NEW PRACTICES AND TRENDS
IN CULTURAL DIPLOMACY[*]

LUCIAN JORA[**]

Abstract. *The new Cultural Diplomacy strategies require a change in the attitudes, discourses, behaviors, and strategies of representations of Cultural Diplomacy practitioners The newer approaches to cultural relations involve a necessary dynamics: from events to projects from bilateral to multilateral, from presentation to co-operation, from products to process, from one-way to two-way, from telling to listening, from self promotion to values promotion and, at the end, the general shift, from selling an image to communicating it through image cultural values and attitudes.*

Keywords: *Cultural Diplomacy, Public diplomacy, cultural relations, international relations.*

The idea of *Cultural Diplomacy* is generally referred to as *International Cultural Policy* or *Foreign Cultural Policy*. The most common standpoint, from the area of political theory, tends to base the concepts of *Diplomacy* (and derived from it *Cultural Diplomacy* or *Public Diplomacy*) exclusively around the state. The close connection between diplomacy and the foreign politics of a state, add the Public and Cultural Diplomacy to the panoply of specific diplomatic practices. The new forms of Public or Cultural Diplomacy are limited to adding new practices and interlocutors to the state as the indisputable subject of any diplomatic practice. However, the reality is more complex than the political theory created to explain it. The non-state actors are increasingly becoming political players in the global sphere. Several authors remark the connection between cultural relations and the foreign politics of a nation, and take "Cultural Diplomacy" as a specific diplomatic practice, embracing the public communication of foreign policy. Cultural Diplomacy imports methods and norms from various

---

[**] Researcher, Romanian Academy, Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations; lucian.jora@europaeus.eu.

areas of social discourse, but it is normally accepted as kind of "Diplomacy" in the strict meaning of the term as far as it remains bounded by governance and keeps its instrumental nature. Anything else is usually labeled as a kind of "cultural internationalism" or "citizen diplomacy", not *stricto senso* "Diplomacy", even if they may help a lot to set up the preconditions for successful intergovernmental cultural relations. Cultural Diplomacy as a form of Public diplomacy, naturally, seems to be most effective when civil societies are interconnected. Diplomacy may still begin and end with interstate relations, but the effective exercise of influence is related increasingly to forging partnerships, leveraging private sector support, managing networks and shaping public opinion.

It is a field of study dominated by conceptual confusion. Cultural Diplomacy is often identified with *Cultural Propaganda,* and, it is indeed Propaganda as far as culture is not exposed for culture but for certain political goals. Cultural Diplomacy as such or under the form of Cultural Propaganda is as old as international relations. For example, it benefits of Roman civilization, (order, language fashion, architecture etc.), have been used as a means of persuasion. Also, Cultural Diplomacy sometimes is associated with *Branding*. The Branding dimension of Cultural Diplomacy involves schematization in order to obtain a lucrative product. What distinguishes the notion of Branding from other forms of Cultural Diplomacy is its commercial motivation. Cultural Diplomacy aims to represent the nation in all its complexity by covering multiple facets. Country Branding is the opposite, a practice that involves simplification and schematization, restricting message to several concepts of imaging.

The proliferation in recent years of non-state actors is transforming international relations including the circulation of ideas. Some consequences of globalization, such as the "crisis of the state" or the impact of new technologies, or the emergence of a powerful civil society, have multiplied the players. Non-state actors are assuming roles that previously belonged to states. In particular, new technology has made it possible to have a global reach and to contact individuals and other organizations, weaving a broad net that allows non-state players to share knowledge and to develop joint actions. They are increasing their autonomy and have started to define new rules, acting more effectively than the states. NGOs, transnational companies, religious groups, think tanks, social movements or university experts have a say on most of the global issues affecting civil society. In the international relations the coexistence of the state with new players means that a new kind of diplomatic relations on different scenarios must be developed. It works very much in coordination, with, and in parallel to the traditional diplomatic effort. The diplomatic historian Frank Ninkovich observed that public diplomacy (and the remarque can be extended to Cultural Diplomacy as a kind of Public Diplomacy) is: "the promotion or communication between peoples as opposed to governments…" and is designed to "build agreement based on common values."[1] More or less, the aim of public and Cultural Diplomacy efforts is to tell

---

[1] Ninkovich (1996), p. 3, Quoted by Margaret j Wyszomirsky (2003), in , *International Cultural Relations, AMulticountry Comparision*, Arts Policy and Administration Program, The Ohio State University, p. 1, available at http://www.culturalpolicy.org/pdf/MJWpaper.pdf.

country's own story to the world. Genuine Cultural Diplomacy as opposed to Propaganda a two-way communication process that includes both efforts to project a nation's image and values to other countries and peoples as well as to receive information and try to understand the culture, values and images of other countries and their peoples. With the continuing exponential proliferation of communication across borders, what constitutes true Cultural Diplomacy now are the elements of exchange and mutuality. From this perspective Cultural Diplomacy differs from Cultural public relations and from governmental carried Diplomacy as such, in terms of purpose. Cultural Diplomacy is not only soliciting admiration or sympathy through the showcasing of national cultural achievements. It is about building trust. Its purpose is to establish mutually beneficial cooperation and partnership.

In the past, Cultural Diplomacy was seen as a part of the broader field of Public Diplomacy, and politicies were believed to generate the necessary space for cultural exchange. Yet things are different today: it is culture which can generate the operating conditions for politicies.

The contribution of "citizen diplomats" and the "people-to-people" Public/ Cultural Diplomacy can be effective carried out through work like town twinning. The communicational revolution the intervention of new non state actors into the "diplomatic game" allows us to consider that today's *Network Diplomacy* is very different from the *Club Diplomacy* of the past (Anholt).[2] The new forms of Cultural Diplomacy also add a more sophisticated approach to nation Branding or competitive identity and it can work together to help create prosperity and improve international relations.[3] If we take the case of EU's Cultural Diplomacy we can note that with or without a centralised official diplomatic "strategy", the communication between Europe and the outside world occurs daily *de facto* in an incalculable number of ways: the televised speech of the member states politicians, the performance of a Verdi opera, the screening of a European coproduction film, the exhibition of a Renaissance of Baroque masters, the Euronews TV or Arte TV (but also the good old fashioned BBC World Service, RFI or Deutsche Welle), the French or Italian fashion shows, the exhibition of gourmet products, etc.

The first emerging new direction in cultural/public diplomacy is (just like in any other field of international relations) the entry of new actors, namely the unconventional "non-state" actors. The definition of "non states actors" usually includes NGO's, multinational corporations but also criminal/terrorist networks and sometimes even individuals which either through their wealth (George Soros) or through new technologies are influencing the international arena. Among the reasons for this evolutions most often are quoted the general consequences of globalization, or the crises of the state. The impact of new technologies and the

---

[2] Simon Anholt (2010), "Places: identity, image and reputation" in Frank Go & Robert Govers *International Place Branding Yearbook 2010: Place Branding in the New Age of Innovation*, Palgrave publication London, p. 13.
[3] Simon Anholt (2008), "The Importance of National Reputation", in *Engagement — Public Diplomacy in a Globalised World*, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London, pp. 30-40.

emergence of a powerful civil society as a cause and effect of it are perhaps responsible for the biggest share of recent changes.[4]

Thanks to the new tehnologies in the last decade non state actors often have the financial or technical resources available until recently only to the states. They are more flexible, more responsible to emergencies and for instance often more effective than the states. China is fighting with Google, US with AL Qaeda, UK with Wiki-leaks founder Julian Assange.

At the center of International Relations remains *the Power* defined first of all as the Power to influence. In terms of power to influence non state players have nowadays the technical possibility to develop joint actions as powerful and often more effective than the states. The coexistence of the state with the new players impose new kind of diplomatic relations and strategies. For instance, in contrast to the classical model of bi-lateral and multilateral relations between states, scholars like Geoffrey Wiseman propose a new model, "polylateralism", capable to adapt and to fit a contemporary reality in which states are dealing in the international arena with the new non-state actors.[5] Just like any other theoretic model who looks well as a theoretical construct in an accademic debate, in practice it has to have enough flexibility to fit the complexity of the international sistem. Some questions regarding this *new actors* seem to be legitimate up to a certain point. The *authority* in the international arena, or *Legitimacy* are two of the most common. In fact these actors are not pretending to be placed as equals to the states, and are not members of international treaties in the same way as states do. They have a clear agenda in which often is more convenient and more effective to be outside the classical system. The question asked by R. Langhore about the negotiating power of actors like Google or the guarantees a state may have that any agreement which such an entity will be observed and respected would be as well legitimated duting the negociation with some states.[6] Issues such the negotiating power in international relations are open also for nation states and some of them are more turbulent, and more non predictable (for internal and external reasons) than a major NGOor multinational company which also in terms of financial capabilities (and solvability) may be better off than some states.

In the last decade practical reality often overcomes the prior reflections from the academic circles. The non-state actors *defacto* and perhaps without prior intention intervene and act in the international sphere, influence the political agenda and impose new strategies and methods of action. In the game of power efficacy may be considered the best legitimacy. They seem to be also more adapted to the globalization conditions being cause and effect of a post national *post suveran* international system. They may be the pioneers of the future

---

[4] Teresa La Porte (2012), "The Legitimacy and Effectiveness of Non-State Actors and the Public Diplomacy Concept", *Public Diplomacy Theory and Conceptual Issues*. ISA Annual Convention, San Diego, April 1-4.

[5] Wiseman, Geoffrey (2004) "Polylateralism" and New Modes of Global Dialogue'in Christer Jönsson and Richard Langorne (eds.) *Diplomacy*, vol. III, London: Sage, pp. 36-57.

[6] R. Langhorne, (2005), "The Diplomacy of Non-State", *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, London: Sage, pp. 331-339.

international system. The way they act or adapt instantly to the new realities, the solutions they found in various circumstances may be a laboratory for many open minded foreign offices around the world.

Another emerging new evolution affecting Cultural Diplomacy is the *multilateralism* which is fast replacing the old fashioned *bilateral* approach.[7] The multilateral approach is triggering an entire set of modified behavior and new strategies of actions. Perhaps the best ground to notice the trend is the European Cultural Diplomacy arena. In 2006 EUNIC was created, as the network of European Union National Institutes for Culture. Concentrating organizations with offices and programs in over 150 countries, EUNIC have in theory unrivaled experience and expertise in Cultural Diplomacy. Steven Green is brilliantly revealing in his essay the acting strategy of EUNIC in at least three stages[8]:

1. Building up partnerships at local countrylevel by forming "clusters" of the institutes operating in a country regardless the cultural field they are involved. Anyway, the more diversity the better. Is not about a chaotic diversity but rather about organizations with a complementary field of expertise. This field of expertise ideally would be specialized at the country level in order to promote specialization and complementarity at for the upper cluster at the EU level. As an example some Baltic states clusters are specialized in wood architecture and restoration while "Mediterranean" clusters may be specialized in stone architecture, and so one. Within a cluster the members agree on joint activities in the arts and language sectors.

2. The thematic clusters once expanding with the help of EU financed programs once solid established institutionally the European Union are expanding worldwide carrying with them (intentionally on unintentionally) both the EU Cultural Diplomacy, and their regions or national state's Cultural Diplomacy.

3. While EUNIC is expanding horizontally in EU, Europe at large and the entire world, it is also deepening its structure vertically. Its members are getting involved in larger more complex projects in a more diverse range of topics. These currently include language policies and use, literary translation and shared arts projects.

This *multilateralism* is well recognized, recommended and encouraged by the EU strategies, programs and official polices. The European Commission agenda, "A European agenda for culture in a globalizing world" proposed a strategy based around: promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue; promotion of culture as a catalyst for creativity in the framework of the Lisbon Strategy for growth and job creation; promotion of culture as a vital element in the Union's international relations. In other words working concept like *Diversity*, *Multilateralism* and an extended definition and mission for culture as a development promoter, are all strategic ideas shaping the EU and its 27 member states official cultural policies.

The third trend directly related with the *multilateralism* would be the formation of foundations set up by governments or international organizations to

_____

[7] Steve Green, (2010), "New Directions" in *Culturay Proyección Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Acción*, Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid.
[8] *Ibidem.*

pursue strategic political goals trough culture. Steven Green gives here two examples Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and Anna Lindh Foundation, and we would add here the EU Japan Institute.[9]

For the new Cultural Diplomacy missions and realities we need to settle or resettle old concepts, and among them the term *culture.*

The broader definition of the term *culture* is contributing to a broader range ofactivities, of objectives, coming into the Cultural Diplomacy arena. *Intercultural dialogue* is perhaps the most obvious current example. Cultural Diplomacy programs, at both national and multilateral level, are now tackling issues such as social cohesion, racism, inequality,discrimination against minorities and migrants, the cultural dimension of inter-religious issues, post conflict resolution.[10] An example is the British Council'sproject Our Shared Europe. This is a response to one of the major cultural challenges facing Western Europe today: the growing mutual mistrust between Muslims and non Muslims.[11] The Council of Europe as an organization culturally at least larger than the UE has a similar projects marching on the idea of *multilateralism* and intercultural dialogue, and intercultural cities. The past experiences shows that keeping the peace and building trust internationally is often about managing diversity, an ignored challenge in the past and a recognized key challenge for the future. Considering this challenge the contribution on non state actors may be the recipee for success in particular in those actions which invole public and Cultural Diplomacy. Accepting the new non state actors as players in the international system as a *de-facto* reality in what involes public and Cultural Diplomacy, stimulates diversity, and diversity stimulates creativity and innovation, two essential attributes for the future knowledge society and post-industrial world at large.

The web will have a major impact in the development of public and Cultural Diplomacy although it is difficult to determine exactly the nature of that impact will be, given the rapid pace of change. Organizations involved in Cultural Diplomacy practices often use the web primarily not only as an extension of their marketing or information activities but as a main tool of visibility and dissemination. It is not just "another outlet" through which they can inform audiences of something happening, but a major tool designed to increase visibility, to collect instant information about the impact of their message and to expand. The trend is confirmed by the gradual move towards the digital media. Effective public and Cultural Diplomacy at global stage involves an intercultural dialogue and it involves an increased level of interaction, and this interaction trough the virtual space can be effectively realized at very convenient costs.

The search for communication and dialogue achieved trough interactivity seems to dominate the use of the web for Cultural Diplomacy aims.[12] Is not only

---

[9] Steve Green (2009), "New Directions", *Cultura y Proyección Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Acción*, themes presented by the author at the conference *La acción cultural exterior: definición de nuevas estrategias*, organized by the Instituto Cervantes and Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid (unpublished).

[10] EC Communication.

[11] Our Shared Europe www.oursharedeurope.org, apud Steve Green, (2010), "New Directions" *Cultura y Proyección Exterior: NuevosValores y Estrategias de Acción*. Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid.

[12] *Ibidem.*

about a platform to reach foreign audiences more easy and more effectively it is also about an essential dimension of Cultural Diplomacy, more exactly, the ability to engage the target group. The search for engagement and feed back demands new kinds of programs and the reshaping of the old ones. Also the entire strategy must keep on track with the rapid changes in technologies and social behaviors associated to it. In the last five years there was an explosive growth of social web communication trough socialization sites like Facebook facilitated by new dedicated devices like e-tablets and smartphones. Stevee Green remarque brilliant the way it introduces a kind of "instant reality check" and a need for instant answers and instant reactions to various issues including Cultural Diplomacy related ones.[13]

Probable there is no better recent example of the challenge represented by the technology revolution than the spread of anger and extreme violence triggered by a short documentary film *Innocence of Muslims* posted on YouTube by a group of extremists. It was instantly perceived as an American government inspired action. As Philip Seib notes, simply is all about technology[14]: "Ten years ago, the *Innocence of Muslims* controversy would not have happened. YouTube did not exist, and without this means of reaching a global audience the offensive snippets of the film would never have been seen".[15] It shows the impotence of foreign policy responsible even in a country like US in front of complex and hard to control realities like those contained by YouTube, Twitter or Facebook. With around 72 hours of video content uploaded every minute in 2011 and growing, YouTube in particular is too vast to be controlled or screened even for US dedicated services.[16] This incident is old and new at the same time. In 1988 were recorded several violent Islamic riots following Salman Rushdie book release, and there was no YouTube. However those riots were targeting a specific physical person and only tangential a government protecting him. We cannot agree entirely as far as Cultural Diplomacy is concerned with assertions like "— a decade or more ago — diplomacy was mostly government to government, with diplomats talking only to other diplomats" because is simply not that easy.[17] A decade or two decades ago, there was indeed a Cultural Diplomacy practiced very effectively trough literature, cinema, music or popular fashion products. Also, some classic Diplomacy's definitions like the one given in 1939 by the British diplomat Harold Nicolson who wrote that among his colleagues "it would have been regarded as an act of unthinkable vulgarity to appeal to the common people upon any issue of international policy"[18] are just irrelevant. The British diplomat was talking about a term with a more restrictive meaning at the time. Even if in 1939 Cultural Propaganda or public diplomacy did exist under various forms, but, those actions were not labeled as *Public* or

---

[13] *Ibidem.*
[14] Philip Seib is Director, at *the Center on Public Diplomacy, USC.* US.
[15] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/philip-seib/the-perils-of-youtube-dip_b_1885633.html, accessed on 20 of September 2012.
[16] *Ibidem.*
[17] *Ibidem.*
[18] Quoted by Philip Seib in "The Perils of YouTube Diplomacy" available on line and accesed by 2810.2012., http://www.huffingtonpost.com/philip-seib/the-perils-of-youtube-dip_b_1885633.html.

Cultural Diplomacy.[19] The importance of the common people gradually increased partly because of their increased decision power, partly because of growing (incontrollable) information sources available to them. The recent information explosion through the internet, places public diplomacy and Cultural Diplomacy as a part of it at the center of any governmental action. In many countries young people taping half a day their Smartphone to navigate on the internet is a common image. Two out of three adults in UK have a Facebook account, and people seem to be just addicted to the social media. This phenomenon is growing with the continuous support of major phone companies. The competition for attention in this environment is fierce and a wise government must adapt its message for the virtual space, instant answers, etc. There must be developed new ways not necessarily to control, but to screen properly the content for a kind of *early warning*. Is out of question to affect the free speech and the internet most important asset, its independence. However, a continuous cultural detente with the Muslim environments capable to explain the difference between national discourse and extremist discourses condemned by anyone and any culture is essential. It cannot be practically realized without effective technical means to compete effectively for audience in the Muslim communities and the Muslim countries. The issue of representatively in which a certain product, artist or author is considered as representatives for the US was perhaps the most powerful and effective *de facto* tool of the American public and Cultural Diplomacy during the Cold War for example. However, the boomerang effect occurs from time to time, when, few extremists are perceived as representatives of US.

The web seems to be well suited as a tool for Cultural Diplomacy actions. Cultural Diplomacy differs from Cultural Public Relations in terms of its purpose. Cultural Diplomacy is not only soliciting admiration or sympathy through the showcasing of national cultural achievements. It is above all about building trust. Its purpose is to establish mutually beneficial cooperation and partnership. It is about establishing mutual benefit as the basis for mutual trust. An important feature of the web seems to be its emphasis on reactions from the audience, which stimulates a base for dialogue. Contrary to Cultural Propaganda, Cultural Diplomacy is based on dialogue not on monologue. Engagement in dialogue at the grass root levels of the society means building a new form of trust, and effective Cultural Diplomacy is all about building trust. Just consider that in the last years when buying a product a web published comment about the product may be more influential that the most expensive advertisement or publicity related ads. The same thing also happens when deciding to visit a destination or choosing a hotel. The independent comments positive or negative are building trust and confidence. Often overlooked but increasingly vital is the web'sability toactas a relay function. It is not just thedirect participants whowill be engaged buttheir ability torelay to others. This acts as a massive indirect

---

[19] At the time, often, actions labeled today as pure Cultural Diplomacy would have been labeled as "Propaganda", at the time a word without negative connotations. Many European countries used to have at the time a "Propaganda ministry" or at least a Propaganda department (Germany, Italy Romania etc).

extension of the audience. The web hasalready changed the business model of many trades (music, hospitality electric and electronic appliances) and the publishing business is adapting too. Cultural Diplomacy is not an exception. Just like in any other domain involving culture there is always the challenge of adaptation to the mass culture and tests while keeping uncompromised the quality of the cultural message.

The *Network Cultural Diplomacy* is also a new term evolving around the new internet technologies. It refers to the increasing trend to engage with people in networks built around a common theme. This people to people approach brings together the broader definition of culture, the move to multilateral activity and the focus on a theme. The European Union's current policies of putting culture into its external relations have a clear focus on networks and capacity building. It's about a three-step approach also used by standard marketing categories of awareness, perceptions, attitudes, beliefs. To change a person's view on each of these takes a progressive and deeper engagement. Its about a shift from"product orientation" to "process based facilitation" and as a result can be noticed that longer-term projects are gradually replacing isolated and unconnected events.[20]

What now constitutes true and effective Cultural Diplomacy is not the show and exhibition factor but rather the elements of exchange and mutuality.[21] The more interactive, collaborative and experiential a communication is, the more successful it will be. Government needs to look beyond one-way "announcement-style" communication and start the process of engagement, participation and collaboration in pursuit of joint outcomes regardless the often rigid diplomatic practices. Diplomacy, in general and Cultural Diplomacy, in particular, in order to be effective is about achieving a sense of "we." In order to achieve that different strategies are pursued, with different results. Facilitating the integration of those coming from different cultural backgrounds in mutual cultural practices may be among the sucesfull strategies. The obsessive repetition of few key words in official discourses and documents could be an indicator of this trend. One of these key words for sure are *mutual* and *mutuality.*[22]

This trend is confirmed by ERICarts "Mobility Matters" report in 2008 which noted the shift towards a thematic approach within the national Cultural Diplomacy agencies, foundations and other agencies.[23] The thematic approach is meant to facilitate the networks and the formation of clusters across borders and cultures. It helps creating an image of independence and depolitisation or in other words from "self" promotion to "value promotion".[24] Among the *value promotion* goals

---

[20] Steve Green (2009), "New Directions", *Cultura y Proyección Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Acción*. themes presented by the author at the conference La acción cultural exterior: definición de nuevas estrategias, organized by theInstituto Cervantes and Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid, 14-15 December 2009 (unpublished).

[21] Martin Rose and Nick Wadham Smith (2004), "Mutuality, trust and cultural relations" *Counterpoint*, available on line at, www.counterpoint-online.org/mutuality-trust-and-culturalrelations/ accessed by 15.09.2012.

[22] The idea of mutuality, of benefit for all, is a fundamental organizing principle in cultural relations. Cultural relations activity is based on exchange, from which each partner gets something tangible.

[23] Mobility Matters http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc/ericarts/final_report_ERICarts.pdf.

[24] Steve Green, (2010), "New Directions" in *Culturay Proyección Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Acción*. Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid.

are usually recommended the following strategies: building of common understanding on issues relating to humanity as a whole, changes from monologue to dialogue, expressing tolerance and openness to different ideas". Practicing naturally these strategies requires a change in the attitudes, discourses, behaviors, and strategies of representations of Cultural Diplomacy practitioners. It is challenging and unexpected to occur in a short term perspective.

In summary, the newer approaches to cultural relations involve several trends: from events to projects, from bilateral to multilateral, from presentation to co-operation, from products to process, from one-way to two-way, from telling to listening, from self promotion to values promotion and at the end, the general shift, from selling an image to communicating it through image cultural values and attitudes.[25]

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Green, Steve, *New Directions* in *Cultura y Proyección Exterior: Nuevos Valores y Estrategias de Acción*. Real Instituto Elcano, Madrid, 2010;

La Porte, Teresa, *The Legitimacy and Effectiveness of Non-State Actors and the Public Diplomacy Concept*, *Public Diplomacy Theory and Conceptual Issues*. ISA Annual Convention, San Diego, April 1-4, 2012;

Langhorne, R. (2005) 'The Diplomacy of Non-State', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 16: 331-339;

Wiseman, Geoffrey (2004) 'Polylateralism' and New Modes of Global Dialogue' in Christer Jönsson and Richard Langorne (eds.) *Diplomacy*, vol. III, London: Sage.

––––––––––––

[25] Joseph Nye refers to the passive kind of listening when he states that "by definition, soft power means getting others to want the outcomes you want, and that requires understanding how they are hearing your message, and fine-tuning it accordingly". In contrast, listening as part of cultural relations "reflects a genuine interest in the other's perspective" and "demonstrates that different viewpoints are taken seriously and that other perspectives are given consideration".