A New Era in Cultural Diplomacy: Rising Soft Power in Emerging Markets

Conference Report
In an increasingly multipolar global system, emerging-economy countries are now paying greater attention to culture and communication as part of the symbolic domain of their national power in global affairs.

But their efforts remain little understood, a gap that the CPD Conference on Cultural Diplomacy held at the University of Southern California on February 28, 2014 aimed to address.

The following is a summary of the proceedings of the conference, followed by observations and recommendations for new approaches to cultural diplomacy in emerging markets derived from the event.

It is the latest contribution to the CPD Rising Soft Power research initiative which seeks to understand how emerging economies are using culture and ideas to advance national interests.
The USC Center on Public Diplomacy’s 2014 conference “A New Era in Cultural Diplomacy: Rising Soft Power in Emerging Markets” opened with introductory remarks by Professor Jay Wang, Director of the USC Center on Public Diplomacy. He expressed hope that the conference would reveal “how emerging markets are exploring and pursuing public diplomacy” as they rise to preeminence.

Ernest J. Wilson III, Dean of the USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism, welcomed participants and guests, expressing pride in CPD’s work on public diplomacy at the global level. “Public diplomacy can do anything it wants to do, even the improbable,” he stated. The Dean went on to point to the large budgets that emerging economies are dedicating to public diplomacy, for example, $6.6 billion in China, as an indicator of the importance and timeliness of the conference’s topic. He concluded with the announcement of a new USC academic minor in public diplomacy.

Panel One – Cultural Diplomacy: Continuity and Disjuncture

In the first panel, cultural diplomacy scholars presented their analyses of international cultural initiatives in Turkey, Indonesia, Russia, and India.

Senem Cevik is Assistant Professor at Ankara University and was previously a CPD visiting researcher. In her presentation, she examined the role of Turkish soap operas as instruments of cultural diplomacy, seeking to answer the question, “What are the effects of soap operas for the broader Middle East?” She explained that this non-governmental example of cultural diplomacy is especially important given what she considered the disorganized approach to public and cultural diplomacy by the Turkish government. Turkey boasts a formidable cultural diplomacy infrastructure, comparable to the British Council or Goethe Institute, and anchored in the Yunus Emre Institute. The Directorate of Overseas Turks manages international exchange and diaspora engagement, but its initiatives are constrained by the absence of a grand strategy. Cevik explained that tangible and intangible assets must be incorporated into such a strategy, and that Turkey does not know which intangible values it wants to champion abroad. In the meantime, Turkey is explaining itself to the world through its soap operas, which are rampantly popular throughout the Middle East.
East. Cevik attributed their success to the inclusion of Muslim as well as Western traditions, thereby making the shows both familiar and exciting to audiences in more conservative states such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Accordingly, Turkey’s soap stars have become symbols of both “Middle Eastern unity” as well as the “Western lifestyle,” bridging a cultural divide that might otherwise have been intractable. Furthermore, the soaps’ popularity has had a positive economic impact upon Turkey, which now benefits from “the country of origin effect” across the Middle East. “Made in Turkey” now connotes a quality product. Cevik concluded with an evaluation of soap opera’s impact, ultimately determining that the extent of the programs’ cultural diplomacy success depends on how Turkey wants to be identified. While the programs do represent “a part of the society,” before the country can understand whether these shows help foreign publics to understand it, it must first understand itself.

Katerina Tsetsura, Gaylord Family Professor of Strategic Communication and Public Relations at the University of Oklahoma, went on to evaluate Russian cultural diplomacy. She began with a discussion of gastrodiplomacy, highlighting the soft power of blini, pancakes that are made for the pre-Easter holiday of Maslenitsa. Blini represent “the Russian soul,” and were presented to the world at the Opening Ceremony of the 2014 Sochi Olympics. The blini were critical in representing continuity between Tsarist, Soviet, and Federal Russia. This was further reinforced by the inclusion in both the Opening and Closing ceremonies of the crying bear that featured in the 1980 Moscow Olympics. Furthermore, Russian ballet, Russian authors, space exploration, and Cyrillic characters were emphasized in both ceremonies to tie these three eras together. However, Tsetsura warned that this continuous messaging may be denigrating Russia’s international reputation. While Russian literature was likely featured in the ceremonies as an example of Slavic cultural prowess, because of Soviet linguistic uniformity, Russian is known as a “language of oppression” in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). This impression is reinforced today as Russia continues a softer form of linguistic imperialism through cultural centers and language schools in the CIS region. Additionally, Tsetsura highlighted the importance of Russian religious diplomacy, as conducted through the Russian Orthodox Church. Because “the unity of Russia came with the arrival of the Russian Orthodox Church,” religion is critical to Russian identity, and the Church continues to be heavily involved in diaspora outreach and cultural diplomacy in the far and near abroad. This, too, was represented in the closing ceremonies at Sochi, during which the Church literally “stood above the people,”
as cathedrals flew overhead. Tsetsura concluded by highlighting three key issues within Russian cultural diplomacy. Firstly, cultural programming is highly centralized, with all initiatives controlled by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and “very little opportunity to change ideas.” Secondly, “Russia still thinks of itself as an empire,” and this hierarchical approach to cultural diplomacy can easily offend target populations who cherish the independence of the last two decades. Finally, Russian cultural diplomacy is constructed “top-down.” Most cultural centers are placed in major international cities, and very little effort is made to reach past national elites.

Developing countries must transcend Western-imposed narratives of victimhood.

Judy Mitoma

with all initiatives controlled by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and “very little opportunity to change ideas.” Therefore, there is no single image of Indonesia that can be presented to the world. In contrast to the centralized Russian approach, Indonesian cultural diplomacy is largely conducted through bottom-up programs. Local artists tour foreign cities and towns, often without the support of the Indonesian government. Since America too is “not a monolithic cultural entity,” the two countries are natural cultural partners. Indonesia-United States arts exchanges are often couched in “face-to-face residency,” in which artists travel between small towns and villages, personally meeting and performing with many of their inhabitants. In November 2013, the Indonesian Institute of the Arts sent a delegation to Los Angeles, which Mitoma recognized as a significant step towards mutual understanding between the two countries. Mitoma expressed hopes that in the future, Indonesian cultural diplomats would find funds within Indonesia, thereby becoming freer to express Indonesian culture without the constraints of foreign influence.

Judy Mitoma, Professor Emerita of World Arts and Cultures at UCLA, discussed cultural exchanges between Indonesia and the United States, focusing on the role of the arts in this relationship. Mitoma began by emphasizing the diversity of Indonesian culture. The country is home to 580 language groups, 13 of which have over a million speakers, and “there is no single arts practice in Indonesia because to do so would put one culture over another.”

Daya Kishan Thussu, Professor of International Communication and Co-Director of India Media Centre at the University of Westminster, considered how the growth of Indian media is enhancing its soft power, as well as its sovereign independence. He began by
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discussing India’s inherent soft power, which stems from the “perception of India as a nonthreatening, spiritual, other-worldly kind of place.” The Indian government, alternatively, emphasizes high culture in its public diplomacy programming, despite the small global audience for traditional Indian music, dance, and art. Indian pop culture, however, has earned a huge international following. Bollywood has become the world’s largest film hub and earns $29 billion annually. Thussu explained the importance of the large Indian diaspora to the international take up of Bollywood and Indian pop culture, reminding the audience that while Bollywood has only been a significant cultural force in the United States for several decades, it was extremely popular in the U.S.S.R. and China as early as the 1950s. The diaspora itself also acts as a strong cultural diplomat. Because many important figures of the Western knowledge economy such as Bobby Ghosh and Satya Nadella hail from India, many Westerners now associate India with “intellectual power.” Thussu then discussed Indian media proliferation. The lack of a national television channel has led to a uniquely vibrant media landscape, but its potential for exportation as an instrument of cultural diplomacy has, until now, remained largely untapped. Finally, Thussu recommended that scholars “de-Americanize the soft power discourse,” as Joseph Nye does not account for the “complex cultural history of other countries.” Thussu also pointed to the importance of studying the “cultural consequences of the rise of India,” emphasizing that India must not only be perceived as a rising economy, but as a growing society, with all the intricacies of a multi-lingual, multi-religious, 1.2 billion-strong civilization.

The panel was moderated by Nicholas J. Cull, Director of the Master of Public Diplomacy Program at USC. After highlighting the importance of “relevance” and “moral leadership” to cultural diplomacy in emerging economies, he asked the panelists why it is important for people to think about the BRICS and other developing states from a cultural perspective. Tsetsura highlighted the “dichotomy” between the Russian state and people. Because “Russian culture is about resistance,” cultural diplomacy allows global publics to identify with Russia regardless of the actions of its government. Cevik suggested that nations should not seek to “touch everyone globally,” and should instead establish relevance within regions of interest. Thussu expressed hope that a stronger cultural discourse from emerging economies would break the hegemony of the Anglo-dominated global media scene. Mitoma emphasized the importance of “bottom-up stories” to the relevance of emerging nations, arguing that developing
countries must transcend Western-imposed narratives of victimhood.

Panel Two – Confucius Institutes: The Globalization of Chinese Soft Power

In the second panel, scholars and practitioners reflected on the structural idiosyncrasies, implementation challenges, and soft power achievements of Confucius Institutes and Classrooms in the United States and South Africa.

R. S. Zaharna, Associate Professor at American University, began the second panel by examining Confucius Institutes through a “network communication approach.” She noted that Confucius Institutes are spreading faster than any of the Western cultural institutes, and that Confucius Institutes are expanding most rapidly in liberal democracies. The Hanban – the centralized body that manages the Institutes – attributes this success to “longevity, culture and relations,” and Zaharna’s research has shown that relational structures are indeed a major advantage for Confucius Institutes. Firstly, the Institutes have a strong “network structure.” This is guaranteed by the dual hubs of Hanban and the program’s website. Additionally, all foreign universities that host a Confucius Institute also have a Chinese partner university, and these two relational layers result in complex “network weaving.” Secondly, Confucius Institutes create “network synergy” by connecting online and offline activities, in recognition of the fact that “interpersonal relations must solidify online resources.” For example, the annual Confucius Institute Conference allows Institute Directors to build on virtual collaborations through in person interactions. Finally, Confucius Institutes employ “network strategy,” by persuading foreigners to be involved through task-, social-, and identity-based narratives. While most cultural exchanges involve a “static entity,” participants in Confucius programs “generate knowledge and innovation,” and become far more engaged than participants involved in counterparts’ cultural programs. Zaharna concluded by recommending that other countries’ cultural institutes pay closer attention to the “relational structures” of the Confucius Institutes and focus on collaboration, stakeholders, and long-term investment.

Jennifer Hubbert, Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Lewis & Clark College, added to the panel by answering the question, “Does soft power really work?” To reach this answer, Hubbert drew on her experience as a chaperone of a Summer Bridge Program, a Confucius Institute initiative that invites high school students to China for 17 days to learn about Chinese language and culture. This program employs two policy mechanisms to achieve soft power: “witnessing the modern” and “the embodied performance of tradition.”
Furthermore, it seeks to portray a “non-contentious” and “exceptionalist” Chinese narrative. However, these “pre-figured notions of authenticity” did not resonate with students, who felt that tour guides’ “controlled” narratives of traditional and modern China were dull and unconvincing. The students saw “particularity, not universality,” and assumed that the textile and aerospace factories they saw during the program were not “real China.” However, outside of the program’s confines, the students experienced a night market, where they did participate in genuine mimetic cultural performance by trying Chinese foods and sending pictures of this process back to the United States. While an exit study revealed that the students are not interested in returning to China, they did want to continue learning Mandarin, which was understood as an economic advantage. Therefore, Hubbert concluded that China’s Summer Bridge Program failed to increase Chinese soft power, but did manage to reinforce the pragmatic importance of Mandarin in the globalized economy. Students did not necessarily want to learn Mandarin, but many did feel that they had to.

Falk Hartig, Post-doctoral Researcher at the Frankfurt Inter-Centre-Programme on New African-Asian Interactions, examined the role of Confucius Institutes in Africa, focusing on the four institutes in South Africa. There, Confucius Institutes are explicitly linked to the Chinese foreign policy agenda to an extent that is not seen in other regions or other nations’ Institutes. In the cultural space, it is the norm to claim that state-funded multinational organizations are merely conveying culture, and the overt geopolitical purpose of African Confucius Institutes therefore represents a notable anomaly. African Confucius Institutes do conduct similar cultural activities to their European counterparts, with an additional emphasis on the pragmatic, including vocational training. But these activities sometimes suffer in quality and scope because of Africa’s shortage of foreign and domestic Chinese language and cultural instructors. This skill gap is caused by a perception among Chinese teachers of “hard living conditions” in Africa, and because there are very few indigenous Chinese language or cultural studies programs. Furthermore, the Confucius Institute teaching materials are designed for Western students, and are not always appropriate for the African cultural and linguistic context. Overall, African-Chinese cultural cooperation does appear to be a “win-win discourse,” as Confucius Institutes are clearly addressing a very real need in African education. However, Hartig ponders, “who is winning what?”
**John Layton** serves as the Assistant Superintendent of Lafayette School Corporation. He was instrumental in bringing Confucius Classrooms – the high school iteration of the Confucius Institute – to his district. While establishing this program, Layton faced three key concerns from stakeholders: (1) exposing children to communist propaganda, (2) sacrificing romance language instruction, and (3) employing qualified teachers. Layton explained that the Confucius Classroom program is well designed to answer each concern, as the curriculum focuses primarily on traditional culture and language exercises, rather than contemporary China. Additionally, external funding allows schools to continue current programs while adding Mandarin instruction, and guest teachers from China fill skills gaps to ensure a high quality of instruction. Layton also emphasized the strength that institutional relationships add to the Confucius Classroom program. By collaborating with the High School of Shanghai, Jiaotong University, and Purdue University, Lafayette students had access to a wealth of educational and cultural resources that would otherwise not have been available. Through these partnerships, Lafayette has hosted Chinese delegations, viewed live performances of the Monkey King, and participated in a workshop with the Hangzhou Conservatory of Performing Arts. Though he was “aware from the beginning that there was an agenda on behalf of the Chinese,” Layton believes that Chinese intentions are mutually beneficial, with the program’s key purpose being the promotion of “peace and prosperity between the two nations.” He also pointed to the fact that Chinese teachers who work in America as Confucius Classroom guest teachers return to China with a more accurate and positive perception of the United States, and that soft power is never a one-way street.

This panel was moderated by **Clayton Dube**, Executive Director of the USC U.S.-China Institute at the Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism. He emphasized that the panelists’ experiences demonstrate that it is “impossible to generalize” the intentions, experiences, and outcomes of a Confucius program. Additionally, he reminded the audience that China’s globalization has lacked a “coherent agenda,” and that even when a straightforward message is put forward by Chinese policymakers, “the message intended is not necessarily the message received.” Building on these considerations, he asked panelists, “What do they want, are they getting it, and how would we know?” Falk responded that it is impossible for Western observers to discern Chinese intentions, but that it is likely that there is no “real master plan in mind.” Additionally, he doubted the soft power impact of Confucius Institutes, as those who attend the Institutes already feel positively towards China. Zaharna discussed the deep networks that the Confucius Institutes have established as a marker of success, while Hubbert felt that “China has a very, very long term perspective” concerning its power projection. Finally, Layton suggested that the local control of school boards has slowed the expansion of Chinese programs
at the high school level.

Lunch Conversation – GREAT Britain in Emerging Markets

Over lunch, Andrew Pike discussed the GREAT Campaign, the United Kingdom’s flagship nation branding program, and its presence in emerging economies. Pike has served as Deputy Director for the GREAT Campaign since the initiative was launched in coordination with the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee. Originally designed to increase interest in the 2012 London Olympics, the campaign’s mandate was expanded following the Games to “drive jobs and growth to Britain.” After conducting extensive formative research, Pike had determined that “luckily, most of the world quite liked us.” However, the GREAT campaign sought to reach beyond this vague favorability to “position the U.K. as the most creative country in the world.” Because of the project’s relatively small budget of $48 million, it targeted 13 focus markets from 2013 to 2015, the majority of which are in developing economies: China, Indonesia, Turkey, Mexico, Brazil, India, the United Arab Emirates and emerging Europe. Pike emphasized the importance of assuming nothing about the audiences in these markets, and basing all programming on audience research. For example, although the campaign seeks to present Britain as an innovative country, in Brazil, many people are interested in the traditional and aristocratic side of the U.K. Therefore, Pike ensured that the old was presented along with the new at events in Brazil. In each of these markets, the GREAT campaign depends on celebrity involvement. 150 celebrities have donated time to the campaign, including David Beckham, Andy Murray, and the royals, who Pike described as “our soft power superstars.” The campaign also engages local “partners and credible witnesses” to ensure its messaging is perceived as legitimate. Pike went on to clarify that he does not consider the GREAT campaign to be a nation branding initiative, but instead a marketing campaign that is designed to provide measurable financial returns: “We don’t change perceptions for no reason. We change perceptions to create impact.” Thus far, Pike estimates that GREAT has achieved a 600 million pound return on investment.

Pike’s presentation was moderated by Jay Wang who emphasized the “versatility” of the GREAT campaign. Pike expanded on this assessment, claiming that “the simplicity of it” was the key factor that has allowed the campaign to become so successful. When
questioned about the campaign’s evaluation strategy, Pike explained that each campaign category – trade/investment, tourism and education – is evaluated differently, with number of business leads, click through to plane bookings, and close cooperation with universities, leveraged to assess the campaign’s impact. Finally, Wang asked what Pike considered to be the biggest lesson that he has learned from the campaign, to which he responded: “It really is just about defining your messages. Having one voice.”

Panel Three – Dialogues through Film

In the third panel, film festival directors and organizers from Nigeria, Poland, Turkey and Mexico shared their unique approaches to film diplomacy and intercultural dialogue.

Hope Obioma Opara, President of Nigeria’s Eko International Film Festival (EIFF), opened the panel with a discussion of Nollywood – the Nigerian film industry – as a tool of cultural diplomacy. While Nollywood produces a higher volume of films than any other film center, its international presence has been fairly weak, as its filmmakers are not well organized on an international scale. This has been partially remedied through EIFF, which not only gave Nollywood producers an international platform for their art, but also welcomed entrants from 15 other countries. Opara hopes that Nollywood and EIFF will become emblematic of free speech – represented by the screening of an Indian movie that was banned in its own country – and human rights – as portrayed by several powerful anti-female genital mutilation films. Opara also pointed to the importance of artistic quality in cultural diplomacy, recognizing that the production quality of Nollywood films will have to increase significantly before they become popular beyond Africa. Now that the government has realized that “Nollywood is helping to brand Nigeria internationally,” it has begun to step in with funding to make these higher quality films a reality.

Vladek Juszkiewicz is the Executive Director of the Polish Film Festival in Los Angeles (PFFLA), which features documentaries, animation, shorts and feature films that are “made in Poland, made by a Pole, or about a Polish subject.” The event targets the diaspora community in Los Angeles, including those of Polish descent who do not speak Polish, and therefore all of PFFLA’s films are subtitled. Juszkiewicz was very conscious of PFFLA as a tool of cultural diplomacy, clarifying that “it was not only about introducing Polish cinema, but more about introducing Poland.” Furthermore, he highlighted the importance of bringing together people from different backgrounds to foster understanding and appreciation.

Visit CPD’s YouTube channel to see excerpts from Hope Obioma Opara’s presentation at the conference.
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PFFLA was designed “to bring people together, not divide them.” Therefore, films are only screened if they refrain from overtly judging a particular group of people. This principle is idealistic as well as pragmatic, as the festival’s most polarizing films, such as a controversial North Korean piece, tend to be the least attended. In addition to the U.S.-Poland dimension of the festival, it also strengthens diplomatic ties with China, India, and Mexico, whose consulates collaborate to bring PFFLA to life. For example, when a Pole screened a film about Siberians immigrating to Mexico, multiple third countries became stakeholders in the event.

Yasemin Yilmaz16, co-founder of the Los Angeles Turkish Film Festival (LATFF), discussed the growing community of Turkish filmmakers and filmgoers in Los Angeles. LATFF was launched at Grauman’s Egyptian Theater in 2012 by a group of Turkish film students who realized that Turkey was one of the very few countries that did not host a national film festival in Hollywood. With the support of the Turkish Los Angeles Consulate and Ministry of Culture, the students sought to “bring Turkish narratives […] to both a Turkish and American audience.” Notably, the viewer’s experience “begins as soon as you get to the theater,” as attendees are greeted by Turkish students offering Turkish delight and discussions of Turkish culture and lifestyles. Yilmaz emphasized that “we believe it’s very important to make a network, a bridge” and that the organizers were “looking for interaction between cultures.” Similarly to PFFLA, LATFF actively collaborates with other international festivals such as the Sarajevo Film Festival. LATFF is also closely associated with USC. Six USC student films were included in this year’s festival, and several young Turkish directors will be selected for mentorship by USC faculty through LATFF competitions. Despite its youth, LATFF is rapidly expanding and has recently launched the Dream Export program, a screenwriting competition and cultural exchange that will be offered at 20 of the top film schools in the United States and in Turkey. Couched in a belief that a foreign culture can be understood only through personal experience, the winners will be given $15,000 to produce a film in their non-native country.

Samuel Douek17 is founder and Director of the HOLA Mexico Film Festival, which began in Australia and has since expanded to Los Angeles. Under the motto “Mexico es mucho más que clichés,” the festival seeks to bring a genuine Mexican cultural experience to international publics. To this end, HOLA Mexico features Mexican food and music, as well as film. The festival has a natural audience among the Mexican and Latin American diaspora, as Hispanics represent a disproportionately large percentage of frequent moviegoers in the United States. Concerning content selection, Douek echoed the priorities of the previous panelists while outlining the need to choose a “diverse”
array of films that present Mexico in a genuine, relatable way, but that also have a “good story” and are “well-produced.” Douek underscored the importance of sponsorship to cultural diplomacy initiatives, especially for big-budget events such as film festivals. This year the festival is designed to “generate a social movement” to combat Mexico’s deeply negative portrayal in the United States. Pointing to a cartoon stereotype of a Mexican luchador-narco, Douek asserted that “anything cultural will help the everyday Mexican decrease this Mexican in a fight.” Building on this concept, HOLA Mexico has given the promotional hashtag #HolaMexicoLucha. The Festival is encouraging supporters to use this tag not only in relation to the event, but also to individually correct misconceptions about Mexico. Douek thereby hopes to link HOLA Mexico with overarching Mexican nation branding priorities.

The panel was moderated by Nicholas J. Cull, who reminded the audience that film is a “very important medium despite our iPhones.” When asked to note a third country’s films that act as strong instruments of public diplomacy, Yilmaz mentioned Spanish, Canadian and Bosnian pieces, ultimately concluding that “we all pretty much tell similar stories,” and that the major differences between countries’ films lie in approach, and not in substance. Opara pointed to the high production quality of American films, while Douek suggested that Israeli films “really bring the sentiment of being there.” He also noted that the body of Israeli films have been culturally enriched by the Israeli Film Board’s practice of funding Palestinians to craft critical narratives. Finally, Juszkiewicz lauded French films for their ability to examine serious social issues in a light, accessible manner.

**Five Key Observations for Cultural Diplomacy Best Practices**

During the course of the 2014 conference, the following themes emerged concerning best practices in cultural diplomacy:

(1) **PRECISELY DEFINED IDENTITY:** Prior to constructing a cultural diplomacy initiative, a government, organization, or artist must fully understand the cultural identity of the nation to be represented. It is impossible for a state to evaluate the success of a cultural campaign or branding initiative unless perceptive goals are clearly articulated. Furthermore, as internet penetration increases, it is likely that publics already have access to information about a given country. It is therefore important that cultural diplomacy not only conveys information, but that it does so in a way that is compelling, unique, and emblematic of the country’s cultural priorities.

(2) **BOTTOM-UP FORMULATION:** It is equally important to understand the culture...
of the target audience. Cultural diplomacy must listen to its potential audience, and this can be operationalized as open-minded formative research. In the absence of this practice, cultural diplomacy can be misinterpreted by its target as cultural imperialism, as seen in Russia and the CIS.

(3) TACTILITY: The strongest cultural diplomacy initiatives convey cultural narratives as tactile experiences. This physicality can be achieved through international exchange programs and active participation in cultural traditions, as promoted through Confucius programs, LATFF and HOLA Mexico, but also more abstractly through well-crafted films and events that capture the essence of a country’s culture, such as the GREAT campaign’s Brazil launch, which brought British physicality to Rio through models of Buckingham Palace and other culturally resonant landmarks. Technology allows anyone to learn about another nation’s culture independently, but the added value of cultural diplomacy helps to transform this information into a tangible and transformative experience.

(4) RELATIONSHIP-BUILDING: The most successful cultural diplomacy programs prioritize relationship-building between the acting and target nations, and also within each nation individually. This is best epitomized by the multilayered institutional and personal relationships of the Confucius Institutes and Classrooms, but relationships also contribute to the success of Indonesian arts diplomacy, as well as that of many film festivals. Relationships make culture feel human, and therefore more credible and compelling than an isolated cultural experience.

(5) DIASPORA ENGAGEMENT: Nationals living abroad are an important soft power resource, and they should be empowered to share their home nation’s culture with their current community. This practice is generally low-cost, with high potential impact. Diaspora community members are often seen as a non-propagandistic representation of their country of origin and also enjoy credibility in the foreign country due to their local relationships and reputation.

Conclusion

If cultural diplomacy is to retain its place of strategic importance as a tool of public engagement, it must fill the gaps in contemporary communications. While the Internet sometimes encourages learning to be an isolated and observational act, cultural diplomacy can inform foreign audiences through lasting relationships and active participation. Domestic communications often convey international relations as a zero-sum game where foreign nations are merely one-dimensional caricatures, but cultural diplomacy can offer a counter-narrative in which diverse peoples and their traditions can co-exist, strengthening each other through mutual understanding, and building new traditions together. These are not easy tasks, but they are of critical importance as public diplomacy seeks to maintain its relevance in the 21st century.
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