

COUNTRY REPORT WRITTEN BY: Prof. Yudhishtir Raj Isar

GRAPHICS & LAY OUT BY: Guillemette Madinier, Laura Gardes and Maiken Høj

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 26 February 2014

The content of this report does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union.
Responsibility for the information and views expressed therein lies entirely with the author(s).

© 2013-2014 Preparatory Action 'Culture in the EU's External Relations'

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
OVERVIEW	4
A special vision of international cultural relations	4
Indian cultural operators: at home and in the world	5
Europe and India: long-established cultural relationships	7
EXTERNAL CULTURAL RELATIONS IN THE CULTURAL POLICY CONTEXT	9
The lead agency for international cultural relations: the ICCR	9
A recently introduced paradigm: ‘public diplomacy’	12
The concerns of civil society actors	14
CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH THE EU AND ITS MEMBER STATES: REALITIES AND EXPECTATIONS	15
A pattern of relationships with the EU and its Member States	16
Doubts regarding the EU as a cultural actor... and practical suggestions	19
CONCLUSIONS.....	24
ANNEXES.....	25
Annex I: Methodology and list of people consulted	25
Annex II: EU-Indian joint programmes and initiatives.....	30
Annex III: Bibliography and references.....	35
Annex IV: List of ‘active’ cultural exchange agreements (CEPs) supplied by the ICCR.....	37

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The diverse peoples of India have interacted culturally with others, notably in Europe, for millennia. Today, those interactions are strong and diverse. The need to actively promote 'international cultural relations' for their own sake rather than for instrumental reasons is among the policy assumptions of the contemporary Indian State. All Indian cultural actors, both governmental and non-governmental, use this term in preference to others such as 'cultural diplomacy' or 'culture in external relations'. Very early in its history, the Republic of India created an eponymous entity for this purpose, the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR), which is the main executing agency for the cultural exchange agreements the government concludes with other countries. In 2006, a Public Diplomacy Division was created in the Ministry of External Affairs and often uses cultural resources in its work, notably in the digital and social media environments.

Alongside the official programmes and activities of cultural exchange carried out by the ICCR, Indian operators in all cultural domains have developed independent relations with their counterparts elsewhere; in so doing, they have tended to foreground present-day and trans-cultural forms of artistic expression, which they find largely excluded from the official cultural 'canon' that guides the ICCR, the Ministry of Culture and the agencies connected with the latter. The legacy of colonialism, as well as present day societal preferences, have given prominence to cultural relations with Europe, although formally the government accords priority to relations with neighbouring countries in South, Central and East Asia in the context of its 'Look East Policy'. While cultural relations with partners in the individual Member States of the European Union (EU) are rich and varied, both governmental and non-governmental cultural actors find it difficult to imagine cultural cooperation at the overarching EU level. They are even sceptical about the potential of such cooperation. Yet at the same time they express clear expectations of a possible dedicated 'culture in external relations' strategy on the part of the EU. Rather than the mere representation of European culture in India and vice-versa, they attach value to the catalytic, capacity-building and mutual learning that can take place through cultural encounters at many levels and indeed many such outcomes have already occurred on a bilateral basis. Indian cultural actors would also like to see dialogical and collaborative relationships take shape and be given significant support at Union level, in other words *across* the entire geographical space constituted by the EU's Member States. There is great potential therefore for deeper dialogical cooperation in the cultural field between a diverse range of stakeholders in Europe and India, provided that it is based on a spirit of mutual learning and capacity building, as befits the realities of today's multi-polar world. But realizing this potential will require the European Commission to develop a cadre of experts in international cultural relations and establish an organisational template for cultural cooperation with third countries that is based upon a thought-out strategy and dedicated funding.

OVERVIEW

The diverse peoples of India, who number almost 1.3 billion (17.31 per cent of the world's population), have interacted culturally with others for millennia. In 1950 already, the year in which the Constitution of the Republic of India was adopted, the government established a dedicated nodal agency for international cultural relations, the eponymous Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR). Created by the federal Ministry of Education, but placed under the control of the Ministry of External Affairs in 1970, the ICCR has always been a key component of the apparatus of state patronage for cultural affairs and it is the official 'face' of Indian cultural representation overseas. Over the same period, the country's cultural and intellectual circles have interacted extensively with their counterparts throughout the world; these cultural exchanges have grown steadily, intensifying considerably in the current period of accelerated globalization and economic liberalization.

A special vision of international cultural relations

The ICCR is a rarity in having been conceived and launched under the direct supervision of India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who attached great importance to international cultural relations. India's civilization was for him a product of Indian 'toleration of other ways than theirs, their capacity to absorb other peoples and their cultural accomplishments, to synthesize them and develop a varied and mixed culture' (Nehru 2008: 674). Indeed the Constitution of India, which adopted the slogan of 'unity in diversity' long before the European Communities were even imagined, recognizes 22 Indian languages (in addition to English), spoken in the 28 (soon to be 29) states and 7 centrally administered 'Union Territories'. Culturally, there is as much cultural difference across the subcontinent – as well as sameness – between Kashmir in the north and Kerala in the south as there is between Poland and Portugal on the European continent.

This intrinsic pluralism is one of the main reasons why Indian cultural actors both governmental and non-governmental display an attachment to *the practice of international cultural relations principally as an end in itself*. They place instrumental considerations decidedly in second place. The terms mainly used in the country are 'international cultural relations' and 'cultural exchange'; in recent years, the notions of 'public diplomacy' and 'cultural diplomacy' have begun to be deployed as well. The section of the Ministry of Culture's 2012-2103 annual report devoted to 'international cultural relations' opens with a definition: 'Ministry of Culture aims at disseminating Indian culture in new territories and further develop the cultural relations between India and various countries of the world.'¹

The instrumental language of 'soft power' has also begun to be used, notably by the Public Diplomacy Division in the Ministry of External Affairs and by a few prominent figures such as Shashi Tharoor, currently a junior minister (Minister of State in Indian parlance) for Human Resources Development, who writes that India's global soft power resources are not systematically deployed in

¹ Government of India, Ministry of Culture, *Annual Report 2012-13*, New Delhi: Ministry of Culture, p.36. Online. Available at: [http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/pdf/Culture-Annual%20Report-2012-13\(English\).pdf](http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/pdf/Culture-Annual%20Report-2012-13(English).pdf).

official practice. He concludes that 'such strategic advantages as have accrued from India's soft power... have been a largely unplanned by-product of the normal emanations of Indian culture' (Tharoor, 2012: 289).² The somewhat idealistic approach to cultural relations this author and other hard-headed Indian critics decry is no doubt largely a legacy of India's long history of cultural and commercial encounters and interactions with the ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece and Rome, subsequent flows to and from Southeast Asia, China, the Arab World and Africa and most recently, during the centuries of European imperialist expansion, the relationships forged with the societies of Great Britain, France and Portugal, as well as, to a small extent, The Netherlands and Denmark. Recently, however, Dr Karan Singh, the President of the ICCR, himself referred explicitly in an interview about the planned opening of Indian Cultural Centres in Washington, DC, and Paris to their place in 'India's soft power diplomacy'.³

Indian society is thus well versed historically in international cultural relations, while the country's open and democratic political system facilitates their easy development today. India's special approach is also shaped by the existence of a huge Indian diaspora, estimated by the Indian government to consist of over 20 million people. They are in fact a key 'target' of the government's overseas cultural relations efforts: it is as if the nation feels obliged to reach out to a segment of itself that is at once a co-producer and a co-beneficiary of the global sharing of Indian culture.⁴

Indian cultural operators: at home and in the world

Indian artists, cultural operators and cultural activists, as well as academics and academic institutions, albeit more extensively in the major cities (Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata and Bangalore), interact today with their counterparts throughout the world, hitherto far more in the global North than in the global South. These interactions have intensified in recent years, as social demand for cultural activities, both traditional and contemporary, has been fuelled and diversified by the cultural aspirations of an increasingly wealthy urban bourgeoisie. Several major universities have standing cooperation arrangements with counterparts in Europe, but culture does not figure significantly in the domains covered under such cooperation.

In the judgement of civil society stakeholders, the Indian State has done little more over the years than dispense patronage. While this patronage has no doubt enriched cultural life in the major cities, it does not constitute a thought-out cultural policy with clearly defined goals. The country's high economic growth rate and urban affluence have in no wise increased governmental spending; in

² As he put it in a 2010 Ted talk 'Why Indians Should Pursue Soft Power': 'India is, and must remain, in my view, the land of the better story. Stereotypes are changing... We've gone from the image of India as land of fakirs lying on beds of nails, and snake charmers doing the Indian rope trick, to the image of India as a land of mathematical geniuses, computer wizards, software gurus. But that too is transforming the Indian story around the world. But, there is something more substantive to that. The story rests on a fundamental platform of political pluralism. It's a civilizational story to begin with. Because India has been an open society for millennia.' Online. Available at: http://www.ted.com/talks/shashi_tharoor.html.

³ 'India to showcase its soft power in US, France: Karan Singh (interview)', *Firstpost*, 5 January 2014. Online. Available at: <http://www.firstpost.com/fwire/india-to-showcase-its-soft-power-in-us-france-karan-singh-interview-1323497.html>.

⁴ There is in fact a Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs, with a website 'dedicated to the vast global community of People of Indian Origin': <http://moia.gov.in/>.

some instances outlays on culture have even declined. The heightened demand for cultural provision is being met more and more by civil society and private initiatives; thus the cultural scene today is more extensive and diverse than before. As a corollary, there is greater interest than ever in relations with peers in the rest of the world. Conversely, the perception of the country as an 'emerging' economic and geopolitical power has increased interest among cultural actors elsewhere for collaborations with their Indian counterparts.

Governments elsewhere are influenced by the 'soft power' paradigm and their business sectors increasingly recognize the power of culture in facilitating trade, sales and investment. Indian companies support the arts in a limited manner, primarily for promotional purposes, drawing on their advertising budgets for ad hoc, one-off commitments to cultural presentations and products. International cultural relations have little or no place in this scheme of things.⁵ Thus Indian cultural operators have benefited little from the country's rising affluence; economic growth has not resulted in increased funding for international artistic or educational exchanges. Nevertheless, Indian artists and academics are confident that they can relate to the West with far less inequality of position than was the case previously. Yet this also leads them to seek partnerships elsewhere than in the West, notably in the neighbouring countries of Asia and beyond. In other words, there is a growing South-South axis of cultural relations, bolstered by India's place in the world's emerging multi-polarity.⁶

It is against this backdrop that cultural entrepreneurship has developed rapidly in both the not-for-profit and for-profit cultural sectors. The contemporary visual arts are thriving commercially, with many galleries in the major cities catering to the demands of an expanding new stratum of extremely affluent Indian patrons. New Delhi's India Art Fair is a private initiative, organised under the aegis of the auction house Sotheby's since 2008; its 5th edition in 2013 presented the work of 104 galleries from 24 countries, including many in Europe. It is estimated to have attracted over 300,000 visitors so far, from India, other Asian countries and the rest of the world. Late 2012 also saw the launch of the country's first art biennial, the 'Kochi-Muziris Biennale 2012', which was financed through a mix of public and private sector support.⁷ The DSC Jaipur Literature Festival is another such enterprise that has gained worldwide notoriety and recognition; its producer is Teamwork, which is the leader among a range of private entertainment companies that now operate in the country. Teamwork organises festivals and produces films as well as other cultural goods and services, primarily in India but also in many other countries, for a range of clients, governmental, non-

⁵ As an Indian observer puts it, such support 'tends to go out to art that needs it the least... the arts are defined for corporate leaders and marketing executives by the elite social circles in which they move. As long as product promotion remains their principal justification for supporting the arts, business houses will continue to give no attention to creative processes, constraints and innovation.' See Anmol Vellani, 'The Case for Independent Arts Philanthropy', website of the India Foundation for the Arts, accessed 10 March, 2012. Online. Available at: http://www.indiaifa.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=20&Itemid=17.

⁶ Yudhishthir Raj Isar, 'The Wealth of a Multipolar World: New Horizons for Cultural Exchange?', white paper prepared for the international seminar 'Public and Private Cultural Exchange-Based Diplomacy: New Models for the 21st Century', organised by the Salzburg Global Seminar and the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, Salzburg, 28 April – 2 May, 2012. Online. Available at: <http://www.salzburgglobal.org/mediafiles/MEDIA68970.pdf>.

⁷ www.kochimuzirisbiennale.org.

governmental and corporate.⁸ There is a growing number of private cultural businesses, notably in publishing and the book trade, through which literature also plays a role in bringing European and Indian readers closer together. For example, the Oxford Book Store chain (with more than 30 stores across the country) has co-publishing and translation agreements with publishing houses in Europe; it has also created the Apeejay Kolkata Literary Festival, which introduces Indian readers to contemporary writing, both European and Indian.

Europe and India: long-established cultural relationships

Many EU countries have long had extensive cultural relations with India. This is notably the case of France, Germany and the United Kingdom, whose cultural institutes have expanded the scope of their interactions much beyond language teaching to a wide range of arts and culture activities, as well as shared reflection on social issues. This development has far-reaching implications, notably as regards the future of the EU's cultural relations, as will be further explored below. The recent surge in India's economic and geopolitical power, the size of the Indian market and the global scale at which Indian companies now operate and/or invest, have all contributed to even greater external appreciation of and interest in Indian culture, supplementing the already established 'New Age' images linked to Indian spirituality, yoga, meditation, etc. This attractiveness has not led, however, to meaningful investment on the part of European foundations in projects involving cultural relations with India – their interest appears to be in other development-related fields, including education.⁹

Until recently much the same may have been said about European corporate funding. But private sector interest is developing rapidly. For instance, the German businesses covered about one-third of the budget of the 16-month extravaganza *Germany and India 2011-2012: Infinite Opportunities*, of which much of the content was cultural; its initiators were the German Foreign Office, the Asia-Pacific-Committee of German Business, the Goethe-Institut and the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research.¹⁰ In 2012, during the 'German Year in India', the Stuttgart-based cable giant LAPP KABEL made what may well be the largest private sector donation ever to a Goethe-Institut cultural programme, namely the staging and touring of *Classic Incantations: The German Film Orchestra Babelsberg performs A.R. Rahman*.¹¹ LAPP is also a contributor to the Indian Film Festival in Stuttgart, now in its 11th year.¹² Another remarkable but short-lived example was the *Skoda Prize for Indian Contemporary Art 2010/11-2012/13*.¹³ An even more striking case was that of the *Bonjour India 2013* programme of the Institut français en Inde, on which further details will be provided

⁸ <http://teamworkproductions.in/>.

⁹ An exception is Germany's Robert Bosch Foundation, which has initiated and supported some Indian cultural projects recently, such as a conference on the role of the museum held in Kolkata and a residency programme for young journalists covering urban cultures that took place in both India and Germany.

¹⁰ See <http://www.germany-and-india.com/home>.

¹¹ A.R. Rahman is a leading Indian composer of film music. See: <http://www.germany-and-india.com/en/event/399>.

¹² <http://www.indisches-filmfestival.de/en/2013/>.

¹³ See <http://www.theskodaprize.com/2012/>.

below. Smaller entities such as the Hungarian Cultural Centre in New Delhi are also managing to secure private funding for selected projects.

The country's popular cinema industry has been a major agent in the positive transformation of India's international image. 'Bollywood' has brought the country's 'better story' to the rest of the world (albeit more extensively in Africa and the Arab World than in Europe). In Europe, the recognition of contemporary Indian authors writing in English has also played a role (it is important to add, however, that authors writing in other Indian languages remain little known in Europe). While such 'normal emanations of Indian culture' have played a major part in promoting European interest in the sub-continent, the government has also resorted to systematic nation-branding through the 'Incredible India' marketing campaign launched by the federal Ministry of Tourism in 2002. This campaign initially targeted foreign tourism, but also domestic tourism as of 2009. States such as Kerala had already begun to position themselves proactively in the international tourism market by then, in the latter case around natural beauty and ayurvedic medical and wellness traditions. Entrusted to the advertising company Ogilvy & Mather India, 'Incredible India', still ongoing, was and remains a fundamentally culture-based campaign, drawing upon India's extremely rich cultural heritage and foregrounding historic monuments and sites. Many westernized Indians, notably arts and culture practitioners, are dismissive of such efforts and would prefer to exclude them from the category of international cultural relations. Yet the emerging new Indian middle class is greatly concerned with the idea of 'Brand India' (Desai, 2011).

EXTERNAL CULTURAL RELATIONS IN THE CULTURAL POLICY CONTEXT

While no explicit cultural policy strategy has ever been articulated by them, both the federal and the State governments provide recognition, patronage and funding for selected cultural activities that conform to an established cultural ‘canon’. They have created a number of institutions for this purpose. At the federal level in the 1950s, alongside the ICCR, a set of apex bodies was created: the *Sahitya Akademi* (literature); the *Sangeet Natak Akademi* (music and dance) and the *Lalit Kala Akademi* (visual arts). Today, the latter figure among the 38 so-called autonomous entities funded by the Ministry of Culture that include museums, libraries, zonal cultural centres, etc. Under the ministry’s jurisdiction also figure ‘Subordinate Offices’ such as the National Museum and National Gallery of Modern Art and ‘Attached Offices’ such as the Archaeological Survey of India which, like counterpart bodies in other countries that are responsible for protected monuments and sites, receives more than 40 per cent of the federal culture budget.¹⁴

The lead agency for international cultural relations: the ICCR

Most of the country’s international cultural relations are managed by the ICCR, which aims at ‘a communion of cultures, a creative dialogue with other nations. To facilitate this interaction with world cultures, the Council strives to articulate and demonstrate the diversity and richness of the cultures of India, both in and with other countries of the world’.¹⁵ The purposes set out in the ICCR’s original ‘Memorandum of Association’ were the following:

- To participate in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes relating to India’s external cultural relations;
- To foster and strengthen cultural relations and mutual understanding between India and other countries;
- To promote cultural exchange with other countries and peoples;
- To establish and develop relations with national and international organisations in the field of culture.

The operations of the ICCR are subject to parliamentary and inter-ministerial scrutiny, but it has its own autonomous board. It does not involve civil society in decision-making other than indirectly, through advisory panels of practitioners, in the selection of artists to be supported or sent abroad. In the eyes of many cultural operators, the performance of the ICCR has often been mediocre. Its director-general is invariably a senior diplomat, but the post has rarely attracted the most ambitious officials. The immediately previous director-general, Suresh Goel, who stepped down

¹⁴ For a much more detailed account of the nature of Indian cultural policy and the official support system see the comprehensive ‘Country Profile for India’ written by Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Raghavendra Tenkayala that was recently posted on the website of the Asia-Europe Foundation’s World-CP International Database of Cultural Policies. Online. Available at: <http://www.worldcp.org/india.php>.

¹⁵ Official ICCR response to questionnaire.

on 31 July 2013, is thought by many to have been an exception. His tenure was marked by an expansion and diversification of the ICCR's work, although much of the credit for this is also due to its current President, Dr Karan Singh, a well-known and respected cultural and political figure. While broadening the scope of the ICCR's activities, notably by somewhat greater engagement with contemporary culture and knowledge production through conferences and seminars, many of them organised inside India, Goel also eschewed the instrumental approach. He referred, for example to cultural diplomacy as being 'more effective at a basic level [than classic diplomacy], because... it can be non-intrusive, non-competitive and can be done without threatening the other side... The idea of diplomacy is to develop understanding between nations. And the prerequisite of that is for people to talk to each other... Cultural relations lubricate the process of dialogue.'¹⁶

Many different activities are a part of this long-established Indian vision of international cultural relations. They include scholarships to foreign students (education have always been seen as part of cultural relations); exchanges of performances and exhibitions; the holding of Festivals of India abroad;¹⁷ the organisation of events such as the International Jazz Festival, the International Dance Festival and the South Asian Bands Festival; organisation of and support to conferences and symposia, including the participation of Indian artists and academics therein. The establishment of Chairs for Indian Studies in universities abroad and of a number of Indian Cultural Centres abroad deserve special mention. The 93 Chairs (of which 35 are in EU countries) cover not just the humanities or cultural history/studies but also Economics, Engineering, Financial management, Corporate Governance and the like. The Cultural Centres have tended to get established first in countries where there was a sizeable Indian diaspora, e.g. Mauritius, Guyana, Suriname, Indonesia, Trinidad and Tobago, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, and Fiji. Mark (2008) cites a *2001 Annual Report* that distinguished between centres set up in such countries and that catered to the 'need of the local Indian population to keep in touch with Indian traditions' and others catering to purely overseas audiences. The former teach various forms of Indian cultural expression (mainly to people of Indian descent) and provide language instruction, etc. In the second category, greater focus is placed 'on intellectual activities such as... lectures, talks, panel discussions and seminars on subjects on contemporary and cultural interest, aimed primarily at enhancing an understanding of India'.¹⁸

¹⁵ Rohan Venkataramakrishnan, 'POWERCRACY: cultural bridges to help cross borders', *Daily Mail Online*, 19 February 2013. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2281216/POWERCRACY-Cultural-bridges-help-cross-borders.html?ITO=1490&ns_mchannel=rss&ns_campaign=1490.

¹⁷ Today's Festivals of India are far less ambitious than the initial series celebrated during the 1980s, which were driven by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's desire to project a dynamic image of contemporary India. The first eight were 'arguably the largest manifestation by any state of a standard cultural diplomacy event, the cultural festival' (Mark, 2008: 207). They were in the UK (1982), France (1985-1986), USA (1985-1986), Sweden (1987), Switzerland (1987), Mauritius (1987-88), the USSR (1987-1988) and Japan (1988).

¹⁸ The 37 existing centres are in: Kabul, Dhaka, Thimpu (Bhutan), São Paulo, Toronto, Czech Republic, Cairo, Suva and Lautoka (Fiji), Berlin, Georgetown (Guyana), Budapest, Jakarta and Denpasar, Tehran, Tokyo, Astana (Kazakhstan), Kuala Lumpur, Male (Maldives), Phoenix (Mauritius), Mexico City, Kathmandu, Yangon (Myanmar), Moscow, Riyadh, Durban, Johannesburg, Colombo, Panamaribo (Suriname), Dushanbe (Tajikistan), Dar-es-Salaam, Bangkok, Port of Spain (Trinidad and Tobago), Abu Dhabi, London and Tashkent. More centres are planned: Paris, Washington, Hanoi, Lagos, Singapore, Rome and Kuwait.

The ICCR is associated in the public mind with performing arts events and exhibitions, as well as seminars and conferences on cultural themes, despite the fact that these pursuits account for only a small part of its total spending. It is the general executing agency for the Ministry of Culture, notably for the performing arts component of Indian festivals abroad or for bringing foreign performers to India, and for the bilateral cultural exchange programme (CEP) agreements that the government has signed with other countries, of which only 35 are considered 'active' and of which only 7 are with EU Member States (see Annex IV).¹⁹ The ICCR is faulted for what many perceive as a backward-looking view that does not reflect the vibrancy of the contemporary Indian cultural scene and for operating mainly in a reactive way, from project to project, with no strategic vision. The Parliament's Standing Committee on External Affairs noted in a 2004 report that given 'ever-changing circumstances', the ICCR needed to 'further increase the scope and intensity of its activities with innovative policies and programmes' which would have to be 'specific, pointed and purposeful'.²⁰ India's signature popular culture product cinema, whose 'soft power' potential is obviously considerable, has been conspicuously absent from the ICCR's remit. Unlike other countries, notably in Europe, the government does not directly support its cinema industry; instead, the industry (like the Indian cultural industries sector in general) flourishes as a private business sector.²¹ Yet the Standing Committee nevertheless suggested that the ICCR should use Indian films in its work, for instance by securing the rights to show films abroad and subtitling them (Mark, 2008).

In addition to its perceived disconnect with the contemporary, the ICCR has been criticized for cronyism in its selection and patronage processes. In response to such criticism, it has brought in the use of independent selection panels comprising artists and eminent people, whose membership rotates. Another perceived shortcoming has been its failure to project the voices and talents of people from all of India's States; in response it has created 19 regional offices. This coverage of what it calls 'the Indian expanse' makes it notionally possible to coordinate activities in the various federal States of India, whether this be a matter of international students and their welfare, performances by troupes visiting from abroad, or the identification of artists and performers to be sent abroad. In recent years, the ICCR has taken increasingly to presenting and/or sponsoring performances and exhibitions of Indian artists in its own premises, notably the New Delhi headquarters. Independent observers question the relevance of this on the part of a body whose mission is to *present Indian culture abroad*.

The ICCR holds that it follows no hierarchy of priorities among world regions. However, since 1991, Indian foreign policy has given priority to its Southeast and East Asian neighbourhood under the 'Look East Policy'. Prominence has been given, for example, to the Nalanda University project at Rajgir, Bihar, designed at recreating an ancient Buddhist university that was 'a lodestar for students from the Far East for centuries before Oxford and Cambridge were even dreamed of' (Tharoor, 2012:

¹⁹ India also has multilateral CEP agreements with IBSA (India, Brazil, South Africa) and BRICS.

²⁰ However, the Committee also noted that whatever recognition contemporary art had achieved was due more to the efforts of private initiative than the efforts of the ICCR.

²¹ As regards the broader cultural industries category, however, heritage conservation together with heritage tourism are governmentally promoted, while the handicrafts sector has long been supported as well.

193). The project was the star attraction at the ASEAN-India Commemorative Summit in December, 2012; an official press release stated that it would re-establish 'an important cultural and academic linkage between India and East & South Asian countries... [and] will be the centre piece of India's cultural diplomacy, and a bridge between the past and the future'.²² ICCR officials also emphasize regionally relevant events such as a recurring Buddhist International Performing Arts Festival and the South Asian Band Festival.

Our analysis of the ICCR's annual report for 2011-2012 (the most recent one available) offers a somewhat different picture as regards the actual geographical distribution of relations. *European destinations still occupy a major share*, for example 18 out of 44 exhibitions organised abroad or artists' exhibitions supported abroad were in Europe, while most of the exhibitions of Tagore artworks during the Tagore Centenary Year (2012) also went to European destinations. Fourteen of the year's 35 'outgoing visitors' went to Europe. Yet among the 'outgoing cultural delegations', some 32 went to EU Member States, whereas 45 went to the Asian neighbouring countries (including Fiji in the Pacific). No 'Festival of India' was organised in a Member State of the EU, however, nor did any of the year's academic visitors come from there. The ICCR has no formally established bilateral or reciprocity agreement with the European Union as such: its relations are confined to individual EU Member States and it cannot therefore cooperate officially with the European Commission. The ICCR operates through India's embassies abroad, many of which have cultural wings (but none of these embassies are given dedicated budgets for cultural activities and only have limited discretionary funds), its own Cultural Centres and network of Chairs, as well as informal partnerships with Indian Associations in various countries. Its annual budget is estimated to be around 23 million euros (as against an overall Indian government budget outlay of approximately 185,033 million euros). This budget represents a decline from a rise that occurred several years ago.²³

Several of the autonomous organisations that operate under the remit of the Ministry of Culture, notably the National Museum and the National Gallery of Modern Art, cooperate directly with European counterparts on the exchange of exhibitions and training programmes for the benefit of Indian curators and conservators.

A recently introduced paradigm: 'public diplomacy'

In 2006, the Ministry of External Affairs established a Public Diplomacy Division whose mission statement is the following: 'The Public Diplomacy Division seeks to create a better understanding of India and its foreign policy concerns. We intend to put in place a system that enables us to engage more effectively with our citizens in India and with global audiences that have an interest in foreign policy issues.' Showcasing India's diverse cultures is an integral dimension of this mission, conceived and executed very much in 'soft power' language: 'India is blessed with an

²²

<http://www.mea.gov.in/pressreleases.htm?dtl/21163/First+Meeting+of+the+Parliamentary+Consultative+Committee+on+External+Affairs+for+2013>.

²³ We were told by an independent informant that as much as 40 per cent of the ICCR's 2012-13 budget was used to cover a deficit incurred as a result of the ambitious expansion of its activities the previous year.

ancient civilisation, a rich cultural heritage, an innovative and entrepreneurial spirit and a dynamic economy that operate within the framework of a secular ethos and a vibrant democracy.’ Yet here too the nation branding goal remains framed in the broader perspective of mutual understanding. The ultimate goal is to increase ‘India’s conversations with the world’. *Europe has not been the main focus*. Instead, the emphasis has been placed on India’s South and Southeast Asian neighbourhood; South-South cooperation and development partnerships in Africa are also privileged.

The Division uses publications, documentary films and other material ‘that enable us to showcase these and other facets of our diverse nation’, including Web 2.0 strategies and social media tools. It also commissions sets of popular and classical music for presentation to local dignitaries abroad, has obtained non-commercial screening rights for a small number of popular Hindi feature films that it makes available to diplomatic missions to organise film festivals locally and commissions documentary films on different facets of Indian culture. It has entrusted a mixed-sector entity, the Public Service Broadcasting Trust (PSBT) with producing films on targeted themes. These and other audio-visual products are being sold through retail outlets and made available online through an arrangement with another private entity, the Magic Lantern Foundation. The Division is also reaching out to several of the major private television channels. *India Perspectives*, the Ministry’s flagship publication is available online; here again work has been outsourced to a private company and the Division has accounts on Twitter, Facebook and Youtube. The ‘*India is’ Global Video Challenge* initiative launched in 2011 invited young people around the world to submit 3-minute videos on three different themes: ‘India is Colourful’, ‘India is Creative’ and ‘India is’. In the first year alone some 256 videos were received from 42 countries across the world, of which the best 30 were shortlisted for an online vote to select the top five. In May 2013, five short films by a young Indian film-maker, Anurag Kashyap, were released on Youtube.²⁴ This social media presence has served as a catalyst for many Indian missions and posts abroad to start their own Facebook pages. The Division also supports ‘India Future of Change’, a five-year project launched in 2010 that enables ‘students and professionals across geographies to compete, collaborate and co-create a better future for all of us’. It consists of a series of contests on academic campuses in India and overseas in the disciplines of business management, design, essay writing, photography and the visual arts. The focus is on perceptions of India and its future through an ongoing exchange of ideas between students and established professionals as mentors.

²⁴ <http://tech2.in.com/news/social-networking/india-is-ministry-of-external-affairs-releases-five-short-films-on-youtube-to-celebrate-india/875598>

The concerns of civil society actors²⁵

The interactions of Indian civil society actors with counterparts in the rest of the world, notably Europe, have grown organically in recent years, despite many difficulties of funding, infrastructure and organisation. Indian cultural operators greatly appreciate the ways in which the European cultural institutes and diplomatic mission have enabled them to explore issues and/or engage in practice that the Indian government would not support and for which there is little or no private sector interest. They note the absence of any real debate within government on cultural policy options and regret that its agencies focus upon traditional 'high culture', thus providing scant support to new, experimental or hybrid forms. What is more, official patronage is seen to extend to a relatively small circle of artists who are favoured by the bureaucracy. Some consider that the 'nationalistic model' of cultural patronage has merely created a plethora of inefficient institutions unable to adapt their vision, strategies, and activities to major changes that have taken place recently in Indian society or address the cultural needs of a new generation of stakeholders. These needs are rooted in and inspired by issues raised at the local level in different urban and rural settings.

With respect to these new needs, a key role has been played by cultural sector 'movers and shakers', both individuals and non-governmental organisations, many of them operating in smaller cities and towns, but generally with little or no municipal support.²⁶ These civil society efforts have secured not only better cultural provision for the Indian public at large but have also vivified relations with partners in other countries, notably with the United Kingdom, the erstwhile colonial power, and other English-speaking countries. There is growing interest, however, in forging relations with Mediterranean and/or Central and Eastern Europe, where working conditions and constraints may well be closer to Indian realities.

²⁵ This section is based on the views expressed on 14 August 2013 by 10 cultural activists, artists and operators who took part in a half-day workshop organized by the Goethe-Institut (Max Mueller Bhavan) in New Delhi. Mr Pavel Svitil, the Deputy Head of the EU Delegation in India, made an opening statement at the workshop and was present throughout, offering useful clarifications on a number of issues raised by the participants. On 26 October 2013 at the Bengal Club in Kolkata, a second such workshop was held at the initiative of the Director East India of the British Council. This brought together 15 cultural operators and academics. See Annex I for details.

²⁶ In the Indian polity, municipalities are not empowered to function as autonomous cultural policy-making or implementing entities as they are in Europe.

CULTURAL RELATIONS WITH THE EU AND ITS MEMBER STATES: REALITIES AND EXPECTATIONS

Both government officials and cultural actors in civil society recognize the singularity of the EU as a supranational economic and political project (despite the crisis of the Eurozone). But they know very little about the EU and its institutions. They find it difficult to see the EU as an entity that can define any common strategic approach and are sceptical of its cultural potential. Officials have developed good collaborative relationships with their European counterparts in individual countries.²⁷ But they find it hard to imagine a cultural programme that is able to transcend the rivalrous motivations of its Member States in promoting their own national interests and cultural self-representation. 'Can the EU seriously offer a shared platform for Europe's very disparate cultures', others ask? In particular when its current level of expenditure on international cultural relations is so insignificant? Neither officials nor independent cultural operators are able to detect any imaginative ideas or initiatives through which a sense of shared Europeanness has been communicated. In this respect, some see India itself, a multi-ethnic society in which a high degree of cultural diversity is a given of everyday life, as a possible 'model for' a future Europe that is truly united yet also diverse in cultural terms. That said, many regret that numerous European stereotypes about India persist, together with Indian stereotypes about Europe, leading to homogenizing understandings of culture on both sides.

Scholars in India also have privileged relationships with intellectual circles in the UK and more generally the English-speaking world.²⁸ As regards the rest of Europe, Indian academics would like to see much more intellectual exchange than there is currently; they observe a marked reduction in recent years of centres of Indian studies in European universities, despite a few exceptions such as France, which has several research institutions in the country, or Poland (and only Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi has a Centre for European Studies). With respect to joint scholarly projects, existing support patterns and structures tend in their eyes to allow European academics to define the terms of engagement and benefit primarily from the funding made available. Indian scholars also point out the high degree of cultural ignorance on both sides. The ordinary Indian has very little knowledge of Europe and its diversity. Such knowledge as exists tends to be stereotyped and, apart from the UK, mostly Western and Northern Europe are known; Central and Eastern Europe very little (the present situation is a far cry from the Cold War period, when ties with the Soviet Bloc countries were based on ideological affinities, and Tito's Yugoslavia was a household word). As regards European visions of India, academics also note the persistence of stereotypes and deplore the decline in Indian studies at the university level across Europe. Hence in the humanities, a deepening of intellectual interactions is very much called for, but this ought to be based on a true spirit of

²⁷ While these bilateral relations are judged satisfactory, several officials saw them as too one-sided. They found that unilateral choices of governments and/or cultural institutions such as museums, for example, tend to be imposed on Indian actors. A greater spirit of greater parity is needed, in their view.

²⁸ All the major Indian universities have collaborative arrangements with their counterparts elsewhere, including Europe, but these have been established as part of normal academic practice, rather than in the name of a self-consciously practiced 'external cultural relations'.

civilizational equality that is still lacking and a recognition that in today's interdependent world it is essential to 'learn how to suffer together, to get to know each other's problems' and to learn from each other.²⁹ As regards EU-sponsored academic cooperation, EC procedures are considered very cumbersome and lacking in transparency. Research in the humanities and social sciences has low priority in DG Research Framework programmes; the same is observed as regards Erasmus Mundus. Given the limitations of the publicly funded universities in India, academics also suggest that the EU look to building links with the private universities. Complementing these academic viewpoints, cultural operators also stressed the importance of education for mutual understanding, notably as regards the potential of the proposed Erasmus Plus programme.

A pattern of relationships with the EU and its Member States

India has always had lively bilateral relations with the nation-states of today's EU and in fact was amongst the first countries to establish diplomatic relations with the European Economic Community in 1962. Yet in all domains, Indian officials demonstrate 'a greater sense of comfort in dealing with individual European nation States', as Shashi Tharoor observes, adding that 'it does not help that India also considers Europe with its multiplicity of complex organisations to be over-institutionalized and over-bureaucratized and, therefore, far more complicated and less attractive to engage with than national capitals' (Tharoor, 2012). India has formally established bilateral cultural relations with practically all EU Member States and has cultural agreements with many, but as mentioned already, most of these agreements exist on paper only.³⁰ A cooperation agreement signed in 1994 took the EU-India relationship beyond trade and economic cooperation; at The Hague in 2004, this relationship became a 'Strategic Partnership'. Culture is present as a general qualifier in the India-EU Joint Action Plan that concerns mainly the political and economic spheres, including trade and investment.³¹ Yet, as one scholar has pointed out, 'these measures lead mainly to dialogue, commitments to further dialogue, and exploratory committees and working groups, rather than to significant policy measures or economic breakthroughs'³². If that is the case for the 'hard' areas, then what must it be for the 'soft'?

Indian officialdom has adopted the EU's term of 'people-to-people contacts'; an India-EU Forum is led by the European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) and the Indian Council of World Affairs (ICWA) and includes participation from academics and think tanks. A fourth India-EU Forum was jointly organised in Brussels in October 2012. As regards education and culture, a general framework is provided by Joint Declarations signed in recent years that cover Education and Training, Multilingualism, Culture and Research and Innovation Cooperation respectively. The first Senior Officials Meetings on Education and Multilingualism were held at a senior official level in Brussels on

²⁹ Interview with Prof. Rajeev Bhargava, 19 July, 2013.

³⁰ <http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/cultural-agreement.asp>.

³¹ *EU India Relations*, dated February 2013. Online. Available at: http://www.mea.gov.in/Portal/ForeignRelation/EU_Relations.pdf.

³² David Malone, cited by Tharoor.

25 May 2011.³³ An Indo-EU Policy Dialogue on Culture was launched in New Delhi in April 2013, focussing on the development of the cultural and creative industries, including the audio-visual sector; on the preservation of cultural, natural and historical heritage; and on sharing the experiences of *Europeana* for the development of National Virtual Library. However, as of late August 2013, the EU Delegation in New Delhi still awaited follow-up suggestions and approval of the joint conclusions from the Indian Ministry of Culture (this might explain why no EU website provides information on the event, whereas it has already been reported on Indian websites). Since 2007, the Commission has invested a mere 690,000 euros through the EU Culture Programme (Special Action for Third Countries) in support of five joint initiatives with India. These included the 'Spice' project which brought together the Attakalari Centre for Movement Arts in Bangalore and European performing artists and '2050 Cultures of Living', an architecture project where the Darpana Academy of Performing Arts and the Srishti School of Art shared views on design and technology with partners from eight European countries.³⁴ The EU Delegation's main cultural initiative in the country is a European Film Festival presented annually in many Indian cities; the seventeenth such festival in 2012 attracted 27,000 people (in reality a tiny number for a country of 1.3 billion people). The eighteenth festival was held from March to July 2013 on the theme 'Celebrating Women'. While the event no doubt did raise awareness of European cinema in India and many requests for more screenings were received, Indian observers think it had very limited impact.³⁵ As EU officials point out, far more significant results could be achieved if the technical and professional issues of cultural cooperation could be addressed and coordinated from Brussels, instead of the Delhi-based EU Delegation having to improvise one cultural action after another on the basis of very little expertise as regards cultural exchange. Annex II.A consists of details on recent activities managed by the EU Delegation and compiled by the latter, including the description of a project concerning the cultural rights of ethnic minorities in the Himalayan region; Annex II.B contains information on cultural cooperation projects involving Indian partners carried out in 2007-2008 and managed by the European Commission in Brussels.

Last but by no means least, much valued cultural cooperation takes place via the cultural institutes established by several EU Member States in India as well as the cultural programmes of individual embassies.

The British Council has been present in the country since 1948, focussing principally on its English-language teaching and broad educational remit, with the arts in second place, and employs over 500 people in 8 sites across the country apart from New Delhi. The Goethe-Institut (present in India since 1959 as the 'Max Mueller Bhavan') and the Institut français (its predecessors have been in India for equally as long) have branches in New Delhi and other cities, while Spain's Instituto Cervantes opened in New Delhi in 2009. French cultural presence as such is also embodied by the French language teaching body, the Alliance française, which has an all-India network of a special

³³ *EU India Relations*, op. cit.

³⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/culture/news/eu-and-india-launch-policy-dialogue-on-culture_en.htm.

³⁵ See the following link for details on the 2013 edition:
http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/more_info/euff_2013_en.htm.

kind, for each of its branches in 14 cities is an autonomous association under Indian law that is chaired by an Indian national. Operating on a much smaller scale is the Balassi Institute or Hungarian Cultural Centre, founded in 1978 in New Delhi that innovates through outreach to schools and peri-urban areas of the Capital as well as other cities; it has recourse to many partnerships as well as private sector funding in order to supplement a very small budget. Italy, Poland and Portugal also operate cultural institutes. The Austrian Cultural Forum in India and South Asia functions as a kind of virtual one and other EU Member States are said to be planning similar initiatives. The Delhi embassies of most of the remaining EU Member States have included cultural activities in their remit for some time now, but because resources both financial and human are very limited, these efforts tend to be *ad hoc* and ephemeral, confined mostly to the Capital. The Embassy of The Netherlands has a clear focus on design and architecture, with the aim of improving ‘the international position of the most prominent sectors of the Dutch creative industry’, and also promotes cooperation around cultural heritage connected with the presence of the Dutch East India Company.

The four large cultural institutes mentioned above have all become meaningful players in the local cultural system, not just in terms of language teaching, but also as venues for artistic and intellectual creativity as well as critical reflection on social and cultural issues. They do not necessarily concentrate on visiting cultural operators from their own countries, but offer a catalytic, ‘honest broker’ type of intervention (of the kind that neither the Indian government nor the private sector is able to offer local stakeholders). This stance is much appreciated by Indian cultural actors, in whose eyes these bodies are now taken for granted as Indian facilitators of cultural innovation. A case in point is the ArtThink South Asia programme for training in cultural management devised by South Asian network of the Max Mueller Bhavan and the British Council, together with the Delhi-based artists association and residency centre Khoj. Cultural operators seek an intensification of such patterns of relations, where representation is superseded by shared reflection on cultural practice and creativity on-the-ground. Such a stance represents in their eyes the ideal form of relationship with the EU and its Member States.

The British Council’s flagship arts project for 2013, for example, was an exhibition called ‘Homelands’ in which an Indian curator chose works of 28 contemporary British artists relating to the relationships between self and place in a world of transitory identities and contested geographies. The exhibition was co-organised with a private museum in Mumbai and travelled to New Delhi, Kolkata and Bengaluru. In this case as well, private sector support from both British and Indian companies was impressive. Another valued intervention has been ‘Re-Imagine: India-UK Cultural Relations in the 21st Century’, a research and dialogue initiative launched in January 2012 with Counterpoint, UK, the India Institute at King’s College, London and the ICCR as partners. A series of debates and dialogues were held in Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai, Hyderabad, Kolkata, London and Edinburgh, involving business leaders, civil servants, development workers, academics, cultural entrepreneurs and artists from India and the UK. A wider group was reached through an online survey. This was supplemented with over 45,000 pages of research on individual sectors such as education, science and innovation, skills, youth and citizenship, English language, business and the arts. A book of essays is due to be published.

As mentioned earlier, *Bonjour India 2013*, organised by the Embassy of France and the Institut français en Inde, which was the second edition of an operation first carried out in 2009-10, was marked by a high degree of business sector support, almost 60 per cent: 24.28 per cent of the total budget of 3.8 million euros was met by direct financing and 34.37 per cent by in kind support. The programme presented over 150 cultural events in 15 Indian cities, 'illustrating the dynamism of our French intellectuals, the variety of cinema production in the hexagon, and giving the French language, our universities and our educational system a place of honour'. France's official assessment of the operation also described it as 'a veritable tool of influence and image-building... [that created across the country and to new audiences] an image of a France that is modern, attractive, accessible to all, dynamic and creative'.³⁶ While several of the events involved artistic and organisational collaborations at a very high level, the emphasis was placed on image building, indeed image changing, as regards stereotypical ideas of France and French culture. Some Indian officials saw *Bonjour India* as a 'best practice' example, yet in fact partnership with Indian governmental bodies, including the ICCR, was rather limited; the operation relied far more on cooperation with non-governmental partners (and corporate sponsors).

Doubts regarding the EU as a cultural actor... and practical suggestions

The notion of cooperation with the EU as opposed to working with partners from Member States appeared rather abstract and unreal to most of our informants. Mindful of the diversity of approaches that exists across India itself, where control by the 'centre' in New Delhi is being increasingly challenged, many Indian informants also wonder whether any EU cultural strategy could be consonant with the diverse and perhaps rival cultural strategies of Member States.³⁷ Very few had any inkling of the European Commission's efforts since the publication of its 2007 *Communication on a European agenda for culture in a globalizing world*, or of the EU's cultural policy related decision-making processes, or of the importance of the EU attaches to the 2005 UNESCO Convention on Protecting and Promoting the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. What cultural initiatives could be taken effectively by a bureaucratic organisation such as the Commission? Some cultural activists fear that any new EU programme will be driven by motives of expediency, for the purpose of promoting 'brand Europe', or to open up new markets, foster trade and gain greater political influence. The few who have already cooperated with European partners under EU-sponsored projects have found the procedures excessively bureaucratic and insufficiently transparent.

As regards the showcasing of India in 2013 at the biennial *Europalia* arts festival in Brussels (October 2013-January 2014), an operation the ICCR spent two years organising (and during which many issues of miscommunication and discordant expectations appear to have arisen), officials question its Europeanness. To be sure, the launch of the event, formally inaugurated by the President of India and King Philippe of Belgium, was given considerable prominence in the Indian

³⁶ The Embassy of France and Institut français en Inde, *Bonjour India 2013. Janvier-avril 2013. Bilan*.

³⁷ One informant, a scholar of contemporary history, considered that their European interlocutors themselves referred to the EU umbrella much less nowadays than in the 'heyday' of European integration and were more likely to play a purely national card.

media as a grand cultural event held on a scale appropriate to the clout of an affluent India. Yet officials see *Europalia* as a purely Brussels-based operation, albeit with a European label since the city is the ‘capital of Europe’, not a true engagement with the cultural diversity of Europe and its multiple audiences. In order for there to be a truly European dimension in their view, the exhibitions and other manifestations taken to Brussels ought to be circulated, at EU initiative, to many other venues across the European continent. This call for a truly Europe-wide dimension to any initiative was made by civil society operators as well.

For many, before even envisaging any collaborative programme of intellectual and cultural exchange, the huge knowledge gap as regards European cultures and their diversity (and vice versa) needs to be reduced. Pan-European initiatives should be devised with a view to overcoming the mutual ignorance: in literature and intellectual life, e.g. a journal on the ‘Europe of ideas’, or a programme of residencies for European writers or stage directors to come to discover India and vice-versa, in the visual arts. Another suggestion was that the European Commission carries out a purposeful media campaign in cooperation with India’s radio and television broadcasting authorities. Knowledge of Europe’s cultural diversity should also be propagated through translations of literary works in European languages other than English (and indeed into Indian languages other than Hindi, as is already the case under a programme of cooperation between Jadavpur University in Kolkata and the University of Bologna, Italy). Conversely, the sharing of Indian culture with Europeans ‘should not be restricted to classical dance and music groups and soloists who are sent to perform in a European city, and who leave the morning after’.³⁸ Although some older informants underline the central role European thought and culture had played in forging their own views of the world (in which, American culture was distinctly less present), none of the younger informants expressed such a view.

For Indian cultural actors, as already mentioned, while breaking down barriers of mutual ignorance is important, even more valuable are the empowering, international networking and capacity-building outcomes of cooperation with the European cultural institutes and missions. The European approach contrasts with that of countries such as China, Japan, or South Korea, whose cultural centres tend to focus on promoting their own cultural forms and agents. Although it is vibrant, the Indian cultural sector is fragmented and financially very precarious. It lacks professionalism, apart from a few exceptions that prove the rule. There is no governmental provision to overcome these lacunae, nor is there significant business sponsorship for the arts, although legislation to include the arts and culture as a recognized category of ‘Corporate Social Responsibility’ is currently before the Indian Parliament. Grant-giving private foundations are rare, although a few operating foundations, particularly in the visual arts, have been created by and for wealthy benefactors, e.g. the Sanskriti Foundation, with its programme of international residencies for artists and the Raza Foundation, set up recently by the eminent painter Syed Haider Raza, who lived and worked for many years in France. European private foundations and corporations for their part are a marginal presence in the funding of cultural relations projects. Yet as an Indian cultural operator suggested, even if a tiny proportion of the profits of each could be earmarked as a corporate social

³⁸ Aruna Vasudev, at workshop held on 14 August 2013.

responsibility commitment towards a Euro-India cultural fund, ambitious projects could be realized – as a win-win proposition for all parties.

A singular private sector example of intercultural bridge-building of special relevance to Europe is the Neemrana Music Foundation created in 2002 by a wealthy businessman of French origin, Francis Wazcziarg, who became an Indian citizen many years ago and has developed a thriving chain of boutique hotels across the country. The Foundation's main focus is promoting appreciation of the European operatic tradition in India but in so doing it also fosters appreciation of Western classical music in general and promotes musical education, organises training programmes and awards scholarships for the benefit of young Indian singers and instrumentalists. It has fostered the emergence of a group of world-class Indian musicians and opera singers in India who can interact in opera and concert performance with European peers and has also created a permanent chorus.³⁹

Most Indian cultural entrepreneurs, who rarely benefit from such corporate backing, face greater constraints in forging sustainable cultural programmes or enterprises than do their peers in Europe. Yet they have nevertheless achieved a great deal. Many of them underline how much their efforts have been facilitated by European actors such as the cultural institutes. 'They have helped us to help ourselves', said one leading arts activist, 'they have empowered us through ideas'. While there was no mention of the potential of learning from Europe's experience in shaping a coherent agenda for the Indian cultural sector as a whole that could bring together all the stakeholders in Indian society and give them voice, several cultural operators did identify the need for 'an advocacy body to allow exchange of expertise, methodologies, and practices'.

An NGO leader in the environmental sector did not think the EU should worry about what issues to choose in order to reach wider audiences in the country. Instead, as so many pressing contemporary questions were now global in nature, Indian actors would be happy to engage with Europeans concerning them, as for example, global warming, erosion of water resources, etc. This view is substantiated by the 2011 'Yamuna-Elbe' public art project (co-curated in Germany and India in New Delhi and Hamburg) that enabled artists from both countries to create works devoted to the shared challenge of sustainable rivers.

Yet as regards the vital question of mobility, for without freedom of movement no pattern of systematic exchange could be sustained, stringent EU visa regulations, notably for access to the Schengen countries, are underlined as a major barrier. One informant in fact proposed the establishment of a 'cultural passport', as had been requested by representatives of international civil society during the negotiations through which the 2005 UNESCO Convention was drafted.⁴⁰

³⁹ www.tnmf.org. Some eight operas have been presented by the Foundation since 2002, together with the musical *Hair* and a number of orchestral concerts.

⁴⁰ Indian roadblocks also exist. Art galleries, for example, note that customs and import duties severely hamper the mobility of art works, making it very difficult for galleries elsewhere to bring shows to India, or to participate in Indian fairs and when individual organisations do so they face huge barriers of red tape and bureaucracy.

A recurring question was ‘with which Indians do Europeans want to cooperate?’ Hailing from the ranks of the educated urban elite already connected with partners across the world, our informants recognized that they themselves were not representative of the full gamut of India’s diverse forms and levels of cultural expression. They could not speak for all stakeholders, notably those in small towns or in rural India, where countless cultural initiatives are being developed, or for that matter in the federal States and many other cities.⁴¹ This issue having surfaced at the 14 August workshop, the British Council took the initiative of organising a second workshop in Kolkata on 26 October 2013, at which different (as well as similar) views and expectations were expressed. Yet many more cultural actors in many more cities should have been involved for the present findings to be considered fully representative of Indian realities. This underscores the fact that any European strategy would have to be very broad-based and bottom-up in order to have a significant impact on the pan-Indian scale or for the slogan of building ‘people to people’ exchanges to have any substance. Furthermore, unless the EU is able to reach out effectively in the digital environment, its strategies would have little or no impact on the country’s young people, and would remain confined to older generations of people in the key cities who work principally in the traditional high arts, heritage and crafts sectors.

The EU also needs to work through India’s large number of universities, notably the new private universities, in order to envisage cultural relations as a process of mutual cultural education. Whether public or private, many of them have become centres of cultural production and presentation; their activities in fields such as architecture, design and arts management are gradually increasing. The important potential of the education/culture nexus in relation to Europe is definitely perceived in India as a potential that is largely untapped. An interesting reversal of the usual pattern of North to South relations is provided by Kolkata’s Science City, the largest complex of science and technology museums in the sub-continent and probably in the whole world, seen by specialists the world over as an example of ‘best practice’ as well as innovative problem-solving; the complex has attracted study visits from many science museum professionals from elsewhere.

Civil society actors fully share official concerns for attitudes of mutuality and reciprocity in cultural relations. They also want to see cooperation with the EU as an entity, rather than simply with counterparts in individual EU Member States. For this to be possible, networking across all the EU Member States would be necessary for any EU-led activity to be deemed significant. Hence the suggestion that a programme of residencies in different Member States be established or the idea that digital information portals be created in order to share information about the many and diverse cultural exchange opportunities that exist both across India and the EU. It is clear also that the attitudes of many governments and cultural players in the EU are perceived as being paternalistic and out of date in a globalized world, ignorant of Indian realities. Indian artists and NGO activists

⁴¹ Few rural cultural practitioners are recognized as such by the city-based cultural elites. However, bodies such as banglanatak.com, a social enterprise that originated in West Bengal and now works across the entire country on rural pro-poor projects, are demonstrating the central place of culture in human development. These bodies have built up partnerships with UN agencies, etc. Banglanatak.com itself has adapted the ‘creative industries’ discourse to Indian conditions. One of its core missions is to ‘develop community led creative industries based on intangible cultural heritage like performing arts and crafts’. True ‘people to people’ exchanges ought to be nurtured by European cultural actors in this important area.

argue for the value of collaborative ventures – of which several have already occurred – in which *mutual learning occurs symmetrically* across continents, in a mode of joint curating and mutual learning. Some see future EU-level cooperation as both a challenge and an opportunity, recognising Europe as a terrain in which multi-layered cultural cooperation can transcend both propaganda and the pitfalls of nation branding. Noting that current EU cultural efforts in India are ad hoc and hence sporadic, the suggestion was also made that an annual schedule of exchanges be established. One way of doing this would be to create a unified online platform which can be utilized by both the individual Member States and the European Commission to make available online applications, reviewing systems and follow through procedures.

The potential of a future EU cultural strategy was also addressed ‘from the other side’, i.e. by EU cultural actors in India, during a workshop session that brought together representatives of the British Council, the Institut français en Inde, the Instituto Cervantes and the Goethe-Institut, the Hungarian Cultural Institute and several cultural counsellors (Belgium, Malta and The Netherlands). The Deputy Head of the EU Delegation also contributed actively to the discussion. The lack of a cultural mandate and expertise on the part of the EU Delegation was noted, echoing observations made earlier by cultural counsellors interviewed individually or at a briefing session with the Team Leader organised by the EU Delegation on 17 July 2013. Cultural counsellors from smaller EU countries (those without cultural institutes), who are able to carry out just a few cultural activities each year on a limited budget, looked forward to EU funding under an eventual culture in external relations strategy. But they were even more interested in mechanisms that could help attain some pooling of resources locally in order to showcase their national cultures, while also working together. A case in point was the simple idea of having a shared ‘EU piano’ that could be used by all the individual cultural missions. Because of insufficient interest on the part of the established players to invest in the exercise, a recent effort to have EU Member States jointly present wares at *Dilli Haat*, the permanent open-air multi-purpose market in South Delhi where merchants from all over India have stalls, did not get off the ground. European diplomats echo Indian civil society actors’ stress on the need for newer forms of electronic communication and media to be used for better outreach. They also reported on the growing involvement of private actors outside the key major cities and noted that certain State governments were becoming interested in cultural cooperation with them.

CONCLUSIONS

The present findings are based on interviews and discussions with a necessarily limited selection of informants, who all belong to the country's western-educated urban elite. In a population so vast, so ethnically diverse and so stratified in socio-economic terms, our conclusions represent but a partial 'sounding'. Many of our generalizations must be subject to caution and correction. By the same token, they afford an incomplete picture of the potential of cultural relations between India on the one hand and the EU and its Member States on the other. While different priorities and needs could well be identified by a truly comprehensive inquiry, it is already clear that there is great potential for deeper and more variegated cultural relations between Europe and India, in the governmental as well as the non-governmental spheres.

Yet there are many barriers: mutual ignorance, stereotypes on both sides, attitudes inherited from a history of highly asymmetrical relationships. The diversification of cultural flows and exchanges in a globalized world is also a major challenge: Europe faces competition from other countries and regions as much in the domain of cultural relations as it does in trade and investment. Fewer Indian actors are as impressed by Europe's achievements or seek out cultural relations with it than Europeans would like to think.

Many EU Member States have established mechanisms of nation branding and cultural self-representation in India that are increasingly appreciated by the growing urban middle class. Some of these mechanisms are effective and visible, notably the cultural institutes. Some of them have been operating for many years, while others are relatively new. Some are resourced significantly, others very little. The ICCR and other official agencies have been and will continue to be willing interlocutors of European cultural actors, both governmental and non-governmental. Expanding European cultural outreach with and through such official Indian partners should naturally be pursued, but it is likely to remain within the already established high culture frameworks. It will also be constrained by limited funding on the Indian side. There is considerably greater potential, therefore, for deepening and broadening the scope of cultural relations by reaching out more determinedly to civil society, notably outside the major cities, as well as by adapting European cultural offer to the needs and aspirations of a growing number of independent arts and culture entrepreneurs. Also by reaching out more effectively to young people who are increasingly connected to digital and social media networks in which 'culture' has taken on different forms and by influencing young Indians' hearts and minds at the secondary and tertiary education levels. A striking recent trend is the catalytic role European cultural cooperation plays on the local cultural scene, particularly when it is premised on mutual learning through projects designed and implemented collaboratively, rather than on the projection of the cultural wealth of any given European nation.

A significant potential for cultural cooperation exists for at the overarching EU level too. India's cultural actors would resonate with any cultural initiative that is truly designed and implemented on the scale of the Union as a whole. The European Commission would not be able to achieve this, however, without a thought-out strategy that includes dedicated funding, a cadre of experts in international cultural relations and an organisational template for cultural cooperation.

ANNEXES

Annex I: Methodology and list of people consulted

As was the case for all the third countries concerned by this Preparatory Action, the first step in the preparation of this report was the so-called ‘mapping’ process. This consisted of desk research, informed principally by official Indian and other websites, supplemented by some scholarly publications, as well as the replies to the mapping questionnaire provided by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR). The questionnaire had been sent to both the ICCR and the Ministry of Culture by the British Council office in New Delhi in March 2013. No reply was received from the Ministry of Culture. The questionnaire was also sent to 30 individual respondents by the Goethe-Institut, New Delhi in May 2013; 5 replies were received.

This material provided the basis for further inquiry through the consultation process. This involved a longer and deeper series of conversations and interviews than was the case elsewhere, since it was conducted by the Team Leader, Prof. Y.R. Isar, who was born and raised in New Delhi and has extensive professional contacts with Indian cultural actors. He spent several months in the country, first from 17 July to 15 September and then again from 28 October till the end of November 2013. He interviewed a cross-section of Indian officials, artists and cultural personalities and interacted as well with staff members of European cultural institutes and embassies. On 17 July, at the invitation of the Deputy Head of the EU Delegation in New Delhi, he briefed the cultural counsellors at one of the regular monthly meetings organised by the Delegation. In the morning of 14 August he moderated a workshop for Indian civil society ‘stakeholders’ that was organised by and at the Goethe-Institut; the same afternoon a similar workshop was held with Cultural Counsellors from European embassies (Mr Pavel Svitil, Deputy Head of the EU Delegation, took part actively in both workshops).

The persons interviewed individually were the following:

Indian officials

- **Dr Venu Vasudevan**, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Culture and Acting Director, National Museum.
- **Mr Jawhar Sircar**, Chief Executive Officer, Prasar Bharati (apex supervisory body for public broadcasting), former Secretary, Ministry of Culture.
- **Dr Karan Singh**, President, Indian Council of Cultural Relations.
- **Mr Suresh Goel**, Director-General, Indian Council for Cultural Relations.
- **Ms Anita Nayar**, Deputy Director-General, Indian Council for Cultural Relations.
- **Ms Dipali Khanna**, Member Secretary (= Director), Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- **Mr Pinak Chakravarty**, Secretary, Public Diplomacy, Ministry of External Affairs.
- **Mr Rajeev Lochan**, Director, National Gallery of Modern Art.

Indian academics

- **Dr R.K. Jain**, Jean Monnet Professor, Chairperson, Centre for European Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University.
- **Prof. Rajeev Bhargava**, Director, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies.
- **Prof. Kavita Singh**, School of Art and Aesthetics, Jawaharlal Nehru University.

Indian artists and arts organisers (civil society actors)

- **Mr O.P. Jain**, Founder-President, Sanskriti Foundation.
- **Ms Prathibha Prahlad**, founder of Delhi International Arts Festival.
- **Ms Pooja Sood**, Director and Curator, Khoj International Artists' Association, New Delhi.
- **Dr Ashok Vajpeyi**, President, Raza Foundation and former Chairman, National Academy of Arts.
- **Ms Aruna Vasudev**, film scholar and founder of the Network for the Promotion of Asian Cinema (NETPAC).
- **Mr Francis Wacziarg**, businessman and founder of the Neemrana Music Foundation.

European informants (including Indian staff of European embassies)

- **Mr Heiko Sievers**, Director, Goethe-Institut, New Delhi.
- **Mr Robin Mallick**, Director Programmes South Asia, Goethe-Institut, New Delhi.
- **Mr Rob Lynes**, Director, British Council, New Delhi.
- **Ms Sujata Sen**, Director East India, British Council, Kolkata.
- **Mr Jean-Yves Coquelin**, Deputy Director, Institut français en Inde.
- **Ms Aruna Adiceam**, Institut français en Inde.
- **Mr Jesus Clavero**, Director, Spanish Cultural Centre, New Delhi.
- **Mr Pavel Svitil**, Deputy Head of EU Delegation, New Delhi.
- **Ms Signe Groza**, Attaché, Press and Information Section, EU Delegation.
- **Ms Ila Singh**, Embassy of The Netherlands, New Delhi.
- **Mr Matthias Themel**, Attaché, Economic Cooperation Sector, EU Delegation.
- **Mr Tibor Kovacs**, Director, Hungarian Cultural Centre, New Delhi.
- **Ms Harleen Ahluwalia**, Hungarian Cultural Centre, New Delhi.

The following artists, cultural thinkers and/or operators attended the 14 August 2013 morning workshop for Indian civil society stakeholders (NB: some were also interviewed individually):

	Name	Organisation
1.	AGARWAL, Ravi	Founder Director, Photographer TOXICS LINK, Delhi
2.	GROVER, Chandrika	Head Pro Helvetia, Delhi
3.	KHURANA, Sonia	Artist Delhi
4.	LALL, Anusha	Director, Choreographer The Gati Dance Forum, Delhi
5.	MALLICK, Robin	Director Programmes South Asia Goethe-Institut / Max Mueller Bhavan, New Delhi
6.	PALAZHY, Jayachandran	Artistic Director, Choreographer Attakkalari Centre for Movement Arts, Bangalore
7.	Prof. RAVINDRAN, K. T.	Professor and Head of the Department of Urban Design School of Planning and Architecture, Delhi
8.	SEN, Sujata	Director East India British Council, Kolkata
9.	SHAH, Parthiv	Founder Director, Photographer Centre for Media and Alternative Communication, Delhi
10.	SIEVERS, Heiko	Regional Director South Asia Goethe-Institut / Max Mueller Bhavan New Delhi
11.	SOOD, Pooja	Director, Curator KHOJ International Artists' Association, Delhi
12.	SVITIL, Pavel	Minister-Counsellor and Deputy Head of Delegation Delegation of the European Union to India
13.	VASUDEV, Aruna	Expert in Asian Cinema NETPAC, Cinemaya, CINEFAN, Delhi

The following officials took part in the 14 August afternoon workshop for European diplomatic/cultural representatives in New Delhi:

	Name	Organisation
1.	AHLUWALIA, Harleen	Cultural Programmes Manager Hungarian Information and Cultural Centre
2.	BORG, Alberta	Second Secretary High Commission of Malta
3.	GASPART, Arnaud	First Secretary Embassy of Belgium
4.	MALLICK, Robin	Director Programmes South Asia Goethe-Institut / Max Mueller Bhavan, New Delhi
5.	ROBERT, Thierry	Deputy Director Institut français
6.	RODRÍGUEZ, Jesús Clavero	Cultural Manager Instituto Cervantes
7.	SEN, Sujata	Director East India British Council
8.	SIEVERS, Heiko	Regional Director South Asia Goethe-Institut / Max Mueller Bhavan, New Delhi
9.	SINGH, Ila	Policy Advisor, Political, Public Diplomacy and Cultural Department Embassy of Netherlands
10	SVITIL, Pavel	Minister-Counsellor and Deputy Head of Delegation Delegation of the European Union to India

At the civil society workshop of 14 August, several participants wondered why only people in the capital city were involved in the consultation process and in the wake of the discussion that ensued, the British Council representative (Ms Sujata Sen) offered to organise a second workshop in Kolkata. This took place on 26 October 2013 and was also moderated by the Team Leader, who travelled specially to Kolkata for this purpose. The participants were the following:

	Name	Organisation
1.	CHAKRABORTY, Manish	Conservation Architect
2.	DAS, Partha Ranjan	Conservation Architect
3.	MUNSHI, Surendra	Retired Professor of Sociology Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta
4.	CHAUDHURI, Nandita Pal	Consultant Folk Art Craft and Performance Practices
5.	GUPTA, Abhijit (Tintin)	Professor of English Jadavpur University
6.	RAJA, Prateek	Proprietor Experimenter Gallery
7.	BHATTACHARYA Nilanjan	Filmmaker
8.	Dr RAUTELA, G.S.	Director General National Council of Science Museums
9.	CHAUDHURI, Supriya	Professor Emeritus Jadavpur University
10.	BASU, Niloy	Project Manager BanglaNatak.com
11.	BHAGAT Maina	Director Apeejay Kolkata Literary Festival
12.	NOWROJI, Meher	President Calcutta School of Music
13.	BHOWMICK, Someswar	Director Educational Multimedia Research Centre St. Xavier's College
14.	VASUDEVANT, Hari Sankar	Professor, Dept. of History University of Calcutta
15.	SARKER, Sharmistha	Programme Officer Goethe-Institut

Annex II: EU-Indian joint programmes and initiatives

A. EU-Indian cultural cooperation activities run by the EU Delegation⁴²

Indo-EU Policy Dialogue on Culture

EU and India signed a Joint Declaration on Culture during the Summit of 2010. In April 2013 a Senior Officials' Meeting took place in New Delhi.

EU Film Festival

This is the Delegation's main event held across numerous Indian cities each year. The 17th festival that took place in 2012 had a footfall of 27,000 people, raised awareness of the European cinema in India and was followed by more requests to screen European films in even more venues. For more information on the 2013 festival:

http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/more_info/euff_2013_en.htm.

Kinotekas

2012 saw the launch of the Kinotekas project under which European films travel to colleges/cine clubs in India to introduce European cinema to young Indian cinephiles. For more information:

http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/more_info/index_en.htm.

EU Cultural Weeks

There are also biennial EU Cultural Weeks. These were last held in November 2011 and they were dedicated to children and youth featuring performances, exhibitions, concerts and films from 19 EU countries. The event planned for 2013 had to be cancelled due to insufficient interest from Member States.

Strengthening Cultural Actors of Himalayan Minorities

EU Contribution: € 500,000.00 (88.53% of total).

Implementing organisation: Pragya Trust

Duration: from 03/2009 to 02/2013

Description:

- *Overall objective(s):* to enhance valorisation and diffusion of cultures of high altitude Himalayan minorities and integrate them in a positive manner in development mechanisms and the mainstream psyche.
- *Specific objective:* local capacity for culture.

Location: The project will be implemented in the high altitude belt (above 2500 metres) of the Himalayan region in India. This comprises parts of six Himalayan states in India:

- the Ladakh region comprising the two districts of Kargil and Leh in the state of Jammu & Kashmir;

⁴² Information provided by the EU Delegation in India.

- the districts of Lahaul & Spiti, Kinnaur and Pangi valley in the state of Himachal Pradesh Central Himalaya;
- the districts of Chamoli, Uttarkashi and Pithoragarh in the state of Uttarakhand Eastern Himalaya;
- the district of West Sikkim in the state of Sikkim;
- the district of Darjeeling in the state of W. Bengal;
- parts of the districts of West Kameng and Tawang in the state of Arunachal Pradesh.

Other Events

Europe Day celebrations have occasionally been organised to include a concert or a dance performance. In 2004, when 10 new countries joined, a joint food fair (*mela*) was organised. The Delegation always tries to make use of various such occasions to also promote European culture. Events have been organised to mark the Award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union, EU-India 50 year friendship, etc. Also in 2013 the Delegation organised a concert by Croatian singers to mark Croatia's Accession to the European Union.

In addition, a wide range of activities is carried out by Member States and their cultural centres. For example, in the audio-visual sector, the MEDIA Mundus programme has supported Primexchange (<http://primexchange.eu/>), a workshop for independent European and Indian film producers for three years. A number of Indian cinemas are also part of the Europa Cinemas Mundus network, which supports the screening of EU films in third countries and of third country films in EU cinemas.

The Delegation's Facebook pages are the following: <https://www.facebook.com/EUinIndia?fref=ts> and <https://www.facebook.com/EUCulturalEventsinIndia?fref=ts>.

B. EU-Indian cultural cooperation activities run by the Commission Headquarters

Special Action 2007 – Culture Programme

Objectives:
Support cultural cooperation projects aimed at cultural exchanges between the countries taking part in the Programme and *Third Countries*, which have concluded association or cooperation agreements with the EU, provided that the latter contain cultural clauses. Every year one or more *Third Country(ies)* is/are selected for that particular year. The action must generate a concrete international cooperation dimension.

For the special action in 2007, the European Commission proposed to concentrate on India.

Duration: 2007-2008

Budget per project: 50,000-200,000 €

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/culture/funding/2007/index_en.php

Name	Brief Description/Overall Objectives	EU Funding / Duration	Contact
Spice	<p>Coordinator Brouhaha International Festival/ Liverpool/ UK</p> <p>Co-organisers 1. Ballet Entredanzas/ Molina de Segura/ ES 2. A.J.A.C. - Associacao Juvenil de Actividades Culturais/ Loures/ PT</p> <p>Associated Partners Attakalari Centre for Movement Arts, Bangalore (India) www.youtube.com/watch?v=YIHxc0IsFO8</p>	85,932 €	<p>Brouhaha International Festival 37-45 Windsor Street Toxteth Liverpool L8 1XE Phone: +44 (0) 151 709 33 34 Email: office@brouhaha.uk.com Facebook: www.facebook.com/Brouhaha.Int Twitter: @brouhaha_int</p>
Echanges croisés sur les techniques de conservation du patrimoine graphique : Chine - Inde - Europe	<p>The European Union has selected the project "Echanges Croisés sur les Techniques de Conservation du Patrimoine graphique ; Chine - Inde - Europe" (CHINDEU) proposed in the framework of the Culture Programme (2007-2013). This project combines British, French, Italian, Hungarian, Indian and Chinese teams and is controlled by the Centre d'Arles Book Conservation (CDC).</p> <p>This project, in particular, aims to promote the exchange of expertise and know-how between different actors in Europe and Asia, involved in the preservation of heritage and graphic and to initiate an intercultural dialogue on conservation techniques of this heritage.</p>	180,000 €	www.ccl-fr.org
TOT - The Orientations	Re-Orientations was a new piece of theatre, devised and performed by artists from India, China and the EU, working in collaboration through 2009-10. This production explored gender issues	January 2009 – December 2010	www.culturefund.eu/projects/tot-the-orientations-

<p>Trilogy</p>	<p>and identity in both Western and Asian cultures through a wide range of artistic forms, both traditional and contemporary. The performance formed a complex amalgam of theatre, video, contemporary dance, ballet, opera and traditional Asian forms. These were used to examine the changing nature of European and Asian identities, and gender identities, in the changing globalised world of the 21st century.</p> <p>This project developed and built on established collaborations between Border Crossings (UK) and partner organisations in India and China, as well as initiating new collaborations in these countries. This project capitalised on existing work to complete a Trilogy of plays and to publish a book including the scripts and related articles. Re-Orientations was performed in London's Soho Theatre in September 2010, and at Shanghai Dramatic Arts Centre in November 2010. The production also undertook a short tour of Sweden in November 2010. It was seen by more than 4,000 people, and was particularly successful in China, where it was performed under the banner of Expo 2010, and achieved 87.5% houses. There was also an extensive programme of participation and learning in both China and the UK. More than 400 young people were involved in participatory workshops around the project: the vast majority of these being in China.</p>	<p>180,000 €</p>	<p>trilogy#sthash.BojUYZh3.dpuf</p>
<p>ICBIE - Indian children's book in Europe - three European children's books in India</p>	<p>The project's goal is to publish translations of one children's book from India in three European countries (Italy, Slovenia and Croatia). The book proposed is <i>Damarucharit</i>, written in Bangla (also called Bengali) by Trailokyanath Mukhopadhyay (1847-1919). European partners proposed to have three European children's books, from Croatia, Italy and Slovenia, published in Bangla translation by the Indian organisation Samatat Sanstha (its publication wing is called Samatat Prakashan; Sanstha, 'organisation'; Prakashan, 'publication').</p> <p>Croatia is proposing <i>Wa and Tapu</i> by Joža Horvat (1915). Slovenia is proposing <i>I want to touch the sun</i> by Tone Patrljič (1940) and Italy is proposing <i>John Tempest's little diary</i> by Vamba (1858-1920). The print order for each of the publications will be 1,000 copies. The Indian book will be published in the Slovenian language, in Slovenia, by the co-beneficiary Inter-Kulturo in Maribor (project manager Zlatko Tišljar), in the Italian language, in Italy, by the co-beneficiary Edistudio in Pisa (project manager Brunetto Casini) and in the Croatian language, in Croatia, by the main beneficiary Croatian Esperanto League. In the absence of direct translators we will arrange translation through an intermediate language – Esperanto.</p> <p>One major goal of the project is to contribute to the awareness of European children's literature among Indian children; therefore the target group includes three Indian elementary schools and libraries in Kolkata, the capital of the Indian state of West Bengal. The twin goal is to familiarize children in three European countries with Indian children's literature. Accordingly, we propose to distribute the books to three Indian and three European schools and to 300 Indian, 100 Slovenian, 100 Italian and 100 Croatian libraries. Coorganisers will organise essay competitions</p>	<p>63,950€</p>	<p>www.esperanto.hr/agado_eu.htm</p>

	<p>in all six schools to encourage the children to write about the books. The best entries in these competitions will win prizes and will be made available for publicity and discussion among the target schools in all four countries; local media coverage will be organised in order to achieve a multiplier effect from this project.</p>		
<p>2050 Cultures of Living</p>	<p>Given the rapid social changes taking place globally, most conventional models of living spaces seem outmoded. Until the 20th century, building proceeded on the assumption that inhabitants, structured in families, would often live and work in one and the same place for an entire lifetime. Yet current upheavals in the demographic structure (birth rate, life expectancy, migration, etc.), in the working world, and in social relations (especially the changing role of women) create new ways of habitation, which result in changing housing needs and require new forms and cultures of living. It is still unclear, however, what future living cultures in a globalised 21st century will look like, and how they will operate. How can architecture, design, the applied arts and urbanism contribute to contemporary and humane living? And in what ways do new cultures of living influence the city and regionally specific city cultures?</p> <p>These core questions are the point of departure for the planned interdisciplinary project (architecture, interior design, town planning), which seeks to provide first answers to and visions for this global challenge through transcultural analysis and reflection on European and Indian living styles. Deliberately, therefore, experts and artists from Europe as well as the (culturally and socio-economically equally heterogeneous) Indian subcontinent are earmarked for the project; especially as by now the significant parameters of the subject matter have global relevance: poverty can today (albeit on a different level) also be found in (Eastern) Europe, and suburbanisation has become an issue also in India.</p> <p>Specifically, the following topics (among others) are to be covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to what extent can the traditional living cultures of Europe and India be transformed to satisfy contemporary needs? • which future-proof forms of living do European and Indian cities, with their often centuries-old character, allow? • what demands do new, especially ‘mobile’ living cultures make on interior design? • through which architectural and economical approaches can new forms of dwelling be developed for the most deprived sections of society? • to what extent can ecological architecture and eco-design provide solutions to today’s requirements (environmentalism, air conditioning, etc.)? • which attributes (naturalness, neighbourliness, affordability) will be indicative for future models of living spaces? 	<p>179,969 €</p>	<p>www.trans-urban.net/2050/home.htm</p>

Annex III: Bibliography and references

Select bibliography (included works cited in text)

- Desai, Santosh (2011). 'Constructing Brand India'. Seminar, 618, February 2011.
- Indian Council for Cultural Relations (2013). *Annual Report, April 2011-March 2012*. New Delhi: ICCR.
- Isar, Y.R. (2012). *The Wealth of a Multipolar World: New Horizons for Cultural Exchange?* White Paper prepared for the international seminar 'Public and Private Cultural Exchange-Based Diplomacy: New Models for the 21st Century', organised by the Salzburg Global Seminar and the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation: Salzburg, 28 April – 2 May 2012.
- Mark, Simon (2008). *A comparative study of the cultural diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. (available at <https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/2292/2943/02whole.pdf?sequence=9>) [last accessed 9 June 2013].
- Ministry of Culture, Government of India (2013). *Annual Report 2012-13*. New Delhi: Ministry of Culture. Online. Available at: [http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/pdf/Culture-Annual%20Report-2012-13\(English\).pdf](http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/pdf/Culture-Annual%20Report-2012-13(English).pdf).
- Nehru, Jawaharlal (2008). *The Discovery of India*. New Delhi: Penguin.
- Rana, K.S. (2009). 'India's Diaspora Diplomacy'. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 4, pp. 361-372.
- Rajadhyaksha, Ashish and Tenkayala, Raghavendra (2013). *Country Profile India* (World-CP International Database of Cultural Policies). Singapore: the Asia-Europe Foundation. Online. Available at: <http://www.worldcp.org/india.php>.
- Tharoor, Shashi (2012). *Pax Indica*. New Delhi: Allen Lane.

Online resources

- Standing Committee on External Affairs 2012-2013 (April 2013). *Ministry of External Affairs Demands for Grants (2013-2014)*. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat. Online. Available at: http://164.100.47.134/lssccommittee/External%20Affairs/15_External_Affairs_20.pdf.
- 'Ministry of External Affairs and Youtube join hands to promote India abroad' (12 November 2012). *Afaqs!*. Mumbai. Online. Available at: http://www.afaqs.com/news/story/35926_Ministry-of-External-Affairs-and-YouTube-join-hands-to-promote-India-abroad.
- Rohan Venkataramakrishnan (19 February 2013). 'POWERCRACY: cultural bridges to help cross borders'. *Daily Mail Online*. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2281216/POWERCRACY-Cultural-bridges-help-cross-borders.html?ITO=1490&ns_mchannel=rss&ns_campaign=1490.
- Ritambhara (30 April 2013). 'On Indian Public Diplomacy'. *e-International Relations*. Online. Available at: <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/04/30/on-indian-public-diplomacy/>.
- European Commission, Culture.
 - 'European Union and India launch policy dialogue on culture'. Online. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/culture/news/eu-and-india-launch-policy-dialogue-on-culture_en.htm.

- *Joint Declaration of the European Commission and the Government of India on Culture*. Online. Available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/culture/our-policy-development/doc/external_relations/joint_declaration_%20with_India.pdf.
- European Union External Action Service. 'India'. Online. Available at:
http://www.eeas.europa.eu/india/index_en.htm.
- Indian Council for Cultural Relations.
<http://iccrindia.net/culturalcentres/culturalcentreslist-april2013.pdf>.
<http://iccrindia.net/chairslist.html>.
- Government of India, Ministry of Culture.
<http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/cultural-agreement.asp>.
<http://indiaculture.nic.in/indiaculture/cultural-relations.asp>.
- Indian Public Diplomacy Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India.
<http://www.indiadiplomacy.in/AboutUs.aspx>.
- Chandramohan, Balaji (17 August 2011). 'The Uses of Public and Cultural Diplomacy'. *Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*. Online. Available at:
http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/TheUsesofPublicandCulturalDiplomacy_bchandramohan_170811.
- Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs. <http://www.mea.gov.in/foreign-relations.htm>.
 - Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs (12 February 2013). *First Meeting of the Parliamentary Consultative Committee on External Affairs for 2013* (press release). Online. Available at:
<http://www.mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/21163/First+Meeting+of+the+Parliamentary+Consultative+Committee+on+External+Affairs+for+2013>.
 - *EU India Relations* (dated February 2013). Online. Available at:
http://www.mea.gov.in/Portal/ForeignRelation/EU_Relations.pdf.
- Press Information Bureau, Government of India (18 April 2013). 'Indo-EU Policy Dialogue on Culture'. Online. Available at:
<http://pib.nic.in/newsite/erelease.aspx?relid=94774>.
- Graham, Sarah Ellen (2 April 2013). 'China and India: Translating Public Diplomacy into Soft Power', *USC Center on Public Diplomacy Blog*. Online. Available at:
http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/newswire/cpdblog_detail/china_and_india_translating_public_diplomacy_into_soft_power/.
- Kanal, Nishtha (6 June 2013). 'India Is': Ministry of External Affairs releases five short films on Youtube to celebrate India'. *Tech 2*. Online. Available at:
<http://tech2.in.com/news/social-networking/india-is-ministry-of-external-affairs-releases-five-short-films-on-youtube-to-celebrate-india/875598>.

Annex IV: List of 'active' cultural exchange agreements (CEPs) supplied by the ICCR

1.	Bangladesh
2.	Benin
3.	Bulgaria
4.	China
5.	Croatia
6.	Czech Republic
7.	Iceland
8.	Indonesia
9.	Kuwait
10.	Lao PDR
11.	Malaysia
12.	Mauritius
13.	Mongolia
14.	North Korea (DPRK)
15.	Norway
16.	Philippines
17.	Poland
18.	Romania
19.	Russian Federation
20.	Slovak Republic
21.	Slovenia
22.	South Korea (ROK)
23.	Sri Lanka
24.	Syria
25.	Turkmenistan
26.	Vietnam
27.	Maldives
28.	Singapore
29.	Trinidad & Tobago
30.	Thailand
31.	Egypt
32.	Colombia
33.	Brazil
34.	Mexico
35.	Myanmar