prohibition is the fact that you have a beast with a cloven hoof (a split hoof) that also doesn’t chew the cud. Now don’t ask me why you can’t eat the animal. You have to talk to rabbis who know that. But those are the formal conditions for the non-edibility of the meat. Foot has to be split, as it is with cows, but also it doesn’t chew the cud, doesn’t ruminate the way as with cows, so it’s okay to eat beef, but not pigs, because pigs do not ruminate.

Okay, I don’t think this is going to work. There’s a link to a reggae song, you can find it, it’s called Axelrod. It’s basically an anti-pork reggae number. It’s an undiscovered classic, I think. So, if you can’t find it, there is an email address for me at the end, look it up, I strongly recommend it to you. Goes on for about 4 minutes, going on about how bad eating piggy-wiggy is and all sorts of bad things that happen to you if you eat pork. And then you got you got Koranic prohibition. “He has only forbidden you dead meat, and blood, and flesh of the swine, and any food over which the name of other than Allah God has been invoked. But if one is forced by necessity, without wilful disobedience, nor transgressing due limits, then Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful.” So there is a bit more kind of flexibility there. You’ve got Ticklah vs Axelrod, do you want to play it? Just a minute, not the whole thing. Thank you very much, round of applause.

So that is Ticklah vs Axelrod. Okay, so different kind of scriptural prohibitions on pork, this is actually the comments thread from the Youtube video which has just been played. And it does show how the topic exists in the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how this can quickly polarise opinions about something as innocuous as pork. Right, some of these comments: “Reading all these comments about eating pork is good or eating pork is bad. That is the problem with the public sphere. And the public sphere is very importantly included on the Internet. This shows how
difference here is some sort of dead flesh and here is another sort of dead flesh. So, the cannibals might say so what we’re not making you eat human meat, we’re not force-feeding you. We’re not saying that, we’re saying “let’s be liberal, we’ve got human flesh eaters on the one side, we’ve got non human flesh eaters on the other side, we can live happily together.” All we want to do is to be left in peace to each other, what could possibly be wrong with that.

Why what we want to say doesn’t necessarily cut it. Easy relativism and easy toleration may work as long as we don’t care too much about the issue. Perhaps we don’t care about pigs. You go to a supermarket where there are lots of pigs. Is that toleration? Do we tolerate each other or do we not care? Tolleration seems like something nobler. I’m a different kind of attitude from toleration, you might think.

On the other hand when we do start caring about things like eating babies when then start thinking “well now we shouldn’t be tolerant, this is really too horrible”. So the cannibals shouldn’t eat babies when they want to, we think “no, that’s not going to do it, we access the moral truth about it, people shouldn’t do it, we shouldn’t tolerate it”. And this seems like a kind of paradox. I’m going to leave it unresolved for you I’m going to let you chew it over, quite appropriately. So, it looks like tolerance disappears down a crack. There is apathy on one hand, people nowadays don’t care about the socks they wear. And then on the other hand is caring so much that you think “well, this thing is so important that I can’t really put up with someone having a different view”. The conclusion is on the screen. Comments are welcome on that email address.
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The executive agency is not its part of the institution that is why I was coming in when you started talking about institutions and that is why I was taking notes after your and during your speech and to say we’re not a private agency we are part of the European institutions.

The Executive agency is responsible for running and implementing in practice, managing certain programs of EU where under the supervision of the European Commission and where all the management level are civil servants, so I am a typical civil servant but the people that work with me and for me are people from this sector and they have been chosen of the bases of their expertise and the experience that they have.

I am the head of the unit responsible for culture and I will explain to you a little bit about it. I would like to talk about their Creative Europe Program if you don’t mind which is the official supports funding program for culture and audiovisual projects.

The underlying thesis of creative Europe is already the richness of Europe is diversity ok? And we see ourselves as a very rich continent in particular when it comes with comparing with others continents where culture is maybe more unified, of course I am not talking right now about global culture because we all agree when we are talking about European identity and we will all remain European. I remain German and European of course.

We are all facing a global culture. Nobody of us would say just because I like Michael Jackson it makes me less European. The underlying thesis for the Creative European program is very much that we believe in this richness and we believe that it is also on the other can the challenge because in order to live together we have to know each other.

In Europe we have gone through of course phases of war where there was intolerance. I think tolerance is one core European value. And the question that you asked does it include apathy, good thing and this is a European value and the European program also consist of the fact that we firmly believe that tolerance is one core European value. And the question that you asked include apathy, I take it from your slight accent that you came from Netherlands and this is exactly the question why everybody’s is looking at Netherlands and saying, you know this is supposedly that tolerant country and why don’t things go so smooth there as we wish?

I am from Germany we are looking at the green parties that are always so multi-cult (it used to be, you know multi-cult?) - when everybody lives together and basically we don’t care what others do and then you had to more conservative parents that said this is not good we should do what others are doing. We make some judgments on certain things because when we see the baby eating is not good we have to maybe do something about it ok? If we think that abducting 200 girls is not good a thing then we should do something about it. And everybody says yes. Of course it depends where you come from.

This is European Creative Program is to support for creative sector in Europe is really the idea that we learn from each other and that we actually learn from each other by crossing borders because many of our creators many of our artists and most of our films, most of works never actually across the border. We are very good at looking at a regional, local regional or national cultural work and we know our artists for example but we hardly ever go cross the borders and know, you know, how many Belgian pop singers do you know? I mean, come on man. Nope.

The EU in the beginning of the course was not in that sense strictly cultural project, it was economic project so they start to build economic relations.

And only slowly and only recently they have realized that they must be some art in this whole issue and also our culture exchange needs to be developed because we are certain if we don’t cross the borders we will not be able to live happy and peacefully together.

How do you get to know the culture of someone? When you read their books, you know their offers, you see the theater plays, you are listening to the music, and you see the theater plays. Of course, there is a part of culture more easily accessible.

What the biggest challenge in Europe? It is our richness. This Richness also means that we have limits. I could not read a book in Macedonian or in Czech or what have you any of these 23 languages that are gathered across the European continent. Basically everybody understands everything more or less through culture in America. How can I know what wrote Macedonian writer is all about if I can’t read the books? How can I actually know not only what it looks like in the times of Ryan air I can probably go easily somewhere if I interested enough but how is my interest stimulate via culture things? (by books, music, by movie etc.) this is the most important thing, the purely heart of creations and this is what Creative Program is doing.

All programs in Europe are based on idea that what we should to do is dialogue and mobility. We have to support unable people to be able to cross the borders and go somewhere else. This is the value of Creative Europe today. It is worth of our money that we help works of art and creators to cross the border. Many people don’t, you know, ever get the possibility of crossing the border. This upcoming Belgian artist and you go to Köln and they don’t know nothing about this upcoming artist. How many upcoming artists do we know? This is what European Program is trying to overcome.

The big program next to is the media program. This is the support for audiovisual industry. Because you know very obviously out are images of transport without words and this is our identity.

We have something in common and the common thing is our values and one of the main values is tolerance. Creative European now that just started in January has brought a is media and culture program under one umbrella, this is because we think that face the common challenges on the one hand there is a very big challenge about the audience development and this has really a lot to do with tolerance.

It is not about just you know losing an audience because we know that all the opera goers are sixty-plus. You hardly see anyone below twenty except for the usual opera nerds. So there’s an issue there but you can have a theater in a place in a neighborhood and nobody in the neighborhood ever goes to visit this
theater. We had an example a year and a half ago in the conference, we had a very big conference about audience development and there was a woman from a theater in Rotterdam and she said "we went out to our neighborhood and actually asked them: what would you expect from us? We are next door, I have never seen your face before. You may be a bit younger, you may not be the typical middle-aged middle-class person, and what would you like to see because this may also be your theater". Then of course you have the reaction of the typical a high-class theater institution that could say you "maybe they just want to hear popular stuff, really easy and not intellectual and demanding". We had this very interesting debate between this woman who said "I went to them and said what do you want to hear? I probably have to go through this, I have to offer you this if this is what you want to hear. Because maybe by something easily accessible, I can catch you and maybe also your parents will come to the theater once". Between this woman and the other woman who was representing a German national ballet and she said "I asked my audience and we would always play le luck de senior every day for 365 days". It’s so boring because this is all they know and this is all they want to see because they have no idea about you know contemporary bands. So this was really interesting to see how many different ideas we have in Europe also about and audience development. Also, it is actually also way of raising awareness about certain values and certain things that are important in Europe that wants to commit the organizations that we fund to going more into the direction of audience development.

The other thing that Europe also does is that it takes into consideration everything that the digital shift has brought with it. We are not just sitting there anymore in front of a television screen nor in the theater. We also want to participate today. You can also produce, you can go home and grab your guitar, you can write a song and put it on YouTube and if you’re lucky, tomorrow you’re a millionaire. So people don’t just consume art anymore, they co-produce, they want to co-create, they want to be taken seriously. We don’t want just some curator to tell us what we have to see and what we have to like. This is the challenge that both media and the support for the artificial industry program faces as the culture program. This is why we have decided to bring this all together under one umbrella and it started this year with around 1.4 billion euros and of course we continue funding, co-productions, common exhibitions, the tour et cetera.

We are particularly fond of producing translations because the book is the core thing. You will never be able to access the book if you can’t read it, even if you wanted it so much. The theater play other things, other elements but with a book there is no way. Either you understand or you don’t understand. This is why the front literary translation.

We also fund organizations that has an objective to showcase certain emerging artists. For example, a very good and young violinist may be stuck somewhere in small Luxembourg and has all the potential to go out to Europe. I would try and make this person circulate in various areas and then maybe he can get or she can get a contract somewhere else. This is what we fund. The culture program is very open in this respect. But it goes a little bit beyond what we have funded so far.

I can tell you that all the projects that I visited and all these people that have worked together in a production or have worked together on an exhibition, museum and things like that, they will never come out a project the way they came in.

In my practice, I was most impressed by those people that told me that they have been working together. It’s always minimum three countries where small project and then six countries for a bigger project so people have to come together from these projects and they have to work together, they have to create a partnership. There’s a lot of funny things that may be funny at the beginning and then turned out to be a really awful fight afterwards because there’s cultural misunderstandings. For example, I’ve heard lot about this in the northern countries. I’m going to be a bit blunt but this occur in the northern and sometimes in little bit richer countries. They were very afraid of introducing a project because they thought "I am going to do this perfectly and can I trust there freaks to do it perfectly? And do I really want to take over the responsibility over the others?". Hence, they didn’t introduce. Afterwards, they didn’t like it so much but because they never got money out of the program. Because the organization were too hesitant. Then there are countries who sends proposal after proposal. There are very different approaches. All these people that have been working together for at least two years minimum all say they have come out of this project as a different person. Because they will have established real working relations with the partners from a similar sector in another country.

It’s also about solidarity. One of the nice things that I have witnessed was a dance program. It was quite big and we funded it with almost two million euros. It was very big and very successful program. Then came the financial crisis. Then, slowly but surely certain organizations just disappeared because the funding was over because of budget cuts. Quite a few Scandinavians, that have a lot of money, said that they wanted the organizations from the poorer countries because they can stimulate us in another way. They can contribute to the success of our project in another way then just money. This is why all amongst us, we agreed to share and then we take over the share of those that cannot contribute anymore. This for me was a really heartwarming experience because it shows that it’s also about solidarity. You can prove solidarity in this respect and this is one of the main values I think that the European Union thinks it has.

We have had specific calls for operation with third world countries and in I looked at figures just before I came. In very plain terms it was mainly the bigger countries that were also introducing more successful projects with third countries. For example, we had projects with Mexico, Arab countries, Canada and Australia (of course they were a little less difficult because they brought money instead of asking). Most of these projects, even though they were successful, they were highly complicated and a little bit lacking focus. Now what creative Europe has done is that it has stopped this kind of support but has opened up in theory to all the neighboring countries in the east and in the south. So now more countries can participate in this program and it is specifically a political sign that Creative Europe wants to give: That we cannot just continue exchanging amongst ourselves even though we may be foreign to each other, you have to open up. Thank you.
Barbara Gessler is currently the Head of Unit Culture for the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). She was previously Head of Press at the European Economic and Social Committee, where she had worked since 2009. Previously she was a representative of the European Commission in Berlin and in Bonn, and for the Directorate-General of Information, Communication, Culture and Audiovisual Media (today named the INFSO). She is a graduate of the College of Europe.

Okay, I’ll keep it brief, I’ll give 15 minutes of introduction, because I have a meeting at six, so I’ll talk for 15 minutes and leave some time for questions. I won’t talk for long, so I hope it will be bearable.

The reason I want to talk about food reserves is two-fold and the reason I’m involved in this NGO action for food reserves is two-fold. One is something, I’m sure we can all agree about, concern about malnutrition and concern about the fact that this has been something that has been talked about for decades and decades and centuries and there have been moments of confidence that lack of food will be solved, I can remember when I was young a million years ago, there were people saying that scientific development is bound to find the cure for the problem, but then a decade later you have very terrible famines in parts of the world. It governed a lot of concern. Everybody knows about live-aid and so on, but even so decades on it remains a problem and however scientifically sophisticated we get, it seems to be insoluble, or at least very hard to solve. So that’s one reason. This small organisation I belong to, doesn’t have a solution to the problem that people haven’t been able to solve for decades and decades. But it has a way of dealing with one aspect of the problem that I think is interesting and which does relate to issues of cultural diplomacy. Our organisation first of all is only looking at a small aspect of the problem. It’s looking at acute malnutrition rather than chronic malnutrition. It’s not looking at the problem of chronic malnutrition which is essentially a product of poverty and which affects millions if not billions of people. That is not what we’re looking at. What we’re looking at is acute malnutrition - that is to say horrific problems that can occur very quickly when there is a spike in the price of food. And that’s what we’ve tried to address. And that’s what our programme is looking at trying to deal with. And the system which we have sorted to promote and we’re not unique in this, although there are some that say that it doesn’t work, I’m going to bypass this for the moment.

The approach we have is based on the idea of setting up food reserves. And the basis if this or behind this is the fact that we’re an organisation that believes that you do have a market economy, you do have a law of supply and demand, that you can’t deal with this problem by swiping this market economy aside. It doesn’t work to have a system of rationing, it doesn’t work to have a system of price controls, and these things get bogged down in impossible procedural difficulties. We will use the law of supply and demand, but know that when there is for instance a severe harvest failure, that when therefore the supply of food goes down severely, that if there are reserves available, then those reserves can be put on to the market and if those
reserves go on to the market, the supply increases and the price therefore comes down simply according to the laws of supply and demand. So we work with the market economy, but we twist it with reserves that we have available when the need arises. So that’s the first aspect and that’s the first five minutes. It’s a system of food reserves.

But the second aspect of this is that it is a regional food reserved. It is not a national food reserve. We want a system where by food reserve operates across national boundaries, where several different countries are brought together. We’ve had discussions with some of them, here in Brussels. We’ve also been to the representation of Macedonia, of Ecuador, of Bolivia, of Peru, and those four countries, the Andean pact. We’ve talked to other countries as well; we would like to have a regional food reserve involving several countries. It may or may not be a part of an existing or related to an existing organisation. There’s an alphabet soup of regional groupings like the Andean group or Mercosur and that’s just South America. We’re looking at a regional grouping. And there are very practical reasons for that in terms of the advantage of regional reserves because problems may arise in one country that are not so severe in another country and there are obvious benefits in terms of the cost if you’re operating at a regional rather at the national level, but of course once you’re involving different nation state, whose relations may not always be perfect, that may involve a lot of rivalry, you’re bringing them together for a practical purpose, but there are always cultural diplomatic issues involved. So it’s a regional reserve.

The third aspect is perhaps the most controversial aspect, so I’ll leave my last seven minutes for that. We propose that it is organised according to what we call “the community method”, what you might call, very much with inverted commas “the EU method”. Now, what lies behind that is a view that the EU system which you know, text books fill up with describing it in terms of partial sharing, supranationalism, etc, you know, you can fall asleep reading the textbooks. But, what the system does involve is one which has worked very well in Europe I would say, since the World War II. After all what are we in Europe, those of us who are from Europe, but a group of tribal and warring countries bunched into the western peninsula of Asia, addicted to conflict. That certainly seemed like what we were in 1945. Something had to be about this. It was no good promising to love one another once again. There had to be institutions, some structures. I’m not addicted to conflict. That certainly seemed like what we were in 1945. Something had to be about this. It was no good promising to love one another once again. There had to be institutions, some structures. I’m not saying an institution can ever abolish warfare, but it can make it a little difficult to get out of bed for. And it was in Europe that this partial sovereignty sharing system emerged through the coal and steel community and then the six treaties late, that slowly drew into the countries. Not because Europe was superior to any other part of the world, certainly not. Not because everyone was busy reading Kant’s perpetuous piece and think “yes, let’s implement that”. Actually because Europe has been inferior to many parts of the world, in the way that it had thought or brought the whole world into a devastating and catastrophic world wars. It developed a system which for reasons you’ll be familiar with as an institute for cultural diplomacy, I hate to call a European system. It’s a system that emerged in Europe, because Europe needed something and it stumbled upon it, perhaps, that’s not unfair to Jean Monnet but whether it stumbled upon it or developed it, it has benefited from it. And, we would like to see that system elsewhere in the world. Not because it’s European and therefore better, but because we feel it’s worked for us when we needed it, maybe it has a place elsewhere. And so building a proposal for a food reserve, a regional food reserve is a suggestion of a structure that reserve which in many ways is similar to the structure within the European Union. In other words the reserves would not be the property of a particular nation-state, if it was the Andean group, Columbia or Bolivia or Ecuador or Peru; it would be the property of the community. And the communities of those four countries could be members in the way that the members of the European Union are separate members. It would be administered by the community. And it would be the community that would be responsible for key decisions such as to release reserves, because it has accepted that the price of a particular commodity was getting too high in a particular member state. And that’s our system. But of course, cultural diplomacy is so important here. You go to the Bolivian representation, you go to the Ecuador representation, you go to the Peruvian representation, and you know they’re very different in many aspects. You know they have much political difference. Peru, Columbia, they have bilateral trade deals with the US and with the EU. Bolivia and Ecuador don’t like that idea. There are all sorts of things. They also would say: “look, this idea of food reserve, don’t bring to us something that is some sort of superior EU idea. We used to have something back with the Inkers, they used to have reserves. And talk to us about some sort of superior EU ideas.” You have to learn that this is something that has to develop and be responsive to local conditions. But we do think that this is a much more effective system for avoiding the wasting corruption, which so often inhibits development in many parts of the world. So, it’s a combination, it’s a belief that food reserves work as a way for dealing with acute malnutrition; it’s a belief that the community method is the best way of administering those reserves. That’s what we’ve been talking to various representations about, that’s what we’ve talked to various MEPs about. We want to have a pilot project. We’re trying to persuade the parliament and the commission that it’s a good idea and that’s where we are, its work in progress. And that’s 15 minutes, so I’ll shut up now.
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I am sure I’ve already told you, didn’t really think about the elements which see identity as a synonym of citizen. An element of EU citizenship? or even symbols, like flags, anthem, motto, whatever. Are those elements defining our identity? Well, if you look in the treaty in fact where we find identity linked to value. Defining an identity by value, when I just joined we talked about value and do we have value. It seems from the principle we have value, we have common value. Again, legally speaking, it is a new concept. Looking at this treaty, I know that it came from the Lisbon treaty. In the treaty, before Lisbon, there were no references to the word ‘value’. We were using another word i.e. ‘principle’. It was founded on the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and so on... So, it was not ‘value’ but ‘principle’. Is ‘value’ similar to ‘principle’? This is a question but we do not have enough time to distinguish them. However, my students do explore their differences.

Looking at Article 2 of the Lisbon treaty, ‘defining the EU value’ which is very interesting and we have two sentences saying that the ‘Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.’ Going on, ‘these values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.’ So, why do we have two sentences? I mean, defining value, in explaining the mutation from ‘principle’ to ‘value’. Well, again, I just would like to respond to this question. The first sentence is essential values, compared to the second sentence. And, the second sentence, however, is not essential values, it is something that may complete the first. So, for sentence two, there are three possibilities, it is a new value from the first part – tolerance, non-discrimination etc. - or other similar values, more or less.

In fact, the first part of the sentence is linked to the second one. Equality is the first part, equality between women and men as a rule of law and I have justice, freedom and pluralism. In some way, we do not think that equality includes the equality between men and women. Why do we have two sentences differentiating the ‘equalities’ – are equality and equality between men and women not the same thing? I have the answer to this but I shall leave this question to you.

Let’s keep going. You may say that the second sentence does not refer to ‘value’ but ‘principle’. What is ‘principle’? How is this defined in society? Well, I can keep on going for quite long. But the question of ‘value’ is not limited to Article 2. The question here refers to the shorter part about human rights. So, they carry the same legal value as in Article 2. Well, even if we have a reference to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, again this carries the same ‘value’, or legal ‘value’ as in Article 2. Why do we discuss this? We would like to define our identity and my ability for us to try to define an identity is through common values. Do we really have common values? In Article 2 – yes, certainly.

In Articles 5 and 6, about the Charter of Interventions, I am sure you are aware of the protocol used by Poland and United Kingdom, saying that it does not extend to them. But we have no classes of citizens. They will have no access to Article 2, the intervention or the charter. I am sorry but if you are Polish or British citizens, they do not apply to you. It does not apply to your identity, even though we are not different.

Let us be a little provocative now. Let us go to the Court. Are values here implemented the same way across member states? Do they have the same understanding of the word? My team had a look into this, taking ‘human rights’ and ‘human dignity’, and looking at one of them – I mean, I am not saying anything bad or wrong. I am simply analyzing them with you – and if you go to the ‘right of life’ – what does this mean? This is in the treaty and the convention. So, what is the right to marry and the right to form a family – what do these mean exactly? And lastly, what does equality mean – equality between women and men?

We investigated this a little and member states national laws – what do they mean? So, when we discuss the right to life, we tend to talk about abortion, of course. When does the law start? When we look at
So, well, could a framework identity be identified by third countries or support the promotion of values externally? I do not know. But maybe the main problem is that. Most of my students are between 19 and 26. Of course, the good news is that voting is compulsory and mandatory in Belgium so they vote. But they do not care even in EU studies. And the question is that, let me conclude this, maybe the main issue is that, as some of the previous speakers discussed, what is the aim? What is the objective of the EU? And we were just discussing the question of food, the question of constitution and reserves, and the common EU policies that we know make up the core of the EU – the question of peace. Peace for you is something – imagine if there were a conflict between Belgium and Germany tomorrow – what about that? Of course, the EU succeeds in that – peace, the economy, free movement – so maybe the problem we have now is to find a common goal, a common goal for the next generation. What are we pursuing and I will stop with that as I have said too much. Thanks for your time!
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“A Few Reflections on EU Cultural Diplomacy”
Prof. Dr. Caterina Carta, Assistant Professor, Department International Affairs, Vesalius College

‘Good morning, it is actually a pleasure to host this European Edition of the Symposia on Cultural Diplomacy here at the Vesalius College.

Allow me just a few words on why I think that we are actually in the right place to talk about Cultural Diplomacy today. Vesalius College is an American-style college that takes full advantage of its location in the heart of Europe. With an international student body of approximately three hundred students and over sixty nationalities, Vesalius is a temple where Cultural Diplomacy is practised on a daily basis.

As you know, the definition of Diplomacy, of Cultural Diplomacy, emphasises the exchange of ideas and information, art and culture, in order to foster mutual understanding and I further emphasise the fact that these connections should tie not only countries, but their people.

No wonder therefore that the European Union needs places like this in order to pioneer culturally diplomatic acts. But beside our own daily experience, and I am sure that we here are actually sharing the same commitment, I think that it is actually very important that we are gathering here to talk about Cultural Diplomacy.

There is no doubt that Culture is not just an instrument but an end, a goal in itself, that underpins societal cohesion at home, but also builds bridges across the borders. Along these lines, in what follows I will briefly advocate for the benefit of the cultural diplomatic cultures to cultural policy at home and therefore in Europe.

In the first place, I believe that if we want to take culture abroad, we should restore culture at home. The picture that we have from Europe is pretty ambivalent. On one hand, according to the Canadian council for Earth, some countries such as Finland, Germany and France stand out as the most generous sponsors worldwide of direct public expenditure on art and museums, for instance.

In parallel, despite incredible cultural heritage, in 2010 Italy allocated only 0.28 of its operating budget on its Ministry of Culture. Unfortunately Greece in 2011 slashed 25 % of the budget for its own Cultural Ministry. It is not difficult to believe and to understand that over 2,000 people were basically cut off from the Ministry of Culture only that year and only in that department.

So, the social cost of this enduring crisis has created a gap between European states and most dramatically, within those states, between the rich and the poor it has grown exponentially. As a result, today the rhetoric of “united in diversity” and the idea of a strong peaceful model of integration are falling apart.
This leads me to the first point that I want to make here today. To paraphrase from a 2013 book from Richard Haass, as with foreign policy, Cultural Diplomacy begins at home. If what you want to restore is potential, then it better restore successful stories at home. This is particularly important because the EU has defined itself both in Europe and as an international actor primarily around its power of attraction, from all of the cultures here.

Well, in times of crisis, art and culture should be the first investment to make. They are carriers of creativity, innovation, preservation, prosperity, development of new skills and social capital. And then, let me actually quote Fabrice here in saying that sadly culture is still considered a luxury, not as an investment.

No wonder that in times of crisis, culture and funding for culture and art are the first casualties of austerity measures. And if the commitments of the member states are creeping at an EU level, the situation is not encouraging, considering, and again I quote your data, that in this multiannual financial framework, 2014-2020, the commission proposed to allocate 1.6 billion euros for the cultural sector. We are talking here about less than 1 euro per capita per each year and 0.15 % of the EU budget with a growth of 0.003 % in the last fifteen years. In this overall context, the EU does not have a common cultural policy yet. The EU’s actions are mainly aimed at encouraging cooperation between member states and supplementing their actions through principles of solidarity and an open method of coordination.

And yet, despite this unity and shrinking budget, the EU commission has managed to take some steps in the right direction, I believe. Projects giving access to culture, cultural and creative industry, media, European, are instruments that can help the cultural sector thrive and also communicate the EU culture outside its borders. To be sure, a common cultural policy is not about levelling the incredibly high richness of our common cultural heritage, but about enhancing the standards of cultural governance and ensuring the well-being of our best ambassadors, the artists.

And here, strictly connected to the first point, comes my second one. Strong EU Cultural Diplomacy is strengthened by an energetic cultural commitment which encompasses domestic and foreign dimensions. The treaty of the European Union, article 167, actually recognises this, that the EU should take cultural aspects into account in its actions. Equally, the 2007 European Agenda for Culture emphasises that culture is a vital element in EU international politics.

Along the same lines, the European Parliament recommended in a report dated 2011 that the European External Actions Service, the EAS, should include a directorate on cultural and digital diplomacy in its organization. EAS works closely with the European Commission to coordinate the strategic deployment of the cultural aspects of external policy. And we are still waiting to see this happen now, actually.

In this fast-paced global context, we should realize that both Public and Cultural Diplomacy constitute integral components of foreign policy. On the one hand, they contribute to framing and maintaining the soft power of an international actor, on the other they constitute an avenue for communicating with foreign and domestic public in increasing reciprocal understanding.

Let me close here with a quote from Professor Grygiel who in the pages of National Interest said, “Europe’s raison d’etre can be restored only by a regeneration of its foundations based on history and culture. The etymology of the word culture,” he proceeds, “refers to the things that need to be cultivated, implying that these things to be cherished for the future. Europe is missing these things now;” he concluded, “and thus, it is becoming little more than a civilizational cult. Decline is a choice, it was recently argued. We are called to decide whether we want to undertake that path. Talking culture, through Diplomacy, is not just a way to build bridges among countries, it is also a way to rebuild our vision of ourselves, and to create more inclusive societies at home. ”

I wish you today a very fruitful discussion with interesting results and follow up. Once again, welcome to the Vesalius College. Thank you very much for your attention.
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“Space for Peace in the South Caucasus”
Senator Dominique Tilmans, Member of the Belgian Senate

( Brussels, May 22nd - 24th, 2014)

Good morning to all of you. Thank you to Mr. Donfried for inviting me to this meeting. Today I will speak about the South Caucasus.

English is not my first language and I hope you will excuse my poor English. I am a woman of peace and of course there is a reason for that. The reason is because I run peace actions in the South Caucasus. I will speak about two colloquiums that I organized in the Belgian Senate in 2010 and 2012 and I will speak about a new project, which is about space.

The goal of those actions... there are three goals. The first one is to allow women to become actors of peace and peace processes in the South Caucasus. And also a force of reconciliation. The second point is to make Europe the equal of the conflict in the South Caucasus in order to try to influence the radical positions in both countries. And three, as my humble level, is to publish the population to the peace as the Group of Minsk wishes it. I don’t know if you know anything about the situation of the South Caucasus. Not a lot people know about it. The South Caucasus are a group of neighboring countries across east and west. It is in the grip of conflicts such as Abkhazia, Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

And the conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh is really unknown in Europe. It is now 20 years since the the major powers of the world— the US, Russia, and France— tried to find a solution for this conflict. We say it is a frozen conflict, but it is not really a frozen conflict because people are dying in both countries. Until now, no solution has been found. It’s really a pity because it is really a region with the same cultural identification. But as usual, the problem is politics. It comes from Russia, let’s say.

I organized two colloquiums in the Belgian Senate in May 2010, called Armenian and Azerbaijani Women to Dialogue. This first meeting gathered two women in order to give them the opportunity to speak—only to speak together, and to seize the opportunity for each of them to become a peace messenger in their own country. This first meeting was really difficult, because you have two women who speak more about hate than friendship. But they agreed that we should go further and try to do something together. And so we organized different meetings in Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belgium and Tbilisi. We also organized a meeting in Switzerland and there we met the International Red Cross and it was a very important meeting because in it they asked all the questions to the IRC about missing persons, about prisoners, and dead people. And there they understood that the governments of both countries were saying things only to spread hate between all the people. Because all the questions of missing people are resolved today. So this meeting we had in Switzerland was really important because it gave trust to them. And then those two women, and women associations from Armenia and Azerbaijan, understood the processes of their governments and the war, and they understood that they had something to do together.

And then I organized a second colloquium, it was in the Belgian Senate again in 2012. It’s called ‘Challenges and perspectives in South Caucasus— roles for women’. This conference brought together a panel of experts like Bernard Fassier; the former vice president of the Group of Minsk, Pierre Aparaxine; deputy head of the delegation of IRC in Europe; Pierre R. who was the ambassador of the European Commission in Baku; Pierre-Philippe Lefort, the EU special representative for South Caucasus; UN Women and a lot of Women associations from Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. This colloquium had two goals. The first was to use Brussels as a sounding board to better apprehend the situation in the South Caucasus and especially the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The other goal was to sensitize authorities from the three regions of the necessity to integrate women in peace processes. After this meeting, we decided to set up a platform of co-ordination of peace by women of the three regions.

The last project is Space for Peace in the South Caucasus. It is a very interesting project. I’m chair of the space working group of the Senate and I was in 2013 chair of the European Inter-parliamentary space conference. I said, well, it can be very interesting to mix those presidencies with the South Caucasus. And so we set up this big project, but you have to know that now it’s been 20 years since Armenia and Azerbaijan refused all projects together. It is really difficult, which is why I try to make it happen. The goal of this project is to bring closer two communities in conflict to prepare the populations for peace. To encourage women, through a scientific approach, to overcome the hostility widespread in both countries and space is our lever—you have to know that space is our future, the future of humanity. Space is in our daily lives— weather forecasting, internet, television, GPS, climate change, mobile phones—we use space all the time. But to develop those services and to go further in the space sector, we need young scientists, because the people who are working in the space sector are usually quite old, and we in Europe and the US don’t have enough young people who are interested in scientific careers and space related careers. We need chemists, physics, lawyers, commercial people, web designers—we need a lot of different young students interested in these skills.

The project I would like to launch in the South Caucasus is dedicated to two women—one Armenian and one Azerbaijani—with scientific and space-related knowledge. It would be better if they had links to Nagorno-Karabakh. They will work together with two young scientific Belgian women, one from the north, one from the south, because we are also a difficult country. And we have an astronaut who agreed to be our scientific reference, and will fix the theme of the project. The project has different phases. The first one is to have a meeting in Brussels, to define the project and its theme. Second, we will have a meeting in Tbilisi. Third, after one year, they will present their work in the Belgian Parliament. And then we will send them to Vienna to attend a launch of a satellite. It’s a wonderful project, we have the support of the Belgian foreign ministry, the Ministry for science and the European space agency. The project has two origins—first is to help, in a conflict zone, young women scientists to accept dialogue and to work together. And second, to demonstrate that the space sector is a sector of the future. It will be, if we succeed, the first time that space can be used for something else other than technology, to be used for peace. I can tell you that a lot of people from the space sector are very interested by this project because they like that space can be used for something else other than technology. That said, nothing is simple in the South Caucasus. When I went back two or three months ago, Armenia had accepted the project, the Armenian young scientist is very talented; in Azerbaijan it is a little bit more difficult—they don’t accept a project like this, because now there are high tensions between the two countries. So diplomacy needs time to be soft. You must
be flexible with your plans. So I decided to change our project a little bit, because I see that it was not possible to succeed right now. I decided to invite Armenian and Azerbaijani scientists to Belgium, to meet our astronaut and our Nobel Physics Prize Laureate, and also to meet a young scientist from the University of Liege. It’s a new way, and I think this project needs time. We shouldn’t push it too strongly. I think this new option will increase trust between us, and I hope that in the end we can arrive at our goal. In the South Caucasuses relations are always going up and down. In the beginning relations were good, and both sides agreed on the project. But now with heightened tensions, we don’t have such an agreement anymore. I think all of us should have to projects for peace in such countries, because it takes us slowly towards our goals. With trust, I believe we can move mountains.
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It is my pleasure to be here this morning and I take this opportunity to thank you most profoundly for inviting me to participate in this very important seminar to share my thoughts on building cultural bridges to strengthen the relationship between Europe and the global community. And of course Europe and Africa more specifically.

Since we are in an academic setting I thought I should reflect on some conceptual questions. And of course, try as much as possible to be as provocative because I am not encumbered by the constrains of diplomacy. So I can speak and talk more openly and frankly about a number of questions. Of course, I believe that you are adopting the Chatham House rules for your discussions. So with that assurance, professor, I will speak as open as possible. Thank you very much.

Of course, the subject that we are discussing has attracted little scholarly attention despite the practices intersection with a range of other subjects. Its long history and substantial investment by some practitioners. First, I think politicians and diplomats, like myself, we would regard cultural diplomacy as a lesser cousin of the whole enterprise of diplomacy. I don’t think we have given cultural diplomacy the place of pride that it has to be given. And, understandably because I think diplomacy by its nature is a very conservative enterprise which is time-honored and is bound by convention. There are a lot of does and don’t in diplomacy. I hope with time we can change this so that we can make a diplomacy more dynamic. To move with the times and of course, to be attractive to young people. It should not be an evocation that should be the preserve of middle-aged men and elderly women. Well, mostly men. There are very few women. Normally, women are the spouses which is very unfortunate but that has to change. We need to see more and more women taking an active part in diplomacy. I think if we were to have more women in diplomacy, I think we would have less conflict in the world. I think we would have more cooperation and less conflict in the world.

The deployment of estates culture and support of its foreign policy was prominent in the cold war-era. Though I would argue that the use of cultural diplomacy during the cold war-era was largely propagandist. It was propagandist in nature and imperialist in nature. It sought to impose particular norms and values that were deemed to be superior. That way, we are deemed to enjoy a greater degree of universality. I think Africa is in serious bouts of that during the colonial periods with the imposition of foreign languages and foreign culture in Africa, the subjugation of many of our people though policies of assimilation. Of course, later, the postcolonial-era with the imperial notion of the promotion of particular cultural values in Africa and elsewhere.
So I don’t think that has given cultural diplomacy a good name as it were. I think it is only after the post-
cold war era that we begin to see cultural diplomacy being defined in ways that are developmental and
ways that are more progressive. Indeed, it is now being embraced by many countries as a useful instrument
for the projection of what Prof. Joseph Nye calls “soft power.” Cultural diplomacy is indeed a key element
of soft power that increasingly more and more states as a tool to propagate, as a tool to promote their
values. Indeed, countries such as the UK, France and Germany continue to support cultural diplomacy.
Many diplomats may support the cultural diplomacy principal but in practice I think we tend to put it at
the lower end of our priorities as I have mentioned. In a world in which diplomatic service have to deal
with a wide range of questions today we deal with a lot of issues – climate change post, 2015 development
agenda, issues of global peace and security, the issues of Ukraine, Syria, of course the multiple conflicts
in Africa in the Sahel region, South Sudan, Central African Republic, Somalia the horn of Africa – all these
issues are preoccupying diplomats in a big way. Of course the issues of cultural diplomacy take it backstep
when it comes to the propagation of the full spectra of the diplomatic arsenal by countries. So in my view,
cultural diplomacy could be a useful tool for promoting peace and development.

I think there are a number of examples were we have seen how cultural diplomacy has contributed to
confidence building measures and softened attitudes between adversarial powers. Of course, the recent
element of the American basketball player Rodman who went to North Korea is not necessarily a successful
example that one can quote or use to demonstrate the effects of the positive impact of cultural diplomacy.
But indeed, if that was managed properly, it could have contributed in some positive way in softening the
attitudes between Pyongyang and Washington and Pyongyang and other capitals of the world as well.
But also we saw, in China for example, how Mao’s diplomacy with Nixon where he was sending Pandas to
Nixon as a way of trying to soften the relations. That also contributed in some way in normalizing relations
between Beijing and Washington at the time. But also the performance by the New York orchestra in
Pyongyang just at the end of the Cold War also went in some way in helping to soften the relations between the
US and North Korea. But I don’t think that we have ensured there is momentum in all these incidents.
These have been more isolated and coordinated kind of incidents which have not been linked to the overall
product strategy of diplomacy. But I am quite certain that if these were connected of the overall objective
of promoting normalization of relations we could have gone a long way in ensuring that indeed the ease
normalization of relations between the US and North Korea in particular.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of South Africa’s freedom and democracy. In fact, just as I speak to
you, the presidents elect is being inoculated in South Africa on Mandela square in Pretoria. Indeed, it is
a very proud and a very special moment for South Africa. Because as you might know, we emerge from
a divided history, a violent history, a past that was characterized by discrimination and apartheid, a past
that was declared by the international community as a crime against humanity. So we have emerged out
of that and 20 years on we have made tremendous progress as a country in terms of building a united
South Africa, taking advantage of the diversity and the strength of this country. And using this strength to
propel us to a new era of unity of development and prosperity. Indeed we occupied our rightful place in
the community of nations playing a positive and constructive role as a responsible global citizen promoting
peace and development in Africa. Also, playing an active part in advocating the reform of global institutions,
the UN and Bretton Woods institutions. Also, building bridges between the between the North and the
South and promote social solidarity. In all this, we have also deployed cultural diplomacy as an important
tool in advancing peace, democracy, justice and human rights globally. Also promoting an agenda with
issues that confront humanity. We are privileged to be home to a diverse range of artists who have made
name globally. The Grammy award-winning Ladysmith Black Mambazo, the Soweto Gospel group from
my hometown where I come from in Soweto. Miriam Makeba was well-known and the jazz legend music
maestro Hugh Masekela performed just on Thursday. He made his performance here in Brussels. Of course,
also Oscar winning actors such as Charlize Theron. The list is numerous but we have deployed all these
people to help promote the South African brand. The South African brand is not distinct from a universal
brand. It is a brand that is used to promote universal values. Democracy, human rights tolerance and the
values of national reconciliation that was advocated by our global icon, the late president, Mandela that
passed away last year.

But more specifically, our cultural diplomacy objectives. Let me just make a reference to some of the
initiatives that we have taken as a country in this area of work. We have played a key role of the development
of the African Union chart for African cultural denizens, which was adopted by the first African Union
conference of Ministers of culture in 2005. It was adopted by the assembly of Heads of State in 2006.
This chart seeks to promote a unified approach cultural values, language, heritage and creative industries
essential to sustainable development.

The cultural development heritage in Africa still faces major challenges of lack of capacity in financial
resources particularly with regards to the listing of the Heritage Sites. Africa is rich in heritage and by now
we should have increased our Heritage Sites listings in UNESCO. However, because of the lack of capacity
in both human and capital, African countries are still behind on this issue. Another challenge is of course to
maintain the balance between preservation and protection of Heritage Sites.

Indeed there is a huge problem with illicit trafficking of cultural items which also undermines the creative
industries in Africa. There is a long history in this activity as I have mentioned, dating back to the dark
days of colonialism, many cultural products had been stolen from Africa. We engaged in a very intensive
discussion with our partners, EU included, to repatriate these cultural items that belong to Africa to where
they belong. I am quite certain that in you, we have a critical mass of people that we can rely on support
to help us to repatriate these cultural items to where they belong. Of course, at the recent summit held in
Brussels between African and European heads of states, there was a pledge that was made of all heads of
states to continue efforts fighting the illicit trade in cultural goods and also they agreed to work towards
protecting the national archives.
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It is by cooperation in tackling these important issues that you can enhance the partnership between and Europe. The promotion of culture is as I have mentioned the key cornerstone for our relationship with the EU. We currently have two very exciting programs that we are running with France and the UK. With France, for example, we have agreed to host alternatively in South Africa and France. The name of the cultural program is “South Africa French seasons”. This season’s program has been successfully held in France in 2013 and in South Africa in 2014. The program concentrates on culture and the arts but also in sports and novel approaches in the fields of education, the sciences and in business. The “French South Africa seasons” offers the French people a claim of the cultural scene of South Africa, which is contemporary and dynamic and embraces the diversity of our society.

The second example of a successful collaboration is with the UK which was lodged in March 2014. The objective of this is to use the power of culture to break down the barriers between people. Also, to build trust indeed mutual respect as well as support economy growth, job creation and sustainable livelihoods. This has helped to improve people to people contact because people to people contact are more enduring than interstate relations. Interstate relations are nice to have but people to people contact are more enduring. They are not constrained by any protocols, any formalities. They are spontaneous. These are the relations that I like more than the formalistic relations of diplomacy which sometimes can be very heavy on protocol. We are soon going to reach a stage in the world where we are going to talk about post interstate relations. We talk about people to people relations as a major dynamic and a major driver of the global exchanges that are taking place. It think this is an exciting period. The social media is also fueling this interchange through Twitter and Facebook and all of that. People are breaking the barriers, you no longer have to go through the formal channels.

The next year is the final year of the implementation of the Millennium Development goals MDG. Indeed the countdown has begun. We are going to have a big meeting in New York next year in September to make an assessment and renew our efforts. But of course our balance sheet does show that a lot still has to be done. Particularly in Africa and other parts of the developing world, we still have a big job in terms of realizing the MDGs. Indeed it has to be this widespread insistence on integration of culture. Culture is a catalyst in the post 2015 development agenda. This was echoed by the UN secretary-general Ban Ki Moon. Recently, when he mentioned that too many well-intended development have failed because they did not take cultural settings into account. Development is not always focused enough on people to mobilize people; we need to understand and embrace their culture. This means encouraging dialogue, listening to individual voices and ensuring that culture and human rights inform the new cause for sustainable development. Culture is at the beginning and at the end of development and indeed this is for this reason the liberations on the 2015 liberation framework must incorporate cultural considerations in the agenda.

Let me conclude by saying we believe that it is critical that cultural diplomacy should be mainstreamed. All countries should mainstream cultural diplomacy. It is important to have cultural exchanges because they break barriers, help create understanding and remove misconceptions as well as stereotypes. Two days ago, I read that Jean-Marie Le Pen was saying that in France that the best way of dealing with the problem of migration is to spread an Ebola disease amongst the migrants in France and that that will help to address the problem of migration. I think all these worrying tendencies that threaten the spirit of tolerance, understanding and coexistence that has emerged in the post-cold war era. If we do not deal with them, they pose the real threat of reversing progress and the advance that we have made over the last 20 years in ensuring that we leave in a humane world where peoples dignity and peoples worth is recognized by all without any prejudice based on ethnicity, color and race. Thank you.
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It gives me indeed a great pleasure of giving you some thoughts about the idea of cultural diplomacy as seen by somebody who has been in public office on a local level in the city of Antwerp for more than fourteen years and ten years as a Vice-Mayor of the city of Antwerp. So that is exactly what I am going to do and take you through this adventure.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, Lorenzo di Medici and Niccolo Machiavelli used it; Louis XIV, Richelieu and Mazanne used it; Queen Maria Teresa and Metternich used it; Elizabeth I and Walsingham used it; it is indeed what we have been talking about for the last few days about cultural diplomacy. There are missions, those people that I have just mentioned were entrusted with the value of diplomatic missions to local and other European courts. These missions required great diplomacy and a sophisticated understanding of what politics is about. All kinds of art were often used as a kind of diplomacy to expose power and to start the conversation. The Dutch, ladies and gentlemen, used culture as diplomacy only a few weeks ago when they put President Obama in front of the night watch – Rembrandt’s most famous painting and an icon of the Netherlands.

But you and I – we do not need Bob Dylan to understand that times are constantly changing. New times require new strategies and these times are evolving in a speed no-one has ever seen before in the history of mankind. I will give you three insights from my experience as I see cultural diplomacy evolving. First of all, I would like to make a statement about the importance of culture and how often it is still an unexplored source of diplomatic power, and I think I will come close to what the previous speaker, His Excellency, has been saying. And there I will give you a set of good practices from my own experience in the city of Antwerp. Secondly, I would like to talk about the shift from vertical to horizontal cultural diplomacy. And the third point that I would like to make is about the new role of diplomats, and how a new kind of diplomats are entering a new level playing field. In all these cases, it will become clear that I do not regard cultural diplomacy as a profession, but rather as a state of mind, more as an entrepreneurial attitude.

So let me start by emphasizing the importance of culture. Heinrich Heine, famous quote of 1823, was “Where they have burnt books, they will ultimately end in burning people.” That, ladies and gentlemen, should not be forgotten. It is one quote that says exactly how important culture is. Culture is key to what in my opinion turns people into what we are. It is what makes us human beings. And a city is a collection of human beings. So culture defines a city. In my city the city of Antwerp has played a tremendous role for that in the past 600-700 years. It was the city where the stock market was invented; where the polyphonist Orlando di Lasso worked; where Thomas Moore sat and wrote his Utopia; where the teens’ tale Bible was printed; and where painters like Massisij, Brueghel and Van Dyke, and our printers were controlling the image industry already in the sixteenth century – I will come to that later. Today, Antwerp is the city of well-known artists as Luc Tuymans and Jan Fabre, and as you know, it is a world’s diamond city and it has the second largest port in Europe. I am saying all of these just to say one more thing – in my city we have 172 different nationalities. Ladies and gentlemen, there is no city in Africa which has that number of different nationalities. Together with Amsterdam and New York, this is the top three in the world. It is a very tiny, small city – 500,000 inhabitants but 172 different nationalities. And that is the part where visitors come in – a change in culture and views, a variety of languages, curiosity, religions. Ladies and gentlemen, they all belong to the DNA of the city.

Now, how can one ever draw the attention of international guests, of companies, businessmen, tourists, investors, students, academics, families if we would not be able to say who we are? How on Earth can we establish relationships by not using culture as the main question? And I may say that in those many years I have spoken to diplomats and ambassadors from all over the world who, I am sorry to say, did not know much about culture – neither their own, nor of let us say the culture of the country where they were stationed. How is that possible today in the 21st century? How can a diplomat be trained without acquiring any cultural knowledge and skills? What really worries me, ladies and gentlemen, is that during diplomatic days – and I think it exists all over the world – where ambassadors are asked to come to the capital of their country and where they are informed and have debate for a couple of days together. Let us be honest – you do not hear a lot of questions about culture at those diplomatic days. All topics most of the time deal with international topics, international conflicts, international economy, financial markets. Nobody asks for possible strategies dealing with culture.

Yet culture is what we are; what distinguishes us from others. In my opinion, culture is the window in which we see the world. And without understanding and appreciating each other’s culture, the windows will be closed and fear will rule the world. And let us not forget, ladies and gentlemen, local conflicts always – and I am affirming that – always have a cultural dimension as well. Movie houses were closed and music was banned under the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. And extremists only recently tried to destroy the Holy Shrines in Mali’s cultural capital Timbuktu. It is always about culture. Look at what is happening in Crimea at this moment – it is about culture. It is not about the assets, it is not about the financial market – it is about who we are. Are we more European, are we more Russian, are we more religious, are we non-religious, are we Christian, are we Muslim – it always goes back to exactly what we are. And it is about culture, it is about identity.

So using culture as a diplomatic tool is exactly what I have been trying to do on a very, very small scale for more than a decade now in the city of Antwerp. We established a partnership with Singapore by bringing to them prestigious exhibitions like the Story of Image and we did the same with the city of Shanghai. Drawing attention, creating awareness, establishing contacts, building partnerships and finally attracting investors and visitors – that is how it works. We created strong ties with New York by working together with Ellis Island for our brand new Red Star Line Museum about migration. And we used our Belgian-born fashion icon Diane von Furstenberg as our Ambassador in Manhattan. We were helped by all the former US Ambassadors, former Ambassadors of the United States to Brussels, to Belgium. And when the Royal Ballet of Flanders goes dancing at Lincoln Centre in New York or the main leading theatre company in this country De Torneros – in the northern part of Belgium, in the Flemish-speaking part of Belgium – they are present every year at the Cour d’Honneur in Avignon. And most recently, and I am very proud to say that if you read...
the newspapers of today it is all over. I came back yesterday from Rome after negotiating for a year and a half for an exhibition which we are opening later this year in September about holy places and holy books and for the first time ever we bring together the three world religions in one exhibition. Muslims, Jews and Christians. And there were three major objects that I wanted to have. I wanted to have some piece of the Kaaba in Mecca in Antwerp. They never left, until now, they have never left the Topkapi museum in Istanbul. I want to have a piece of the Dead Sea scrolls from Jerusalem which are so important for the Jewish culture. They never left Jerusalem since they were placed in a bunker of a museum. And I wanted to have a painting of Caravaggio in Italy in the Saint Augustino church which was painted by Caravaggio for that specific spot. That painting, ladies and gentlemen, did not leave Italy in the last 237 years. I am so proud today that because of the help of diplomats and persons from all over the world, those three objects will be present in the museum of Antwerp later in September.

So it is all about connecting people – and connections are the start of relationships. Relationships are the cornerstone of any kind of investments, whether this is economically or politically. And it is necessary to say that this kind of networking is going in all directions and not any longer in vertical peer-to-peer direction. The new way people communicate and network with each other nowadays entails a new kind of cultural diplomacy. And this brings me to my second point – my first one was about the importance of culture; my second is the shift from vertical to horizontal cultural diplomacy. In the game of power efficiency will become the best legitimacy. A new revolution affecting cultural diplomacy is what I call horizontalism, my second is the shift from vertical to horizontal cultural diplomacy. In the game of power efficiency will become the best legitimacy. A new revolution affecting cultural diplomacy is what I call horizontalism, my second is the shift from vertical to horizontal cultural diplomacy. In the game of power efficiency will become the best legitimacy. A new revolution affecting cultural diplomacy is what I call horizontalism, my second is the shift from vertical to horizontal cultural diplomacy. In the game of power efficiency will become the best legitimacy. A new revolution affecting cultural diplomacy is what I call horizontalism. The more diversity, I would say, the better. This is not about chaotic diversity, but rather about organizations and programs in more than 150 countries. They built up partnerships by forming clusters of the institutes operating in a country regardless, and this is important, regardless of the cultural field they are involved in. The more diversity, I would say, the better. This is not about chaotic diversity, but rather about organizations with a complementary field of expertise. As an example, some Baltic states’ clusters are specialized in wood architecture and restoration, while for instance some Mediterranean clusters maybe specialized in stone heritage and so on. Anyway, EUNIC is expanding horizontally in the EU and this horizontalism is well-recognized, recommended and encouraged by the EU programs.

The reason why I cherish this example of EUNIC in the European administration and why I embrace this new, broader definition of culture is because it reflects perfectly what we have been doing also in the last ten years in Antwerp. It might surprise you, ladies and gentlemen, but new cultural diplomacy is actually going back to old cultural diplomacy. Back to times when the expression cultural diplomacy did not exist yet and people were not yet confined to their job description. They were not locked up in rules and functions yet, they were not limited to their departments, competence profiles or vertical careers. Diplomacy in those days was an art and an attitude – not a specialization you could learn at school. I speak of the times before the Industrial Revolution, before the factories and the romantic ideas that arose to escape reality. This old horizontal model is making a comeback.

For instance, in my city in Antwerp, since I was elected as a Deputy Mayor ten years ago, I have been trying to make people understand in Antwerp that economy and arts, culture and finance are no counterparts, but complements of the same ambition. As Charles Laundry and Richard Florida, and others launched the third cultural industry, this idea already existed in previous times – long before the romantic idea of the poor, suffering artist a la Van Gogh became popular. I am referring to the sixteenth century, the golden age of Antwerp. I am referring to those times when Antwerp was the Manhattan or the Hong Kong of the Baroque age. I am referring to those times when industrial printing was made to perfection in Antwerp. You can still visit the Plantin Museum. Plantin was, if I may say, what Steve Jobs is today. He was controlling the word and image production of the then known world. Kings and Queens, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Albrecht Durer, Sir Thomas Moore, Lukas van Leeden strolled around in the city seeking contacts and connections. It was the age of Van Dyke and Rubens, and both were cultural diplomat by excellence. If you ever, ever need an example of a cultural ambassador and you want to make a statement going back for 500 years, than you would definitely want to look up the life of Rubens.

Rubens was a diplomat and got assignments of King Phillip II to create, ladies and gentlemen, peace between Spain and the Spanish Low Countries, and England. He is a classical example of, what I would call, somebody with a horizontal diplomatic career. He painted for Maria di Medici, Queen of France, the English King, the King of Spain, and many, many, many others. Like a kind of let us say James Bond, he drove in a carriage through Holland with closed curtains, afraid of being caught by the Protestant Dutch as being a spy for the Catholics. He had already the reputation of being one of the greatest artists of his time, if not the greatest of all times, and one of the most important things – and it is something which I always like to say in this country, in Belgium – where we sometimes make the political life miserable because of the fact, ladies and gentlemen, and it is still going on today, there are large political representatives in this country that are not capable of talking to each other because they do not speak the same language. Rubens in his days spoke seven languages. I can assure you – to learn French for me as somebody who lives in the northern part is not difficult. And to learn Flemish or Dutch for somebody who lives in the south is not difficult. And to learn English is not difficult. And to learn Chinese is not difficult. If you want to learn something from somebody, if you want to understand somebody, that is what you should do. I am not getting elected tomorrow, I am not participating in the elections, but let me say one thing – I would find it great that before you would be able to get elected, you would have to pass a test to understand your colleagues who you would be speaking to there. It would make life easy. It is exactly what Rubens did in those days. He learned Spanish, he learned Italian, he learned German, he learned French without computers, Google and Wikipedia. Can you imagine that?
Ladies and gentlemen, if I am talking about Rubens there is one book I would like to emphasize for you. It is a tremendous book. It reads almost – I was going to say better than a Dan Brown and you see what I am saying – but it is a tremendous book by the author Mark Lamster and he wrote a book about Rubens with a title Master of Shadows – the Secret Diplomatic Career of the Painter Peter Paul Rubens.

Ladies and gentlemen, cultural diplomacy never ends. 400 years later Peter Paul Rubens is still for me a great cultural diplomat. I cannot talk as a representative of my city in the world about my city without referring to Peter Paul Rubens – just as the Ambassador did when discussing South Africa. Go to the Prado in Madrid, the Hermitage in Saint Petersburg or Banqueting Hall in London – that is the future of cultural diplomacy.

Horizontalism implies that we all have to become a bit more Rubens, I would say. The future does not belong to the one trick pony that excels in its own specialization – we need more than ever people who can help us in keeping the overview. We need you – connect us! I always refuse to be confined in my vertical role as merely being responsible for culture, tourism, economy or some other things. I have travelled around the world using cultural assets as a touristic and economic trumpet cards. And on the other hand, we teach our people of the cultural and economic department to think broadly, to think internationally, to join forces and to cluster our assets. This horizontal approach, this cross-selling of our destination is the key, in my opinion, of sustainable partnerships – not only for my country, but for the whole of my city as well.

This is, of course, not confined to civil service – it is a collaboration of private industry, artists and all kinds of players abroad. And they all share one common way of thinking. It is that you should not only create a good will for your work and as a consequence for the place where you live and that you represent. No! It is not that one way of communicating anymore. Our roles are horizontalized. Our roles are enlarged and what we all should do is teaching the people in their own place to think outside in, to have empathy for what is happening abroad, to filter the right information about the right places. Places that can link to yours. That thinking outside in is different to what was a thinking from inside out. That is the DNA of a modern cultural diplomacy. That attitude cannot be spread out of over a city, a region, or a nation by people who are diplomats or politicians only. Of course, I agree with His Excellency – we need our diplomats more than ever. But it is no longer the responsibility of diplomats only. It is also about people to people as the ambassadors or the diplomats. On the contrary, it should be an attitude of all those who have than ability to cross borders – both geographically and intellectually.

And this brings me seamlessly to my last and third point. I see a new role for diplomats and I see a new kind of players abroad. And they all share one common way of thinking. It is that you should not only create a good will for your work and as a consequence for the place where you live and that you represent. No! It is not that one way of communicating anymore. Our roles are horizontalized. Our roles are enlarged and what we all should do is teaching the people in their own place to think outside in, to have empathy for what is happening abroad, to filter the right information about the right places. Places that can link to yours. That thinking outside in is different to what was a thinking from inside out. That is the DNA of a modern cultural diplomacy. That attitude cannot be spread out of over a city, a region, or a nation by people who are diplomats or politicians only. Of course, I agree with His Excellency – we need our diplomats more than ever. But it is no longer the responsibility of diplomats only. It is also about people to people as the ambassadors. On the contrary, it should be an attitude of all those who have than ability to cross borders – both geographically and intellectually.

And this brings me seamlessly to my last and third point. I see a new role for diplomats and I see a new kind of players abroad. And they all share one common way of thinking. It is that you should not only create a good will for your work and as a consequence for the place where you live and that you represent. No! It is not that one way of communicating anymore. Our roles are horizontalized. Our roles are enlarged and what we all should do is teaching the people in their own place to think outside in, to have empathy for what is happening abroad, to filter the right information about the right places. Places that can link to yours. That thinking outside in is different to what was a thinking from inside out. That is the DNA of a modern cultural diplomacy. That attitude cannot be spread out of over a city, a region, or a nation by people who are diplomats or politicians only. Of course, I agree with His Excellency – we need our diplomats more than ever. But it is no longer the responsibility of diplomats only. It is also about people to people as the ambassadors. On the contrary, it should be an attitude of all those who have than ability to cross borders – both geographically and intellectually.
Putin and tell him “Mr. Putin, we are going to put some cameras in Moscow to see what is happening in the streets and we have very good news – you can put one in Brussels as well!” He would not reply. What at that moment diplomats could not achieve all of a sudden Google Street View has done.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you need any other example of what kind of times we are living in today? In 1933, the British diplomat Harold Nicholson wrote that among his colleagues – and I am going to quote him: “It would have been regarded as an act of unthinkable vulgarity to appeal to the common people upon any issue of international policy”. The British diplomat was talking about a term with a more restrictive meaning at the time. Even in 1933, cultural propaganda or cultural diplomacy did exist under various forms but those actions were not labeled as public. It is necessary to say that these times will never come back. In 2014, the importance of those so-called common people gradually increased because of their increased decision-power and the growth in the uncontrolled information sources available to all of them. Look at what is happening at the moment in Turkey. What happens if the government decides that the people should no longer have access to the Internet, to Twitter or to Facebook? It creates a revolution.

Ladies and gentlemen, cultural diplomacy is all about trust. And trust is what the world needs. So, and I end with this – I want to give you an example of a man whose funeral we had yesterday. It was somebody I had the honor of working with when I started my political career. I worked closely with the former Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene who passed away last week and was buried yesterday. He was a man of not too many words, but he was a man with a great vision – everybody agrees on that. He is very known and very well-respected in the whole of Europe. He was able to lead Belgium into the Eurozone in difficult times. But one of his tricks was his silence. Very famous in Belgium is his standard response to journalists in times of political crises when he said, “No comment.” This silence, this way of being discreet was highly esteemed by his friends and political opponents, and so he could gain trust. In one of his last interviews he said, “These are other times and require other capabilities. Trust will be built in public.” This strategy of Jean Luc belonged to the old vertical times and he knew very well that trust will be built up in public and by the public nowadays. He knew that that new rules and new definitions require new players. “Trust will be built up in public” could have been the title of my speech today, because more than ever listening will become part of our cultural relations. Listening offline and listening online. Reflecting a general interest in others’ perspective and demonstrating that their viewpoints are taken seriously and that other perspectives are given consideration.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, cultural diplomacy is a specific type of entrepreneurial behavior and like entrepreneurship, it is an attitude and a state of mind. I started this keynote with the name of Machiavelli and I will finish with him by referring to what he wrote: “Entrepreneurs are simply those who understand that there is a little difference between obstacle and opportunity and are able to turn both in their advantage.” I am very hopeful about the future of cultural diplomacy because I only see opportunities there.

---
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Hello everybody, after the last lecture by Mr. Heylen, whom I know because I have lived in Antwerp for five years I feel like I have to give some completely different lecture and I’ll just pick out some words because everything I am going to say has a whole lot to do with what he said and I have a completely different view on society and the world. It starts with trust, I’ll admit that one, trust is a basic thing when it comes to cultural dialogue and inter-religious dialogue and so on but that is exactly the problem. There is a whole lot of distrust and not so much on the other side. The distrust is within us, it’s within the European culture. This is one thing.

The second thing is that we look at cultural diplomacy as if we are going to do some dialogue with the other cultures. It’s the others which are culturalised and we don’t culturalise ourselves, we don’t even have a clue what our culture is about.

One of the fun things about our culture is that basically many of the examples given were things about entrepreneurship and business for the simple matter that our culture right now, today has become a monoculture of global consumption. A global consumption society, that’s the vision, and everybody else is being dragged into it and all and all if you travel the world a bit you can be optimistic and all fun about it but half of the time all cultures are re-eradicated because of that culture. Only look at the way we dress, for example, when we talk about cultural dialogue we aren’t talking about cultural dialogue, we are trying to universalize other people into Western culture. Look at dresses, for example. If an Arab, a Chinese, an African dresses in Western clothes there’s no problem, we aren’t talking about cultural dialogue, we are trying to universalize other people and re-eradicate their own culture.

It’s the others which are culturalised and we don’t culturalise ourselves, we don’t even have a clue what our culture is about.

Last thing I want to mention because it’s a typical thing that comes up again and again. All those bad other cultures like the Taliban in Afghanistan and the people in Mali. That’s a completely modern phenomenon when Sunnis are bombing Shias in Pakistan at the moment that didn’t use to be the case 50-60 years ago. It’s a thing that originated within the aftermath of colonialism. It’s something that originally is within nationalism. Let’s take something typical that everybody equates with the culture of Islam, like suicide bombing, which is absolutely ridiculous within Islam but we associate it with it. But when you look at the research being done about suicide bombing, all the research shows that 80-90 per cent of suicide bombers in the last 15-20 years have all been secular suicide bombers. The big majority is the Tamil Tigers of Sri Lanka and in India, those are the biggest groups of suicide bombers. And when you look at Iraq and Afghanistan, suicide bombing only originated after the occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq and the moment they left Iraq suicide bombing declined and almost disappeared, except for the couple of instances with sectarian conflict which didn’t use to be there and which is there now. So we have a bit of a blind spot for what we are doing and creating in the world. And when we come back to Antwerp it’s all nice to talk about 150 cultures we have. Yes, it’s great and, it’s a fun city to be at. But somebody wearing a headscarf can’t be sitting at the desk to register somebody in the municipality because he might not be neutral. If a person is neutral in his dealings that should be all fine so Muslims in Antwerp particularly feel very distrust and yes they distrust the politicians because they haven’t trusted Muslims for the last 20 years so it makes me a bit angry to talk about ‘oh let’s just export our culture’: what the hell are we exporting?

So to say why I am saying all these kinds of things all and all. Myself, you heard a bit of my CV but the most important part probably is that I am the halal monk at the moment, it’s a bit of a project. It’s a personal project: I go around the world and have interviews and conversations with some of the most influential on an international level theologian and spiritual leaders of the Islamic world and the most well known artists of the Islamic world. For example, the last master of ottoman suf music, and one feminist Muslim theologian who leads prayers in America and is controversial because of it. Of one of 15 most influential people on the top is Abdul Hakim Murad. He’s a scholar in Cambridge. So I have conversations with these people and that’s what I have been dealing with for a couple of years now.

Just to explain a bit about European-Islam and the point it is at today, because it’s useful to understand what we have when we talk about the Muslim community. First of all from nationality Islam to strand Islam, so many Muslim groups came to Europe simply because they were migrant workers and certainly in Flanders for example, they started working in mines and so on. So basically these were groups of rural people coming from their particular national background and that’s what they took with them. You’d have Turkish Muslims, Moroccan Muslims, and so on. That’s kind of how they felt and also how in the last 20 years they have been treated. If there was a problem with racism, which there was, it was a problem with the Turks, the Moroccans, now the Bulgarians and so on. But since 9/11 everything changed of course and you get a problem with Islam and all of a sudden they are not Turks and Moroccans but they have come to be seen as those Muslims and those Muslims supposedly have a problem. Now, those Muslims themselves because they are the third and fourth generations start connecting themselves as Muslims, partly because they are pushed to do so and partly because that’s their background now. They don’t have the connection with the country where their parents and grandparents were born in because they are third and fourth generation. So in this global age where everyone is looking for identity, of course, Islam is a big thing. But one thing is Muslim gurus is not the only new evolution but it is an evolution. They don’t necessarily look to the whole idea of a problem with Islam is not just a European thing but something you will find all over the world. There’s within that big group of people – and it’s not just a European but a global thing – I think if you look at all religious today and their global community I think the most busy one when it comes to talks and debate and interesting discussions is actually Islam. Because it’s being pushed all over the world, the whole idea of a problem with Islam is not just a European thing but something you will find all over the world. So there’s a lot of internal debates, there’s influential scholars, some of them become bit guru-like, others don’t and are just high scholars, you have got everything in Europe from ‘flower of power’ Suffi students to the bearded jihadists, yes they are all there, but the big majority is right in the middle. It’s something like a hard-working normal Muslim who goes to work, goes home, tries to feed his kids, goes to bed and is happy with his life. So, there’s a bunch of Dutch and German Muslims and they have all made similar clips following that new tradition of showing that there’s happy Muslims. It gives a lot of debate on the Internet and on Facebook and so on. But one of the things that you have to realise is ‘why the hell do they have to do it’, what do you see? Just the most normalest of people just dancing and they
call themselves Muslims so they are happy Muslims. I like the clip; there’s people who say you shouldn’t do it. That you don’t always have to portray that you are a happy Muslim, that’s an option, but that’s what’s interesting for me. There’s a bunch of Muslims who have the feeling that they have to do it, that the rest of the world thinks this is something very bizarre. Dancing and fun Muslims, where the hell all are they? Well, they are all around because you don’t recognize them. Not every Muslim walks around with the beard and a Kalashnikov. So the thing is that, yes we do have Islamophobia in the West and yes it’s a part of our culture. Yes, of course Islam has a bunch of problems all over the world but if we are going to criticise those then we also have to criticise our own problems and we have to dare to call them part of our culture. If supposedly every problem in the Muslim world comes from being Muslim, it partly has to do with the cultural root, traditions, history, stubbornness of scholarship and all you want but that’s not my topic. My topic is to see how your own psychological problems deal or are connected to your own culture. And so Islamophobia is one of those expressions that we have within our culture, which is a big fear of the other, namely Islam, which has been there for centuries and still Muslims in the European Union are about 90 millions, 3.8 per cent in total. In Belgium that’s about 10 per cent, which is quite a lot. It makes for a big problem if somebody who wears a headscarf is not capable of working in the municipality at the desk, that’s a strange thing. To kind of circumvent it there was even talk about not letting gay people wear their rainbow t-shirts. That’s how far this idea of neutrality goes but it starts from the fear of Islam. Another point is that it’s real, it’s not just Amnesty International but a bunch of NGOs warning for Islamophobia and you see in it burqa ban and headscarf debates, debates about Minarets which are not allowed to be built but every church should be allowed to do so. It’s not that Islamophobia is a specific set of thinking, it’s a type of fear and of monolithising the whole Islamic culture, acting as if there’s not difference within Islam, as if there’s always been one Islamic that has always been like that and has not been capable of evolving. It’s a concept of Islam that makes you fearful of the other. Now, the burqa ban is a perfect example: people aren’t allowed in Belgium, in France to wear a burqa and the whole fully covering clothing. There’s about people think –because there’s not real research – above a 100 of those women in Belgium. So because of 100 of them who have never done anything wrong, we have created a law which doesn’t allow them to wear it. So we took the freedom of religion, we took it away because of some perceived threat of security which has never been a real threat, which is strange if you look at it from a real juridical perspective. But it’s not a juridical perspective that we take when we discuss these things that should be obvious. So that being said that there’s a lot of discussion, a lot of variety within the Muslim community today, but we are fearful of it, it makes us not see people like Aki Nawaz. He’s a guy, he’s from London, for 20 years he is an outspoken Muslim but he has always been a very active defender of human rights, very critical of British society but just as well of his own Pakistani community, that doesn’t matter. The guy, like I say, human rights, hip-pop, he started as a punker. He came from the punk scene of the 80s in London, still he’s a bit of a punker, that’s why he’s always that critical and he’s into human rights. Still, outspoken Muslim, not just outspoken, he goes to Pakistan and he finds the real, old, religious traditional music people of Pakistan, for example, Mausam Fatah Ali Khan, who is a nephew of – who some people might know – Nusrat. This is the type of music that comes out it. What you are seeing here is punk music on top of religious devotion and they are actually singing devotional songs to Ali, who is the nephew and socal law of the prophet. It’s one big thank you and praise to Allah. That’s the traditional way of doing it with a lot of vocal improvisation and together with the hip-pop punk. So why do I take this? Because for me it’s a bit of an example of expression within the current third and fourth generation Muslim community. That’s the stuff that’s living and creating their own cultural awareness: this kind of fusion of modernity and tradition and that’s the stuff we can’t understand. That’s why we can only make this fundamentalist thing and moderate thing. But what to do with a guy like Aki Nawaz who is fervent human rights agent and still is tremendously religious, what do we do with it? We have this false dichotomy that somebody who is really religious is dangerous and somebody who is moderate, that’s the good guy. That is in itself is cultural imposition, I am a theologian, I am a Christian, I am extremely faithful if I look at myself and completely convinced of the existence of God to say something of his benevolence and that he has to work through me to get to a better world. That’s what I am convinced of and I am not too scared to say it but it’s a strange thing to say, and when you say it people look a bit like ‘uh he’s a bit of a freak isn’t he?’ and I hope I am not.
in Africa did not make sense, that in the Middle-East didn't make sense and so on. And it's a bit the same thing this classifying of cultures, it is also something that most cultures didn't do. Like for example again the Sunni and Shia: it's a division that has been there sometimes but that most of the time wasn't.

I'll give an example. There is this woman called Laudet, she's a famous female saint from the 12th century in Kashmir. People would go to it, they would be Sunny, Shia and Hindu. People would have forgotten whether she was Hindu or Muslim but that's something that in our nation-state connected to their culture doesn't make sense. But that's what makes sense in half of the world. Half of the world or 80 per cent is a hybrid thing. Scientific truth as the highest correctness, this idea that religious and spiritual ways of dealing with the world would be less important. That in itself is disastrous if you want to have a real cultural dialogue because half of the time science doesn’t say anything about ourselves. It doesn't say anything about how to be kind, how to be compassionate and so on. That's what religions do and that’s why they are so hugely important and half of the time more important than science. Not to say that science didn't do great stuff, of course it did. The economy of capitalism and industrialization I think it’s just that’s what it is and that’s also obviously something that infuriates a lot of people all over the world. Why not an economy based more on rural sets of cultural understanding, it could be done, and then the last thing I’ll come to is, together with this capitalism and industrialization and with the scientific progress thing, there is a myth and we don’t see as a myth. We see it again as the inevitable, as the de-culturalised normal flux of the world where everything will eventually a bit like we are. It won’t. It’s a myth in there. There is an almost religious conviction and at least a very cultural conviction that we are up to the top, up and up and up, and it’s impossible and we have all known it. If the whole world lives like people in the West, we all know it, then we need to two, three, four other globes. It’s impossible, and again frugality and all those kinds of things are things that religions deal with, which brings in people like for example Ajaz Khan: he works for a secular Ngo but he is an expert in micro-finance and, as such, he comes from a Muslim tradition where people are rethinking the whole thing of not asking interests. I’ll admit that: lots of Islamic banking and Sharia complying banking isn't Sharia complying at all. It's a bit of a hassle to make modern banking seem like Islamic banking while it’s not. But discounting that, the fact is that people are thinking about it, that maybe it made sense and how to implement it, and he found at least for development work a couple of ideas that are really working. Billions of people are following now and giving some money without wanting loans back directly to farmers in Pakistan and so on. Just saying, he’s a guy who took his traditions and put it within a new style of thinking. So to overcome the tension that we have with the Islamic community, certainly in Europe and at a global level do we dare to talk from within religion and to step out of this supposedly neutral secular version of non-culture which is culture after all.

And I’ll give an example: the Halal and the feast of sacrifice. I guess it’s in a lot of other countries as well but certainly in Belgium every time that the feast of sacrifice arrives then the Muslims are the big butchers again and the primitive guys who don’t care about the animals and so on. Let me tell you one thing: the way we slaughter animals has never been nice and the way our industrialised way of slaughtering animals has come to exist, had nothing to do with animal welfare and had everything to do with consumption, with going faster and with needing more animals slaughtered faster and that's exactly the same problem that we have at the feast of sacrifice. There are too many Muslims and not enough possibilities to do something decent with the animals and so you get awful images. But it’s not what Muslims want, if you look within the Islamic tradition the animals have to be treated right, only a very good expert can do the slaughtering. There are plenty of rules which actually go for the animal welfare but never ever do you hear politicians go that far to come to this understanding which is obviously there. We all want the benefit of the animals.

Now what we do not put into question is the way we handle our own animal production but we all frame it on the Muslims. So to get out of it we can find each other but we have to dig deeper within our own problems and our own cultural stickinesses. And that's the last one, one of the stickinesses is that we left spirituality behind. I don’t want to make it sound like this floaty concept. I only want to make it sounds like: ethics doesn't just come from a logical perspective on the world. That has never motivated people. If you want real ethics to be lived, look at religion. I am not saying everybody has to be religious, absolutely not. But there’s a sense of soul which is an aspect, a dimension of being human that we have negated for the last two, three, four centuries. And that one is something we have to talk about and again that’s the one that the Muslim world at the moment is debating all over the globe. Thank you.
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