

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Čeginskas, Viktorija L. A.; Lähdesmäki, Tuuli

Title: Dialogic approach in the EU's international cultural relations : joint EUNIC-EU delegation projects as heritage diplomacy

Year: 2023

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2022 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Rights: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Rights url: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the original version:

Čeginskas, V. L. A., & Lähdesmäki, T. (2023). Dialogic approach in the EU's international cultural relations : joint EUNIC-EU delegation projects as heritage diplomacy. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 29(1), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2022.2141719>

Dialogic Approach in the EU's International Cultural Relations: Joint EUNIC-EU Delegation Projects as Heritage Diplomacy

Viktorija L.A. Čeginskas ^{a*} and Tuuli Lähdesmäki ^b

^a Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland;

^b Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

* Corresponding author: Department of History and Ethnology, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland. Email: viktorija.ceginskas@jyu.fi

Viktorija L.A. Čeginskas (PhD in Cultural Heritage Studies, MA in Contemporary History, East European History and European Ethnology) is a post-doctoral researcher at the Department of History and Ethnology of the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. She currently works in two research projects, SENSOMEMO (www.sensomemo.fi) and HERIDI (<https://r.jyu.fi/heridi>), both funded by the Academy of Finland. Čeginskas recently co-authored two monographies (Europe from Below, Brill 2021 and Creating and Governing Cultural Heritage in the European Union, Routledge 2020) and co-edited two volumes (Politics of Memory and Oblivion in the European Context, Routledge 2022 and Challenges and Solutions in Ethnographic Research, Routledge 2020). She has published in a number of peer-reviewed journals (e.g., International Journal of Heritage Studies, European Societies, Santander Art and Culture Law Review) and is editor of the open access journal Ethnologia Fennica. ORCID: 0000-0002-5794-9503

Tuuli Lähdesmäki (PhD in Art History and Sociology) is an associate professor at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland. She has the title of Docent in Art History at the University of Jyväskylä and in Area and Cultural Studies at the University of Helsinki. Lähdesmäki is currently leading the HERIDI project (EU Heritage Diplomacy and the Dynamics of Inter-Heritage Dialogue), funded by the Academy of Finland. In her previous projects, funded by the Academy of Finland, HORIZON2020, and ERC, she has explored the EU's heritage, diversity, and cultural policies, intercultural dialogue, cultural identities, belonging, and public space. Lähdesmäki's recent publications include co-authored books Learning Cultural Literacy through Creative Practices in Schools (Palgrave Macmillan, 2022); Europe from Below (Brill, 2021); and Creating and Governing Cultural Heritage in the European Union (Routledge, 2020). Lähdesmäki has worked as a Visiting Scholar/Professor at

the University of Cambridge, the University of Limerick, the University of Pécs, the European University Institute, and Fulda University of Applied Sciences. ORCID: 0000-0002-5166-489X.

Dialogic Approach in the EU's International Cultural Relations: Joint EUNIC-EU Delegation Projects as Heritage Diplomacy

Culture and cultural heritage have become central aspects in the European Union's (EU) foreign policy that increasingly emphasizes dialogue and people-to-people connections as the basis for international cultural relations. This article explores 11 projects jointly facilitated by the European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) and EU Delegations in nine countries located in Europe, Africa, and South America as part of a strategic cooperation between the European Commission, the European External Action Service and EUNIC. We identify five modes of highlighting dialogue as a key element in the EU's international cultural relations and discuss how the ideas of dialogue, cultural heritage, values, and diplomacy are entangled and interrelated in our data. The study underlines the core role of the cooperation between EUNIC and EU Delegations and shows how a dialogic approach determines the EU's international cultural relations and at the same time interconnects its international and internal policy aims.

Keywords: dialogue; European Union; EUNIC; EU Delegations; international cultural relations, heritage diplomacy

Introduction

In September 2021 the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, announced the European Union's (EU) new global investment and infrastructure development plan, the Global Gateway (GG) initiative. The GG takes a 'dual approach of dialogue and decisive action' (SOTEU 2021, 18) to promoting connectivity in EU international relations in which dialogue comes first but simultaneously serves to boost the EU's global competitiveness (SOTEU 2021, 18; JOIN 2021, 1). As von der Leyen emphasized, this strategy seeks to build partnerships and strengthen people-to-people connections between the EU and its partner countries worldwide. The aim is to promote the GG's economic, social, and environmental model through projects to create dialogue with civil society actors in non-EU countries, facilitated by EU member states

and many other stakeholders, including the over 140 EU Delegations representing the Union in non-EU countries and international organizations (JOIN 2021, 12). The GG's emphasis on dialogue, people-to-people connections, and multi-actor cooperation reflects the latest developments in the EU's international relations. The aim of this article is to shed light on these developments by exploring the role of dialogue in the EU's cultural dimension of these relations. The article aims to understand the dialogic approach in the EU's international cultural relations and to explain how dialogue entangles with the notions of cultural heritage, values, and diplomacy in the projects implemented as part of these relations.

Since the mid-1990s, the EU has paid more attention to culture in its international relations and gradually integrated the use of cultural heritage within its external actions. The Barcelona Declaration (1995), an agreement on closer collaboration between the countries in the Euro-Mediterranean region, introduced a new approach to the EU's foreign policy that promoted the spirit of dialogue and the creation of partnerships in the areas of security, economy, and culture in order to deepen understanding between people (Nasser and Bouquerel 2020). The European Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World (2007), the Preparatory Action report on Culture in EU External Relations (2014), and the Joint Communication: Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations (2016) have been milestones in introducing culture as a third pillar in the EU's foreign policy. The Joint Communication can even be perceived as indicating a paradigm shift in the EU's approach to international relations. In it, the policy focus moves from safeguarding cultural heritage and strengthening EU identity, integration, and economic development to acknowledging the potential of culture and cultural heritage in a framework of security and defence to prevent violent extremism, fight against radicalization, and help settle conflicts (JOIN 2016; see also Mälksoo

2016, 380; Nasser and Bouquerel 2020). The European Commission (EU 2014, 18) has described these policy changes by noting how the EU has placed culture at the ‘heart of international relations’ through promoting intercultural dialogue, emphasizing the role of culture for sustainable social and economic development, and supporting cultural heritage as a sector in its own right (JOIN 2016, 7; see Helly and Galeazzi 2016, 8). Moreover, the more recent EU documents dealing with international relations include a greater focus on values. The EU uses a values-based discourse in its bilateral and regional cooperation that promotes democracy, human rights, rule of law, sustainable development, economic transition for achieving peace, and political stability (MacDonald and Vlaeminck, 2020; Nasser and Bouquerel 2020; Trobbiani and Kirjazovaitė, 2020; see also Groth in this issue). However, integrating cultural heritage into the EU external actions goes beyond soft power politics for achieving foreign policy objectives, such as strengthening sustainable development or the establishment of democracy. It also supports the EU’s own international legal obligations, and those of its member states, in the safeguarding of (intangible) cultural heritage (Hausler 2019).

In this new strategic approach to culture and cultural heritage in the EU’s international relations, cultural operators and civil society actors in a plethora of public and private, institutional and non-governmental organizations are given a central role as drivers for societal change and institutional reform (EU 2014; Nasser and Bouquerel 2020; Trobbiani and Pavón-Guinea 2020, 221). The Joint Communication identified the umbrella organization of the European Union National Institutes for Culture (EUNIC) as a key partner for implementing the EU’s new international cultural relations strategy (JOIN 2016, 10). EUNIC promotes cultural programmes and projects related to arts, creative activities, tangible and intangible cultural heritage, language learning, and education in more than 100 countries. Its members bring in experience of developing

and managing cultural activities and involving local cultural operators, civil society organizations, and public bodies in promoting EUNIC's activities in local contexts. The EU identified EUNIC as a key partner in its international cultural strategy and in 2017 the European Commission, EUNIC, and the European External Action Service (EEAS) signed an administrative agreement for creating 'a new form of partnership' (EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017, 1). The aim of this partnership is 'to go beyond projecting the diversity of European cultures in order to generate a new spirit of dialogue, mutual listening and learning, joint capacity building, co-creation and global solidarity' (EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017, 1). Joint principles highlight equality and reciprocity as common values of the partnership, which is to be implemented from the bottom up in activities with partner countries (EUNIC 2016, 4).

In this article we examine dialogue, cultural heritage, and values as entangled ideas in the EU's international cultural relations that underpin the new strategic approach in the EU's foreign policy. We approach this entanglement through eleven projects jointly facilitated by the EUNIC and EU Delegations. These projects were implemented as pilot activities to test and evaluate the cooperation between the European Commission, EUNIC, and EEAS (EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017, 3). We ask 1) how dialogue is manifested in these projects, 2) how the ideas of dialogue, cultural heritage, and values define and become entangled in the EU's international cultural relations, and 3) what kind of diplomacy the projects seek to promote. We focus on the project reports and public descriptions that represent the facilitators' views on and implementation of the EU's international cultural relations.

Our study contributes to the scholarship of heritage diplomacy by exploring it within a wider framework of international cultural relations. In this framework, cultural heritage is approached as part of broader processes of meaning-making, negotiation of

values, and cultural connectivity, including the transfer and (re)production of meanings and values. Our study furthers the dialogic approach in recent research on heritage diplomacy by emphasizing the variety of ways in which dialogue can be understood and defined in international cultural relations. Moreover, our study deepens understanding of the EU as a diplomatic actor by scrutinizing how its international cultural relations have been recently facilitated and implemented. The broad scope of literature across various fields, including international relations, law, social science, conflict studies, (critical) heritage studies, memory studies, and post-colonial studies, show that heritage is inherently political. Culture and heritage play an important role not only in shaping states' nation-building and external representation in diplomacy but also in their pursuit of social cohesion, reconciliation, and justice in post-conflict contexts. In this, cultural heritage can be a site of conflict and a form of political participation that is central to transform politics and society and reflects the values underlying judicial practices and political decisions. Our article seeks to explore how these greater political goals and social ambitions work. While we attempt to broaden the understanding of heritage diplomacy, a concept that is still often understood as adding bi- and multidimensional cultural flows and exchanges to the projection of culture as a mechanism of soft power, the rich data has forced us to limit the scope of our article to our research questions.

In the following, we first introduce the operational framework for the EUNIC's and EU Delegations' joint projects, the empirical data drawing on these projects, and our research method. After this, we discuss how dialogue, cultural heritage, and values are approached in the scholarship examining international cultural relations and heritage diplomacy. We then analyse the dialogic approach taken in the joint projects and identify five modes of manifesting dialogue drawing on cultural heritage to enhance international cultural relations. We end our paper by discussing the mixed role of the

joint projects in the EU's international and internal relations and conclude with our findings on what kind of diplomacy these projects promote.

Data and methods: The EUNIC's and EU Delegations' joint projects

Our study draws on eleven joint EUNIC-EU Delegation (EUNIC-EUD) pilot projects implemented in nine EU partner countries in Europe, Africa, and South America. These projects were launched as part of the recent developments in the EU's international cultural relations policies. Following the 2017 Partnership Agreement between the European Commission, EUNIC, and EEAS, two strands of pilot projects were launched to test practical arrangements of enhanced cooperation in situ and to analyse suitable financial instruments in line with the EU principles of subsidiarity and complementarity (EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017, 2; JOIN 2016, 4). These two strands include mid- to large-scale EUNIC-EUD joint projects and more recently launched and still ongoing small-scale European Spaces of Culture projects. In this article, we focus on the EUNIC-EUD joint projects, which ended between 2019 and 2021, with the exception of the 'House of Europe' project in Ukraine, which was planned to run until 2023 before Russia's attack on the country. These pilot projects sought to develop a shared strategic vision in cultural relations and a joint framework for professionalizing the partnership between participants. The aim was to 'lead to stronger national and local cultural policies in the partner countries, including a protection of cultural heritage and support for other forms of arts and culture activity' (EUNIC global 2021, 48).

The EUNIC-EUD projects (see Table 1) were implemented in Egypt, Senegal, Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo (two projects), Tunisia, Bolivia, Cuba, Peru, and Ukraine (two projects). Both the selection of partner countries and project funding priorities coincides with the geostrategic reflections stated in the GG, which places a strong focus on the African continent and the EU's neighbouring countries in Eastern

Europe and across the Mediterranean. In average, these projects were designed for 27 months. The ‘Lëlu Di Wajal’ Art’ project in Senegal was the shortest with the duration of nine months, while the four longest projects were implemented in the Democratic Republic of Congo (‘Master Classes of Photography,’ 36 months), Ukraine (‘Culture Bridges,’ 35 months, and ‘House of Europe,’ 48 months), and Tunisia (‘TFANEN: Tunisie Créative,’ 60 months). In total, the eleven projects received funding of over €25.5m for the period 2016–2021 (including ‘House of Europe’ planned to end in 2023). The projects in Ukraine were funded in total with over €13m and the six projects in the African countries received in total over €10m, whereas the three projects in South America were funded with only €389,000 (see Table 1).

The EUNIC-EUD projects were implemented in countries that offered ‘favourable conditions’ for cooperation between the EU Delegations and EUNIC cultural institutes (EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017, 3), which in practice referred to countries that hosted major EUNIC clusters. Created in 2006 and currently including 38 cultural institutes from EU member states and associated countries (including the United Kingdom), EUNIC is organized into clusters, which are established where at least three EUNIC members are represented in a country (website EUNIC global/About). Besides the EUNIC cluster members and EU Delegations to the respective country, the joint projects involved cooperation with embassies of EU member states and local stakeholders, such as cultural organizations and civil society actors. In this framework, the European Commission’s role in the projects was to define and offer the strategic outline. The EUNIC members’ role was to engage in networking and managing the projects through their cultural contacts, while the EU Delegations and embassies contributed chiefly by facilitating the project activities abroad, providing funding, and occasionally inviting experts or actors from organizing venues for cultural and scholarly

events (see Table 1 for an overview of collaboration partners). The role of local stakeholders was to provide the cultural content for the projects, as creators and/or participants.

The leadership in the EUNIC-EUD projects reflects the cultural institutes' financial capacity and human resources (see websites EUNIC global/Joint Guidelines; EUNIC.eu/Joint Guidelines). Based on our data, the projects seem to favour the leadership of bigger national cultural institutes over smaller ones and allow the bigger countries to play a more relevant role in building relationships with non-EU partners. In addition, the national cultural institutes of former European colonial powers, such as the Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID) in Cuba or Institut Français in Tunisia, were either actively participating in or leading the cooperation between the EUNIC cluster and the EU Delegation in the partner country. In these two cases, the embassies were supporting the projects as additional cooperation partners. Such cooperation seems to underline EU member states' continuing interest in maintaining relationships with their former colonies.

Most of our data regarding the EUNIC-EUD projects was found on the EUNIC's website, including visualized reports of the projects and their activities (website EUNIC global/ Projects). The reports vary in length, content, and style. We also searched for more information on the projects in the archived news on the websites of the participating EUNIC cluster members and on the websites of the EU Delegations to the respective countries. Moreover, we included in our data key reports evaluating the cooperation between the EUNIC clusters and EU Delegations (e.g., EUNIC global 2018, 2021). All texts in our data are written in the context of the EU's international cultural relations and reflect its policies, value discourses, and political and ideological aims. Thus, we cannot determine from our data how the individual cultural operators or

civil society actors in these projects practiced and experienced dialogue or understood the entanglement of dialogue, cultural heritage, values, and diplomacy. Instead, the data gives an overview on how such cooperation was generally designed and practised by the participating European actors.

Our data analysis was guided by critical close reading with a focus on explicit and implicit references to dialogue, cultural heritage, values, diplomacy, and cultural relations. Critical close reading aims at ‘mindful, disciplined reading of an object with a view to deeper understanding of its meanings’ (Brummett 2010, 3). Moreover, the method seeks to reveal the functioning and meaning-making process of the explored phenomenon and highlight the contexts in which the meanings are produced in the data (Lähdesmäki and Čeginskas 2022). In our study, critical close reading was interactive teamwork: we constantly discussed our remarks and observations from the data and jointly structured them into meaningful units, which advanced our analysis.

Dialogue, heritage, and values in heritage diplomacy

During the past decade, the interrelation between foreign policy, cultural heritage, and intercultural dialogue has been theorized and conceptualized in terms of heritage diplomacy. The concept of heritage diplomacy has recently elicited increased interest among scholars from multiple fields (Lähdesmäki and Čeginskas 2022). With the concept, scholars have sought to rethink the traditional understanding of cultural diplomacy in terms of cultural relations drawing on nation-branding, showcasing a country’s cultural achievements for foreign audiences, and the use of soft power in foreign policy (Winter 2015). Earlier studies of heritage diplomacy predominantly focused on bi- and multilateral cooperation in heritage-related projects run by the states’ official authorities or international organizations (Luke 2012; Luke and Kersel 2013),

whereas scholars have recently scrutinized the role of local small-scale cultural operators and civil society actors in building relations through cultural heritage based on dialogue (e.g., Andersen, Clopot, and Ifversen 2020; Clopot, Andersen, and Oldfield 2022; Čeginskas and Kaasik-Krogerus forthcoming). These recent studies have identified heritage diplomacy more broadly as a catalyst for new relations by providing ‘contact zones’ for dialogue within and between diverse communities and cultural groups (see also Kersel and Luke 2015; Chalcraft 2021). Even though scholarship identifies a broad variety of meanings for heritage diplomacy, it does not sufficiently explain the diverse dimensions and notions of dialogue that international cultural relations can include, create, and promote. These dimensions range from the social to the political, and the institutional to the individual. Moreover, scholars should emphasize the dialogic potential of cultural heritage for international cultural relations by drawing on the conception of heritage as an act of communication (Dicks 2002) and an arena for negotiating (dissonant) meanings, values, and identities (e.g., Harrison 2013; Kisić 2016; Van Huis et al. 2019).

Winter (2015, 2019, 2021) has been influential for understanding heritage diplomacy within a broader framework of foreign policy, power relations, and governance. His work on China’s Belt and Road Initiative has revealed how diplomatic attempts motivated by economic interests and global power politics can become imbued with positive ideals and values, such as peace, exchange, friendship, dialogue, trust, and prosperity (Winter 2021, 701, see also 2019). Of particular relevance for our study is Winter’s (2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2021) view on culture as a joint parameter in a country’s international and domestic governance and power relations, which blurs rigid distinctions between internal and external objectives, policies, and practices in states’ international relations. Researchers on the EU’s use of culture in international relations

have taken a similar approach (Carta and Higgott 2020; see also Mäkinen et al. in this issue).

Dialogue has become key to EU integration and international relations policies. In the early 2000s, dialogue emerged as a new paradigm in EU policy discourses and has since become a normatively charged and frequently used trope (Lähdesmäki, Koistinen, and Ylönen 2019). Much repeated but seldom defined, dialogue is commonly framed in EU discourses as a value and part of European (intangible) cultural heritage that serves in these discourses either as a functional means, essential objective, or a policy outcome, depending on the context (Čeginskas and Kaasik-Krogerus forthcoming).

In our article, we understand the EU's international cultural relations dealing with heritage as heritage diplomacy that draws on a value-based discourse and seeks to institutionalize the idea of dialogue in building relationships within the EU, between member states, and beyond the EU, with non-EU countries worldwide. Cultural heritage and values are closely related to practices of international cultural relations. In general, all cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, draws on and transmits a set of values. EU policy discourses commonly frame values such as peace, human rights, equality, democracy, rule of law, and solidarity as part of Europe's cultural heritage (Lähdesmäki and Mäkinen 2019; Lähdesmäki et al. 2020). The EU considers cultural initiatives as an important means to negotiate and promote shared values internally and externally to enhance economic growth, development, and stability, and to foster cooperation and mutual understanding (Trobbiani and Kirjazovaitė 2020, 91). When cultural heritage is linked to such values, it is easy to consider it as a positive means for peace-making through building dialogue. In EU policy discourses, references to conflict or

disagreement as contributing to productive dialogue are rare (see Mouffe 2005; Čeginskas and Kaasik-Krogerus forthcoming).

Empirical analysis: Dialogue, heritage, and values in EUNIC-EUD projects

Our analysis shows that the core aim of the EUNIC-EUD projects is to promote sustainable economic, social, and cultural development in the partner countries by establishing and enhancing people-to-people cooperation with local artists and cultural operators, representatives of educational institutions, and civil society organizations. In the explored projects, the cultural and creative sector included visual arts, photography, theatre, dance, music, literature, film and cinema, design, fashion, architecture, handicrafts, tangible and intangible heritage, and archaeology promoted through festivals, creative hubs, digital platforms, libraries, museums, media, and publishing (see Tables 1 and 2). In our data, the EUNIC-EUD both explicitly and implicitly approached their joint attempts to establish people-to-people contacts in partner countries as dialogue. Next, we discuss the five different but intersecting modes through which the idea of dialogue was manifested in the EUNIC-EUD projects.

Multilevel cooperation as dialogue

The analysed projects sought to implement a key dimension of the EU strategy on international cultural relations, that is, to promote cooperation between actors at the local, regional, national, and international levels. Such cooperation forms the first approach to dialogue in our data. In the partner countries, cooperation between the EUNIC and EU Delegations enabled governmental actors, cultural institutions, and civil society organizations to create new contacts and initiate new joint activities. Actors at different levels commonly cooperated in activities to build new networks and exchange

ideas, but also deepened collaboration between existing EU-supported cultural projects and programmes in the partner countries.

The analysed EUNIC-EUD projects often ran activities to develop institutions in the partner country's cultural and creative sector to highlight the role of culture in advancing economic growth, social cohesion, and sustainable development, and funded this through grant schemes. Such institutional development occurred typically through multilevel cooperation. For instance, both EUNIC-EUD projects in Ukraine implemented culture-related activities that enabled mobility, exchange, and collaboration first between local and national cultural actors, and secondly, with their counterparts in the EU member states and the UK. The 'Culture Bridges' project, managed by the British Council in partnership with the EUNIC cluster and the EU Delegation in Ukraine, sought to support institutional development in the Ukrainian cultural and creative sector through 60 international travel grants, 21 international and 15 national mobility and cooperation projects, and 20 workshops developing cultural management skills and competences to apply for further funding from the EU's core cultural programme Creative Europe (website Culture Bridges). The project was part of the EU's support to the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement. Based upon consultation with Ukrainian stakeholders on the needs of their cultural sector, it aimed to foster people-to-people contacts and cultural exchange (EUNIC global 2018, 134).

The other project in Ukraine, 'House of Europe,' included over 20 separate programmes that sought to foster national and international exchange in the fields of media, youth work, social entrepreneurship, education and culture, and creative industries (website House of Europe). The programmes brought together artists, activists, and creative professionals from all over Ukraine and EU member states to identify challenges, share knowledge and experience, and discuss new approaches in the

above fields (website House of Europe). Different cultural institutes within EUNIC Ukraine implemented the activities according to their individual strengths and in cooperation with Ukrainian governmental authorities and national institutes, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry of Culture and Informational Policy, Institute of Cultural Policy, Ukrainian Cultural Foundation, and Ukrainian Institute. Dialogue was set as a core goal of these programmes, such as in the Active Citizens Camps, which sought to connect local activists, entrepreneurs, and policymakers from Ukraine, the EU, and UK to ‘improve self-awareness, learn to understand others, and use dialogue as a tool for empathy, find out how to unite the community for social intervention and to plan sustainable social action’ for their communities (website House of Europe/active citizens camps).

The explored projects indicate how the EU’s interaction with local stakeholders helped to define regional and national priorities and themes from the bottom up, but the goals for cooperation also drew on the EU’s prior top-down analysis and mapping of the needs in the partner country. Our data underlines the bottom-up interaction with local actors as the ideal point of departure. This ideal can be easily seen as responding to the emphasis on dialogue in the EU’s international cultural relations policies. In practice, the EUNIC-EUD projects also promoted cooperation between EU and European actors. The idea of dialogue was thus narrowed to strengthening official contacts between European cultural policy officials and cultural project managers.

Socioeconomic development as dialogue

Most of the projects in our study included a strong socioeconomic emphasis seeking to engage people in cultural production and reception. Socioeconomically motivated cultural activities form the second approach to dialogue in our data. The project descriptions constantly underline that the EUNIC-EUD projects consider specific local

contexts in their attempt to address diverse challenges in the partner countries, including sustainable development, social cohesion, and social inclusion. The projects typically intertwined this socioeconomic emphasis with capacity building of future artists and cultural actors. For instance, the ‘Lëlu Di Wajal’ Art’ project in Senegal sought to use cinema to support Senegal-based artists affected by the coronavirus pandemic. The 2018 EUNIC global report (2018, 116) emphasizes the project’s bottom-up impact on disadvantaged neighbourhoods and professionalization for cinema students:

This area was chosen strategically, working in partnership with the Senegalese government who had chosen cinema as one of the priority creative industries for the country. Actions under this contract revolve around two main needs identified with them: facilitating access to culture through film projections in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Dakar lacking cultural centres; and supporting the professionalisation of young script-writers to allow them to access the national cinema fund scheme established by the Senegalese government to finance cinema productions.

The core social aim of the projects was to make culture accessible to a very broad range of people. The ‘Master Classes of Photography’ project in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo) intertwined this aim with capacity building. The project consisted of a workshop series led by professionals from Congo, other African countries, and Europe with a long-term goal to establish photography as a degree programme at the Academy of Fine Arts in Kinshasa. The workshops focused on artistic creation, journalism, documentary, and advertisement as suitable tools for Congolese students to spread ‘their own vision of Congo in the world’ (website EUNIC global/DRC/MCP). A representative of the Portuguese cultural institute (Camões, I.P.) in the EUNIC DR Congo cluster noted how their projects in general sought to empower young people,

decentralize cultural activities, and ensure that culture reaches local communities outside the capital.

In the projects, the social aspect was commonly combined with the aims of sustainable economic development, such as enhancing job creation and entrepreneurship of artists and cultural operators in the partner countries. This became particularly evident in the ‘Towards a Creative Economy Framework’ project implemented in Egypt in partnership with the British Council. The project aimed to ‘positively influence and foster development of sustainable change’ by facilitating multi-level dialogue between stakeholders to elaborate a policy framework for the local creative economy (EUNIC global 2018, 96). By involving more than 250 policymakers, cultural practitioners, artists, academics, and entrepreneurs, the activities aimed to ‘encourage dialogue, collaboration and co-creation in genuine partnership leading to quality and impactful results’ (EUNIC global 2018, 93). The project objectives corresponded to EU priorities (and the Egyptian government’s strategy) by emphasizing the role of the local creative and cultural sector for wealth creation and job development, especially among youth, women, and refugees, as well as highlighting capacity-building and reduction of geographical disparities in the creative and cultural sectors at all levels. Cultural heritage and innovation were set as thematic priorities (EUNIC global 2018, 91, 93).

These projects were often developed to respond to various socioeconomic challenges and improve local conditions in the partner countries. The role of local stakeholders in creating dialogue was often limited to participating in activities implemented by the EU and the local national officials and authorities to advance economic growth, with only potential social benefits for the local population.

Value politics as dialogue

Many of the EUNIC-EUD projects involved grassroots actors – some of whom were vulnerable and underprivileged – in cocreation activities that sought to empower people to promote social change. This political and social advocacy commonly drew on value politics and a rights-based approach to development, which we identified as the third way used in our data to deal with dialogue. Here, the rights-based approach means attempts to improve power relations in the partner country by creating trust and building bridges between local people whose rights were not recognized and the local institutions obligated to fulfil their rights. In our data, such advocacy work commonly focused on democratic values that the EU underlines as its founding principles. These values include human rights, freedom, equality, non-discrimination, and respect for cultural and linguistic diversity (see e.g., TFEU 2007). Many of the EUNIC-EUD projects explicitly built on these values and sought to enable local institutions to recognize the rights of underprivileged people and empower them.

One example of this approach is the ‘Gender Equality Through Art’ project in Bolivia. According to the EUNIC Global website, the project aimed at ‘empowering the Bolivian cultural sector to promote equality, gender equity and sexual diversity and to strengthen its link to civil society organisations’ (website EUNIC global/Bolivia). This focus aligns directly with the objective of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR 2014), which aims to strengthen, promote, and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, mainly through supporting relevant civil society organizations. In the project, the EUNIC cluster and EUD cooperated with Bolivian partners in culture and civil society to change attitudes to machismo by raising awareness of gender equality, LGBTQIA, and other human rights. The project was created in three stages. First, the EUNIC cluster mapped relevant Bolivian cultural and civil society organizations and then sought to promote listening, dialogue, and

mediation between key cultural sector actors. Second, experts from Bolivia and abroad (Argentina, Colombia, and Canada) were invited to advise local working groups on how to develop cultural activities to promote gender equality and LGBTQIA and other human rights. At the third stage of the project, the activities were carried out (website EUNIC global/Bolivia).

Our analysis of these EUNIC-EUD projects suggests that activities aimed at building dialogue and relations with local stakeholders were based on (introducing and strengthening) Western/European democratic liberal values and social politics. This emphasis in activities with partner countries determined the nature of the EU's power politics in its international cultural relations. Through EUNIC-EUD projects, the EU participates in global power play with values at stake.

Cultural heritage as dialogue

Although various EU policy documents (e.g., JOIN 2016) recognize the role of cultural heritage in international cultural relations, only two of the eleven pilot projects explicitly referred to cultural heritage in their activities. Cultural heritage as a broad category of cultural traditions, narratives of the past, and ways of life in specific cultural contexts was, however, implicitly included in most of the projects. In our data, cultural heritage was treated as an arena for dialogue between cultural operators from the partner country and the EU. This dialogue included knowledge exchange and capacity building in heritage management and conservation as well as cultural exchange to introduce each partner's cultural heritage to new audiences. Cultural heritage thus forms our fourth approach to dialogue.

One of the projects explicitly focusing on cultural heritage in our data was entitled 'European Cultural Project for the Bicentennial of Peru.' It addressed cultural heritage and cultural relations between Peru and European countries by organizing

academic conferences and other cultural events on the Sechura archaeological pottery and Andean textiles. The project also implemented the translation of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince* into the indigenous language Shipibo on occasion of the 120th anniversary of the author's birth. The translation was meant to reflect on Peru's multi-ethnic society and contribute to the conservation of local indigenous languages and heritage communities. Moreover, the project aimed to reach new audiences beyond the capital city, strengthen the capacities of Peruvian professionals in cultural and creative industries, and develop active citizenship by raising awareness of human rights, diversity, environmental protection, and climate crisis (website EUNIC global/Peru). Many of the project's cultural activities showcased 'European' culture and heritage to Peruvian audiences by organizing international dance, music, theatre, and cinema festivals, which prominently featured European works. In the project, the joint EUNIC-EUD activities promoted a traditional understanding of heritage, underlining its key role in identity building and creating social cohesion and collective narratives. The aims of the project simultaneously highlighted the EU's economic and general security priorities in building relations with Peru.

The two projects in our data that explicitly addressed cultural heritage took novel approaches in fostering and conserving heritage. The Peruvian project and the 'CLIC – Culture to Connect' project in Cuba used the term 'emergent heritage' to underline contemporary performing arts and cinema as heritage and to use innovative solutions to conserve heritage and develop inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable cities. These aims reflect the joint EUNIC-EUD strategy for international cultural relations in these countries (see website EUNIC global/ Peru; website EUNIC global/Cuba) as well the EU's broader GG initiative. In them, cultural exchange intertwines with economic and social sustainability.

Cultural diplomacy as dialogue

As the example from Peru indicates, the EUNIC-EUD projects included cooperation between the EU and partner countries that looked like cultural diplomacy. In our data, this diplomacy could be articulated as dialogue, and it forms our fifth approach. The EUNIC-EUD projects often stressed the involvement of artists, performers, designers, and researchers in international events and highlighted cooperation between local and European culture and creative professionals to showcase each other's cultural achievements. The EUNIC members and EU Delegations set the framework for the cooperation and often facilitated the events and showcasing activities.

The 'European Award for Congolese Literature' project serves an example of the cultural diplomacy approach. In it, EUNIC-EUD in the DR Congo jointly implemented the *Prix Makomi*, an annual literary award for young Congolese writers to give them more opportunities for publication and attention to their work in the EU. The project involved several EUNIC cluster members and local partners, including a network of independent cultural centres and the Institut National des Arts and Académie des Beaux-Arts in the DR Congo. The EU Ambassador in DR Congo and the representative of the Cultural Focal Point at the EU Delegation to DR Congo explained in an interview that the project activities were mainly organized by Europeans but 'all that is done through listening to the demands and needs of our local partners. There is nothing but a Congolese focus in all our activities and our "Leitmotiv" is to work with and for Congolese people' (website EUNIC global/DRC/EACL). The literature award was part of the EU engagement in development cooperation with the DR Congo aiming at social impact. The cultural content of the award seemed secondary. According to the EU Ambassador (ibid.), the project essentially aimed to

help people to reflect about their own society and the way they want their society to

evolve. And literature plays an important role in better understanding your own social, cultural, and economic conditions. For example, if you have a short story that describes how hard it is for a girl to go to school, this can be a way to know better about current social conditions and ideally to reflect on what needs to be done in order to improve girls' access to education.

Another aim of the project was to strengthen institutional capacities between European partners by increasing the visibility and image of the EU and its member states in DR Congo. In this respect, the project served classical objectives of cultural diplomacy by seeking to extend influence and promote trust in international relations through culture-related activities. The European actors aimed to pool resources to implement more and larger projects and reach broader audiences than they could individually. According to the EU Ambassador in DR Congo, such cooperation and aims reflect 'the essence of our common European project' and 'underpin our principle of doing things together, which is the mission of the EU' (website EUNIC global/DRC/EACL).

Discussion: International cultural relations as intertwined internal and foreign policy

Even though the EUNIC-EUD pilot projects are the EU's instruments for promoting international cultural relations, our analysis indicates that they also function as an arena for the EU's internal policy and collaboration between European actors and institutions. The Bolivian project serves as an example of this: the EUNIC cluster in Bolivia was only created after the EU Delegation invited the European national institutes to jointly apply for a special fund dealing with human rights and social development. Despite divergent structures in the national institutes, the enhanced communication and activities during preparation for the project helped the EUNIC cluster members to find a joint strategy and to become almost 'a cluster of friends,' as the EUNIC website notes

(website EUNIC global/Bolivia). In the EU's international relations, dialogue between EU actors appears at least as important as the interaction between the EU and partner countries or the cooperation with local partners. Like in other EU cultural initiatives, one of the core aims of the EUNIC-EUD joint projects is to create cohesion between member states and their cultural actors, and thereby to promote a sense of belonging to the EU (see also Mäkinen et al. in this issue).

Our data highlights how the EUNIC-EUD pilot projects emphasize civil society collaboration and people-to-people contacts to reach wider audiences on topical issues in the local context (e.g., machismo, discrimination, girls' access to education, and minority rights) that could encourage societal change. The projects not only aimed to respond to local needs but also to advance EU strategic priorities in the relations with partner countries (see also Trobbiani and Pavón-Guinea 2020; Labadi 2020). The EU's international cultural relations are, thus, essentially about EU power politics that reflect global competition. For instance, since the accession of Spain and Portugal to the EU in the mid-1980s, the EU has positioned itself as an alternative to US policy in Central and South America, as well as in the Caribbean. Although the EU's overall impact in this region has remained low (Howorth 2016, 394–395), the three EUNIC-EUD projects in South America can also be seen to pursue the goal of presenting the EU as a potential institutional model that furthers cultural, economic, and political integration of the region.

The analysis of the projects underlines how the EU's international relations draw on the EU's internal policy priorities. The EU's value discourse determines the aims and priorities of collaboration with partner countries. In the EUNIC-EUD projects in South American and African countries, the EU pursues its value agenda to bring about societal change in the partner countries rather than to embed activities in a time frame

that better respects developments in local contexts. Studies on the EU educational diplomacy and development projects have come to the same conclusion: such projects often connect financial support and European value politics with requests to implement swift changes in the local curricula (Piros and Koops 2020; Labadi 2020). On the one hand, this might be considered as a form of external interference with local customary practices echoing a colonial mindset. On the other hand, by introducing the same ideas and values, the EU can help to establish standardized practices of cooperation, commerce, and exchange with partner countries and ensure that all partners play by the same rules. Collaborative cultural projects involving civil society in activities on education, human rights, and equal opportunities may indeed promote bottom-up social change and simultaneously strengthen relations between the EU and partner countries. As a representative of the Portuguese Institute of Cooperation and Language in the EUNIC cluster of the DR Congo stressed, their project was about social development and ‘building long lasting relationships and ultimately creating trust’ with the Congolese cultural actors and the EU Delegations (website EUNIC global/DRC/MCP). Hence, the EU’s shift towards civil society in international cultural relations set up new strategic priorities that are mutually beneficial for the EU and the partner countries.

Conclusions

Our study indicates how diplomacy is created in the EUNIC-EUD pilot projects by following two parallel modes of connectivity: 1) people-to-people relations, which includes enhanced cooperation between European cultural institutes and local cultural operators and organizations; and 2) more traditional cultural diplomatic relations that includes showcasing European culture and cultural branding of the EU through the work of EUNIC clusters and EU Delegations. Based on our study, we argue that the EU’s international cultural relations can be seen as establishing a dialogic approach,

which represents neither a clearly defined cultural nor heritage diplomacy. There are different levels of dialogue entangled in EU policy, which take place: between the EU and its member states; between the EEAS, EU Delegations, and EUNIC; between different European cultural institutes; between the EU and partner countries; between cultural actors of EU countries with their counterparts in the partner countries; and between various local cultural and civic society communities and groups within the partner countries (typically invited to the collaborative activities by the EUNIC cluster). Especially, the dialogue taking place between the EEAS, EU Delegations, EUNIC, and EU member states aims at establishing a unified EU strategy on cultural affairs that outlines the EU's international cultural relations and their implementation.

The EUNIC-EUD project reports and public descriptions frequently refer to dialogue. Our critical close reading of the data revealed five intersecting modes of dialogue in these projects, depending on the level and intended addressees. First, dialogue comprised multilevel cooperation and both bottom-up and top-down interaction between actors representing local, regional, national, and European/EU organizations or institutes. Second, dialogue was related to attempts to tackle socioeconomic challenges through cultural activities to build capacities of local people, future artists, and cultural actors. Third, dialogue promoted values underlined in EU policy discourse through grassroots advocacy work with underprivileged people in the partner countries. Fourth, dialogue was understood as exchanging knowledge on cultural heritage including managing it, conserving it, and introducing it to new audiences. Fifth, dialogue could comprise showcasing cultural achievement to project partners in the operational framework set by the EUNIC members and EU Delegations, similarly to the traditional understanding of cultural diplomacy.

As our study suggests, the joint pilot projects served to develop the 2016 EU strategy by furthering joint understanding of the role of culture and cultural heritage in international relations and creating a clear division of competence between EUNIC and EU Delegation members in practice (see EUNIC global 2018, 2021; JOIN 2016; EUNIC/EC/EEAS 2017). Their enhanced cooperation serves to strengthen the position of the EU (rather than its member states) by aligning diverse interests, priorities, and practices in the members states and EUNIC into one joint EU approach. Hence, the projects do not necessarily strengthen the EU's external relations with its partner countries but reconfigure and align the EU's internal focus to enhance the EU's common strategy in international relations.

Cultural heritage as a broad category of cultural traditions, narratives of the past, and ways of life was implicitly addressed in most of the EUNIC-EUD projects. In the project reports and descriptions, culture, cultural heritage, dialogue, and values formed an entangled basis for collaboration in the partner countries. Indeed, values are a central element in the EU's joint activities with local stakeholders and define (at least discursively) the EU's practices of external policy today, based on ideas of equal partnership and mutual interest (see SOTEU 2021; JOIN 2021). By including values-based discourse in its international cultural relations, the EU emphasizes the social dimension of cultural heritage, such as its potential for community and capacity building, social participation, democratic rights and values. This helps to develop a form of heritage diplomacy that is not (only) associated with tangible cultural heritage.

Similarly to China's Silk Road narrative of connectivity and cultural entanglement, the EU's value-based narrative of international cultural relations is framed with positive ideals, such as peace, exchange, friendship, dialogue, and trust, which masks strategic economic and geopolitical interests and attempts to succeed in a

global power game (Winter 2019, 2021; see also Lähdesmäki and Čeginskas 2022). These values constitute the basis for the rules of (creating) dialogue in the EU's international cultural relations. The EU's value-based approach to heritage diplomacy operates on the assumption of a common framework of rules governing the cooperation between partners, which can only work if all parties agree on common goals and follow values that underpin their commitment to collaboration (see also Lechner and Frost 2018, 14, 127). Russia's war on Ukraine clearly shows the limits of dialogue in international relations when all partners do not share the same 'rules' and values. The Global Gateway initiative can be understood as the EU's latest attempt to establish internationally recognized practices in international relations, designed to create stability within and outside Europe and promote common interests based on shared democratic values.

Based on our results, we find some inconsistencies in the EU's international cultural relations policy. As cultural heritage not only encourages dialogue but can also be a source for conflict, the EU needs to consider the challenges involved in deploying cultural heritage for diplomatic endeavours within and beyond Europe. While the documents dealing with the EUNIC-EUD joint projects often highlight the importance of involving local stakeholders and considering different views and cultural standpoints in building international cultural relations, the notion of Europe and the representation of European stakeholders in the documents remain one-sided and culturally narrow. In the documents, the concept of Europe's culture and cultural heritage excludes, for instance, its migrant and minority communities. As pointed out also by Jakubowski, Hausler, and Fiorentini (2019), these groups' cultural heritage is neither adequately recognized nor protected within the EU.

The joint communication on a new strategy for international cultural relations (JOIN 2016) marks an important shift in the EU's foreign policy and, for the first time, recognises culture as a priority for Europe's interaction with the world. The EU's international cultural relations aim to strengthen civil society through a bottom-up approach of dialogue and mutual listening and learning. However, our analysis of the EUNIC-EUD joint pilots reveals two contradictory approaches and opposing priorities in the implementation of the EU's international cultural relations: on the one hand, short-term and one-sided strategic communication focused on spreading positive messages about the EU and, on the other, long-term approaches aiming to build trust through collaboration, while taking into account local contexts and needs (see also Dâmaso 2021: 22).

So far, the EU has primarily used cultural heritage in international relations to foster economic development, social integration, and collaboration between stakeholders within and beyond Europe, rather than to build relations between individuals and communities. Moreover, in this use of cultural heritage, the EU rarely explicitly pays attention to hierarchical power relations shaped by colonial and imperialist legacies and their Eurocentric worldviews and values. To increase credibility and trust in international cultural relations, the EU needs to counteract the risk of recreating a colonial or a centre-periphery hierarchy in the relations between the EU (and its member states) and the partner countries. The success of EUNIC-EUD activities also depends on implementing long-term projects and allocating adequate financial means for their continuity and legacy to improve international cultural relations.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Academy of Finland under Grant No. 330602 (HERIDI 2020–2024).

References

- Andersen, C., C. Clopot, and J. Ifversen. 2020. "Heritage and Interculturality in EU Science Diplomacy." *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 7 (175). doi: 10.1057/s41599-020-00668-8.
- Barcelona Declaration. 1995. Barcelona Declaration adopted at the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference (27 and 28 November 1995). Bulletin of the European Union. November, No 11. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Union.
- Brummett, B. 2010. *Techniques of Close Reading*. London: Sage.
- Carta, C., and R. Higgott, eds. 2020. *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe. Between the Domestic and the International*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Čeginskas, V. L. A., and S. Kaasik-Krogerus. Forthcoming. "Dialogue in and as European Heritage." *Journal of European Studies* (Special Issue on European heritage and Citizenship, edited by A. Van Weyenberg, S. Volk and M. van der Waal, accepted manuscript).
- Clopot, C., C. Andersen, and J. Oldfield. 2022. "New Diplomacy and Decolonial Heritage Practices." In *Decolonizing Colonial Heritage. New Agendas, Actors and Practices in and Beyond Europe*, edited by B. Timm Knudsen, J. Oldfield, E. Buettner, and E. Zabunyan, 274–291. London: Routledge.
- Chalcraft, J. 2021. "Into the Contact Zones of Heritage Diplomacy: Local Realities, Transnational Themes and International Expectations." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 34: 487–501. doi: 10.1007/s10767-020-09391-3.
- Culture Bridges website. Accessed 11 May 2022. www.culturebridges.eu

Dabdoub Nasser, C., and F. Bouquerel. 2020. "Culture in International Relations. Between Discourse and Practice." In *The Cultural Turn in International Aid. Impacts and Challenges for Heritage and the Creative Industries*, edited by S. Labadi, 37–54. London, New York: Routledge.

Dâmaso, M. 2021. *Implementing the EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations. Toward a New Paradigm*. CPD Perspectives. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press.

Dicks, B. 2000. *Heritage, Place and Community*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

EIDHR (European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights). 2014. Regulation (EU) No 235/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 establishing a financing instrument for democracy and human rights worldwide. *Official Journal of the European Union* (15 March 2014), L 77/85–92.

EU (European Union). 2014. Preparatory Action. 'Culture in EU External Relations'. *Engaging the World: Towards Global Cultural Citizenship*. Luxembourg: European Union Publications Office.

EUNIC. 2016. General Assembly Report, Copenhagen 8–9 June 2016. Accessed 11 May 2022. <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/resources/docs/eunic-general-assembly-report.pdf>

EUNIC.eu website. Accessed 11 May 2022.

- Joint Guidelines: EC – EEAS – EUNIC Partnership. <https://eunic.eu/joint-guidelines>

EUNIC/EC/EEAS. 2017. Administrative Agreement. Partnership Agreement between EUNIC, the European Commission and the European External Action Service. Accessed: 11 May 2022. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2017-05-16_admin_arrangement_eunic.pdf

EUNIC global. 2018. Report on the current state of the partnership between EUNIC clusters and EU Delegations. Lessons learned and recommendations for methods and models of 'enhanced cooperation'. Brussels: eunicglobal.eu

EUNIC global. 2021. Cultural Relations. Key Approaches in Fragile Contexts. How Cultural Relations can enhance Peace and Stability. A Report by Jordi Baltà (Trànsit Projectes) on behalf of EUNIC, the British Council and ifa. Brussels: eunicglobal.eu

EUNIC global website. Accessed 11 May 2022. www.eunicglobal.eu/

- website EUNIC global/About. www.eunicglobal.eu/about
- website EUNIC global/Bolivia. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects/promotion-of-gender-equality-in-bolivia>
- website EUNIC global/Cuba. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects/cuba-elic>
- website EUNIC global/DRC/EACL. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects/what-weve-achieved-together-is-beyond-my-wildest-dreams>
- website EUNIC global /DRC/MCP. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects/eunic-drc>
- website EUNIC global/Joint Guidelines. <https://eunic.eu/joint-guidelines>
- website EUNIC global/ Peru. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects/peru>
- website EUNIC global/ Projects. <https://www.eunicglobal.eu/projects>

European Agenda for Culture in a Globalizing World. 2007. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world. COM/2007/0242 final.

Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Hausler, K. 2019. "Cultural Heritage within the European Union's External Relations: More than a Policy Objective?" In *Cultural Heritage in the European Union*

A Critical Inquiry into Law and Policy, edited by A. Jakubowski, K. Hausler, and F. Fiorentini, 365–394. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Helly, D., and G. Galeazzi. 2016. Culture in EU development policies and external action. Reframing the discussion. European Centre for Development Policy Management. Briefing Note, 92 (July 2016). www.ecdpm.org/bn92

House of Europe website. Accessed 11 May 2022. <https://houseofeurope.org.ua/en>

- website House of Europe/active citizens camps.

<https://houseofeurope.org.ua/en/programme/active-citizens-camps>

Howorth, J. 2016. “EU Global Strategy in a Changing World: Brussels’ Approach to the Emerging Powers.” *Contemporary Security Policy* 37 (3): 389–401. doi: 10.1080/13523260.2016.1238728

Jakubowski, A., K. Hausler, and F. Fiorentini. 2019. “Final Conclusions.” In *Cultural Heritage in the European Union. A Critical Inquiry into Law and Policy*, edited by A. Jakubowski, K. Hausler, and F. Fiorentini, 445–461. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

JOIN. 2016. Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council.

Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations. High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Brussels (8 June 2016), JOIN (2016) 29 final.

JOIN. 2021. Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank. The Global Gateway. European Commission and High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Brussels (1 December 2021), JOIN (2021) 30 final.

Kersel, M. M., and C. Luke. 2015. "Civil Societies? Heritage Diplomacy and Neo-Imperialism." In *Global Heritage: A Reader*, edited by Lynn Meskell. 70–93. Somerset: John Wiley and Sons.

Kisić, V. 2016. *Governing Heritage Dissonance: Promises and Realities of Selected Cultural Policies*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.

Labadi, S., ed. 2020. *The Cultural Turn in International Aid. Impacts and Challenges for Heritage and the Creative Industries*. London: New York: Routledge.

Lähdesmäki, T., and V. L. A. Čeginskas. 2022. "Conceptualisation of Heritage Diplomacy in Scholarship." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (ahead of print). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2022.2054846>

Lähdesmäki, T., and K. Mäkinen. 2019. "The 'European Significance' of Heritage: Politics of Scale in EU Heritage Policy Discourse." In *Politics of Scale. New Directions in Critical Heritage Studies*, edited by T. Lähdesmäki, S. Thomas, and Y. Zhu, 36–49. New York: Berghahn's Books.

Lähdesmäki, T., A.-K. Koistinen, and S. C. Ylönen. 2019. *Intercultural Dialogue in the European Education Policies: A Conceptual Approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lähdesmäki T., V.L.A. Čeginskas, S. Kaasik-Krogerus, K. Mäkinen, and J. Turunen. 2020. *Creating and Governing Cultural Heritage in the European Union: The European Heritage Label*. London: Routledge.

Lechner, S., and Frost, M. 2018. *Practice Theory and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luke, C. 2012. "The Science Behind United States Smart Power in Honduras: Archaeological Heritage Diplomacy." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 23 (1): 110–139.

- Luke, C., and M. M. Kersel. 2013. *US Cultural Diplomacy and Archaeology: Soft Power, Hard Heritage*. London: Routledge.
- MacDonald, S., and E. Vlaeminck. 2020. "A Vision of Europe Through Culture: A Critical Assessment of Cultural Policy in the EU's External Relations." In *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe. Between the Domestic and the International*, edited by C. Carta, and R. Higgott, 41–62. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mälksoo, M. 2016. "From the ESS to the EU Global Strategy: External Policy, Internal Purpose." *Contemporary Security Policy* 37 (3): 374–388. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2016.1238245>
- Mouffe, C. 2005. *On the Political: Thinking in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Piros, S., and J. Koops. 2020. "Towards a Sustainable Approach to EU Education Diplomacy? The Case of Capacity-Building in the Eastern Neighbourhood." In *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe. Between the Domestic and the International*, edited by C. Carta, and R. Higgott, 113–138. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- SOTEU (State of the Union Address). 2021. European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen: Strengthening the Soul of the Union. European Commission. Last accessed on 3 May 2022. https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/strategic-planning/state-union-addresses/state-union-2021_en
- TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union) 2007. Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. *Official Journal C 326* (26/10/2012).
- Trobbiani, R., and L. Kirjazovaitė. 2020. "Euro-Mediterranean Cultural Relations: A Northern Current in Troubled Waters?" In *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe. Between the Domestic and the International*, edited by C. Carta, and R. Higgott, 89–111. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trobbiani, R., and A. Pavón-Guinea. 2020. “Navigating Uncertainty: The Future of EU International Cultural Relations.” In *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe. Between the Domestic and the International*, edited by C. Carta, and R. Higgott, 217–237. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Huis, I., S. Kaasik-Krogerus., T. Lähdesmäki. and L. Ellena. 2019. “Introduction: Europe, Heritage and Memory – Dissonant Encounters and Explorations.” In *Dissonant Heritages and Memories in Contemporary Europe*, edited by T. Lähdesmäki., L. Passerini., S. Kaasik-Krogerus, and I. Van Huis, 1–21. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Winter, T. 2015. “Heritage Diplomacy.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 (10): 997–1015.

Winter, T. 2019. *Geocultural Power. China’s Quest to Revive the Silk Roads for the Twenty-First Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Winter, T. 2020a. “Silk Road Diplomacy: Geopolitics and Histories of Connectivity.” *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26 (7): 898–912.

Winter, T. 2020b. “Geocultural Power: China’s Belt and Road Initiative.” *Geopolitics* 26 (5): 1376–1399.

Winter, T. 2021. “The Geocultural Heritage of the Silk Roads.” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 27 (7): 700–719.

Tables

Table 1. Overview of eleven EUNIC-EU Delegation projects based on project descriptions on the EUNIC’s website.

Table 2. Keywords of EUNIC-EU Delegation projects in each country based on project descriptions on the EUNIC’s website.

Table 1. Overview of eleven EUNIC-EU Delegation projects based on project descriptions on the EUNIC’s website.

Country	Project	Year	Budget (€)	Actors
Bolivia	Gender Equality Through Art	2019–2020	105,000	Goethe Institut, Alliance Française, Spanish Agency of International Cooperation for Development (AECID), French Embassy, local partners representing indigenous, LGBTIQA and creative communities
Cuba	CLIC- Culture to Connect (between Cuba and Europe)	2020–2021	100,000	AECID, EUNIC Cuba cluster (Goethe Institut; Portuguese Institute of Cooperation and Language (Camões, I.P.), Alliance Française, Instituto Cultural Rumano, British Council, Italian Agency for Development & Cooperation; EU Delegation to Cuba, European embassies (Spanish, French, Italian, German, Austrian, Romanian, Portuguese)
Peru	European Cultural Project for the Bicentennial of Peru	2020–2021 (1 yr 6 m)	175,000	Goethe Institut, EUNIC cluster (Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Alliance Française), EU Delegation, Italian embassy, Ministry of Culture in Peru, Municipality of Lima, World Monuments Fund Peru, Museo de Arte de Lima
Ukraine	Culture Bridges (CB)	2017–2020 (2 yr 11 m)	1,363,000	British Council, diverse EUNIC members based in Ukraine; local partners representing creative and cultural sector
Ukraine	House of Europe (HoE)	2019–2023 (4 yr)	12,200,000	Goethe Institut, British Council, Institut français, Czech Centre; EUNIC cluster members; EU Delegation to Ukraine
Democratic Republic of Congo	European Award for Congolese Literature (EACL)	2017–2019 (2 yr)	200,000	Institut français, Goethe Institut, Centre Wallonie-Bruxelles, Camões, I.P., Spanish embassy, Italian embassy, Institut National des Arts, Académie des Beaux-Arts, other local partners
Democratic Republic of Congo	Master Classes of Photography (MCP)	2017–2020 (3 yr.)	90,000	Académie des Beaux-Arts Kinshasa, Délégation Wallonie-Bruxelles, Institut français, Goethe Institut, Camões, I.P., Italian embassy, Spanish embassy, EU Delegation to DR Congo, experts from Congo, other African and European countries
Egypt	Towards a Creative Economy Framework	2018–2019 (1 yr 6 m)	120,000	EUNIC, Drosos Foundation, AhK, Hivos, diverse other local partners
Senegal	Lëlu Di Wajal’ Art	2020 (9 m)	50,000	Goethe Institut, Délégation générale Wallonie-Bruxelles, EUNIC Senegal cluster members, EU Delegation to Senegal, Africalia, Africa Culture Fund
Sudan	Sudan and Europe: Creative Connections	2019–2021 (2 yr)	300,000	Goethe Institut, Institut Français, British Council, Italian Embassy, AECID
Tunisia	TFANEN: Tunisie Créative	2016–2021 (5 yr)	9,700,000	EU Delegation to Tunisia; British Council; Ministry of Culture in Tunisia

Table 2. Keywords of EUNIC-EU Delegation projects in each country based on project descriptions on the EUNIC’s website.

	Bolivia	Cuba	Peru	Ukraine (CB)	Ukraine (HoE)	DR Congo (EACL)	DR Congo (MPC)	Egypt	Senegal	Sudan	Tunisia
Capacity building		X	X	X		X	X			X	X
Creative industries		X	X				X	X		X	
Cultural sector		X	X		X				X		X
Grant scheme				X	X				X		X
EU Delegations	X		X								
Covid-19					X				X		
Diversity			X								
Multilingualism			X								
Creative cultural industries		X									
LGBTQIA	X										
Gender	X										
Human rights	X										
Contemporary									X		
People-to-people					X						
Youth							X				
Mobility				X							
Co-creation				X							
Award						X					
Publishing						X					
Literature						X					
Museum										X	
Fashion										X	
Policy								X			
Job market								X			
Professionalization								X			