The International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (ICCPR) is a unique, high profile academic event, every second year, integrating cultural policy scholars around key research problems and theories in the multidimensional cultural and arts realms. It is an intellectually demanding, intense, organisationally-complex endeavour and the most respected conference cycle in the cultural policy academia world.

ICCPR comes to Asia
In 2016, the 9th edition of ICCPR arrived for the first time in Asia: to Seoul and hosted by the Sookmyung Women's University for 5 days in July. ICCPR 2016 offered a range of over 15 panel discussions (roundtables, focus and thematic sessions) and 75 research paper sessions, thus bringing to the cultural and academic audience over 150 presentations on the current state of art in research on cultural policy-related topics, as elaborated in university communities and research centres around the world. With no exaggeration, this forum for discussion on cultural policy is the best barometer of recent trends in academic work in the cultural sector and with a focus on cultural sector professionals.

This year, ICCPR was held in Asia for the first time since its inception in 1999. It took place in Seoul, Korea.

1 www.iccpr2016.sm.ac.kr/
8 emergent thematic domains at ICCPR 2016

What then are the most intensively and extensively reflected topics by cultural policy academics? My selection of the key problems discussed within the framework of this edition of the conference - contributed to by nearly 300 academics - comes down to 8 central, emergent thematic domains, all highly relevant and obligatory to re-think within Asian and European cultural sectors and cultural policy practices:

1. Comparative perspective of cultural policies in Asia and their (in)dependence of the creative economy rationale
2. The status of the artist and economic compensation for cultural labour
3. Cultural diplomacy, with a special comparative focus on its governance models
4. The practices of networking in cultural policy research and education
5. Education methods, processes of professionalisation and self-development conditions of present and future cultural policy actors (such as cultural practitioners and scholars)
6. The role of the artists and citizens in a culture-led regeneration of cities; and, urban cultural policies, with a special focus on global cities
7. A range of critical perspectives on digitalisation policies as related to the creative economy and cultural policies
8. Civic engagement in cultural policies in the context of digitalisation and globalisation

What we have learned from the range of multiple, varied research presented at ICCPR 2016 conference is this: the potential for inspiration and common spaces of co-operation for Asian and European cultural policy researchers is ready to be activated within all dimensions and topics mentioned above.
6 cultural policy topics to re-think

The ICCPR conference raised a series of questions that are of interest for Asia-Europe dialogue in cultural policy. Some of these topics – such as the status of artists and cultural professionals; digital environment; integration of culture in development frameworks, particularly in cities; active involvement of and inputs from civil society in policymaking – reflect the issues already highlighted in UNESCO’s recent report on current trends, advances and challenges in the global cultural policy landscape, Re-shaping Cultural Policies (November 2015)².

The majority of the points, I wish to list here, were introduced by Prof. Jerry C. Y. LIU in his comments to the focus session, Rethinking Korean Cultural Policy at ICCPR 2016. I would like to adapt number of them for my conclusive comments. There is an emergent need for a serious consideration on several issues that are common to both continents’ realities. It all has to be supported by research activities and exchange of reflection among European and Asian cultural sector experts. Asians and Europeans now face the necessity of rethinking:

1. Cultural democratisation processes as in national, regional and cities cultural policies; autonomy and fair space for civic society and its role in participative cultural policymaking (as a balance to centralised national and nation-oriented policies)

2. The role of arms-length bodies, their transparency and representation

3. A selection of effective tools for keeping the balance of economic and intrinsic (artistic and aesthetic) values in arts and culture, creative sectors; and, providing tools for retaining the ‘human touch’ as well as human values - the affective human side in an increasingly powerful, technologically-driven creative industries landscape

4. Cultural policy tools for decentralisation in the cultural sector, including re-activation of the subsidiarity principle³ for the smallest cultural communities

5. The role of social entrepreneurship as a more vital and prospective ingredient in the cultural and creative industries

6. Supporting research and educational institutions that are keeping a critical perspective on public policies, thus bringing balance and vitality to cultural policy debates and providing a full range of representation from diverse cultural policy actors

---


³ Subsidiarity principle is understood as an organising principle that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralised competent authority. The idea, that a public authority (government, city) should have a subsidiary function (more supporting, not subordinate), performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level.
Above all, there is an urgent need for reintegrating efforts of governmental and civil society interest of more access to cultural offer and cultural education. This would probably lead to a ‘new architecture’ for culture and cultural institutions and provide a balanced frame of value measurement and the meaning of public interest in culture. The challenging fields mentioned above should be actively considered as subjects for future Asia-Europe projects, including policy debates, research studies, data collection, cross-sectorial meetings. Doing so will enrich inter-governmental co-operation as well as that among civic organisations in Asia and Europe.

***

This report was commissioned by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) and prepared by Dr. Marcin POPRAWSKI, ENCATC Vice President, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland. It is based on the discussions and paper presentations at the International Conference for Cultural Policy Research (5-9 July 2016, Seoul, Korea). This report can be downloaded on the ASEF corporate website at: http://tinyurl.com/ASEFiccpr2016 as well as on ASEF’s arts portal at: http://culture360.asef.org/news/iccpr-2016/

***

ICCPR 2016 was organised by Sookmyung Women’s University (Seoul, Korea) and the Korea Arts Management Service (KAMS). It was presented by the Korean Association of Arts Management and supported by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea; Seoul Metropolitan Government; Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF); National Research Foundation of Korea; Korea Tourism Organization; Doosan; Hankook; and, Japan Foundation. www.iccpr2016.sm.ac.kr/

***
The **Asia-Europe Foundation (A rolling)** is a not-for-profit intergovernmental organisation located in Singapore. Founded in 1997, it is the only institution of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM).

In the field of culture, AEF promotes various forms of cultural cooperation between Asia and Europe, including artistic collaborations, bi-regional networks and policy dialogue. In addition to fostering sustainable partnerships between Asian and European arts organisations, AEF also facilitates dialogue between the arts sector and government agencies responsible for culture.

In the area of cultural policy, the Asia-Europe Foundation (AEF) aims to stimulate dialogue and analysis on current debates in Asia and Europe, including the cultural agenda of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM). In particular, AEF facilitates conversations between cultural professionals and government officials across Asia and Europe. AEF also commissions national cultural policy profiles for the WorldCP-International Database on Cultural Policies (worldcp.org). WorldCP aims to make up-to-date policy information publicly accessible. For more on AEF’s work in cultural policy, visit: [http://tinyurl.com/asefculturalpolicy](http://tinyurl.com/asefculturalpolicy)
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4 The **Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)** is an intergovernmental forum for dialogue and cooperation established in 1996 to deepen relations between Asia and Europe, which addresses political, economic and socio-cultural issues of common concern. ASEM brings together 53 partners (21 Asian and 30 European countries, the ASEAN Secretariat, and the European Union). The 53 ASEM Partners are Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, the Lao PDR, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the United Kingdom, Viet Nam, the ASEAN Secretariat, and the European Union.