



SEMINAR ON CULTURE AND CONFLICTS: THE CASE OF UKRAINE

Brussels, 25 November 2014

The event was co-organized by Salzburg Global Seminar and *MORE EUROPE* – external cultural relations and supported by the EU and its Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace.¹

1. Executive Summary

The common threads in the various new insights regarding the role of culture in conflicts voiced by participants concerned: culture as a soft, peaceful tool to address hard, serious challenges and transform seemingly stale, “dead-end” conflict situations; culture as a tool to mobilize, engage, address the wider population, “the masses”; culture as a tool to stimulate dialogue, communication and eventually understanding – before, during or after conflict; the risks connected to the use and abuse of culture and cultural identities; and – as a result – the need to integrate culture into general (EU) policies and make better use of its potential.

The **mainstreaming of culture**, the **revision of granting mechanisms** and procedures, and the **enhanced engagement with stakeholders** (including but not limited to cultural operators) came out as the three priority recommendations agreed by participants through the collective intelligence exercise. These were followed by recommendations regarding the increase of mobility, the allocation of specific funding, and the revision of project matrix.

2. Proceedings

Driven by the realization of the need to better understand the culture-conflict nexus, the seminar pursued **two objectives**: discuss the ways in which culture can contribute to or mitigate conflict and formulate recommendations for policy-makers. The conflict in **Ukraine** opens way to multiple debates on culture and was selected as a case study to contextualize the discussion.

The testimonies by cultural operators from the field and presentations of the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP), the Concept Note on Culture and Conflict in Ukraine, and

¹ *The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union.*

Ukraine as a regional context formed the core of the **morning session**. A number of dichotomies and issues were raised during the discussion, including: short-term vs. long-term planning; flexibility vs. continuity; spontaneous grass-roots initiatives vs. sustainable infrastructure; civil society vs. government; causes vs. consequences; trust; mobility; instrumentalization of culture.

The **afternoon session** was devoted entirely to a collective intelligence exercise, addressing the new insights on culture-conflict nexus and formulating recommendations for the IcSP and EU external action in general.

2a. Summary of Proceedings – Morning Session I

Mr. Gottfried Wagner, *MORE EUROPE*– external cultural relations adviser; opened the seminar, having noted that it is driven by the realization on behalf of the EU and EU Member States of the *importance of culture* and the need to better understand the *culture-conflict nexus*.

Ms. Malgorzata Wasilewska, Head of Division K2 – Conflict Prevention, Peace Building and Mediation Instruments, welcomed the participants on behalf of **Mr. Pierre Vimont**, Executive Secretary General of the European External Action Service (EEAS). She reaffirmed the personal and institutional support for this initiative among the EEAS leadership. The EU High Representative/Vice President Ms. Federica Mogherini encouraged the EEAS staff to think out of the box, and the present seminar is a good example of doing so in practice. Ms. Wasilewska invited the participants to be *creative, constructive* and at the same time *realistic* when discussing what happens when one approaches conflicts taking culture into account, and when formulating recommendations for policy-makers.

Mr. Wagner continued, stressing the need for a deep understanding of the *soft power* of culture in difficult times, of culture’s enormous potential in terms of economy, the risks related to the instrumental use of culture in order to *divide societies* – contrasted with culture’s huge potential to *build bridges*. In times of conflict, the culture lens may also be a means to step back and see the *wider picture*.

He concluded by recapping the program of the seminar and specifying the tasks set out for the group, namely: offer a comprehensive approach to culture, reinforce the programming capacity of the relevant EU services and formulate recommendations that are as concrete as possible. Mr. Wagner stressed that the conflict in Ukraine is used in this seminar merely as a case study to contextualize the discussion and that the real subject of the seminar is the role of culture in conflict in general terms.

The opening remarks were followed by a presentation by an invited cultural operator **Ms. Tina Ellen Lee**, Artistic Director of Opera Circus (UK). Ms. Lee spoke about her organization’s experience in using *music* as an instrument to engage *youth and children in traumatized societies*, for example in Srebrenica (Bosnia). Music operates in a holistic, non-verbal way and so helps to generate *emotional and physical response*. Culture in a broader understanding, and music and other creative arts in particular, facilitate the creation of *environments of tolerance* and understanding in divided, traumatized communities. Ms. Lee stressed that there are *no quick fixes* “to rebuild the people” and *no large-scale solutions*. In fact, from her experience, local people usually feel offended and rather estranged by foreign experts who enter a community with ready solutions. Instead, she advocated for continuous engagement on the ground and consistent work to build and sustain safe creative spaces that encourage the sharing of ideas and concerns.

Next, the *Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace* (IcSP) was introduced by **Mr. Ronan Mac Aongusa**, Service for Foreign Policy Instruments (FPI), EEAS. Mr. Mac Aongusa started by noting the valuable experience of cultural operators and its potential value in improving the programming activity on the IcSP, carried out on an annual basis and in a systematic and planned way. He outlined the main objective of the seminar for him – to find ways to *incorporate the collective ideas* generated during the seminar *into the future planning* and to *bring the thread of culture in*. Maximizing the input of civil society in all of the areas of the IcSP/FPI work is an issue the FPI team is dealing with constantly. How cultural operators could specifically contribute to the EU peace-building and conflict prevention is a sub-issue to be addressed during and after today's seminar. Mr. Mac Aongusa provided additional detail on the structural set up of the IcSP, the main themes and tools of its activities, and some statistics on the previous programming cycle. He concluded by acknowledging the utility of his own prior experience of working on the European Neighbourhood, the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme and the EuroMed Heritage in ensuring a degree of *continuity* while at the same time stimulating *innovative*, out-of-the-box thinking on the subject.

In response to a question by Mr. Wagner, Mr. Mac Aongusa addressed a general tendency towards *larger projects* (budget-wise) and the challenges this poses to cultural operators (whose activities are thus often ineligible). He encouraged cultural operators to explore funding opportunities through other EU instruments, including the ones without “culture” explicitly mentioned in their titles, and acknowledged the need on the part of the EU to give clearer information on the opportunities for *sub-granting*.

The opening presentations were followed by a **short introduction round** by the participants, which revealed the *highly diverse composition* of the group gathered for the seminar, both in terms of institutional *affiliation* and professional and personal *motivations* to participate.

The first part of the morning was concluded by a presentation of the *Concept Note: Culture and Conflict in Ukraine* by **Ms. Clare Shine**, Vice-President and Chief Programme Officer, Salzburg Global Seminar, and **Ms. Sana Ouchtati**, Director, *MORE EUROPE – external cultural relations*. Ms. Shine described culture as a new *lens* for looking at conflict and as a tool to release *bottom-up energy* at a time when there is a wide crisis of faith in ‘elites’ and in their ability to provide solutions. Cultural differences are often at the root of conflict or are mistaken for such. A growing interest in the *culture-conflict nexus*, and in particular in the ways in which culture can contribute to or mitigate conflict, can be observed among both private and public foundations. Local cultural operators enjoy a deep understanding of opportunities in place and space; they can support the efforts of external donors but also need support from them. Ms. Shine stressed the relevance in this debate of concepts of *home*, *identity*, *belonging*, *entitlement* and *rights*, as well as the risks of instrumentalizing culture and conflating the notions of *justice* and *reconciliation*. Culture can keep a conflict alive – or be a way to transcend it. Understanding intergenerational dynamics around conflict and its legacy is essential here. Ms. Ouchtati continued by presenting *key recommendations* of the EU-commissioned “*Preparatory Action on Culture in External Relations*”, among others: a strong call to reinforce the role of culture in conflict prevention and conflict resolution; the need to integrate policies to prevent and respond to the wilful destruction of cultural heritage in times of violent conflict; the need for dialogue as a process of restoring trust, mutual respect and understanding; focus on local communities and youth; the need for interdisciplinary cultural projects; and the important supporting role for the EU and EU Member States. Finally, Ms. Shine

voiced a number of *discussion points* proposed in the Concept Note to guide the conversation throughout the seminar.

2b. Summary of Proceedings – Morning Session II

Mr. Dirk Schuebel, Head of Division, Eastern Partnership – bilateral, EEAS, offered some insights on *Ukraine in a regional context*. He started off with a quote from Mr. Yuri Andrukhovych, a famous Ukrainian writer: “We talk about values, you talk about prices”. Mr. Schuebel briefly discussed the main events in Ukraine and EU-Ukraine relations of the past year. Addressing the immediate future, he mentioned the fight against *corruption* and the *decentralization* reform as two main *internal challenges* for Ukraine. The need for a real *cease-fire*, for restoring *border control* and for an effective policy to deal with *refugees and IDPs* are also among Ukraine’s top concerns. Mr. Schuebel then addressed the support the EU provided to Ukraine in different forms, including the support to the Euromaidan, the financial support package, the creation of the Support Group for Ukraine and the EU Assistance Mission (EUAM) to support security sector reform, the support for the OSCE Mission in Ukraine and the work of the trilateral contact group, the ratification and partial provisional application of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement and the striking of a gas deal with Russia. He noted the relevance of his prior experience with Transnistria and Moldova and stated that many lessons could be learned from that case also with regard to the culture-conflict nexus and the use of culture for reconciliation.

His colleague, **Mr. Jose Roman Leon Lora**, Team Leader for Scientific Cooperation, Education and Social Policy, Support Group for Ukraine, continued on the subject, arguing that the conflict in Ukraine opens way to multiple debates on culture. At least the following three should be addressed: the status of *Russian* in Ukraine; the status of *Crimean Tatars*, their communal institutions and cultural heritage; and *political culture* in Ukraine, Maidan being both a large political culture movement and an event that changed the whole political culture of the population.

In response to a question by Mr. Wagner about the possible mistakes of the EU, Mr. Schuebel addressed the EU pressure for Tymoshenko release and the arguments about the EU allegedly failing to consult Russia and thus provoking its reaction.

These presentations were followed by a round of **testimonies from the invited cultural operators**.

Ms. Oksana Forostyna, Executive Editor of “Krytyka” journal in Ukraine, introduced the journal and its main products, including “Critical Solutions”, coincidentally launched just two weeks before the start of the Euromaidan. She then spoke about a crowd-funding call the journal released recently – and a response from someone that this was not at all important in the current context, in comparison to the needs to crowd-fund the Ukrainian army, the IDPs, hospitals and various unprotected social groups. Ms. Forostyna agreed. “What we, cultural operators in Ukraine, feel – we feel guilty. *We feel guilty, because right now we, with our long analytical articles, are luxury; we are whipped-cream.*” Ukraine is at war. This is not a conflict of cultural identities, language identities, or historical memories. Approaching it as such is shallow and a loop-hole for relieving the responsibility. It is very tempting to define the conflict in Ukraine as a clash of identities, thereby shifting a very complex conflict into the domain of irrationality, transforming it into something that need not be treated seriously. Ms. Forostyna believes that such an approach is infantilization and simplification: “*The war in Ukraine is planned and orchestrated; it is rational*”. The best way to deal with the situation is to stay normal. We need more success stories, also from cultural operators, and sustainable cultural institutions. It is essential to “*keep the horizon of normality in sight*”. The mission

of “Krytyka” is to educate the readership in terms of the tone, the intonation of discourse: conflicts begin not when people disagree, but when people start shouting. She concluded by stating the “*three mantras*” in dealing with the situation: sustainable institutions, keeping the horizon of normality and sanity, and flexibility and trust from external partners.

Mr. Hjlamar Jorge Joffre-Eichhorn, Founder, Theatre for Dialogue (a German-Bolivian citizen), spoke about his current activities in Ukraine next. He believes that *interactive theatre*, which is participatory, non-professional and communal, is the best tool to *make peace, reconciliation and justice “actionable”* and release the bottom-up energy. This form of theatre is a chance to *practice change* and propose solutions. After a description of the context at the start of their initiative in Ukraine in January 2014, Mr. Joffre-Eichhorn presented activities of the Theatre for Dialogue: a total of 50 activities in 7 cities of Ukraine with a budget of merely 7,000 USD. He noted the positive reception of the initiative and the format among the participants. The issues they work around currently include deaths, transitional justice, IDPs, reconciliation, legislation and democratization of societies. He concluded by stating that theatre can be *used very ambitiously and powerfully* – not only do cultural operators in the field need to be more ambitious in their work, but understanding the arts as a very powerful tool for change will help the EU fulfil its mandate to deliver peace, justice and reconciliation in the world.

Ms. Anna Medvedeva, Communications Director of IZOLYATSIA Platform for Cultural Initiatives, Donetsk, Ukraine, started off by presenting the platform, its activities and social role in Donetsk prior to the conflict. One of the most important roles of culture and arts is demonstrating the *diversity of opinions* and worldviews and making people *feel responsible for their own lives* and choices. It is precisely this end that IZOLYATSIA pursued in Donetsk, a city with otherwise a very poor cultural scene and a population living very traditional (Soviet-style) and linear life trajectories. The Platform used a space of 8ha to mobilize creative people of the city and present opportunities for art, education and creative industry. In just a few years, it grew from events that attracted 20 participants to events with an audience of 2,000 people and more. In June 2014, the *facilities of IZOLYATSIA have been seized* by the separatists and converted into a prison. The team had to flee the city. Now they continue their work from Kyiv. Their main focus at the moment is to reflect on *what has happened* and *what is happening*. The “Underground Dreams” and “Zakhoplennya” projects have been very successful. In the nearest future, they wish to *build bridges* between the cities in Donbas area that have been liberated by the Ukrainian Army, in order to give them impulses and ideas and so stimulate grass-root activities.

Mr. Yaroslav Minkin, Founder, Stan Art Group, poet, cultural innovator and civil activist, Lugansk, Ukraine, represents what he referred to as “*the pro-democratic side of Lugansk*”, which contrasts sharply with “*the post-Soviet majority*” of the population of the region. Personally, he realized the importance of the culture-conflict nexus more than 10 years ago. The aim of his group is to show a different side of Lugansk, not the one that is currently supporting the so-called self-declared Lugansk People’s Republic. Founded in 1999 as “*an alternative to Soviet writers*”, Stan Art Group enjoyed zero support from the authorities and in fact entered into an *aesthetic conflict* with the majority population, which was nostalgic of the Soviet Union and its cultural heritage. Quickly, it grew into a *civic conflict* too: in 2004, during the Orange Revolution, they formed the core of pro-democratic activists, in the situation when 95% of the people of Lugansk supported Viktor Yanukovich. In the years that followed, their work suffered from multiple obstacles, as political elites were not at all interested in including them in local *political* processes and began to exert additional *pressure* from 2010 onwards. The fact that Ukrainian cultural operators have *no instruments* at their disposal and

often have an *old-fashioned understanding of culture* and its role was also not helpful. In 2013, when the Euromaidan started, the artists of Lugansk formed the core of protesters and tried to educate the people in a peaceful way. In 2014, when the anti-democratic people from Lugansk, Serbia and Russia came to the city with weapons, their work became impossible and all of them *had to flee from Lugansk*. Currently, they try to engage with similar groups in Odesa, Kharkiv, Kherson – Ukrainian cities that may still be struggling with their own identities and choices. Mr. Minkin concluded by saying that an effort to develop a *country-wide cultural strategy* for Ukraine that would draw on *diverse local identities* is of the utmost importance.

Ms. Elena Tupyseva, Director and Co-Founder of TsEKh and Moscow's Aktovy Zal's Cultural Centre, Moscow, Russia, opened her presentation with a remark that it is not an easy task to be the only Russian in the room, in a way pressured to represent the whole country. Working in the field of contemporary dance, she does not deal with the crisis in Ukraine directly. However, as a Russian citizen she is influenced by it. *Mass media* is manipulating the society, and it is indeed very difficult to resist the flow of information from TV. The task of the artistic field is to *resist the majority opinion* of the country and *sustain the collaborations* with external partners, including in Ukraine, that exist. As a representative of the independent Russian artistic scene, Ms. Tupyseva sees it as her responsibility to *represent Russia abroad* and try to build *a relationship of trust* between herself and her international colleagues, so as to give Russia a different face and demonstrate that they exist and their work is reliable. It is not an easy moment for Russia, and the multiple personal connections to Ukraine make it all the more difficult. Cultural operators are the people to rely on when *building the present and future* situations. Ms. Tupyseva also mentioned the trend in Moscow for cultural operators from the independent field to go and work for governmental cultural institutions, but she noted that no infringements on their artistic freedom could be observed. Also the so-called law on foreign agents did not affect cultural operators and their cooperation with foreign foundations: it was drafted to limit the operations of human rights NGOs and as such is applied selectively.

The testimonies of the cultural operators were followed by a dynamic **Q&A session**.

In her intervention, **Ms. Tetiana Shulha**, Sector Manager regional development, youth and culture, EU Delegation to Ukraine, seconded Ms. Forostyna on the absence of dividing lines in Ukraine along the criteria of religion, language or ethnicity and stated that the three main phenomena to be taken into account in planning future (cultural) operations are *paternalism* and *propaganda*, which strongly affect the population in the East of Ukraine, and *post-traumatic syndrome*, which is quickly spreading around the country as the conflict goes on.

Mr. Philipp Dietachmair, European Cultural Foundation, asked cultural operators to reflect on their *contacts with Russian/Ukrainian partners* and how these have or have not been affected by the conflict. To this, Mr. Minkin responded that, even though Lugansk is only 80km off the Russian border, they did not have one Russian partner, neither among cultural operators, nor among human rights organizations; the contacts were and are only at a personal level. Similarly, Ms. Medvedeva responded that since IZOLYATSIA platform had no Russian partners, despite the geographic proximity of Donetsk to Russia, there are also no conflicts at the moment. IZOLYATSIA's primary orientation was to the West and the Western system of values, and so their cooperation with Russian partners was limited to isolated individuals. Ms. Forostyna commented that nothing has changed for "Krytyka", as initially they had been very selective in contacts with Russian counterparts, "picking only decent people", and "decent people remain decent people". Ms. Tupyseva responded that the four Ukrainians in her dance company of forty-five people stayed and continue working, and

that there is no conflict within the group. And Mr. Joffre-Eichhorn told the participants that Theatre for Dialogue is currently developing a cross-border (Ukraine-Russia) initiative to work with the parents of the deceased (soldiers) on both sides.

Ms. Lee commented on the presentations by other cultural operators and mentioned that next year will mark the 20th anniversary of the genocide in Bosnia – and there are *lessons to be learned* from their experience in this context, such as: the absolute importance of *mobility* of artists; better *cooperation* with and *utilization* of cultural operators, so as to avoid reinventing the wheel; fighting corruption; and the need for a more innovative way of *evaluating* projects.

Ms. Kathrin Merkle, Head of Culture and Democracy Division, Council of Europe, raised a question of a lack of cooperation, coordination and indeed *communication between the governmental and the non-governmental sectors* in Ukraine.

The question of a real-life cultural basis of the *East-West divide* in Ukraine was raised by one of the participants. To this, **Mr. Leon Lora** responded that the sole cultural problem that existed at the beginning was the resistance of the people of Maidan to the generalized cynicism of society and authorities, to brutality and corruption. The East never talked about independence and, in fact, at that time was the strongest supporter of Ukraine and the government. Mr. Leon Lora emphasized that the fact that the so-called separatists have some social basis does not mean that they are acceptable and that their ideas and demands are acceptable. Moreover, the Ukrainian population has demonstrated in two rounds of elections that it is in fact extremely moderate and can teach a lesson to many EU Member States: radical candidates together did not gain even 5% of the votes. The issue with Crimean Tatars was practically resolved by the Ukrainian authorities prior to the conflict. It is now, in the annexed Crimea, that Crimean Tatars are facing repressions. *“If you wish to speak of a cultural cleavage, you will always find it. But it is not there in Ukraine.”*

Ms. Forostyna concluded the Q&A session with a statement that *“any dialogue is much more productive when Kalashnikovs are not around”*, which received wide approval from the audience.

3. Summary of Proceedings – Afternoon Session

Mr. Wagner opened the **afternoon session** by voicing some *keywords and dichotomies* from the morning discussion, including the following: short-term vs. long-term planning, action; flexibility vs. continuity; spontaneous grass-roots initiatives vs. sustainable infrastructure; civil society vs. government; horizontal vs. vertical; trust; capacity-building; mobility; success stories; instrumentalization of culture; causes and consequences.

An explanation of the method of **collective intelligence** by **Mr. Alain Ruche**, Senior Adviser on Cultural Matters, EEAS, and **Ms. Nathalie Legros**, Research Programme Officer, European Research Council Executive Agency, DG Research, European Commission, followed. Importantly, the participants were asked to step out of the specific context of the conflict in Ukraine and into thinking about the culture-conflict nexus in general.

4. Collective Intelligence Exercise

4a. Part I – Culture and Conflicts

In the first round, the participants were tasked with discussing in small groups **the first question: Following this morning presentations and testimonies, what new insights come to your mind regarding the role of culture in conflicts?** Each group, or discussion table, was invited to formulate 3-4 main insights and write them down on a piece of paper, to be presented to the rest of the group shortly. The following *sets of insights* were produced by the four groups:

- Our vision of culture can be part of prejudice, use culture in a specific moment
- Culture can transform, speak to emotions
- Culture can be a tool to disarm and open a new approach [to dealing with conflict]

- Interdependence of hard and soft power
- Policy-shaping potential of culture
- Activism, culture as a peaceful weapon
- Culture within strategic communication

- Conflict of values vs. conflict of cultures
- The need for better use of popular & mass culture, social networks
- Understanding of identities and protection of identities against discrimination
- Short vs. long-term engagement

- Culture as a tool to transform the traditional way of thinking
- Culture as a vehicle to promote bottom-up participation and empowerment from the roots
- The use of culture as a preventive tool to promote understanding, communication and dialogue

While, at first glance, the above insights may seem to be all different, a few **common threads** come out strongly:

- culture as a soft, peaceful tool to address very hard, serious challenges and to transform seemingly stale, “dead-end” conflict situations
- culture as a tool to mobilize, engage, address the wider population, “the masses”
- culture as a tool to stimulate dialogue, communication and eventually understanding – before, during or after conflict
- the risks connected to the use and abuse of culture and cultural identities
- and – as a result – the need to integrate culture into general policies and make better use of its potential

4b. Part II – Recommendations for IcSP Programming

After a collective discussion of the insights generated and the linkages between them, in the second round the participants were invited to change tables and discuss in small groups **the second question: Based on the new insights, what concrete recommendations can we propose to improve the programming cycle of the IcSP?**

Also this round resulted in lively debates within the groups. Following the discussion, the groups were invited to write their recommendations on post-its, to be subsequently attached to a joint board and arranged in a meaningful way. This time, no maximum number of suggestions was set, and the groups were free to propose as many as they wished.

The **first group** had five recommendations:

- include and treat culture as a complementary, cross-cutting element of peace-building activities
- make external (European) support more flexible and reactive to the changing context
- incorporate (legitimate) local knowledge, local expertise in programming
- designate specific funding to peace-building and arts
- ensure that respective efforts target and reach out to wider audiences (mass culture).

The **second group** had six recommendations:

- mainstream culture in all European programmes and instruments (all the way to security and military)
- create a platform for dialogue between cultural operators and EU officials
- launch pilot projects on cross-border mobility
- improve internal mobility
- engage in educational and youth projects
- promote mobility skills among the youth.

The **third group** had four recommendations:

- improve the accessibility of EU funding to small cultural operators and civil society groups (by revising the required size and budget of projects and allowing for sub-granting)
- enhance the representation of cultural operators in programming
- improve the transparency of sub-granting
- strengthen the coordination between different stakeholders in the process.

All three groups mentioned, in different wording, the creation of additional opportunities and structures to engage cultural operators in EU programming. This raised a question of whether such cooperation would affect the independence of cultural operators and eventually bias their activity. The question was debated by the participants, with arguments for and against being voiced.

Finally, the **fourth group** had six recommendations:

- carry out targeted work between cultural operators and the EU on assessing the impact of activities
- empower the beneficiaries and EU delegations in the field to report on the impact of activities
- provide training on cultural sensitivities for the staff of CSDP missions and EU delegations
- develop and provide user-friendly (for cultural operators) information on granting and sub-granting opportunities
- include cultural sensitivity among project evaluation criteria (in general)
- fund “communication channels”/ “peace bridges” in conflict regions.

After all groups had voiced their suggestions and attached their post-its to the board, the participants were invited to re-assess the different recommendations, think about and discuss the linkages between them, and re-group the recommendations in clusters, re-arranging the post-its respectively. In the end, all the recommendations were **grouped in six clusters**, with the following “working titles”:

- **matrix** [for evaluating projects and reporting on impact]
- **mobility** [of cultural operators, populations, youth]
- **mainstreaming** [of culture in EU policies, programmes and instruments]
- **stakeholders** [as active participants of EU programming and project/impact evaluation]
- **specific funding** [to culture and arts in conflict prevention and peace-building]
- **granting and mechanisms** [to enhance the use of EU resources and the realization of local actors’ potential]

In the final round, the participants received 3 “votes” each and were asked to vote for the cluster(s) that they deemed most important. The distribution of votes among the clusters was the following: matrix – 8; mobility – 3; mainstreaming – 23; stakeholders – 13; specific funding – 8; mechanisms and granting – 23.

5. Summary of Collective Intelligence Exercise and the Seminar

In summary, the mainstreaming of culture, the revision of granting mechanisms and procedures, and the enhanced engagement with stakeholders (including but not limited to cultural operators) came out as the three priority recommendations agreed by participants through the collective intelligence exercise.

In closing the seminar, the participants were invited to share their **final reflections on the day** and fill in the evaluation forms. Among the different comments, the participants stated that they were very much impressed with the *testimony of the cultural operators*, and some were pleased to hear that these were close to their own assessment of the situation. Other participants expressed a degree of *surprise at how convinced the participating EU officials were* of the importance of culture and voiced a concern that, without doubt, not all EU policy-makers were equally convinced, especially not the ones distributing the funds. Thus, the need for “advocates of culture” inside the institutions and for cultural operators to continue pitching culture as an important issue remains relevant. *A continuous collective effort of both sides* would be necessary, as one of the participants stressed. Competition between cultural operators would be harmful to the common cause, another participant added. On a different note, some of the participants, both from EU institutions and from outside, expressed their content with the *format of the seminar*, the *diverse composition of the group* and the possibility for representatives of different institutions to *work together so closely and informally* – towards a collective result. Finally, cultural operators from Ukraine and Russia expressed their gratitude for *an opportunity to speak to this audience*, and indeed to each other, and their pleasant surprise at the level of expertise on the issue among EU policy-makers (which they assumed to be lower). “So, it turns out that we know and you know – and *the lack of mechanisms is the main problem*”, one of the cultural operators concluded.

In his final remarks, **Mr. Ruche** expressed his satisfaction with the team work during the seminar and pledged to inform the Secretary General of the EEAS about the seminar’s results.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6a. Recommendations for EU Services on IcSP programming

- **Mainstreaming**
 - **Mainstream culture** and include it as a complementary, cross-cutting element of peace-building activities
 - Provide **training on cultural sensitivities** for the staff of EU instruments, CSDP missions and EU delegations
- **Specific funding**
 - Designate **specific funding** to culture/arts in peace-building
- **Granting and mechanisms**
 - **Include cultural sensitivity** among project evaluation criteria.

6b. Recommendation for EU Services on Future External Action

These recommendations are more general than the ones presented in 6a., however they are also applicable for the EU Services on IcSP programming.

- **Matrix**
 - **Empower stakeholders**, in particular cultural operators and EU delegations in the field, in assessing impact of funded activities
- **Mobility**
 - Launch pilot projects on increasing internal **mobility**, cross-border mobility and especially youth mobility (of cultural operators and beyond)
- **Mainstreaming**
 - **Mainstream culture** in all EU programmes and instruments (all the way to security and military)
 - **Engage stakeholders**, in particular cultural operators, in EU programming in order to incorporate local knowledge and expertise; for this, create a **platform for dialogue** between cultural operators and EU officials
- **Granting and mechanisms**
 - Make EU support more **flexible and reactive** to the changing context
 - Improve the accessibility of **EU funding to small cultural operators** and civil society groups; for this, revise the required size and budget of projects, allow for sub-granting, develop user-friendly (for cultural operators) information on granting and sub-granting opportunities, including the provision of texts in different languages.

6c. Recommendations for Cultural Operators

- **Matrix**
 - **Engage in EU evaluating** the impact of respective activities, advocate for a stronger role in this
- **Mobility**
 - Launch pilot projects on increasing internal **mobility**, cross-border mobility and especially youth mobility (of cultural operators and beyond)
- **Mainstreaming**

- **Engage in EU programming** in a more active and coordinated manner, including through the creation of a platform for dialogue among cultural operators themselves, and between cultural operators and EU officials. In particular, contacts and linkages between cultural operators and the existing platform for dialogue between civil society and EU policy makers in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building – the Civil Society Dialogue Network (CSDN) managed by EPLO (European Peace-building Liaison Office) – should be taken into consideration.
- **Granting and mechanisms**
 - Ensure that respective efforts target and reach out to **wider audiences** (mass culture), with specific focus on **educational** and **youth** projects.

Annex – Seminar Evaluation by Participants

The seminar was very positively evaluated by the participants, as the analysis of 23 filled-in evaluation forms shows.

The *relevance of the seminar to a participant’s daily work* was assessed at 7.2 (on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all relevant and 10 is extremely relevant). Notably, 15 out of 23 scores were 8 or higher.

The feeling of inclusion and of *one’s opinion being taken into consideration* was assessed at 7.4 (on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all and 10 is extremely). Notably, there were only four scores below 7.

The *contribution of the cultural operators* to this seminar was assessed as highly relevant, with a score of 8.7 (on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all and 10 is extremely). Notably, 8 out of 23 participants assessed it as “extremely relevant” and gave it a top score of 10.

On the question of *which part of the workshop one found most relevant*, the opinions divided practically evenly between the morning and the afternoon parts, with 13 respondents favouring the morning presentations (and specifically cultural operators’ testimonies) and 10 respondents favouring the collective intelligence exercise in the afternoon. Notably, four participants stated that the entire day, with its both parts, was extremely relevant to them. Interestingly, one participant singled out the networking standing lunch as particularly useful.

In general comments, many participants stressed the *usefulness* of such an initiative and the hope that it will *be repeated* in the future, especially for the purpose of “reaching out to the non-converted”. Many remarked that the seminar was very *well organised and run*. Some singled out the added value of the unusually *diverse composition of the group* and the very good interaction between the participants.

Report by Dr. Olga Burlyuk, Centre for EU Studies, Ghent University