

Hyungseok Kang  
PhD Candidate (2013)  
Culture, Media & Creative Industries  
King's College London

## **Reframing Cultural Diplomacy: International Cultural Politics of Soft Power and the Creative Economy**

Over the past decade governments have increasingly paid attention to the practice of Cultural Diplomacy (CD). Although CD isn't new, it has merited more recognition through the emergence of cultural dimensions of international relations and development discourses. Furthermore, combining CD with the concept of soft power after the 9-11 attack on the World Trade Centre in the USA, have vitalized the field. CD, in itself, is commonly defined as the 'exchange of ideas, information, art, and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual understanding' (Cummings, 2003:1). However, this notion is insufficient to address its broader implications and multi-dimensional aspects. Due to the growing importance of cultural dimensions in analyzing the ever-increasing complexity of international affairs, CD emphasizes the influence that transnational flows have on shaping national identities and foreign perceptions. Its vast ranging currencies include cultural relations, cultural co-operation, public diplomacy, and even propaganda. However, former Counter-terrorism director of the EU, Gijs de Vries warns; "it is not a panacea ... it can support political dialogue and economic cooperation, but a quick fix it is not" (British Council, 2009:9). Surely, the incoherent conceptual and pragmatic framework has resulted in haphazard usage of the term. Former UNESCO official Raj Isar writes, "too much is expected of cultural diplomacy today, that it is pressed into service in the name of goods that it cannot deliver" (Isar, 2010:33). Partly due to varying levels of enthusiasm surrounding CD on the one hand, and the lack of serious commitment to it by governments on the other, inquiry into its discursive and empirical frameworks has been lacking.

This paper proposes that CD is not a simple foreign policy tool, but a multi-dimensional process of international cultural politics underpinned by varying national objectives and sociopolitical contexts. CD is a long-term process involving a range of policies, initiatives, and activities for the purpose of advancing national interests. Therefore, specific means of strategic implementation differs across countries. This is achieved through the strategic channeling of cultural and media flow composed of texts created within the cultural industries. In specific, it involves government actors engaged in international cultural politics through utilizing instruments of cultural policy. CD concerns three areas of national interests: cultural identity (social), soft power (political), and the creative economy (economic). These three areas are the primary basis of the policy approaches to CD. This paper will reframe the theoretical and empirical framework of analysis of CD by taking an overview of the disarray of policy discourses and political rhetoric surrounding CD. This will be accomplished by:

First, defining the conceptual and theoretical framework of CD;

Second, addressing CD's implications of three areas of national interests: national cultural identity (social), soft power (political), and the creative economy (economic), and explain the relationship between them;

Third, highlighting thematic issues surrounding CD in practice, and identifying broader patterns and trends of CD to set an empirical framework for future case studies.

## **Conceptual Framework of CD**

### *Differentiating Public Diplomacy and Cultural Diplomacy*

It is important to differentiate between the concept of Public Diplomacy (PD) and Cultural Diplomacy. While PD and CD are fundamentally compatible on many levels, they are not synonymous. Defining CD as a domain of larger framework of PD can be misleading, since it often leads to pigeonholing the scope of CD to only include arts diplomacy and civil society cultural exchanges. More importantly, it undermines the complex cultural implications in international relations and the contemporary global political economy.

Diplomacy is defined by Nicholas Cull as an 'international actor's attempt to manage the international environment through mechanisms short of war, and engagement with another international actor' (Cull, 2009:12). The process of globalization and emergence of the information age characterized by advancements of communication technologies have adjusted the power distribution structure. Manuel Castells explains,

"I understand power to be the structural capacity of a social actor to impose its will over other social actor(s). All institutional systems reflect power relations, as well as the limits to these power relations as negotiated by a historical process of domination and counter-domination... the process of formation of counter-power is the capacity of a social actor to resist and challenge power relations that are institutionalized. Indeed, power relations are by nature conflictive, as societies are diverse and contradictory. Therefore, the relationship between technology, communication, and power reflects opposing values and interests, and engages a plurality of social actors in conflict" (Castells, 2007)

Engagement of plurality of social actors in conflict has broadened the realm of diplomacy by including new actors: corporations, NGOs, and the civil society. In turn, PD gained greater significance in foreign policy agendas both as a concept and practice, along with a growing emphasis on 'Soft Power', as a staple of daily democratic politics (Nye, 2009). In this context, governments began to utilize PD as means to cultivate public opinion abroad, furthering the aims and execution of foreign policies (Cull, 2006). Public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy are fundamentally compatible, as they are both concerned with management of the international environment and the power dynamics through engagement with a

wide range of new social actors. CD is distinguishable from PD as its primary actors are government agents engaged in international cultural politics (i.e. transnational flow of cultural texts). Arndt writes that “cultural diplomacy can only take place when formal diplomats, serving national governments, try to shape and channel this natural flow to advance national interests” (Arndt, 2006:xviii).

The term public diplomacy was first coined by the former Dean of the Fletcher School, Edward Gullion, concerning the influence of social standpoints in international relations that fall outside traditional diplomacy (Cull, 2006). There have been varying approaches to conceptualizing of PD since then. G.D. Malone refers PD as a common term for public undertaking in the fields of information, education and culture, aimed at fostering positive attitude to one’s country abroad (Malone G.D., 1998:1). H.Tuch views it in a foreign policy context as efforts to establish a communicative environment for foreign policy, as a “damage limitation exercise to reduce the level of mistakes, misunderstandings and bad reception, which complicate the relations of a given country with other one” (Tuch H., 1990:1). The Report of the Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy of the U.S. Department of State from 2005 is titled, “Cultural Diplomacy: The Linchpin of Public Diplomacy” (U.S. Dept. of State, 2005), places cultural diplomacy under the domain of public diplomacy. Such placement of cultural diplomacy is underpinned by the Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, primarily concerned with dissemination of national cultural values abroad. This notion of cultural diplomacy is referred primarily as variety of programs and initiatives facilitated by the government, in forms of cultural exchanges and showcasing visual and performing artists abroad. Despite the larger role of CD in facilitating the American victory over the Cold War in terms of ideological warfare, this type of cultural diplomacy should be more accurately labeled as ‘arts diplomacy’. Therefore, when the director of the Kennedy Center, Michael Kaiser critiqued the “traditional forms of cultural diplomacy” (Kaiser, 2009), it would’ve been more accurate to label it as ‘arts diplomacy’.

Institutionalization of culture by government is not a novel idea. Rather, culture is a dynamic concept within institutional and policy frameworks. Raymond Williams defines culture as ‘the signifying system’ through which a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored (Williams, 1981:13). Despite the complex nature of this definition due to its adoption in several incompatible disciplines, Raymond Williams suggests three categories of usage of the term, ‘culture’ as:

A general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development,

A Particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group, or humanity in general

The works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity (Williams, 1983).

A much more holistic understanding of ‘culture’ is critical in defining the conceptual framework of CD. Defining CD as a domain of larger framework of PD can be misleading, since it is often noted synonymously with ‘arts diplomacy’ or

'exchange diplomacy', and undermines the complex cultural implications in international relations and the global creative economy noted above. CD would more accurately be framed under the remit of cultural policy and international cultural politics. This is because cultural power is about transforming or constituting the identity of the actors and the issues themselves as noted above (Singh, 2010). Singh refers to the first sense as the power taking on instrumental/structural dimension, and the latter transformative sense as the meta-power dimension (Singh, 2010). The objective of CD can be both to utilize culture as a tool as well as affecting the change in culture through channeling of cultural industries texts, thereby being multi-purposive and multi-dimensional.

In this sense, one of the reasons for the lack of serious attention paid to cultural diplomacy (in terms of funding and strategy) by the U.S. may be due to the notion that with globalization/Americanization, their cultural values and expressions are not necessarily under threat. However, since September 11, public and cultural diplomacy have notably been re-prioritized. For other countries, CD is a multi-dimensional and multi-purposive process requiring a sophisticated international cultural strategy aimed at nation's global competitive advantage. Cultural diplomacy has two primary dimensions. First, it emphasizes the role of culture in relations with other countries benchmarked through soft power, and national competitiveness in the global creative economy.

### **Theoretical Framework of CD**

The discourses surrounding the relationship between culture and development have significantly transformed the relationship between culture and government over the past few decades (Sen, Commonwealth Foundation, 2010; UNCTAD, 2010). The cultural dimension has been increasingly incorporated in social, political, and economic agendas of governments. This has resulted in institutional and policy approaches serving a diverse array of national interests in local, national, and international contexts. 'Culture' is now widely adopted as a resource (Yudice, 2000), capital (Bourdieu, 1984), and power (Nye, 2004). canthus we can "expect the economy and the polity to be globalized to the extent that they are culturalized" (Waters, cited in Yudice, 2000). With the divisive aspects of culture noted in Clash of Civilizations discourse (Huntington, 1996) highlighting the greater need for intercultural dialogue (UNESCO, 2010; Council of Europe, 2001), it is a truism that today, "cultural awareness of other peoples and nations is essential to international cooperation and successful commerce" (Feigenbaum, 2001). CD is operating within a wider context of globalization and growing cultural dimensions of national interests.

Cultural policies and programs are generally manifested in the third notion of diverse activities encompassing the aesthetic expressions aimed at transforming the anthropological sense suggested in the first two definitions. From a governmental perspective, the cultural dimension pertains to the notion that power is "either about effecting or constraining particular outcomes, or about transforming or constituting the identity of the actors and the issues themselves" (Singh, 2010). Thereby the politics of identity in terms of cultural

policy is driven by the systematic arrangement of the cultural industries. British Academic David Hesmondhalgh explains, the cultural industries are “most directly involved in the production of social meaning whose activities primarily aim to ‘communicate to an audience, and to create texts (songs, narratives, performances)... heavy on signification and created with this communicative goal in mind” (Hesmondhalgh, 2007:12). From a policy perspective, the focus on cultural industries allows the examination of both the instrumental and the transformative or constitutive logic of cultural power and identities noted above (Singh, 2010). Although traditionally policies governing cultural industries and representations have been eclipsed by the national prominence accorded to foreign policy or defense (Singh, 2010); emerging attention to CD highlights the multidimensional implications of ‘culture’ in the discussion framework of global political economy.

The plethora of competing messages transmitted through transnational flow of cultural industries has reinvigorated the importance of Cultural Diplomacy in particular as a form of international communication (Ryniejska-Kieldanowic, 2009). For a locality, the primary aim of modern cultural policy is creating economic value through the accumulation of cultural capital. The “new economy is a knowledge-based, and knowledge is acquired through institutions that are shaped by culture...therefore, cultural wealth of nations is the key to the New Economy” (Feigenbaum, 2001:17). Therefore, cultural wealth or accumulation of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984) is a prime objective of cultural policy. CD pertains to governments informing and influencing foreign audiences to advance national interests with cultural power fostered through instruments of cultural policy. The configuration and production of culture is a legitimate concern of public policy now, as it comprises both public and private goods (Feigenbaum, 2001). Cultural policy concerns systematic arrangement of the flow of these texts in the cycle of production, distribution, and consumption in local, national and international settings.

Cultural policy has been approached through two ideological streams: cultural rights and cultural diversity. UN Declaration of Human Rights states, “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts, and to share in the scientific advancement and its benefits” (UN 1948, Article 27(1)). This principle is manifested in domestic cultural policy through two approaches: cultural democracy (elitism) and democratization of culture (populism). Both address the ways in which national culture is defined and developed. There is tension in between the two approaches of cultural governance at a national level due to the incompatible goals of excellence versus access, and government roles as facilitator versus architect (Craik, McAllister, et al, 2003). The previous cultural turn in social policy addressed utilizing aesthetic cultural formats through institutions such as museums to fostering certain cohesive social ‘culture’ (Bennett, 1996). In this conception, the ‘cultural democracy’ approach to cultural policy emphasized promoting greater accessibility of ‘high culture’ to the public (‘top-down’). The government aimed at establishing and legitimizing sense of a singular, cohesive sociological culture. Thereby proponents of cultural democracy view the government’s role as a preserver of traditional culture, and promoting a subsidization of the ‘high arts’ because of their insufficient production due to market failure. In contrast,

'democratization of culture' concerns participatory (populist) notion of culture, and a cultural policy with emphasis on ethnic and cultural diversity ('bottom-up'). While democratization of culture also concerns government funding, they tend to lean towards a more inclusive and broader understanding of culture as shaped by all sectors of society. Therefore, it leans towards the understanding of culture as driven by the private commercial sector, in addition to the government.

While these two approaches of cultural policy tend to be seen as mutually exclusive, this begs the question of what comprises a national culture and how it should be fostered. This question could then be extended to the role of cultural diplomacy as well; what are the ideals and cultural identity government aims to portray and disseminate abroad? One answer is the emergence of hybrid cultures through accelerating transnational migrant and media flow facilitated by communication technologies and globalization. In this context, another aspect of the cultural policy framework is highlighted – cultures are constantly in flux and relate to the 'symbolic dimension of life which is a place where people constantly make meaning and enacts their identities' (LeBaron, 2003). The culture-government relationship is extended to the remit of CD in the context of national identities being shaped by private sector and civil society cultural exchanges outside of direct government control. Therefore the practice of CD is concerned with government's role in developing national culture, as well as communicative dissemination abroad amidst the existing cross-sectoral and transnational cultural flow.

Cultural diversity is another stream of cultural policy discourse. An interdependent sociopolitical and economic aspect of cultural diversity underpins the surrounding policy approaches. From a social perspective, there are numerous terms to describe different aspects of cultural diversity, such as multiculturalism, cultural pluralism, interculturalism, cultural fusion, etc. However, cultural diversity reflected in cultural policies normatively focuses on two aspects of cultural diversity: 'multiculturalism' and 'interculturalism'. 'Multiculturalism' aspect focuses on cultural diversity 'within' a society. This approach encompasses basic human rights, equal participation of all minorities (ethnic, gender, etc.) in cultural life and formal legal and institutions provisions related to the issue. 'Interculturalism' aspect focuses on cultural diversity 'between' states, societies and/or cultures. This approach is regarded as a political concept noting balanced exchange between cultures and states, including all cultural goods and services (Obuljen, 2003). While not always articulated as instruments in favour of cultural diversity, many traditional instruments of cultural policy (subsidies, limitations of ownership, network of public institutions or quota requirements) are in fact aimed at the promotion of cultural diversity, by intervening in cultural markets dominated by multinational corporations. CD pertains to the multi-purposive process of promoting the country's culture through utilization of cultural policy instruments under the dual aspects of cultural diversity, both in terms of political representation and increased share in the global cultural market.

On an international institutional level, UNESCO Convention on Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions (UNESCO, 2005) aims to

ensure the sustainability of diversity of expressions both in terms of political representation and economic market share in the cultural market. The tensions surrounding the dominance of U.S. in cultural goods and services pose a threat to national identities under the forces of cultural imperialism accelerated through globalization. Despite corporate actors of cultural globalization disregarding the rigid boundaries of nation-states, transnational corporations still operate businesses mostly from their home country (Iwabuchi, 2009). Therefore nation-state framework is still highly relevant both as a “spatially controlled entity and as a discursively articulated geography” when analyzing uneven global cultural flows (Iwabuchi, 2009:32).

Beyond the one-dimensional notion of “Globalization equals Americanization”, Koichi Iwabuchi poses a more complex view of diversity in a global cultural market. Globally disseminated cultural products and images are consumed and reconfigured through process of hybridization in each locality. Increase in cultural diversity is being governed by the logic of capital in the context of globalization. As globalization brings ‘peculiar form of homogenization’ with “America” as a base format, the world is becoming more diverse through standardization and more standardized through diversification. As its cultural dynamic is driven by the marketing logic of multinational corporations, dominant stereotypes of national cultures are fostered and unbeneficial cultural differences are disregarded (Iwabuchi, 2009:28). This evolving paradigm of cultural diversity provides a framework of CD in pragmatic terms. Engagement in international cultural politics is driven by the principles of cultural diversity fostered by the governmental institutions, but the multi-national corporations drive the evolving framework in which cultural diversity is practiced.

### **Cultural Politics of Identity, Soft Power, and the Creative Economy**

The framework of CD in terms of international cultural politics is suggested as the international hierarchy of prestige (English, Isar, 2010). Isar writes, the true actors of CD are neither nations, nor people, but rather government agents and envoys joining nationalism and internationalism and engaging in what Raymond Williams calls the practice of ‘cultural policy at display’ (Isar, 2009:47). Based on the development of domestic cultural industries underpinned by politics of identity, CD relates to global competition through two paradigms: soft power (political) and the creative economy (economic). Culture serves a communicative function of channeling cultural industries texts to foster desirable sociocultural outcomes amongst foreign citizenry. The way in which ‘culture’ is adopted in practice also differs from state to state.

#### *Soft power and the Creative Economy*

National competitiveness within the framework of international hierarchy of cultural prestige is implicated in two paradigms: soft power and the creative economy. These independent paradigms refer to sociopolitical and economic implications of CD.

With the rise of 'the network society', issues that have traditionally been considered of domestic concern have been given an international dimension, and vice versa (Castells, 2000). Various national policies now have international ramifications. Therefore, foreign policy advanced and promoted without legitimate international consensus have dire consequences (as the case of decline of foreign perception of the U.S. after invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan). The capacity to attain positive foreign support is measured through soft power. The concept of soft power has gained much attention in the recent decades as well as gone through various reformulations.

In "Three Faces of Power", Kenneth Boulding outlines the difference between destructive or threat power; productive or exchange power; and integrative (conditioned) power. In Boulding's view, national power is a combination of political and military sources (threat power), economic sources (exchange power), and social sources (conditioned power) (Boulding, 1989). Due to his skepticism of the coercive power of the hegemonic nations, he believed in the possibility of an integrative power, suggesting a departure from the extreme views of coercive power. John Kenneth Galbraith also advances the same line of reasoning through three different types of power in his book "The Anatomy of Power". Three types of power according to Galbraith were: compensatory (submission is bought), condign (submission is won by making the alternative painful), and conditioned (submission gained by persuasion) (Galbraith, 1983). Adding to previous discourses on power, Joseph Nye defines power as the "ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes you want, which can be achieved through three ways: threats of coercion ("sticks"); inducements and payments ("carrots"); and attraction that makes others want what you want". The varying understandings of state power have been gradually reduced to two categories: 'hard' or 'soft' (Zhang, 2010: 384), largely attributable to Nye's coining of the term 'Soft Power'. Nye's explanation of soft power is primarily concerned with the third way out of his suggestive methods: "getting others to change their behaviors to your liking as result of attraction" (Nye, 2009).

Cultural diplomacy is primarily associated with soft power. Nye explains 'culture' as one of three sources of a nation's soft power. He identifies three sources of a nation's soft power as its culture, political values, and foreign policies with internationally consented credibility and moral authority (Nye, 2006). Nancy Snow writes that 'soft power is culture power' and suggests in pragmatic terms, the three ways in which soft power advantage of a country is measured are:

1. when culture and ideas match prevailing global norms;
2. when a nation has greater access to multiple communication channels that can influence how issues are framed in global news media; and
3. when a country's credibility is enhanced by domestic and international behavior (Snow, 2009, p.4).

However, governments emphasize the multilateral notion of CD underpinned by principles of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue (UNESCO, Council of Europe) not only for the sake of Cosmopolitan Constructivism. They also aim to enhance their credibility and effective advancement of foreign policy objectives



by shaping the global norm of values and ideas through culture. CD aims to foster soft power through legitimizing their foreign policy in conjunction with the global cultural norm. This is achieved by utilizing the transformative and constitutive power of culture to target foreign citizenry.

In challenging the fundamental assumptions of Rationalism (“power struggle” or “selfish rational factor”), and zero-sum view of the international system, Reflectivist theories introduced new elements such as ‘culture’ and ‘identity’ to the study of diplomacy and international relations (Villanueva, 2010:46). Within the emerging conflict dimension to culture, Pratkanis writes, “the course of war is no longer determined by a rational calculus of interests by elite rules, but rather by the prejudices and emotions of everyday people” (Pratkanis, 2010). Mutual understanding amongst citizens through intercultural dialogue can prevent violent eruption of conflicts between various social actors. In turn, universalistic objectives of peace, prosperity, and human development both within (“multiculturalism”) and between (“interculturalism”) states are in line with national interests of most. The normative view of CD in terms of promoting mutual understanding and cultural-cooperation through intercultural dialogue and cultural exchange is propagated within the framework of cosmopolitan constructivism. Cosmopolitan constructivism is “a theory philosophically based on multilateral diplomacy, formulated by people interested in peace, understanding and friendly relations among nations” (Villanueva, 2010:46). In this sense, Villanueva proposes that CD is a constitutive camp that can “help attain universalistic and normative foreign policy objectives, like befriending other nations, the building of a sound communications channels with societies abroad, and the understanding and appreciation of culture different from ours” (Villanueva, 2010:46). Multi-lateral diplomacy fosters a political environment of international co-operation based on the logic of common pool resources (especially in addressing shared global concerns, such as the climate change). However, CD is not just about idealism (as suggested by Cummings), as governments’ foreign policy objectives also have a nationalistic element. In case of the U.S., maintaining the hegemonic status requires not just economic and military prowess, but also the key to hearts and minds of the foreign public. For others, acquiring a leading role in the international politics of regionalism also relies on credibility and legitimacy in terms of foreign perception.

Although soft power primarily concerns the sociopolitical influence of public opinion and culture abroad through fostering positive national image and advancing foreign policy objectives, it has significant economic implication as well. First, understanding the culture of other people and nations is essential to not only international cooperation, but successful commerce in increasingly global markets (Feigenbaum, 2001). Second, the text of cultural industries’ is partly dependent on national branding (Anholt), which is fostered through soft power, and promoted through the process of CD.

David Throsby notes that the increasing economic orientation to cultural policy began to take hold in the recent times. This is based on “The idea that a creative sector can be identified within the larger macroeconomy which is a particular source of economic dynamism in the new information age”

(Culturelink, 2009: 7). While Throsby notes that a concern for the economic aspects of cultural policy does not by any means imply a capitulation to an exclusively economic conceptualization of art and culture, it concerns the creation of cultural value in society alongside the generation of economic value in various form in the economy” (Culturelink, 2009:7). Thereby, the sociopolitical implications of culture are inter-related to the economic dimensions within the global creative economy. Engagement in international cultural politics encompasses competition in the global market place of the creative economy.

According to the figures reported by the UNCTAD, global trade of the cultural goods and services has reached 800 billion in 2010 (UNCTAD, 2010). The UNCTAD Creative Economy Report suggests the potential of the creative economy as a source of economic development. The instruments of cultural policy required for CD include development of domestic cultural industries as suggested above. In this process of transnational cultural and media flow, non-state actors create social and symbolic value in the cycle of production, distribution and consumption within the creative industries without direct government intervention. Since these actors aren't necessarily driven by national interests, government institutions engaged in international cultural politics (and CD) take up the facilitator role in strategic channeling of cultural, media, and information flow in ways that fit into national agendas. The economic orientation of this flow is pertinent to government intervention rhetoric. In principle, while cultural policy aims to develop cultural industries domestically and foster cultural identity, CD concerns the foreign audience development in the global cultural market.

## **Conclusion**

This paper argued that CD should not be viewed narrowly as a tool of foreign policy under the remit of public diplomacy, but rather as a multi-purposive process of international cultural politics, achieved through utilizing cultural policy instruments. While the complex cultural dimensions of international relations underpin CD; it aims to singularly advance national interests through channeling the transnational flow of cultural industries. This encompasses the transformative and constitutive nature of culture in aesthetic and anthropological sense. Cultural policy, addressing configuration of cultural industries, is underpinned by emphasis on politics of cultural diversity. When culture is viewed as a resource (Yudice, 2000), capital (Bourdieu, 1984), and power (Nye, 2004), national cultural identity becomes a significant policy concern. Culture is thus both a commodity as well as means of social transformation. The multi-dimensional process of CD is assessed through two paradigms of national agendas: sociopolitical and economic. The first sociopolitical paradigm of national interest is benchmarked by soft power. Governments aim to deploy the constitutive and transformative nature of culture through it by targeting foreign public. The second paradigm addresses the economic agenda, pertaining specifically to increasing market share in the global creative economy – an increasingly significant source of economic development.

Culture is an ever-more important aspect of international relations because of globalization and advancements in communication technologies that reconfigure the power dynamics between different social actors. CD serves as an important aspect of successful bi-lateral and multi-lateral diplomacy and consequently requires a holistic conceptual framework for sound pragmatic implications.

There are two thematic issues affecting CD. First issue concerns the emergence of hybrid cultural identities characterized by 'peculiar homogenization' through the capitalist logic. Engagement in international cultural politics is driven by the principles of cultural diversity fostered by the governmental institutions, but the multi-national corporations drive the evolving framework in which cultural diversity is practiced. In this sense, CD can be viewed as a marketing tool for nation branding. As the role of government underpinned by the principles of cultural diversity (both multiculturalism and interculturalism sense) can be seen to be significantly driven by the economic agendas, are governments exploiting the political rhetoric of 'mutual understanding' and 'soft power'?

In conclusion, this paper proposes that future empirical frameworks of CD should be benchmarked through soft power and the market share of cultural industries underpinned by the principles of cultural diversity. While each aspect has complex implications sociocultural, political, and economic realm, the specific results of CD should be seen as an intersection of the two dimensions.

## **Bibliography**

- Anholt, S. (2010) Places: Identity, Image and Reputation
- Arndt, R. (2005) The First Resort of Kings. Potomac Books.
- Bennett, T. (1995) The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics. Routledge
- Bennett, T. (2001) Differing Diversities – Transversal Study on the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity. Council of Europe Publishing
- Boulding, K. (1989) Three faces of power. Newbury Park; Sage Publications
- Bourdieu (1984) Distinction
- Castells, M. (2000) Rise of Network Society. Blackwell
- Castells, M. (2007) Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society.
- Commonwealth Foundation (2008) Putting Culture First
- Commonwealth Foundation (2010) Statement on Culture and Development
- Council of Europe (1954) European Cultural Convention
- Council of Europe (2001) Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Prevention Project
- Council of Europe (2005) Faro Declaration on the Council of Europe's Strategy for developing Intercultural Dialogue
- Council of Europe (2007) Fribourg Declaration on Cultural Rights
- Cull, N. (2006) 'Public Diplomacy' Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase. USC Center on Cultural Diplomacy
- Cull, N. (2009) Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past. USC Centre for Public Diplomacy
- Cummings, M. (2003) Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey,
- DeVries (2009) Cultural Diplomacy. British Council
- English, J. (2005) The Economy of Prestige.
- ERICarts (2008) Sharing Diversity – National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe
- European Commission (2007) The European Agenda for Culture
- Feigenbaum, H. (2001) Globalization and Cultural Diplomacy. Arts, Culture & the National Agenda Issue Paper. Centre for Arts and Culture.
- Galbraith, J. (1983) The anatomy of power. Houghton Mifflin, Boston

Hesmondahalgh, D. (2007) Cultural Industries

Huntington, S. (1996) Clash of Civilizations

IFACCA (2009) Achieving Intercultural Dialogue through the Arts and Culture

Isar, Y.R. (2009) Cultural Diplomacy: An Overplayed Hand? Cultural Diplomacy. Public Diplomacy Magazine. Winter 2010. Pp.29-44. USC Centre for Public Diplomacy

Isar, Y.R., Anheier, H. (2007) Cultures and Globalization Series. 1. Conflicts and Tensions.

Ivey, B. (2008) Cultural Diplomacy and The National Interest: In Search of a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Perspective. Arts Industries Policy Forum. The Curb Center at Vanderbilt University

Kaiser, M. (2009) How effective is Cultural Diplomacy? Huffington Post

Kieldanowicz () Cultural Diplomacy as a Form of International Communication. Institute for Public Relations.

LeBaron (2003) Culture and Conflict. Beyond Intractability.

Malone, G.D. (1998) Organizing the Nation's Public Diplomacy. University Press of America.

NAJP (2003) Arts & Minds. Cultural Diplomacy amid Global Tensions. Based on a Conference Presented by the National Arts Journalism Program, Arts International and the Center for Arts & Culture.

Nye, J. (2004) Soft Power: The means to success in world politics. Public Affairs

Nye, J. (2009) Soft Power and Cultural Diplomacy (adapted from a speech delivered at Syracuse University Cultural Diplomacy Symposium, New York, Sept. 20,2009). Cultural Diplomacy.

Obuljen, N., Scob-Dokic, N. (2003) Comparative cultural policy issues related to cultural diversity in South East Europe. Mapping the approaches and practices. Public Diplomacy Magazine. Winter 2010. Pp.120-124. USC Centre for Public Diplomacy

Pratkanis A. (2009) Public Diplomacy in International Conflicts: A Social Influence Analysis. Ch. 12, Routledge Handbook for Public Diplomacy. Routledge.

Schneider, C. (2003) Diplomacy that Works – 'Best Practices' in Cultural Diplomacy

Sen, A. () Culture and Development

Singh, J.P. (2010) International Cultural Policies and Power. Palgrave McMillan

Snow, N. (2009) Rethinking Public Diplomacy. Routledge Handbook for Public Diplomacy. New York. Routledge.

Throsby, D. (2009) Keynote Speech. Culturelink Asia-Pacific Cultural policy Conference.

Tuch, H.N. (1990) Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, chapter 1, pp.3-11

Yudice (2000) Expedience of Culture

United Nations (1948) Universal Declaration of Human Rights

(1966) International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

UNCTAD (2008) Creative Economy Report

UNCTAD (2010) Creative Economy Report, Creative Economy: A Feasible Development Option

UNESCO (1996) Our Creative Diversity

UNESCO (2005) Opatija Declaration on Intercultural Dialogue and Conflict Prevention adopted by the European Ministers responsible for Cultural Affairs

UNESCO (2001) Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.

UNESCO (2009) World Report: Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue.

UNESCO (2005) Convention on Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions

Villanueva, C. (2010) Cosmopolitan Constructivism: Mapping a Road to the Future of Cultural Diplomacy. PD Magazine Winter 2010. Pp. 45-56

Williams, R. (1983) Keywords. London: Fontana.

Zhang W. (2010) China's cultural future: from soft power to comprehensive national power. International Journal of Cultural Policy. Vol. 16, Issue 4, pp.383-402. Routledge