

Project Title

**"De-Provincializing Soft Power: A Global-Historical Approach, 1990-2015"
São Paulo Conference, April 2017**

Funding from Alliance's

**T.I.E.R – Trilateral Initiatives in Emerging Regions
2017**

Principal Initiators

Victoria de Grazia **Moore Collegiate Professor of History, Columbia University, New York**
Email: vd19@columbia.edu **Phone: + 1 212 854 3667**

Richard Balme **Professor at Sciences Po, Paris School of International Affairs and Centre for
European Studies, Paris**
Email: richard.balme@sciencespo.fr **Phone: + 33 1 45 49 72 60**

Jean Tible **Professor of International Relations at São Paulo University, São Paulo**
Email: jeantible@usp.br **Phone: +55 11 3091-3780**

Contents

Abstract	3
Narrative	4
Budget	9
Timeline	10
Selected Bibliography	11
Curriculum Vitae	12
Letters of Support	14

Abstract

Columbia University (European Institute), Sciences Po, and São Paulo University are partnering in a research project leading to a two-day conference in São Paulo in April 2017 to study Brazil's use of cultural power in foreign relations in the period from circa 1990 to 2015. Project participants will analyze Brazil's concepts and practices of cultural power in the light of the US and European experiences of soft and normative power, and will also compare them with the experiences of Turkey and China. This is the third and final phase of a three-year project, "**De-Provincializing Soft Power: A Global-Historical Approach, 1990-2015,**" which was started in the fall of 2014, and has been conducted by an international team of scholars and students from Columbia and Sciences Po in partnership with universities in Turkey, China (Renmin University) and Brazil (São Paulo University). The project combines innovative methodologies from international history, international relations, communications, and cultural studies, and its main outcomes will be a collaboratively written global history of soft power, curriculum development and student research, and an open-access website.

De-Provincializing Soft Power: A Global-Historical Approach, 1990-2015
São Paulo Conference, April 2017

The three principal initiators of the present project (Victoria de Grazia from Columbia University, Richard Balme from Sciences Po, and Jean Tible from São Paulo University) propose to conduct a research project leading to a two-day conference in São Paulo in April 2017 to study Brazil's use of cultural power in foreign relations in the period from 1990 circa to 2015.

This is the third, and final, phase of a three-year project "De-Provincializing Soft Power: A Global-Historical Approach, 1990-2015," which was started in the fall of 2014 and is led by historian Victoria de Grazia with the support of the European Institute at Columbia University and of Columbia University's Global Centers in Istanbul, Beijing, and Rio de Janeiro.

The first phase of the overall project focused on Turkey and led to a conference in Istanbul in June 2015 hosted by the Columbia Global Center in Istanbul. The project just concluded its second phase, focused on China, and held a conference in Beijing on June 16-17, 2016 hosted by Renmin University and Columbia Global Center in Beijing. The project received funding from Alliance's Trilateral Initiatives in Emerging Regions for its second phase in 2016 and its Beijing conference.

In addition to the three initiators of the present proposal (Victoria de Grazia from Columbia University, Richard Balme from Sciences Po, and Jean Tible from São Paulo University), the project involves an international team of scholars who participated in the conferences in Istanbul (2015) and Beijing (2016) and which includes: Jack Snyder from Columbia's Department of Political Science, Richard John from Columbia's School of Journalism, Lerna Yanik from Kadir Has University in Istanbul, Dilek Barlas from Koc University, Mustafa Kutlay from TOBB University, Pang Zhongying and Wang Yiwei from Renmin University, and Fernando Santomauro of the City of Guarulhos, Brazil.

This application for funding from Alliance's Trilateral Initiatives in Emerging Regions **is only for the third phase** of the "De-Provincializing Soft Power" project and includes: 1) the preparation and organization of the **conference in São Paulo in April 2017** and 2) the completion of the research that will culminate in writing the first global history of the cultural persuasion in foreign policy. As this third phase is part of a larger ensemble, the present note describes the research question, conceptual background, and methodology of the overall project, and how the 2017 São Paulo conference fits into this project.

I. The Question:

The principal question our project addresses is this: How do emerging regional hegemony use cultural power in foreign relations at a time of significant global shifts in hegemony? This question arises from a set of prior questions that inform our methodological approach: Why did liberal American international relations theory coin the term 'soft power' circa 1990? Why did it evolve so differently from an equivalent term, "normative power," that was being debated in Europe in the same years? What accounted for the strikingly rapid diffusion of the term "soft power" across the globe from the outset of the 21st century? And how, as the concept was appropriated and functionalized in nations as different as Singapore, South Korea, and Russia, China, Turkey, and Brazil, did the practice of cultural power in international relations transform the nature of global governance?

The project started from the premise that the original concept was bound up with the re-founding of the U.S.-led liberal international order and began to be used in the early 1990s, when a more complex world of multilateralism, information technology, and international NGO networks emerged. The American term 'soft power' paralleled the European debates over the notion of "civilian" or "normative power," to the degree that despite different terminologies and historical experience, both were partaking in a transatlantic conversation over re-securing core western liberal values and widening the NATO Alliance.

Over the last two decades, emerging powers have more explicitly pursued their own “soft” agendas on the international stage. New regional actors reassessed how to position their own cultural resources to make their influence either commensurate or perhaps even superior to their economic, political, and military weight. Taking a global perspective, we thus treat the wildfire spread of the term “soft power” as an indicator of a larger creative anxiety over how to pursue national and multilateral interests. And we want to understand why in this historical period of time, roughly since the 1990s, but especially in the years of the Global War on Terrorism, the rise of the BRICs, and the extraordinary reconfiguration of sovereignty under the aegis of cyber-communicability, soft power has become a marker of a new kind of global intra-state political competition, and potentially, a new force for multilateral global governance.

Our approach has been to conduct a multilateral three-year study of the concept and practice of soft power in order to de-provincialize or de-locate it from the cross-Atlantic locus in which it was initially formulated and debated. The specific cases (Brazil, China, and Turkey) offer distinctive characteristics in this domain with respect to political cast, civilizational resources they have brought to foreign relations (coming out of meta-narratives about their pasts as empires or anti-colonialists), paradigmatic institutional practices, and how they have staked out territories of influence, often with an eye to one another’s presence. All have taken the soft power turn to rebalance the power of the United States and Europe, framing their values in post-colonial terms.

II. Conceptual Background

Since its inception, the project has made significant conceptual leaps. The first was to recognize that in quarter-century since when Harvard professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr. first formulated the term soft power, we can now engage with at least two successive cohorts of scholarly critique. “Soft power” studies has thus emerged as a way for the field of international relations to address issues such as reputation, emotions, and cultural complexity and to juxtapose geopolitical and IR theories with social and cultural theories: for example, Gramsci (hegemony), Bourdieu (cultural capital), Foucault (micro-power), Butler (performativity), and Grewal (network power). They also provide a new frame for debates to overhaul Cold War diplomacy and inspire a more historically and conceptually informed policy-school curricula to prepare students for careers in public, corporate, and NGO diplomacy.

The paradox, however, is that as the concept of soft power was disseminated globally, it has also become a key word that conceals more than it reveals. Local appropriation of the American-inflected “soft power” concept thus obfuscated the local taproots and originality of regional undertakings, at the same time as producing a more competitive politics of persuasion. More acutely aware of the changing character of American hegemony, emerging powers thus became more active in using their own cultural, financial, and other resources to rebalance American hard power, while European countries have promoted moral norms as the remedy for the American pursuit of hyper-power interests. New actors, moreover, have deployed soft-power instruments such as cultural institutes and development aid to compete with each other in terrains such as Africa where the United States and Europe once had relative monopolies. In many cases, particularly in China, reclaiming rights to cyber-sovereignty in response to U.S. tech companies has become a new terrain of competition.

In sum, as the multi-polar nature of global competition has advanced, the provinciality of the original conception of soft power, meant to restore America’s leading position in the world, has been exposed. Viewed from the global-historical perspective of our inquiry, the soft power moment assumes its truer historical and conceptual dimensions, to signal a distinct historical period, roughly from 1990 to 2015. This saw “soft power” after originating as a U.S. social invention, becoming global as it attached itself to national hegemonic projects, facilitated by the global economic bubble and to contrast American unilateralism, especially in military interventions. Whether this moment could be said to be over, starting from the financial crisis of 2008, is open to debate, though from our cases, putting Turkey, Brazil, the EU and the U.S. on one side, and the PRC on the other, outlooks toward investing governmental support for soft/normative power, have begun to diverge significantly.

III. Methodology: De-Locating/Re-Contextualizing “Soft Power”

Our project proposes to de-provincialize research and teaching about soft power at three levels: the first is to unpack the conditions and situations in which soft/normative power has emerged since the early 1990s; the second, probing the conditions in which the related concepts and practices circulate in our set of regional powers (Brazil, China, Turkey); the third, developing a historical approach to international system/relations to illuminate key constituents of change in state investment in cultural/communicative powers.

Brazil, China, and Turkey are all significant regional powers with interests bridging several continents, and have generated substantial literatures in the topic.¹ Rather than viewing them merely as counter-examples to American and European projects of soft/normative power, our goal, in each country has been to engage in a constant work of translation through which we identify the institutions, civil society initiatives, state and cultural diplomacy practices, commercial cultural activities, diasporic networks, and rhetorical toolkits countries draw on to reposition themselves in an age of international insecurity. The effort to engage historians with international relations experts for each country has been uniquely fruitful to understand how soft/normative power has become entangled in local debates over time, thereby providing a strong narrative thread for the quarter-century period, 1990-2015.

A selection of papers prepared for the Istanbul (June 2015) and Beijing (June 2016) conferences, as well as the list of participants at each conference can be accessed at <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/b8mmgdlg1a9zj1o/AABPx9oPcHpmcYd8IUfhjjIsa?dl=0>

Turkey, which was the focus of the first year of our project in 2014-2015, has been ambitious about asserting itself as a regional power since the mid-1980s, first under the rubric of the “Turkish model,” then, especially after the Justice and Development Party came to power in 2002, via “neo-Ottomanism.” In either model, Turkey drew on its historical and cultural heritage as an important soft power asset in public diplomacy, while simultaneously exploiting the opportunity of trade-driven foreign policy instruments towards the Balkans, the Middle East, and Turkic-language areas of the former USSR. The upheavals of Arab Spring, Turkey’s own heavy-handed crackdown on Gezi protests in 2013, and the fallout in late 2013 with the Gulen movement, which had provided ample organizational capacity in public diplomacy, mark a series of disruption to Turkey’s former pragmatic functionalist approach to soft power. Turkey’s ideological engagements with like-minded peers in the post-Arab Spring Middle East, the ongoing Syrian conflict and the refugee crisis, and the increasing authoritarianism of the JDP government not only point to a significant shift in Turkey’s cultural influence in foreign affairs, but also lead us to question the limits of “cultural power” by an increasingly coercive, nationalist states in a conflict-driven geopolitical environment.

In the second phase of the project (2015-2016), we analyzed China, which is a leading proponent of soft power after the EU with the largest budget share of any nation for public diplomacy practices. In addition to substantial investment in sports stadia and other social infrastructure in Africa, President Xi Jinping launched China’s “One Belt, One Road” (OBOR) initiative in 2013 to connect major Eurasian economies through infrastructure, trade and investment. With this initiative China has taken a significant leap forward in the conception and investment of “soft power” at a time when many similar initiatives by the U.S, Europe, Turkey, and Brazil have dropped off due to various political and/or economic crises. We find that is no coincidence. China deliberately positions its efforts in response to the insufficient economic capacity and growing domestic trade protectionism in many nation-states following the Great Recession in 2008. By proposing its own growth as a point of inspiration (“the great rejuvenation of an ancient human civilization”) and emphasizing to uphold joint construction of infrastructure and sharing of benefits, rather than “one-way outputs” such as the Marshall Plan, China’s Belt and Road initiative responds to the much-

¹ See selected bibliography for examples of the literature on the U.S., Europe, Brazil, China, and Turkey.

abused concept of “soft power,” while trying to adapt to a new global order of insecurity by building “multi-modal” networks of road and rail routes, gas pipelines, power grids, and fiber optics. Therefore, the case of China allows us to not only draw out comparisons with previous soft power projects (e.g. the Marshall Plan and other Western initiatives, Maoist undertakings or Soviet Bloc aid programs), but also examine how the country exploits its own identity and heritage, i.e. the so-called “Chinese character” of cultural hegemony. Our leading interlocutors in China, who are uniquely positioned to have been participant-observers of academic and policy debates over the past two decades, help us facilitate this research at the intersection of international history and IR.

Following this methodology for the final phase of our project (2016-2017), our third case, Brazil, will add to what we have already documented about the practices of Turkey and China. The “republic of diplomats,” as Alain Rouquié (2006) called it, Brazil opened up to a more ambitious regional influence as it moved from dictatorship to liberal government in the mid-1980s. Priding itself on not having waged war with its neighbors since 1870 and identifying as a “negotiating power,” in a jab at Global North military interventionism, Brazil was positioned over the last quarter-century as the Global South’s leader on the front of multi-cultural music, art and architecture, cinema and television, carnival, and (not least) football to position itself as a negotiator rather than aspiring hegemon. The country’s pronounced preference for soft power over hard power gained traction throughout the presidency of leftist populist Lula, who was a “soft rebel” that usually played by the rules, and occasionally asserted autonomy, such as opposing the Iraq War or winning the bids for hosting the World Cup in 2014 as well as the Olympics in 2016.

We will pursue a critical historical approach to locate when and how concepts and practices of cultural persuasion were introduced and transformed in Brazil. We will examine what kind of policies and institutions have been imperative in pushing “soft power” to the forefront of Brazilian diplomacy, along with the actors that latched onto these concepts. We will ask: What were the local notions that inflect positions and policies on cultural/soft/normative power? What are the relationships between Brazil’s domestic and international economic goals and its cultural efforts in foreign affairs? Especially, we will be building on our study of Chinese cultural/developmental politics toward Africa, to explore the different development and cultural politics embodied in Portuguese-language and post-colonial connections. Most importantly, we will investigate what the very recent events in Brazil, such as the World Cup in 2014, declining economic performance and allegations of corruption tell us about the state of cultural power in international relations in the post-recession global order? Our Brazilian interlocutors who come from the fields of international relations (Jean Tible, Fernando Santomauro) and international history (Hugo Rogelio Suppo, Monica Leite Lessa) will help question, historically, to what extent the “soft power” imaginary of a nation, its economy and status in the BRIC formation in a boom moment, could overreach its effective capacities.

IV. Organization of the Project

The present funding proposal is only for the third, and final, phase of the three-year project “De-Provincializing Soft Power.” This third phase will start in the fall of 2016, and will lead to **a two-day conference in São Paulo in April 2017**, jointly organized by Victoria de Grazia, Richard Balme, and Jean Tible. The conference will be hosted by the University of São Paulo.

The São Paulo conference will be organized along the same model as the conferences which the project held in Istanbul in June 2015 and in Beijing in June 2016. The goal of the conference will be three-fold: 1) we will address the overriding research agenda with papers by the core faculty and participants from the various countries involved; 2) we will adapt the scope of our overall project corresponding to the empirical cases we will examine in Brazil; and 3) we will solicit opportunities for student instruction and research by collaborating with graduate students from Columbia, Sciences Po, and São Paulo University.

Before the conference, Victoria de Grazia will, in coordination with Richard Balme and Jean Tible, circulate a think piece that will identify critical moments in the history of soft/normative power relevant to Brazil, key examples of current practices, and the canonical texts that inform debate. Faculty participants will not only prepare responses to this particular piece, but they will also raise questions so that conference sessions can focus on discussion. In the run-up to the São Paulo conference, project participants will use our Wikischolars website for continuing discussion and dissemination of their papers.

The São Paulo conference will bring together a group of 16 professors and students. Victoria de Grazia, Richard Balme, and Jean Tible will be joined by: 3 Columbia professors and students (including the project coordinator), 4 Brazilian professors and students from São Paulo and other universities, 1 student from Sciences Po, 3 professors from Turkey, 2 professors from China.

The project will have immediate as well as lasting outcomes in **capacity building** which will benefit the three universities represented by the principal initiators: **Columbia, Sciences Po, and São Paulo**. It will also help develop further the cooperation initiated in the first two phases of the project by Columbia and Sciences Po with **Koc University, TOBB University and Kadir Has University in Turkey and with Renmin University in Beijing**.

- The São Paulo conference, and the research conducted in preparation for it, will create opportunities for **faculty** from Columbia, Sciences Po, and São Paulo to enrich undergraduate and graduate courses on history of diplomacy and on related topics taught in their respective institutions. Project participants will compare and contrast syllabi, thereby raising questions about how to rethink theories of soft/normative power beyond the canonical texts that have emerged out of American and European undertakings.

Cooperation between Columbia and Sciences Po faculty in this project will also be greatly enhanced by the fact that Richard Balme will be teaching at Columbia as an **Alliance Visiting Professor at SIPA** in the 2017 spring semester, during which the São Paulo conference will take place.

- Simultaneously, the preparation for the São Paulo conference will offer a semester-long opportunity for **students** at Columbia, Sciences Po, and São Paulo to collaborate with faculty on their research and to interact with counterparts at the other universities. Students will develop research papers for the conference, where they will give feedback to each other and receive comments from the participating faculty. Participating graduate students will be able to continue their research beyond the conference for their degree program.

- Following the project conferences in Istanbul in 2015 and Beijing in 2016, the São Paulo conference will sustain and add to the international **network** of scholars and students, with strong anchors at Columbia, Sciences Po, Koc, TOBB, Kadir Has, Renmin, and São Paulo, whose discussion will be sustained through the Wikischolars site that includes relevant bibliography, proceedings of each conference, and working papers by the core faculty.

- After the conclusion of the overall three-year project, the knowledge and relationships built through the São Paulo conference (and the ones in Istanbul and Beijing) will support the writing of a succinct **global history of soft power**, jointly authored by Victoria de Grazia and participants from China, Brazil and Turkey. The working papers and relevant syllabi will be posted on an open-access website, and support the establishment an NEH Summer Seminar for College teachers which in its curriculum and guest lecturers will continue to draw on the transnational network.

The overall budget for the São Paulo conference and work leading to it is \$ 31,150. **The initiators of the project would be grateful to Alliance for considering funding to this project in the amount of \$ 15,000** to be allocated to the travel expenses of participants in the São Paulo conference.

The project's budget and expenses will be centrally managed by the European Institute at Columbia University. **Additional funding** for this project will come from matching funds from the Initiative on Cultural Power (ICP) fund at the European Institute. Per the donor's instructions, a contribution from the ICP fund will be made available to the European Institute only as a match to the funding to be received from Alliance.

Selected Bibliography

Appendix II: Selected Bibliography

On the U.S and Europe:

- Diez, Thomas. 2013. "Normative Power as Hegemony." *Cooperation and Conflict* 48(2): 194–210.
- Keene, Edward. 2013. "Social Status, Social Closure and the Idea of Europe as a 'normative Power.'" *European Journal of International Relations* 19(4): 939–56.
- Keene, Edward. 2014. "The Standard of 'Civilisation', the Expansion Thesis and the 19th-Century International Social Space." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 42(3):651–73.
- Parmar, Indirjeet and Michael Cox. *Soft Power and US Foreign Policy: Theoretical Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Seybert, Lucia A. and Peter J. Katzstein. Forthcoming. "Circulatory Power in World Politics."
- Tocci, Nathalie, ed. 2008. *Who Is a Normative Foreign Policy Actor?: The European Union and Its Global Partners*. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.

On Brazil:

- Casanova, Lourdes and Julian Kassum. "From Soft to Hard Power: In Search of Brazil's Winning Blend." INSEAD Faculty & Research Working Paper, 2013.
- Dumont, Juliette and Anaïs Lechét. *Brazilian Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century "Pelo que é nosso!": a diplomacia cultural brasileira no século XX*. 2014.
- Rouquié, Alain. *Le Brésil au XXIe siècle: naissance d'un nouveau grand*. Paris: Fayard. 2006
- Lessa, Mônica Leite; Suppr, Hugo Rogélio (Eds.) *A Quarta Dimensão das Relações Internacionais: a dimensão cultural*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa; Faperj, 2012.

On China:

- Barr, Michael. *Who's Afraid of China? The Challenge of Chinese Soft Power*. London: Zed Books, 2011.
- Brautigam, Deborah. *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Li, Mingjiang, ed. *Soft Power: China's Emerging Strategy in International Politics*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2011.
- Li, Shubo and Helge Rønning. "China in Africa: Soft power, media perceptions and a pan-developing identity." *Chr. Michelsen Institute, CMI Brief* 12:3 (2013).
- Wang, Yiwei. *The Belt and Road Initiative: What Will China Offer the World in Its Rise*. New World Press. 2016.

On Turkey:

- Atalay, Zeynep. "Civil Society as Soft Power: Islamic NGO's and Turkish Foreign Policy." *Turkey between Nationalism and Globalization*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Barlas, Dilek. 2005. "Turkish Diplomacy in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. Opportunities and Limits for Middle-Power Activism in the 1930s." *Journal of Contemporary History* 40(3):441–64.
- Fisher Onar, Nora. "Neo-Ottomanism, Historical Legacies and Turkish Foreign Policy." *The German Marshall Fund, EDAM Discussion Paper Series*, October 2009.
- Oktem, Kerem. "Projecting power: Non-Conventional Policy Actors in Turkey's International Relations" in *Another Empire: A Decade of Turkey's Foreign Policy under the Justice and Development Party*, ed. Kerem Öktem, Ayşe Kadioğlu, and Mehmet Karli. Istanbul: Istanbul University Press, (2012): 77-108.

Curriculum Vitae

Victoria de Grazia (American) is Moore Collegiate Professor of History at Columbia and directs the European Institute. The project builds on Professor de Grazia's longstanding work on transatlantic and international history which culminated in two lines of publications, one on transatlantic commodity and cultural flows (*Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth Century Europe*, Harvard 2005, with editions in Italian, German, Spanish, and forthcoming in Chinese), the other on consumer cultures (*The Sex of Things: Women and Gender in Historical Perspective*, California 1996).

As Director of Columbia University's European Institute from 2008 to 2015, de Grazia has mounted numerous projects related to international history and soft power. These include a multiyear project on The Great Powers in the Mediterranean. Over the past three years, she has overseen co-curricular programs in the field of new diplomacy in collaboration with colleagues in the Journalism School and SIPA and involving students and practitioners from the military, international philanthropy, international broadcasting, and diplomacy.

Victoria de Grazia was educated at Smith College, the University of Florence, and Columbia University, where she received her Ph.D. in history with distinction in 1976. A member of the founding collective of *Radical History Review*, de Grazia has served on the board of editors of numerous international journals including the *Journal of Modern History*, *Genèses*, *Contemporary European History*, and the *Journal of Consumer Culture*. From 1997 to 2002, she was the National Chair of the Council for European Studies. In addition to teaching at the Free University in Berlin, University of Fudan, Università degli Studi Federico II in Naples, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and European University Institute in Florence, where she held a chair from 2002 to 2004, she has lectured widely on themes related to the history of international commercial and consumer circuits. From 1995 to 1997, she directed Columbia's Institute for Research on Women and Gender and continues to serve on its steering committee.

De Grazia has been the recipient of numerous awards for the study of European history, notably the Rome Prize of the American Academy in Rome, two Jean Monnet Fellowships from the European University Institute, a Fulbright scholarship, and grants from the German Marshall Fund of the United States, ACLS, and Guggenheim Foundation. In 2005, she was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Richard Balme (French) is Professor at the Paris School of International Affairs, and Senior Fellow at the Centre for European Studies in Sciences Po. He is the scientific director of the Master in International Public Management and of the Executive Master "Politiques et Management du Développement – Potentiel Afrique". He regularly teaches as Visiting Professor at the School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University in Beijing.

He teaches public policy analysis, comparative politics and international relations. His current research interests cover EU-China relations, comparative environmental governance, and climate change policy and diplomacy. Among his recent publications are *European Governance and Democracy: Power and Protest in the European Union*, (with D. Chabanet, Rowman and Littlefield 2008); *Europe-Asia Relations: Building Multilateralisms*, (with B. Bridges, Palgrave, 2008); *Administration et Action Publique en Chine contemporaine*, *Revue Française d'Administration Publique*, 150, 2014.

Balme obtained research grants from the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), the National Science Foundation, the Fondation Jean Jaures, and the Lee Hysan Foundation in Hong Kong. He was an appointed member of the Conseil Economique, Social et de l'Environnement (2012-2014), and of the Sino-French High Level Expert Group preparing for the COP 21 in Paris (2013-2015).

Jean Tible (Brazilian) is Professor of International Relations at São Paulo University, and author of *Marx Selvagem* (Savage Marx, São Paulo: Annablume, 2013). He graduated from the Catholic University of São Paulo with a B.A. in International Relations (2001), received an MA in International Relations from the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (2005) and a Ph.D. in Sociology from the State University of Campinas (2012). His research interests include Marxism, Brazilian foreign policy, social movements, international relations theory and political theory.

Budget
Conference in São Paulo, April 2017
(in US \$)

Expected sources of funding	
Alliance's contribution sought in this application NB: Alliance's funding will be applied to travel expenses only	15,000
Initiative on Cultural Power (ICP) at the European Institute NB: ICP funding to match Alliance's funding	15,000
European Institute's additional contribution	1,150
Expected total contributions	31,150
Estimated costs	
Human resources Including: Project Coordinator's salary at \$ 3,000	3,000
International travel for conference participants Including: 5 return flights from New York to São Paulo at \$1,200 1 return flight from Paris/Berlin to São Paulo at \$1,500 3 return flights from Istanbul to São Paulo at \$ 600 2 return flights from Beijing to São Paulo at \$2,000 NB: European Institute already purchased tickets for flights from Istanbul which were not use in phase 2 of the project, and cost mentioned above (\$ 600 each) is the estimated additional fee for changing tickets.	13,300
Lodging Including: 4 nights at \$250 for 6 participants coming from outside the Americas 3 nights at \$250 for 5 participants coming from New York	9,750
Local transportation	900
Food NB: lunch, dinner, and coffee for 16 participants for 2 days	1,600
Conference Room at São Paulo University cleaning fees and various	600
Total direct costs	29,150
Indirect costs Administration and Program support	2,000
Estimated total costs	31,150

Timeline

September - October 2016	<p>Conference call between the three main initiators of the project (Victoria de Grazia, Richard Balme, and Jean Tible) to review the work of the Beijing conference of June 2016, and launch the preparation of the São Paulo conference.</p> <p>Meeting of Columbia's core faculty participating in the project with Professor Balme and Tible in conference call.</p>
November -December 2016	<p>Think piece - prepared by Victoria de Grazia in coordination with Richard Balme and Jean Tible – circulated to conference participants.</p>
February-March 2017	<p>Participants in the conference disseminate their papers on the conference Wikischolars website.</p>
April 2017	<p>Conference in São Paulo hosted by São Paulo University</p>
April-May 2017	<p>Wrapping up of conference materials and discussions</p>