Middle East Journal of Agriculture Research
Volume: 12 | Issue: 04| Oct. – Dec.| 2023

EISSN: 2706-7955 ISSN: 2077-4605
DOI: 10.36632/mejar/2023.12.4.50
Journal homepage: www.curresweb.com
Pages: 747-771

Gastro-Diplomacy or food diplomacy: A Case study

Martin Hilmi

Governance Consultant, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome, Italy

Received: 24 Oct. 2023 **Accepted:** 20 Nov. 2023 **Published:** 05 Dec. 2023

ABSTRACT

The research had as its main aim to consider the role and importance of Persian cuisine in diplomacy (gastro-diplomacy) within the context of Iranian foreign policy. The research considered the Iranian context in terms of the economy, society, culture, politics and agri-food sector and its foreign policy and public diplomacy. It also considered the background to gastro-diplomacy and how it, within the overall context of public diplomacy, is also intermingled with trade diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and nation marketing and branding. The research was conducted using an abductive approach, which leaned somewhat to the qualitative side of such an approach and was based on literature, sources of secondary data and information, and primary data and information found within, based, for example, on country cases and online videography. The research conducted was divided into three phases, an initial exploratory research of literature and sources of secondary data and information, this being followed by an in-depth second exploratory research of literature and sources of secondary data and information and a third phase which provided for a far more in-depth research of literature and sources of secondary data and information. The analysis was conducted via using coding and categorizing (both deductively and inductively) and then comparing the findings with gastro-diplomacy practices derived from literature and sources of secondary data and information and from country-based cases found within. The findings delineated public diplomacy, trade diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and of course gastro-diplomacy. The findings also provided for the delineation of Iranian foreign policy and in particular Iranian public diplomacy, and in specific Iranian gastro-diplomacy. These findings, provided that, interestingly, even though Iran, has a centuries old tradition in its foreign policy theory and practice to place Persian food and cuisine at the centre stage, gastro-diplomacy in its modern foreign policy, and in specific public diplomacy, had a minimal role, with no country directed public sector strategy, policy programme and specifically devoted institution. However, gastro-diplomacy was found to have a large role to play in citizen and people to people diplomacy, commonly fostered by restaurants and supermarkets found in foreign countries. Also such practices were found to contribute considerably to the marketing and branding of Iran. The limitations of the dissertation were based on time and budget constraints primarily, which implied, for example, only using literature and secondary sources of data and information.

Keywords: Agriculture, Food, Cuisine, Gastronomy, Gastro-diplomacy, Public diplomacy, Nation marketing, Nation branding, Iran.

Introduction

Gastro-diplomacy is not a very well-known term as per its novelty, in general, and in particular in the agricultural and food sector and in specific at the governance and policy level of the agri-food sector. Gastro-diplomacy can be defined as simply a practice of 'sharing a nation's cultural heritage through cuisine' (Solleh, 2015). Indeed, gastro-diplomacy went from the 'unknown' subject matter area on to being found in debates and discussions in academic journals, and this all within only a few years (Rockower, 2014). However, as per such novelty, gastro-diplomacy does, per se, seemingly call for further research to be conducted. In fact, Rockower (2020) points to the fact that in the last decade gastro-diplomacy has become an important element of public diplomacy, for example, and thus this also

Corresponding Author: Martin Hilmi, Governance Consultant, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome, Italy.
E-mail: - martin.hilmi@fao.org

pointing to the fact that further research is needed. Moreover, Luša & Jakešević (2017) provide that gastro-diplomacy in terms of current theory and research, lag considerably behind actual practice. This also pointing to the need for further research on the subject matter.

In this regard, Zhang (2015), interestingly, documents a series of public sector gastro-diplomacy campaigns by Japan, Malaysia, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand, while Pham (2013) provides a case study on the Republic of Korea's gastro-diplomacy, Solleh (2015) provides also a case on Malaysia, while Debora *et al*., (2015) provide a comparative study on gastro-diplomacy between Malaysia and the Republic of Korea and Rockower (2014) also points to case studies provided in the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Peru. This indicates that country based cases in terms of gastro-diplomacy are viable and feasible and in this regard, deriving from the research and review of literature and sources of secondary data and information, which also included within primary data and information, and taking into full consideration the boundaries of this research, Iran has not seemingly been covered in terms of gastro-diplomacy. Iran is also apt for such research as Rockower (2014) provides that gastro-diplomacy is commonly, but not always, found in middle powers states and indeed this reflects Iran as such.

This further research on gastro-diplomacy also adds value as per incrementing knowledge on the subject matter, contributing also to the conceptual and theoretical foundations of the subject matter and helps further fill many of the calls for further research on the subject matter. The research further enhances this stance by focusing on Iran, hence adding another country case study to the subject matter area.

Aim and objectives of the research

The main aim of the research was to attempt to understand what the role and importance of gastro-diplomacy was within public sector Iranian public diplomacy. Within this main research aim there were four main objectives: What is gastro-diplomacy? What direct and indirect role does gastro-diplomacy have within Iranian public diplomacy? Does gastro-diplomacy in fact have a significant role to play within Iranian public diplomacy? Does gastro-diplomacy in fact contribute to Iranian public diplomacy and nation marketing and branding?

Background

Gastro-diplomacy, as defined by Rockower (2020), is a 'concerted public diplomacy campaign by a national government that combines culinary and cultural diplomacy—often backed up by monetary investment or other tangible resources—to raise its nation-brand status, and not simply an ad hoc or one-off culinary tasting event.' Further, Solleh (2015) considers gastro-diplomacy as food in the diplomatic process and as the practice of sharing a cultural-cuisine heritage. Cuisine and related food and its ingredients are an integral part of what is termed cultural diplomacy. Cull (2009) defines cultural diplomacy as an attempt by an actor to facilitate the actor's culture internationally so as to facilitate the management of the international context. The transmission of culture within the international scene commonly occurs, among the many 'vehicles' of diplomacy, as also for example, via trade diplomacy. Interestingly trade, as provided by Pigman (2016), is in fact diplomacy, as it is an ongoing exchange process, that also provides, inevitably, for social change as per the cultural significance, among the many, of products and services traded. Thus gastro-diplomacy is embedded within cultural and trade diplomacy, but also is found within, as per its very nature, contributing to nation marketing and branding.

Dinnie (2016) provides that the brand of a nation is 'defined as the unique, multidimensional blend of elements that provide the nation with culturally grounded differentiation and relevance for all of its target audiences.' Nation branding attempts to foster successful outcomes in terms of, for example, trade, exports, tourism and so forth (Dinnie & Sevin, 2020), via developing and managing the reputation, identity and image of a country (Kaefer, 2020). In fact, nation branding and marketing are also provided to be akin to what is called public diplomacy. In the words of Mellisen (2005) 'nation-branding and public diplomacy are sisters under the skin.'

Public diplomacy is the attempt by an actor to manage, via foreign public engagement, the international context (Cull, 2009). Indeed, public diplomacy is about state actors interacting with global publics or target audiences, whereas diplomacy in the traditional sense is primarily relations between governments (Snow, 2009). In sum, public diplomacy is the shift of diplomacy towards publics. The

prominent objective of public diplomacy is to attempt to influence indirectly publics and thus also have influence, indirectly, over foreign governments (Berridge, 2015). This much like, nation marketing and branding, cultural and gastro-diplomacy is conducted using what is termed 'soft power.' In fact, nations in their diplomatic efforts have usually three main 'strategies' to attempt to provide for successful outcomes in the international context: sticks, carrots and attraction (Nye, 2008). Soft power is basically an attraction strategy based on the attraction power and capabilities of a nation. The soft power of a nation according to Nye (2008) rests on three resources: its culture, its political values and its foreign policies. Thus, it is clear that public diplomacy involves a much broader and diverse set of public or target audiences than 'traditional' diplomacy,' with a far broader range of interests, image and reputation building (Leonard *et al*., 2002) and more subtle forms of diplomacy as, for example, that provided by gastro-diplomacy. As such public diplomacy is intertwined with nation marketing and branding, trade diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and gastro-diplomacy.

The Iranian context

Iran has a current population of circa 84 million, with a per annum growth rate of about 1.3 percent (BTI, 2022). The country is prevalently urban with circa 76.3 percent of the population living in urban areas and 23.7 percent living in rural areas (FAO, 2023). The Iranian government has a strong focus on centralization, including its administrative organization, security and intelligence apparatus and the economy (BTI, 2022). The economy is mainly in the hands of the public sector, circa 80 percent, via fully public or semi-public organizations, and the private sector, which accounts for about 20 percent of the economy, and is provided by mainly private companies and cooperatives (BTI, 2022). However, a good deal of public enterprises are not owned by the government, but are in the hands of religious, military and revolutionary foundations, which are controlled, directly or indirectly, by the supreme leader (BTI, 2022). In 2020, Iran's GDP was US$610.66 billion compared to US$583.7 billion of 2019 and US$435.59 billion of 2018, but the real GDP growth contracted from 12.5 percent in 2016 to -5 percent in 2020 (BIT, 2022), while the inflation rate (CPI) decreased from 41 percent in 2019 to 30.5 percent in 2020 (BIT, 2022).

Within the economy, agriculture still plays a key role, as it accounts for circa 20 percent of GDP and employs one third of the work force (Rashidghalam, 2020). The government has as its main objective that of self-sufficiency and provides a number of supports and trade policies in merit to protect the sector (Motamed, 2017). This self-sufficiency objective has provided that the sector be heavily regulated in attempts to ensure food security and avert foreign competition, but has resulted cyclically in trade deficits (MFAD, 2017). The sector is composed mainly of small privately owned farms, of circa 10 hectares, which are not profitable, and many work collectively, but do not have direct access to markets as food goes through differing distribution options prior to arriving at the retail level (MFAD, 2017). There are myriad of public organizations involved in the sector that range from the Iranian Ministry of Agricultural Jihad, and its numerous sub-organizations, to the Ministry of Health and Medical Education to the Ministry of Industry, Mine and Trade and also includes: 31 associations, 31 unions, 11 councils/cooperatives/consortiums, 21 universities and 27 research centres (MFAD, 2017). Iran, overall though, in terms of agricultural production and related products has seemingly reached 80 percent self-sufficiency (Due Diligence, 2021). Thus, Iran's motivations for trade in agricultural goods is somewhat dampened, even though exports still remain strategic, and exports have increased over the recent years, but Iran still imports considerably,[1] providing for a negative trade balance (Due Diligence, 2021).

However, after many decades, the Iranian economy is still caught in a myriad of informal payments, nepotism, interferences and bureaucratization, and along with such mismanagement, increased sanctions and the pandemic have all severely affected economic outcomes (BIT, 2022). Indeed, there is still not a general consensus on what the Iranian economy should be, its main objectives and aims, what it should represent and what it should ultimately provide in terms of outcomes and impact, both internally and externally (Pesaran, 2011). In fact, the quest of Iran's economic independence can best be seen as perplexing (Pesaran, 2011) as it seems in a constant state of

[1] Motamed (2017) provides that, among other factors, imports are for major gains, as per the increase in population, increasing incomes and production constraints that are physical in nature, while MFAD (2017) provides imports are owed too outdated farming practices and the lack of machinery use.

fluctuation, this much in line with what is provided by Gohardani & Tizro, (2019) in that Iranian society is constantly undergoing 'turbulence', which never seems to settle in a stable social order, based on an established clear set of institutional arrangements. Still Gohardani & Tizro, (2019) consider that the root causes to this, generally, were from three strong 'recent' historical events: the constitutional revolution of 1906, the Oil Nationalization Movement of the early 1950s, and the Islamic Revolution of 1979. Indeed, Iranian society is seemingly still in a constant dynamic and permanent flux, and there is a general sense of disillusionment as well as despair with the situation that is felt by Iranians and non-Iranians alike (Gohardani & Tizro, 2019).

Methodology

Public diplomacy is a fairly and relatively novel field (Gilboa, 2008) and gastro-diplomacy, which is inherently part of public diplomacy, is even more novel (Rockower, 2014). This relative novelty of public diplomacy provides for an underdeveloped theoretical perspective and thus and consequently lacks a guiding comprehensive and integrated theoretical framework (Golan, 2015; Gilboa, 2008). In fact, for example, public diplomacy scholarship relies on such fields as political science, mass communications and international affairs (Golan & Yaung, 2015). Gilboa (2008) further provides that the subject matters that contribute to public diplomacy are many and varied and comprise, for example: marketing, branding, rhetoric, cultural studies, technology, psychology, political science, history, international relations, sociology, cultural studies, and public opinion. Thus, seeing that gastro-diplomacy is part of public diplomacy, its novelty and lack of well-defined theoretical framework, can imply, seemingly, for theoretical limitations and as such consideration for this was accounted for within this research.

The research took a positivist and objectivist research philosophy stance (deductive) and a constructivist and interpretivist research philosophy stance (inductive), in other words an abductive approach. However, the abductive approach 'leaned' more towards a qualitative stance, by degree, which was based predominantly on literature and sources of secondary data and information, but also included primary data and information that were found within, for example, cases studies and online videos of interviews and presentations. The research conducted was divided into three phases, an initial exploratory research of literature and sources of secondary data and information[2], this being followed by an in-depth second exploratory research of literature and sources of secondary data and information[3] and a third phase which provided for a far more in-depth research of literature and sources of secondary data and information[4].

The first explorative research phase of the research focused on identifying key search terms; while the second phase focused on an in-depth exploratory research. The research commenced with an exploratory research of literature and sources of secondary data and information in an attempt to identify key search terms to be used for the research. This attempted to consider key search terms that were related directly and indirectly to the research's main aim and objectives. The following key search terms were found: gastro-diplomacy; gastro diplomacy; gastrodiplomacy; gastro-diplomacy Iran; gastro diplomacy Iran; gastrodiplomacy Iran; Iranian gastro-diplomacy; Iranian gastro diplomacy; Iranian gastrodiplomacy; gastro nationalism; gastro-nationalism; gastronationalism; gastro nationalism Iran; gastro-nationalism Iran; gastronationalism Iran; Iranian gastro nationalism; Iranian gastro-nationalism; Iranian gastronationalism; food diplomacy; food diplomacy Iran; Iranian food diplomacy; culinary diplomacy; culinary diplomacy Iran; Iranian culinary diplomacy; cultural diplomacy; cultural diplomacy Iran; Iranian cultural diplomacy; public diplomacy; public diplomacy Iran; Iranian public diplomacy; Iranian foreign policy; nation marketing; country marketing; nation branding; nation marketing Iran; country marketing Iran; nation branding Iran; Iranian nation marketing; Iranian country marketing; Iranian nation branding; diplomacy; diplomacy Iran; Iranian diplomacy.

With the above key research terms in hand, the second phase of the research focused on an in-depth exploratory research conducted using four main online search engines: Google Scholar; Research Gate; Refseek; and Science Gate. This resulted in a number of publications being found, which were mainly books and journal articles, but also some online articles and videos (interviews and

[2] This was provided over a two month period circa, between August and September 2022.
[3] The second phase of the research lasted circa three months, between December 2022 and February 2023.
[4] The third phase of the research lasted circa five months, between March and July 2023.

presentations) and country-based case studies of actual gastro-diplomacy practices. The publications were selected based on a number of criteria: who collected the data and information; when it was collected; how was it collected; what was collected; peer review process conducted; date of publication; identifiable authors; identifiable publisher; and references used. A preliminary analysis of the literature and secondary sources of data and information was provided qualitatively. The literature and sources of secondary data and information were analysed via content analysis: coding and categorizing (both deductively and inductively) (Lamont, 2015), in a continuous (as sources were coming in) and in an iterative manner. The criteria used for quality within the research followed those of reliability, validity and replication as provided by Bryman (2012) but were qualitative in nature and thus based on trustworthiness and credibility. The results of the exploratory research provided for some guidance to the next research phase.

The third phase of the research involved an in-depth research of literature and sources of secondary data and information, and was conducted in a systematic[5] way and was also exploratory, but also historical and descriptive. This research used online search engines, online databases and specific academic journals. These were as follows: Core; Google Scholar; JSTOR Arts & Sciences I Collection; Research Gate; Refseek; Science Gate; and specific academic journals on Iran: Iran; Iranian studies; and Iranian review of foreign affairs. The key search terms used were the same as in the first research phase: gastro-diplomacy; gastro diplomacy; gastrodiplomacy; gastro-diplomacy Iran; gastro diplomacy Iran; gastrodiplomacy Iran; Iranian gastro-diplomacy; Iranian gastro diplomacy; Iranian gastrodiplomacy; gastro nationalism; gastro-nationalism; gastronationalism; gastro nationalism Iran; gastro-nationalism Iran; gastronationalism Iran; Iranian gastro nationalism; Iranian gastro-nationalism; Iranian gastronationalism; food diplomacy; food diplomacy Iran; Iranian food diplomacy; culinary diplomacy; culinary diplomacy Iran; Iranian culinary diplomacy; cultural diplomacy; cultural diplomacy Iran; Iranian cultural diplomacy; public diplomacy; public diplomacy Iran; Iranian public diplomacy; Iranian foreign policy; nation marketing; country marketing; nation branding; nation marketing Iran; country marketing Iran; nation branding Iran; Iranian nation marketing; Iranian country marketing; Iranian nation branding; diplomacy; diplomacy Iran; Iranian diplomacy.

As like in the second phase of the research, analysis of the literature and secondary sources of data and information were provided qualitatively. The literature and sources of secondary data and information were analysed via content analysis: coding and categorizing (both deductively and inductively) (Lamont, 2015), in a continuous (as sources were coming in) and in an iterative manner. The findings from the analysis were then used in a comparative manner with gastro-diplomacy practices derived from literature and sources of secondary data and information and from country-based cases. The criteria used for quality within the research followed those of reliability, validity and replication as provided by Bryman (2012) but were qualitative in nature and thus based on trustworthiness and credibility.

The research methods employed provided for limitations to be considered in the findings and related conclusions of the research, thus implying limitations to inferences that can be made to a wider universe. The limitations were the novelty of the subject matter area of gastro-diplomacy and the underdeveloped theoretical perspective related to the subject matter area. Further the lack of budget, also implied limitations, as for example, being able to do empirical work in Iran, was not possible. Also, time constraints did not allow, for example, to carry out filed interviews and online interviews, and consideration had to be given to the common lengthy time needed to go through qualitative data and information. True, the research, even though taking an abductive stance, leaned far more towards a qualitative stance. In fact, and in this regard, commonly thought, limitations of qualitative research methods had to be considered. Such limitations, for example, being: implied limitations of previous researches; non-causality; non-statistical representation; verification of findings can be challenging; researcher bias; researcher interpretation; maintaining rigor; inferences to a wider universe; etc. However, and interestingly, Tracy (2020) provides that such common limitations can be averted, via for example, applying qualitative methods for replicability, validity and reliability, and generalizations to the wider universe can be provided by using significant cases that are representative.

[5] This focused mainly on meta-ethnography but did not exclude meta-analysis.

Findings

Trade diplomacy

Cull (2009) provides that diplomacy is an attempt by an actor to engage with other actors on the international scene so as to try and manage the international context. In fact, it can be stated with a good degree of confidence that for centuries, trade has been one of the main motivators for international diplomacy and an integral part of it (Berridge, 2015). For example, one of the main reasons for the spread of diplomatic missions in the past was indeed trade (Berridge, 2015). Trade diplomacy is defined by Tussi (2013) as attempting to managing trade, trade regimes and trade regime influences on markets both nationally, internationally and globally. In essence trade is the exchange of goods, services, capital, and labour, and is an ongoing process (Pigman, 2016) and this in turn provides for inevitable social change. For example, people from different nations exchange products and services which have defined cultural values and identities embedded within. Thus, and fundamentally trade diplomacy fosters 'cultural trade.' However, trade diplomacy is now not only a government to government, international trade institutions, and treaties affairs, but is comprised of a plethora of multiple stakeholders that directly and indirectly affect trade diplomacy ranging from global enterprises to NGOs, to climate activists, to citizens, to community organizations (Pigman, 2016). Overall, thus trade diplomacy is not only one of the main motivators of diplomacy per se, but is also inherently linked and intertwined to public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and gastro-diplomacy.

Public diplomacy

Commonly, public diplomacy concerns governments interacting with foreign publics, in attempts to augment influence, so as to obtain support for foreign policy aims in a particular country, for example (Mellisen, 2005; Snow, 2009). Sharp (2005) defines public diplomacy as a process of direct relations with the publics of foreign countries to facilitate the values of another country, while Cull (2009) provides that it is the attempt of an actor, internationally, to manage international contexts via relations and engagements with foreign publics and Berrigde (2015), interestingly, defines public diplomacy as 'white propaganda' (propaganda rebranding) mainly targeted at foreign publics. Interestingly, Leonard *et al*., (2002) provide that effectively public diplomacy and its related efforts are public goods.

The main characteristics of public diplomacy according to Hocking (2005); Henrikson (2006); and Cull (2009) are: international communications and broadcasting; advocacy; listening; exchange; culture; accountability; social network intensification; public social media; nation rebranding; and consolidation, containment, penetration, enlargement, transformation, and partnering. In public diplomacy, according to Cull (2009), what is done is important, not what is said. Berrigde (2015) points to public diplomacy 'going over the heads' of government, i.e., indirect diplomacy, which attempts to appeal to and influence foreign publics. Golan & Yang (2015) further this point, providing that public diplomacy is mainly about communications management in attempts to cultivate long term relations with foreign publics, with the ultimate objective of gaining support for a country's foreign policy. Snow (2020) adds in, of course, power. Power here also meaning in what is termed soft power. Soft power according to Nye (2008) can be defined as being able to obtain the desired outcome via attraction and as such persuading others to adopt one's own goals. It rests on three resources of a nation state: foreign policy, political values and culture: but it is based on more than argumentation, persuasion and influence, it is the capacity to entice and attract (Nye, 2008). However as provided by Schneider (2006) it all requires 'hard dollars'. Further, Snow (2020) considers the comparative advantage with regard to soft power of a country being based on: the culture and norms being in tune with prevailing global norms; credibility being enhanced by a nation's domestic and foreign behaviour; and access to communications channels.

Still Snow (2009) points to a 'shift' in public diplomacy that now also concerns, for example, people and groups of people, non-governmental organizations, etc., that can potentially influence, directly and indirectly, opinions and attitudes about a foreign policy provided by a government. To a much greater degree, public diplomacy has become a form of people to people diplomacy (Snow, 2009). The reasons for this are multiple, for example, one among the many, has been the rise, reach, ease of access and low cost of information and communication technologies, enabling easier and greater

information exchange across borders, greater person to person interactions and more transparency[6] (Snow, 2009). Interestingly Golan & Yang (2015) provide for a 'new' and 'integrated' public diplomacy that considers the relational approach, not only with governments, but also, and importantly, for example, with the private sector, NGOs, citizens, etc.; the shaping of communications and related information; the shaping of discussions and debates in all media; nation marketing and branding; culture and values; and policies. All these approaches being considered in the short, medium and long term. Leonard *et al*., (2002) provide that public diplomacy is about: understanding other countries' needs, people and culture; building relations; communicating; attempting to adjust misunderstandings and misconceptions; finding areas of commonality and of interest; involving stakeholders; and positioning and augmenting image and reputation.

Cultural diplomacy

Embedded in diplomacy, in particular trade diplomacy, and more in specific within public diplomacy is cultural diplomacy. Cultural interactions between people, and more recently nation states, have a very long history. In fact, Bound *et al*., (2007) provide that the exchange of cultures has been intermingled with foreign relations for centuries. Culture and its exchange can be seen as a 'soft power' aspect of relations in the international context as opposed to the 'hard' aspects of, such matters as, for example, international agreements, international organizations, international military alliances and so forth (Bound *et al*., 2007). However, and inevitably, such a soft aspect of diplomacy will percolate, into hard aspects of diplomacy. In fact, it is via cultural exchanges that points of differences are found and points of commonality are also found as culture provides for discussion and debate as well as for exposition and explanation, for example (Bound *et al*., 2007).

Cull (2009) defines cultural diplomacy as an attempt by an actor to facilitate the actor's culture internationally so as to facilitate and enable the management of the international context. Cultural diplomacy is basically the 'export' of cultural examples (Cull, 2009), and was traditionally linked to interactions among elites (Bound *et al*., 2007). However, now cultural diplomacy is multifaceted (Mellisen, 2005). It comprises culture as a medium of mass people to people exchanges that are so fast moving, as a result of, for example, the expansion of internet connectivity, that diplomacy itself is seemingly directed by cultural diplomacy (Bound *et al*., 2007). Indeed, culture does have the ability to reach large numbers of people, and deliver some clear tangible and intangible 'products' and 'services' that support nation marketing and branding and such products and services being defined how people perceive not just such products and services, but also each other (Bound *et al*., 2007).

Importantly though, cultural diplomacy is what can be termed a two-way street (Schneider, 2006), where feedback, for example, can also be received on cultural products, such as food, for example. Cultural diplomacy can thus foster understanding between people and their cultures and provide a good medium, for enhancing image and nation branding, for example. Further, cultural diplomacy is about hearts and minds, but also about tourism and its economy (Bound *et al*., 2007). Moreover, and even if formally distinct, cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy have common overlaps and objectives (Bound *et al*., 2007) and in the realm of building relations, not only with other governments, but also other societies, as boundaries are starting to blur even further (Mellisen, 2005). In fact, for example, to obtain more and better outcomes from diplomacy in general and public diplomacy in particular, 'piggybacking' on cultural events, interacting with non-state actors and their initiatives becomes a 'must' for most diplomats (Mellisen, 2005) in the present day.

Gastro-diplomacy

Food, and its related cuisine, are one of the most vivid expressions of culture. In fact, one of the most traded 'cultural products,' with a high degree of economic importance, is not just food, but restaurant cuisine (Waldfogel, 2020). Since time immemorial food has always played a major part in relations between people, and within the more modern era of nations states, such a role has become

[6] In the era of digitalization, online diplomacy is termed digital diplomacy. Manor (2019, p.15) provides that digital diplomacy requires a long-term perspective that 'influences the norms, values, working routines and structures of diplomatic institutions, as well as the self-narratives or metaphors diplomats employ to conceptualize their craft'.

even more prominent in international politics and related diplomacy. In fact, agriculture in itself has taken on a rather unprecedented role in diplomacy (McGlade, 2009), this being owed also to storage and transport 'revolutions' which have enabled and facilitated food to become global for the first time (Nau, 1978), with a good degree of consistency and intensity. Food can be used by governments in various ways, in terms of diplomacy, as a source of strength and influence in both agricultural and food markets as well as in political and economic relations (Nau, 1978), but as provided by Curtiss (1946) food can go undetected by many, as it can have a rather subtle role in relations between people and nation states. Indeed, food can play a powerful role in terms of soft power (Luša & Jakešević, 2017) and is often used for non-food related purposes, as food itself involves political, cultural, social, economic and natural environmental elements (Nau, 1978), including climate and its impact on climate change.

In this regard gastro-diplomacy[7] is a 'concerted public diplomacy campaign by a national government that combines culinary and cultural diplomacy—often backed up by monetary investment or other tangible resources—to raise its nation-brand status, and not simply an ad hoc or one-off culinary tasting event, via a holistic and educational approach that raises international awareness of a country's culinary and cultural heritage' (Rockower, 2020, p. 206). Pham (2013) also provides a definition for gastro-diplomacy as a public sector effort that exports a national culinary heritage, within the realm of public diplomacy, in attempts to create good will towards a nation, enhance a nation's brand, foster trade and provide for relational cultural and personal interactions. Interestingly, Rockower (2012, p.235) had defined gastro-diplomacy in 2012 in more simplistic terms as gastro-diplomacy using 'a country 's culinary delights as a means to conduct public diplomacy and to raise a nation's brand,'[8] much in line with that of Solleh (2015, p.163) who defined gastro-diplomacy as simply a practice of 'sharing a state's cultural heritage through cuisine'.

Gastro-diplomacy is an attempt to win 'hearts and minds' not via rational argumentations, but via sensory interactive emotions that are tangible (Rockower, 2020) and as also further provided by Suntikul (2017) it does this indirectly by targeting emotional interactivities and connections.[9] It also has an underlying trail of fostering and enabling trade and economic growth (Nirwandy & Awang, 2014), this not only in food products for example, but also in tourism and fostering growth in such a sector (Lipscomb, 2019). Best practices in gastro-diplomacy can be provided by, according to Rockower (2020), as eight: enabling and facilitating soft-loan financing for the setting up as well as the expansion of restaurants; enabling and facilitating access to authentic ingredients for such restaurants; fostering chef participation in cultural diplomacy and exchanges and institutionalizing chefs in formal diplomatic processes and protocols; including cuisine in cultural diplomatic events; fostering and enabling educational programmes in cuisine; attempting to have the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) recognition of specific dishes or national cuisine as a whole as a national heritage; focusing on interactions with national as well as international non-sate actors; and fostering people to people diplomacy. The eight best practices identified by Rockower (2020) can be seen in a summarized form in Table 1.

Table 1: Gasto-diplomacy best practices

Enabling and facilitating soft-loan financing for restaurants
Access to authentic ingredients
Chef participation in cultural diplomacy
Cuisine in cultural diplomatic events
Educational programmes in cuisine
UNESCO recognition
Interactions with non state actors
People to people diplomacy

(Source: Rockower, 2020)

[7] Gastro-diplomacy is part of cultural diplomacy which in turn is part of public diplomacy (Rockower, 2012).

[8] The differences in the definitions provided by Rockower between 2012 and 2020, demonstrate an evolution of the concept and a better delineation of it.

[9] However, it should be noted that gastro-diplomacy has also an important domestic role: it attempts to unify citizens based on a national cuisine (Lipscomb, 2019). This however can also be divisive as, for example, what foods and what cuisines do effectively represent a nation in practice.

Indeed, the people-to-people diplomacy element of gastro-diplomacy is one of the major elements of gastro-diplomacy per se, as it enables people to better shape perceptions and provides for better understanding (Rockower, 2012). Suntikul (2017) in terms of gastro-diplomacy also considers the importance of people-to-people diplomacy. Zhang (2015) provides for the numerous actors involved in gastro-diplomacy, apart from the state and its diplomats, and includes food companies, chefs, tourist companies, social media, television and public relations enterprises, for example. This all implies that gastro-diplomacy is fostered by the public sector, within, for example, the overall context of public diplomacy and in specific cultural diplomacy, but also is provided by the private sector, for example, via restaurants as well as by the 'social sector,' for example, via people-to-people diplomacy.
In terms of gastro-diplomacy practices, and considering real world cases, four country case examples are provided in Box 1.

Box 1: Gastro-diplomacy country cases

Thailand

This was seemingly the first country to launch a global gastro-diplomacy policy. It was the 'Global Thai program' that involved the government of Thailand using its food and cuisine, within its cultural diplomacy and overall public diplomacy to increase Thai restaurants globally from 5500 to 8000, facilitate them with a soft loan programme, Thai ingredients imports, and help in hiring Thai chefs. The main objectives were not only to enhance understanding about Thai cuisine and its food, but its culture, attract tourism and overall foster long-term relationships. This first programme was followed up by a second, called 'Thailand: Kitchen of the World,' with the main intent of educating people on Thai food and cuisine, provide 'Thai brands' to Thai restaurants globally that met defined criteria and standards and overall enhance the nation brand of Thailand. The results provided to make Thai food known, move it into mainstream cuisine, and increase brand recognition not only of Thai food per se, but also for the country at large.
(Source: Rockower, 2012)

The Republic of Korea

The government campaign called 'Korean Cuisine to the World' aimed at increasing Korean restaurants globally to 40 000, provide for cooking classes within international cooking schools, and support Korean culinary students with grants and scholarships to attend international cooking schools. It also supported people to people gastro-diplomacy, via Korean backpackers to visit numerous countries and provide free samples of Korean food. However, there was also a 'spontaneous' gastro -diplomacy campaign, provided by the Korean community in Los Angeles, USA, that successfully fused Korean cuisine with Mexican cuisine, making the 'Korean taco' and the 'Korean taco truck.' The results of the government campaign and that of the people to people campaign in gastro-diplomacy provided for an increase of awareness, knowledge and experience with Korean food and its fusion with Mexican food, heightened understanding of the cuisine and overall increased the country brand of Korea.
(Source: Rockower, 2012)

Malaysia

The initial efforts in gastro-diplomacy of the Malaysian government were focused on halal food, targeted mainly at Muslim countries. It comprised also two major events devoted to halal food targeted at the halal industry. This programme was then incorporated into a much wider gastro-diplomacy effort called 'Malaysia Kitchen for the World.' It was the Malaysian government's gastro-diplomacy initiative, targeted at defined countries, with the aim of augmenting Malaysian restaurants globally and educating and informing people about Malaysian food and cuisine. The outcomes were expected to enhance trade in food products, both ingredients and farm products, to kitchen equipment, halal supplies for businesses as well as tourism. In terms of restaurants a full enterprise development package was provided, including for example, site selection, promotion, networking, etc. It also organized events, for example, such as street food festivals and mobile vending food trucks. It also set up partnerships with well-known international restaurants, dining magazines, well known foodies as well as setting up a website and social media presence. It also provided for educational aspects, such as for example cooking classes.
(Source: Debora *et al*., 2015)

Taiwan
The Taiwanese government set up a gastro-diplomacy initiative that focused on setting up a Taiwanese food foundation, international food festivals, providing chefs to international competitions, and setting up restaurants. Interestingly, prior to the setting up of the government-based gastro-diplomacy effort, the private sector had already provided for considerable successes with restaurant chains, bakery chains as well as food-based films and TV dramas. The outcomes provided for more tourism, but still faced challenges in terms of defining more uniquely Taiwanese cuisine from that of the People's Republic of China's cuisine and also in nation branding as still per the People's Republic of China, and hence providing for a challenge in its brand uniqueness building.
(Source: Lipscomb 2019)

Gastro-diplomacy is most often used by what may be termed 'middle nation state powers' who are neither small enough to go mostly unnoticed and who are not large enough to act like superpowers (Rockower, 2020). Typically, such 'middle nation states' have several challenges in terms of visibility and recognition, in the global arena, which range from unawareness of the nation, to lack of understanding of the nation, to negative connotations about the nation (Rockower, 2020). As such these middle nations use, for example, gastro-diplomacy as a sensory and 'tasty' nation brand experience, that makes such a nation more tangible, potentially providing for uniqueness and fosters more awareness about the specific nation brand (Rockower, 2020). But gastro-diplomacy, interestingly, is also used by superpowers such as, for example, the USA and already well known 'culinary powers' such as France, for example (Rockower, 2020).

However, according to Rockower (2020), gastro-diplomacy is not food or culinary diplomacy, as food diplomacy is basically set around food aid and relief, while culinary diplomacy is food usage in diplomatic settings and functions. In fact, Luša & Jakešević (2017) provide that culinary diplomacy has a narrower target audience, while gastro-diplomacy is intended for vaster target audiences. Chapple-Sokol (2013) provides that culinary diplomacy has its roots deep in the history of diplomacy even though set mainly for better cross-cultural understandings among diplomats, but is evolving. Culinary diplomacy can be private culinary diplomacy, which occurs behind closed doors of diplomacy, but there is also public culinary diplomacy that is more in tune with cultural diplomacy and hence fostered to a far wider audience (Chapple-Sokol, 2013). In both public and private culinary diplomacy, both provide for the sensory communication of food and the 'physical closeness of commensality create a powerful locus that is centred on the space in which food is shared. Everything is in play: formal or informal; the seating arrangement; the type, origin and quality of foods; who is there and who is not' (Chapple-Sokol, 2013, p.182). However, in public culinary diplomacy in particular there are two more aspects to add on: nation-branding and outreach, but at its basis, it is still all about food sharing, be it between diplomats, heads of state and people (Chapple-Sokol, 2013). Thus, there are seemingly similarities and overlaps between gastro-diplomacy and culinary diplomacy, including that also Chapple-Sokol (2013) considers culinary diplomacy different from food diplomacy which is more prevalently devoted to food aid and relief as do Luša & Jakešević (2017) who also consider food diplomacy in the same realm.

Interestingly Luša & Jakešević (2017, p. 108) also provide for what is termed gastro-nationalism, which seemingly has identitarian connotations as it is a ' persistent effort to preserve a claim over specific types of food or drinks, specifically of one nations' flavours and tastes or culinary experiences, offering them at the same time, under that national etiquette, to the global market.'[10] In this regard Chapple-Sokol (2013) provides that indeed food and its cuisine is an important national identifier and a powerful one as such as food is seen via a national perspective of identity it can become to a much greater degree more influential. Selim (2016) provides for much the same in that food and cuisine are powerful tools in cultural preservation in an era of globalization. In fact, Waldfogel (2020) provides that concerns with cuisine, are not so much related to balance of payments matters, but more with the influence that cross border trade can provide. Interestingly Colás *et al*., (2018, p.149) provide that

[10] Interestingly, and as provided by some, identity seemingly is such a complex matter that it cannot really be provided by national food and related cuisine (Nirwandy & Awang, 2014). Further and as provided by Waldfogel (2020) most commonly, but not always, ingredients for restaurants are bought locally for example, but the 'cuisine culture' is not. Moreover recipes, usually, do not come under intellectual property protection (Waldfogel, 2020).

national cuisine is in fact derived from nation building that entailed 'urbanization, common educational curricula, military conscription, common public spheres of media and communications, and social and geographical mobility, bringing people from various regions and ethnicities into common intercourse and participation in urban cultures.' In fact, Tettner & Kalyoncu, (2016) on this matter provide that food and related cuisine have strong bindings that are rich in cultural heritage as producing ingredients, preparing food, and eating are strong unifiers as well as being strong identifiers. Indeed, as also provided by Taher & Elshahed (2020) food and cuisine have a strong influence on upkeeping social cohesion.

Ichijo (2020) asserts that gastro-nationalism is used as a defensive tool and DeSoucey (2010, pp.433-448) provides that it 'signals the use of food production, distribution, and consumption to demarcate and sustain the emotive power of national attachment, as well as the use of nationalist sentiments to produce and market food: it is the institutionalized protection and promotion of certain food items as grounded in their place of production.' This, somewhat clearly 'mixing' the cultural, political, and economic resources and identities of a nation (DeSoucey, 2010). Ranta (2015) also provides that food is becoming increasingly nationalistic and that this is a policy of many governments that foster their own national and local produce as an integral part of heritage. For example, the EU framework for protected geographical status, which enables, legally, that food products emanate and originate from a specific locality (Ranta, 2015). Interestingly, Ranta (2015) refers this all to be based on gastro-nationalism and gastro-diplomacy, but also culinary-nationalism, thus 'mixing' culinary and gastro, something that Rockower (2020) definitionally separates, for example.

However, Ranta (2015) goes beyond just food as food, much like, for example Rockower (2020); Luša & Jakešević (2017); Ichijo (2020); and DeSoucey (2010) and focuses on the symbolics of food i.e. belonging to a defined group as well as the important political impacts food can have, see the Arab Spring for example, between 2008 to 2011. Zhang (2015) adds to food symbolism and incudes: attitudes, values, ideas and communication. In terms of food symbolism, Ayora-Diaz (2021) adds that food and especially its taste are highly symbolic and related directly to identity. Reynolds (2012) furthers this point on food as a political instrument: food is not different than any other power. Low (2021, p.191) still furthers the discourse in terms of the political impacts of food, in that 'sensory experiences and metaphors surrounding the consumption of food in the political arena of social life intertwine with and signify complex statecraft processes of power, cultural representation, political subjectivities and contestation.' Indeed, food can send strong and powerful political messages, pending on who consumes it, what is consumed, where it is consumed, and under what circumstances it is consumed (Low, 2015). Spence (2016) also provides that food can affect decision-making in diplomacy and has a significant role to play. Thus, as per the above, it seems that even though distinct, to a degree, gastro-diplomacy, culinary diplomacy and gastro-nationalism have similarities and evident overlaps.

Nation marketing and branding

Public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, and gastro-diplomacy even though within the same 'stream,' have their distinctness, but share, of course, common objectives, characteristics and objectives. One of these objectives, among the many, is ultimately contributing to nation marketing and branding, if not nation[11] re-marketing and re-branding[12]. Dinnie (2016, p.5) defines nation branding as 'the unique, multidimensional blend of elements that provide the nation with culturally grounded differentiation and relevance for all of its target audiences.' Branding derives from marketing and provides for a competitive edge, based on its differentiation possibilities, its name and importantly its significance (Kotler & Gertner, 2002). The branding of nations is based on their names, for example, in terms of such 'logos' as, for example, 'made in' (Kotler & Gertner, 2002). However, nation branding prevalently rests on culture, its many components and facets and its deep roots within a nation. According to Dinnie (2016), culture is the real authenticator and the truest. Ermann & Hermanik, (2018) and Kaefer (2020)

[11] Fan (2006) provides that there is a subtle difference between nation brand and country brand, even though such are used interchangeably. People who have the same ethnic background and language are usually referred to as a nation, while land area which is accredited to a nation is a country.

[12] Nations in the global system, so as to develop economically, have had to go well beyond national public policy and global public policy, and have had to compete in the global market, thus nation marketing and branding being used to attempt to obtain a competitive advantage. It is all about positioning the nation in the perceptions of the global populace (Kotler & Gertner, 2002).

add the social, traditional, people, business, place and tourism elements to the cultural element in nation branding. Kotler & Gertner (2002), for example, provide that it also rests on geography, history, and famous people. However, another way of considering a nation's branding is provided by Kaefer (2020), in terms of a 'value platform' which represents a nation's unique identity, beliefs, and intents and how these are nurtured to bring value to the nation brand representation.

Iranian foreign policy

From the outset of the 1979 revolution, Iran's foreign policy has had two main undercurrents: a non-aligned stance, which fostered neither east or west, and 'exporting' the revolution (Senyurt, 2012). This was based on the character of the revolution that set-in place a high degree of quest for independence, resistance and 'exporting' a 'model' of Islam to the middle east and not only (Ahadi, 2013). Over the decades though, and according to Osiewicz (2021), other two newer undercurrents have emerged, these being the survival of the theocratic regime and sustainable growth. However, there has been an overall undercurrent which has been fundamental to its foreign policy, and this has been isolationism (Juneau & Razavi, 2013).

Formally, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, provides for the routines and practices of foreign policy and diplomacy (Kazemzadeh, 2020). The foreign minister is appointed by the president, but the supreme leader retains ultimate power in such a decision (Kazemzadeh, 2020). The characteristics, nature and dynamics of foreign policy and its related diplomacy, usually rest on the interplay between foreign minister, president, and the supreme leader, which in turn depend mainly on the power dynamics between the supreme leader and the president (Kazemzadeh, 2020). As such, and in reality, the foreign minister is not the real decision maker in foreign policy (Kazemzadeh, 2020). Green *et al*., (2009) though provide that typically the 'overall' Iranian system is highly bureaucratic, secluded, clannish, secretive and informal and so as to better understand Iranian foreign policy, requires essentially, and in reality, to consider the oligarchy, its factions and the derived policies from such a system (Kazemzadeh, 2020).

Iran's foreign policy deals on two separate, but interconnected, levels. On the one side relations with state actors, including regional and global actors, and on the other side with non-state actors (Abdolmohammadi & Cama, 2020). The main drivers of Iranian foreign policy are a mixture of ideology, pragmatism, domestic politics and power according to Juneau & Razavi (2013), while for Ramazani (2013) the drivers are identity, independence, authoritarianism, factionalism, environment, democracy, instruments (subversion, soft power, hard power, procrastination), and power. According to Katzman (2016) the main drivers of Iranian foreign policy are many and competing and are: ideology, leadership perceptions, long term interests, and the regime's various factions. It seems, as still provided by Katzman (2016), that Iran's foreign policy is overlapping and, sometimes contradictory and is highly influenced by the domestic politics and its dynamics, pending on political parties and their alternations in the presidency, and evident resulting fluctuations in policies and decision making (Abdolmohammadi & Cama, 2020). This has provided for the development of what may be termed 'parallel diplomacy' which discriminates relations between state and non-state actors. (Abdolmohammadi & Cama, 2020).
Foreign policy is practiced by being non-explicit and providing for 'vailed' positions and declarations and balancing ideology with pragmatism: domestic inner conflicts between mainly reformists and hardliners are also part of foreign policy practice (Osiewicz, 2021). This enables flexibility to confront the most diverse scenarios that may appear and hence seemingly makes Iranian foreign policy multidimensional, with a priority of the survival of the regime, the interest of the immediacy of its foreign relations in the region, prevalently the Persian gulf, central Asia and some states in the middle east, such as, for example, Palestine, Syria and Lebanon[13] and attempts to assert itself in a more prominent role with the USA, Russia, China, India and the EU. Too a degree, Iran's foreign policy, can be seen within what may be termed faith-based diplomacy, where religion is the basis of communication with foreign publics[14] (El-Nawawy, 2013). However, and seemingly, Iranian foreign policy has

[13] Indeed, Iranian foreign policy has a long history of attempting to speak 'over the heads' of Arab regimes and directly to the populace (Green *et al., 2009*).

[14] Within this realm, faith over the past seven decades has played a growing role within politics and in particular in diplomacy and according to El-Nawawy (2013, p.115) can lead to, in the case of political Islam and related

oscillated between pragmatism and faith ideology (Abdolmohammadi & Cama, 2020). In fact, Iran's foreign policy will use sometime ideological approaches and other times geopolitical approaches.
The focus of Iranian foreign policy, as provided previously, is mainly devoted to its immediate environment. In terms of the Middle East, Iran has a four pronged strategy: support alliances with friendly states, semi-state actors and non-state actors; attempt to balance rivalries within the region, either locally born and/or foreign, via military capabilities; avert western influence in the region; and overall expand Iranian influence in the region (Mousavian & Chitsazian, 2020). However, and overall, Iran has been attempting to integrate into the global economic system, even though still with undertones of 'neither east nor west,' providing itself as a model for other Islamic countries and being part of the non-aligned movement as well as attempting to strengthen ties with Russia, China and Venezuela (Senyurt, 2012).

Iranian public diplomacy

In Iran there is no specific institution that formulates public diplomacy, but there are some public institutions that do (Ahadi, 2013). The main provider of public diplomacy is the Islamic Culture and Relations Organization (ICRO), with, interestingly, only a complementary role for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ahadi, 2013). The elected president of the republic enacts much of the public diplomacy, but with ultimate authority resting in the hands of the supreme leader (Wastnidge, 2015). However, in practice, the ICRO is the coordinating unit in Iran's cultural diplomatic activities with other states, and appoints cultural councillors to be posted in foreign countries, who's main tasks are to organize, fairly independently from Iranian embassies, for example, cultural exhibitions, religious events, fostering relationship with host country cultural institutions and Persian language learning (Wastnidge, 2015). ICRO's main underlying efforts are based on three principal matters: fostering Islamic unity, promoting revolution, and stronger and deeper relations with Muslim countries (Wastnidge, 2015).

In the years just after the revolution, Iranian's soft power was used within the middle east and not only, and was quite effective as it was mainly based on culture (Ahadi, 2013). This was much in line with the historical aspect of Iran having used its cultural heritage for centuries in foreign policy, and for example, was a major pillar also in the times of the Shah (Wastnidge, 2015). Interestingly though, according to Wastnidge (2015), soft power initiatives are commonly 'top-down', but have a dual nature, where the presidency enacts public diplomacy, but ultimate decision-making rests with the supreme leader. Iran's soft power is based on many different aspects and characteristics of Iran and is provided via a host of differing channels (Wastnidge, 2015). For example, identity is a major aspect (Bar, 2004). But its main pillar in public diplomacy is cultural diplomacy, as Iran has considerable millennia of culture to share. Such a cultural diplomatic stance contributes extensively to its soft power and such cultural diplomacy tends to have far less challenges from other countries and international audiences (Ahadi, 2013). Indeed, Iran's soft power is primarily based on three elements: culture, values, and policies, of which culture has a major say (Ahadi, 2013). However, one of the main thrusts of Iran's cultural diplomatic efforts are concentrated around Iranian culture steeped in Islam (Wastnidge, 2015). The intended target audience of public diplomacy efforts are prevalently Muslims in the Middle East, Central Asia and the Caucuses (Ahadi, 2013). Iranian public diplomacy is enacted via a number of different channels and tools. It uses various satellite TV channels, fosters, motivates and encourages students from other countries to Iranian educational institutions, provides for publications in various languages and uses websites and social media (Ahadi, 2013). This all intended, within one of the main objectives of soft power, to provide for the 'attraction.'

Iranian gastro-diplomacy

Persian cuisine, for well over two thousand years (550 BC to 1700AD) was of major importance within politics (Lauden, 2015). At the time, one of the main government departments, was the Imperial kitchen: it functioned as a fully administrative department, recording food intakes and profits from Imperial farm production to food donations made, all headed by the executive chef, and supported by the royal physician, who in up and coming times of war, would provide for fortified foods and also in

foreign policy, some 'creative solutions that address the root causes of conflicts and represent a questionable moral authority's approval to reconcile.'

time of illness prepare the required (Lauden, 2015). Food was used as per payment in kind, as per rations and also distributed widely to, for example, royal bodyguards, artisans, women, etc., (Lauden, 2015). Persian cuisine, over the centuries was widely assimilated (and modified) to suit, for example, the oncoming of Islam, the Mughal and Ottoman empires, but not Europe where French cuisine had become the main stay of diplomacy since the mid-seventeenth century (Lauden, 2015).

As provided previously, the main aim of the government of Iran, in terms of the agricultural and food sectors is for self-sufficiency (Green *et al*., 2009). Such sectors are deemed strategic for the government as they represent 18 percent of exports (Due Diligence, 2021). Interestingly though, ICRO, being the main entity for Iranian public diplomacy, and fostering mainly cultural diplomacy, does not provide much in terms of information about food and cuisine, apart from explanations of Iranian food, within the contexts concerning inbound tourism to Iran (ICRO, 2023). This thus seems more culinary and gastro-diplomacy devoted to tourists visiting Iran and little, if any, culinary and gastro-diplomacy devoted to foreign countries. This seemingly pointing, on a preliminary basis, to the matter that there is no state directed policy and/or programme on gastro-diplomacy.

However, it seems that culinary diplomacy is the main stay, where Persian cuisine, is provided for diplomatic events, provided by embassies, and including also more wider forms of culinary diplomacy, which overlaps with gastro-diplomacy, via Persian food festivals, for example. TRVI World (2022) provides an interview via the Iranian embassy in Indonesia. What is mentioned in the interview to the Iranian ambassador is gastro-diplomacy, but what emerges seems also culinary diplomacy. For example, the embassy chef demonstrates how to make some Iranian dishes, thus to a degree, goes beyond culinary diplomacy, and more into gastro-diplomacy, as the interview was provided via a TV station (TRVI World), hence transmitted to a wider public, than what is commonly prescribed by culinary diplomacy, set for diplomatic publics and occasions. Hence it seems that via the embassy there is mainly culinary diplomacy but also gastro-diplomacy and the two seem to overlap and intermingle. ANC (2018) provides for the embassy of Iran in the Philippines in the context of a cultural event, thus a cultural diplomacy initiative, that includes, fostering, for example Iranian historical sights, for investors and tourists, but also fostering art, poetry, ceramics and calligraphy, based on a people-to-people relations. There is also within such a cultural event, Persian food, where the embassy chef provides for recipes as well as tasting. Thus, is seems culinary diplomacy, but also gastro-diplomacy, as like with the case of Indonesia, it is transmitted to a wider audience via TV. There is also an interview with the Iranian ambassador who addresses, for example, trade, tourism, and education exchanges, but also addresses in specific agricultural trade imports from Iran. Thus, in this case it seems both culinary and gastro-diplomacy are intermingled in the wider cultural diplomacy of the Iranian embassy. As seen previously, in fact, the main thrust of Iranian public diplomacy is most commonly cultural diplomacy.

Still in another case, from the Iranian ambassadorial level, Atjam (2022) considers the Netherlands. Here a food festival was provided, under the initiative called 'food flavours.' It also provided for Iranian exhibition of traditional table setting (*haft sin*) for the Iranian new year (*Nowruz*) as well as music. The embassy chef provided for recipes and provided for food tasting. There was a clear reference, by the Iranian ambassador, to Iranian gastronomy and culinary arts as part of Iranian culture. The event and initiative was targeted at the Dutch younger generation in attempts to foster people to people relationships. In this case there was seemingly more an emphasis on gastro-diplomacy, but with culinary diplomacy undertones. Yet in another case, from Malaysia, The Sun Daily (2021) reports on the occasion of the Iranian new year (*Nowruz*): an event of cultural exchange and what was termed food diplomacy, still from the ambassadorial level. The event was on cultural exchange, but also on food and cuisine, and the importance of this within culture. The event was attended, though, by a well-known Malaysian chef, who attempted to provide for Iranian cuisine, within the event of cultural exchange, based on food. Tourism was also emphasized in terms of cultural exchange. Thus, also here, within a cultural diplomatic event, gastro-diplomacy was provided as an initiative, but still with undertones of culinary diplomacy.

Still in terms of gastro-diplomacy, another case, provided by Kamal & Chung (2022) from Canada relates to what can be termed the Persian diaspora. Diasporic culinary traditions can be generally defined as cuisines provided by migrants to foreign countries, who are from a particular ethnic background and have established culinary identities within such countries (Kamal & Chung, 2022). In the case provided by Kamal & Chung (2022), in Vancouver, Canada, it was found that effectively the

Persian community there was providing for gastro-diplomacy, but in a citizen diplomacy[15] manner, via privately-owned restaurants, for example, but also what may be termed a people to people form of diplomacy.[16] Indeed, there was a strong sense of promotion and advocacy provided by the Persian community, i.e. gastro-diplomacy, for Persian cuisine in Vancouver (Kamal & Chung, 2022). In another case from Los Angeles, USA, Addison (2019b) provides that there is the largest Persian community globally outside of Iran, of circa 87000 people, residing in southern California. One of the main activities provided is that of cuisine, related private restaurants and Persian supermarkets that effectively provide for culinary diplomacy, as if effectively such restaurants were 'Iranian embassies,'[17] but also for gastro-diplomacy as their reach to wider publics not only in Los Angeles, but more generally in southern California, is quite extensive (Addison, 2019b) as that of Persian supermarkets. Indeed, this seems to be citizenry diplomacy, where the private sector fosters gastro-diplomacy for Iranian cuisine and related food products. In yet another case, provided by Akbari (2019) in Vienna, Austria, Persians residing there are more than 8000. There are many restaurants, privately owned that provide for culinary diplomacy, but more likely gastro-diplomacy as per their reach, but also Persian food supermarkets that also provide for gastro-diplomacy. This, yet again, providing for citizenry diplomacy, where the private sector fosters gastro-diplomacy for Iranian cuisine and related food products. Interestingly, Pinterest (2023) considers Persian restaurants on a global basis, and provides that Persian restaurants have a wide reach globally and are present in many countries. Effectively also here, representing citizenry diplomacy, where the private sector fosters gastro-diplomacy for Iranian cuisine and related food products.

Interestingly, still in the realm of citizenry diplomacy, in the UK there is the Persian Hospitality Network, which provides an online presence with the main aim of raising awareness about Persian people, including Persian culture and cuisine (Persian Hospitality network, 2023). It is provided for Persian people to profile activities, as an information hub, and for non-Persian people to access such information (Persian Hospitality network, 2023). It has a strong emphasis on Persian cuisine and is thus part of private-led gastro-diplomacy that focuses on citizenry and people to people diplomacy. Still online there is the Persian Restaurants Network, yet another private led gastro-diplomacy effort, which promotes and raises awareness about Persian restaurants in many different countries (Persian Restaurants Network, 2023). It also provides, for example, for people to write reviews of restaurants and provides for recipes, in a form of people-to-people diplomacy. Further, and interestingly, Eventbrite (2023) provides for training events on how to make Persian food, hosted by the DC cooking school (Eventbrite.com, 2023). This in yet another form of people-to-people diplomacy, within the overall context of private-led gastro-diplomacy. Moreover, and interestingly, there are other privately led initiatives, provided by organizations that are not of Iranian origin. For example, there is the case of Conflict Kitchen, in Pittsburgh, USA, which promotes Iranian cuisine on its menu, in a form of attempt at rapprochement between the USA and Iran (Conflict Kitchen.org, 2023). Interestingly each event is not only devoted to food, but with events, publications, debates and discussions (Conflict Kitchen.org, 2023). This is clearly a form of 'reverse' cultural diplomacy that provides also for a good degree of gastro-diplomacy.

Discussion

Iranian foreign policy, as provided previously, is generally bureaucratic, secluded, clannish, secretive, informal (Green *et al*., 2009), overlapping and at times contradictory (Katzman, 2016). It is based mainly on the power interplay between the supreme leader and the presidency (Kazemzadeh, 2020) and the undercurrents of oligarchs. This, and to a degree, seemingly, provides that foreign policy

[15] Tyler & Beyerinck (2016) provide that citizen diplomacy is how private individuals can provide motivation, attitudes and practices to influence and effect world affairs.

[16] People to people diplomacy is where people interact, in terms of communications, for public matters, more than private matters that can have influence on national and international political matters, including foreign policy (Ayhan, 2020).

[17] Persianrestaurant.org (2023) provides that there are numerous privately owned Persian restaurants in every state of the USA. These effectively also providing to be effective 'Iranian embassies' that foster culinary and more aptly gastro-diplomacy. Very much the same can be implied by Persian supermarkets still in the USA (Infoyab, 2023).

is in a constant dynamic and flux, reflecting very much Iranian society, as provided by Gohardani & Tizro, (2019), which is also in a constant and permanent flux. Thus, there is seemingly a lack of 'stabilization' in foreign policy matters, in one defined direction or more directions and also continuity in such a direction or directions. This, in fact, does provide for not only complexity in foreign policy matters, but also evident misunderstandings and contradictions. Indeed, such foreign policy trends to percolate into Iranian public diplomacy, and into its main pillar of cultural diplomacy. In fact, Iranian cultural diplomacy is mainly guided by ICRO, but the presidency and ultimately the supreme leader has a say in matters, with the foreign ministry only having a complementary role (Ahadi, 2013). This governance scheme, inevitably, leads to rather generalized strategies, inconsistencies and delegation to lower levels within the cultural diplomacy governance. This delegation of governance is seemingly set so as to avert conflict within the higher governance structures. In fact, much of the cultural diplomacy is left to embassies, where appointed cultural councillors organize and implement cultural events, quite independently. This process also seemingly being secretive, secluded, informal and at times contradictory, as cultural events, for example, do not seemingly have a major overall strategy, apart from underlying aims of fostering Islamic unity, promoting revolution, and stronger and deeper relations with Muslim countries (Wastnidge, 2015). Evidence of this surfaces in terms of Iranian efforts at 'promoting' Iranian food and cuisine, that seemingly rest, to some degree, on culinary diplomacy provided by embassies and in wider events that may be televised, and on Iranian festivities, such as the Iranian new year (Nowruz) where food and cuisine take on a far more gastro-diplomatic role.

However, and overall, and derived from the findings, there is seemingly no direct Iranian government policy and/or programme on gastro-diplomacy that can be comparable to, what for example Rockower (2020;2014;2012)[18]; Suntikul (2017); Solleh (2015); Zhang (2015); and Pham (2013) provide in terms of gastro-diplomacy. Further and importantly gastro-diplomacy policies and programmes provided by other countries, as shown in Box 1 previously, concerning Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Taiwan, provide further evidence to this when comparing the programmes and policies of these countries to those of Iran. For example, there are common practice commonalities that emerge from the country cases from Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Taiwan, and such demonstrate that policies and programmes are: public sector devised and implemented; commonly have designated institutions for such purposes; provide for the opening of restaurants in foreign countries; assist with soft loan finance for restaurant enterprise start-up and development; provide for cuisine education; and events. The six practices derived from the case studies can be found in a summarized form in Table 2.

Table 2: Six practices derived from the country case studies of Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Taiwan

Public sector devised and implemented
Designated institutions
Opening of restaurants in foreign countries
Soft loan finance
Cuisine education
Events

(Source: Lipscomb, 2019; Debora et al., 2015; Rockower, 2012)

Interestingly, practices provided by Table 2 above, but also from Table 1, are seemingly absent to a much greater degree from public sector Iranian public diplomatic policy, in terms of gastro-diplomacy, as most often it is the embassies on their own that organize and set up food and cuisine events, which are to a degree, more culinary diplomacy, than gastro-diplomacy. Indeed the lack of a 'centralized' gastro-diplomatic policy and/or programme is somewhat surprising, as for example, the long and traditional role that Iranian food and cuisine has played in the history of the country, see previously what Lauden (2015) provided; the inherent link of Iranian food and cuisine to culture; and also to a fairly good global acceptance of Iranian food, as according to Waldfogel (2020), cuisine trade patterns are dominated by Italy, Japan and Mexico, but Iran is in the 19th place for cuisine appeal globally, hence

[18] This can be provided by comparing the findings from public sector Iranian gastro-diplomacy with the best practices as provide by Rockower (2020) in Table 1.

Iranian food cuisine is on the global cuisine trade radar. Indeed, the case evidence examples provided previously, devoted to private Iranian restaurants found globally, are also a good testimony to the degree of acceptance, globally, of Iranian cuisine.

The above, though, does not mean that Iranian gastro-diplomacy does not occur, it is simply not in the public sector hands, to a high degree. Comparatively to the cases provided on Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Taiwan, the degree to which the Iranian government, hence public sector, involvement in gastro-diplomacy is minimal, and mainly 'delegated' to embassies in various countries, under a broader Persian cultural umbrella. The other cases provided previously of the various Iranian embassies in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines demonstrate this amply, with the exception of the case in the Netherlands, where the embassy actually provided for an event called 'food flavours' (see Atjam, 2022), even though also here 'mixed in' with wider cultural aspects of Iran.

Mostly, and to a high degree, Iranian gastro-diplomacy is left to private citizen diplomacy and people to people diplomacy. Indeed, people led gastro-diplomacy interestingly has overlaps with citizenry and people to people diplomacy. As also provided previously above, citizen diplomacy is how private individuals can provide motivation, attitudes and practices to influence and effect world affairs (Tyler & Beyerinck, 2016), while people to people diplomacy is where people interact, in terms of communications, for public matters, more than private matters, that can have influence on national and international political matters, including foreign policy (Ayhan, 2020). Evidence from the cases presented previously, for example from Austria, Canada, UK and USA as well as the plethora of Persian restaurants in various countries as provided by Pinterest (2023), for example, demonstrate this to a good degree. Indeed, such private-led gastro-diplomatic initiatives can both knowingly and unknowingly, willingly and unwillingly and directly and indirectly contribute extensively to gastro-diplomacy. In the case provided on Canada, for example, where a specific mention was made of the Persian community in Vancouver, to provide for gastro-diplomacy is a knowingly, willingly and a direct example of gastro-diplomacy. But, there is also the more unknowingly, unwillingly and indirect case of Pinterest (2023), where restaurants are found globally, but with no specific indication that gastro-diplomacy is being provided for, even though, it should be noted, that the simple existence of so many restaurants in various countries as provided by Pinterest (2023), imply gastro-diplomacy.

Further, and interestingly, there is also the digital privately led gastro-citizen and people to people diplomacy side of matters, seemingly portraying for digital gastro-diplomacy, as the cases provided previously on Pinterest (2023), Persian Hospitality network (2023) and Persian Restaurants Network (2023) amply demonstrate. Clearly the above cases are to a very good degree commercially based, but do effectively provide for Iranian gastro-diplomacy that is not fully self-interested as per enterprise development and profit seeking, but in line with citizen and people to people diplomacy that also provide for public matters and not just private interests (Ayhan, 2020; Tyler & Beyerinck 2016). Further, and interestingly, and within this realm of general public interest in gastro-diplomacy intermingled with private interest, the case of Conflict Kitchen, in Pittsburgh, USA, promotes Iranian cuisine, even though not being Iranian-owned. It has, interestingly, the inherent intent of attempting rapprochement between the USA and Iran (Conflict Kitchen.org, 2023). Moreover, such is not only devoted to food, but also to the events, publications, debates and discussions (Conflict Kitchen.org, 2023) on the matter and being clearly a form of 'reverse' cultural diplomacy that provides also for a good degree of gastro-diplomacy.

As per the citizen and people-led gastro-diplomacy, nine practices have emerged from the various cases: citizen diplomacy; people to people diplomacy; promotion; advocacy; awareness; interaction; relationship building; networking; and digitalization. These nine practices can be found in a summarized form in Table 3.

Table 3: Nine practices derived from the case studies

Citizen diplomacy
People to people diplomacy
Promotion
Advocacy
Awareness
Interaction
Relationship building
Networking

Digitalization

(Sources: Addison, 2019b; Akbari, 2019; Conflict Kitchen, 2023; Eventbrite, 2023; Kamal & Chung, 2012; Persian hospitality network, 2023; Persian restaurant network, 2023; Pinterest, 2023)

The above is much in line with the part of public diplomacy, as provided by Snow (2009), devoted to a form of people to people diplomacy. It is also in line in the part of cultural diplomacy as provided by Bound *et al*., (2007), devoted to seeing cultural diplomacy as mainly a people to people affair in terms of cultural tangible and intangible product and service exchanges. Further and most clearly it is also in line with the important part of gastro-diplomacy as provided by Rockower (2020; 2012) devoted to the focus on non-government actors i.e., citizens and people to people diplomacy and much the same being provided by Zhang (2015). Consequently, even though not fully government and public sector economy directed, private citizen led gastro-diplomacy can be provided for, and seemingly quite effectively as per the results of such gastro-diplomacy. For example, Waldfogel (2020), provides that in terms of cuisine trade patterns, Iran is in the 19th place on a global scale. Indeed, this also indicates that private citizen and people to people led gastro -diplomacy does also contribute, to a good degree, to Iranian nation marketing and branding.

Indeed, such private sector led efforts do contribute to nation marketing and branding also, both knowingly and unknowingly, willingly and unwillingly and directly and indirectly. Such nation marketing and branding is based, to a good degree, on private-led citizen people to people gastro-diplomacy, which leverages, on the centuries old tradition of Persian foreign policy being based, to a good degree, on Persian experiential flavours (cuisine), as provided, for example, by Lauden (2015). This all seemingly positioning the Iran brand with a far more historical traditional view of the county and nation, based on Persian culinary flavours and also far more based on Persian people than on the Iranian government.

However, and as also provided previously, and overall, the minimal public Iranian government gastro-diplomacy does overlap and intermingle mainly with culinary diplomacy and the cases, for example, of the Iranian embassies in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines demonstrate this to a degree. This, interestingly, going somewhat contrary to what Rockower's (2020) delineated and separated definitions of gastro-diplomacy and culinary diplomacy, as also provided by Luša & Jakešević (2017). But, in practice, matters may differ somewhat. Also, and interestingly, Iranian private citizen people to people gastro-diplomacy, in the cases provided, also overlaps with gastro-nationalism, but does not seem to portray the same high-level accent of identitarians and defensive posturing that such a term may imply as, for example, provided by Ichijo (2020) and DeSoucey (2010). In fact, Ranta (2015) does refer to the overlap between gastro-nationalism and gastro-diplomacy, but also with culinary diplomacy, or what Ranta (2105) refers to as culinary nationalism.

Conclusions

From the findings what emerges to a good degree is that the public sector, in other words, the Iranian government, and its related foreign policy and public diplomacy, have a minimal role in gastro-diplomacy. This commonly, being delegated to embassies and the cultural attaché within. This minimal role thus provides that gastro-diplomacy is not a mainstay in Iranian public diplomacy, and quite far from it. Thus, it can be provided, with a good degree of confidence, that the role and importance of gastro-diplomacy within Iranian public diplomacy is minimal. However, the role of gastro-diplomacy provided by the private sector, citizen and people to people gastro-diplomacy, is high, to a good degree, and contributes considerably to nation marketing and branding for Iran. Indeed this finding seemingly merits further research on it, so as to further understanding and gain knowledge on citizen and people to people gastro-diplomacy both from a conceptual and theoretical perspective as well as a practical perspective, including its contribution to nation marketing and branding.

With regard to the four objectives within the main aim of the research, the first devoted to gastro-diplomacy was further researched in an attempt to better delineate it, increase understanding and comprehension of it and its practical implementation. Indeed from a conceptual and theoretical point of view gastro-diplomacy can be defined on its own, even though, with some evident overlaps with culinary diplomacy and gastro-nationalism, for example. However, in practice and from evidence provided from Iran, gastro-diplomacy is intermingled to a good degree with culinary diplomacy and cultural diplomacy, as per Iranian public diplomacy provided from the public sector. In regard to Iranian

private public diplomacy, gastro-diplomacy is heavily 'mixed' with citizen diplomacy and people to people diplomacy. Hence in practice gastro-diplomacy cannot be so finely delineated in such a 'pure' way as can be done in conceptual and theoretical realms. These two findings which emerged from the research seemingly also merit further investigation.

In terms of the direct and the indirect role of gastro-diplomacy within Iranian public diplomacy, officially, gastro-diplomacy does not have a formal state led policy, programme and institution within Iranian foreign policy, but has a very minor role in its official public diplomacy, that is mainly referred to within the overall cultural diplomacy mainstay of such and delegated to initiatives provided by various embassies in various countries. Thus, it can be provided, with a good degree of confidence, that gastro-diplomacy has a minimal direct role in Iranian public diplomacy and thus also in Iranian foreign policy, and can only be considered, to a rather minor degree to have an indirect role. However, knowingly and unknowingly, willingly and unwillingly, and directly and indirectly the private sector, citizen and people to people led gastro-diplomacy also here takes the helm in the role of gastro-diplomacy. But the role, with a good degree of confidence, can be both direct and indirect, knowingly and unknowingly and willing and unwillingly.

In terms of the significance of gastro-diplomacy within Iranian public diplomacy, the research found that from a public sector point of view this was minimal. In other words, gastro-diplomacy has minimal significance within public sector Iranian public diplomacy. However from a private citizen and people to people diplomacy, gastro-diplomacy had a high significance. It should be noted though, that in both cases, public and private perspectives, gastro-diplomacy was intermingled with other forms of diplomacy, within the umbrella of public diplomacy.

In terms of gastro-diplomacy contributing to Iranian public diplomacy and nation marketing and branding, from the public sector perspective, is rather minimal. However, in terms of private sector, citizen and people to people led gastro-diplomacy this does contribute to a good degree to Iranian public diplomacy and nation marketing and branding. In fact, this role of private sector, citizen and people to people led gastro-diplomacy is seemingly a mainstay in nation marketing and branding for Iran as it has and does contribute considerably to such efforts, and this contributing considerably to the minimal Iranian public sector efforts in regards to this from a gastro-diplomatic perspective.

References

Abdolmohammadi, P. and G. Cama, 2020. *Contemporary domestic and foreign policies of Iran*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, Switzerland

Addison, B., 2019a. Newsletter: Two Iranian Americans food writers talk Persian restaurant menus and home cooking, [online] available at https://www.latimes.com/food/story/2019-08-09/andy-baraghani-naz-deravian-persian-restaurants-los-angeles (accessed 11/06/2023)

Addison, B., 2019b. Two food writers eat all at the Persian restaurants in SoCal (Ok 18 of them), [online] available at https://www.latimes.com/food/story/2019-08-05/persian-iranian-restaurants-westwood-glendale-irvine-anissa-helou (accessed 11/06/2023)

Ahadi, A., 2013. Public diplomacy in the middle east: a comparative analysis of the U.S. and Iran, *Iranian Review of Foreign Affairs*, 4(1): 105-128

Akbari, F., 2019. Immigrants' business naming: Persian restaurants and supermarkets in Vienna's linguistic landscape, Onoma, 54: 99–116

Amanat, A., 2017. *Iran: a modern history*, Yale University Press, London

Amin, C.M., 2015. The press and public diplomacy: 1820-1940, *Iranian Studies*, 48(2): 269–287

Amuzegar, J., 2014. *The Islamic Republic of Iran: reflections on an emerging economy*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK

ANC. 2018. Food diplomacy Iran, [online] available at https://www.facebook.com /ANCearlyedition/ videos/food-diplomacy-iran/1025509517659104/ (accessed 09/06/2023)

Anholt, S., 2007. *Competitive identity: the new brand management for nations, cities and regions*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Aronczyk, M., 2013. *Branding the nation: the global business of national identity*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA

Atjam, R.L., 2022. Iranian flavours in The Hague: Iran the gate of all nations, Diplomat magazine, [online] available at https://diplomatmagazine.eu/2022/03/21/iranian-flavors-in-the-hague-iran-the-gate-of-all-nations/ (accessed 10/06/2023)

Ayhan, K.J., 2020. A typology of people to people diplomacy, [online] available at https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/typology-people-people-diplomacy (accessed 11/06/2023)

Ayora-Diaz, S.I. (Ed). 2021. *The cultural politics of food, taste, and identity: a global perspective*, Bloomsbury Academic, London

Ayora-Diaz, S.I., 2021. Introduction: the cultural politics of taste in global perspective, *In* Ayora-Diaz, S.I. (Ed). 2021. *The cultural politics of food, taste, and identity: a global perspective*, Bloomsbury Academic, London

Banks, R., 2020. Public diplomacy evaluation, *In* Snow, N. and Taylor, P.M. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook on public diplomacy*,2nd Edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA

Bar, S., 2004. *Iran: cultural values, self images and negotiation behavior*, Institute for Policy and Strategy, Lauder School of Government, Diplomacy and Strategy, The Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya

Barkin, S., 2008. Qualitative methods? *In* Klotz, A. and Prakash, D. (Eds). 2008. *Qualitative methods in international relations: a pluralist guide*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Beck, L. (Ed). 2016. *Iranian foreign policy: context, reginal analyses and U.S. interests*, Nova publishers, New York, NY, USA

Benjamin, M., 2018. *Inside Iran: the real history and politics of the Islamic Republic of Iran*, O/R books, New York, NY, USA

Berridge, G.R., 2015. *Diplomacy: theory and practice*, 5th edition, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index (BTI). 2022. *Iran: country report*, Gütersloh, Germany

Bound, K., R. Briggs, J. Holden, and S. Jones, 2007. *Cultural diplomacy*, Demos, London

Bryman, A., 2012. *Social research methods*, 4th edition, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA

Burnham, P., K.G. Lutz, W. Grant, and Z. Layton-Henry, 2008. *Research methods in politics*, 2nd edition, Palgrave McMillan, New York, NY, USA

Center of Public Diplomacy (CPD). 2015. Eight great gastodiplomacy nations, [online] available at https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/story/eight-great-gastrodiplomacy-nations (accessed 31/05/2023)

Chapple-Sokol, S., 2013. Culinary diplomacy: breaking bread to win hearts and minds, *The Hague Journal of* Diplomacy, 8:161-183.

Colás, A., J. Edwards, J. Levi, and S. Zubaida, 2018. *Food, politics, and society: social theory and the modern food system*, University of California Press, Oakland, CA, USA

Cooper, A.E., J. Heine, and R. Thakur, (Eds). 2013. *The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK .

Conflict Kitchekn.org. 2023. About, [online] available at http://www.conflictkitchen.org/about/ (accessed 11/06/2023)

Constantinou, C.M., P. Kerr, and P. Sharp, (Eds). 2016. *The SAGE handbook of diplomacy*, SAGE, London

Cull, N.J., 2009. *Public diplomacy: lessons from the past*, Figueroa Press, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Curini, L. and R. Franzese, (Eds). 2020. *The SAGE handbook of research methods in political science and international relations*, SAGE, London

Curtiss, W.M., 1946. Food, famine and diplomacy, *The American journal of economics and sociology*, 6(1): 1-16

Debora, G., C. Ongkowidjojo, and M.A.S. Hikam, 2015. Enhancing competitive identity in global competition: a comparative study of gastrodiplomacy in Malaysia and South Korea, *Journal Universitas Paramadina*, 12(1):1319-1347

DeSoucey, M., 2010. Gastronationalism: food traditions and authenticity politics in the European Union, *American Sociological Review*, 75(3):432–455

Dinnie, K. 2016. *Nation branding: concepts, issues, practice*, 2nd edition, Routledge, Abingdon, UK

Dinnie, K., and E. Sevin, 2020. The changing nature of nation branding: implications for public diplomacy: implications for public diplomacy, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Due Diligence (DD). 2021. *Agricultural and agri-food industry in Iran*, European Union.

El-Nawawy, M., 2013. Muslim's online faith diplomacy, *In* Seib, P. (Ed). 2013. *Religion and public diplomacy*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Ermann, A. and K.J. Hermanik, (Eds). 2018. *Branding the nation, the place, the product*, Routledge, London

Ermann, A. and K.J. Hermanik, 2018. Introduction: branding the nation, the place, the product, *In* Ermann, A. and Hermanik, K.J. (Eds). 2018. *Branding the nation, the place, the product*, Routledge, London.

Eventbrite. com.2023. Learn to make Persian cuisine, [online] available at https://www.eventbrite.com/e/learn-to-make-persian-cuisine-tickets-617186801337 (accessed 11/06/2023)

Fan, Y., 2006. Branding the nation: what is being branded? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1): 5–14

Farzanegan, M.R. and P. Alaedini, (Eds). 2016. *Economic welfare and inequality in Iran: developments since the revolution*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Farzanegan, M.R. and P. Alaedini, 2016. Introduction, *In* Farzanegan, M.R. and Alaedini, P. (Eds). 2016. *Economic welfare and inequality in Iran: developments since the revolution*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA

Feigenbaum, H.B., 2001. *Globalization and cultural diplomacy*, The centre for arts and culture,

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2023. Country profile: Islamic Republic of Iran [online] available at https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#country/102 (accessed 18/03/2023)

Foreign Policy, 2022. How countries use food to win friends and influence people, [on-line] available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/08/20/food-diplomacy-countries-identity-culture-marketing-gastrodiplomacy-gastronativism/ (accessed 16/09/2022)

Ghorbani, M., 2013. *The economic geology of Iran: mineral deposits and natural resources*, Springer, New York, NY, USA

Gilboa, E., 2008. Searching for a theory of public diplomacy, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616: 55-77

Goff, P.M., 2020. Cultural diplomacy, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA

Gohardani, F. and Z. Tizro, 2019. *The political economy of Iran: development, revolution and political violence*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, Switzerland.

Golan, G.J., S.U. Yang, and D.F. Kinsey, (Eds). 2015. *International public relations and public diplomacy: communication and engagement*, Peter Lang, New York, NY, USA

Golan, G.J. and S.U. Yang, 2015. Introduction: the integrated public diplomacy perspective, *In* Golan, G.J., Yang, S.U. and Kinsey, D.F. (Eds). 2015. *International public relations and public diplomacy: communication and engagement*, Peter Lang, New York, NY, USA.

Green, J.D., Wehrey, F. and C. Wolf, 2009. *Understanding Iran*, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, USA

Hart, J., 2018. Historicizing the relationship between nation branding and public relations, *In* Viktorin, C., Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., Estner, A. and Will, M.K. (Eds). 2018. *Nation branding in modern history*, Berghahn Books, New York, NY, USA

Henrikson, A.K., 2006. *What can public policy achieve?* Netherlands Institute of International Relations.

Hocking, B., 2005. Rethinking the 'new' public diplomacy, *In* Mellisen, J. (Ed). 2005. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.

Ichijo, A., 2020. Food and nationalism: gastronationalism revisited, *Nationalities Papers*, 1–9.

Infoyab. 2023. Supermarkets in the USA: discover top Persian supermarkets in the USA, [online] available at https://infoyab.com/usa/supermarkets/ (accessed 11/06/2023)

Islamic Culture and Relations Organization (ICRO). 2023. Iranian food, [online] available at https://en.icro.ir/Iranian-Food (accessed 11/06/2023)

Jaber, N., and J.M. Forman, 2021. Gastrodiplomacy: food as an instrument of cross-cultural understanding, [online] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oqUPHisrr50 (accessed 06/10/2022)

Juneau, T. and S. Razavi, (Eds). 2013. *Iranian foreign policy since 2001: alone in the world*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Juneau, T. and S. Razavi, 2013. Introduction: alone in the world, *In* Juneau, T. and Razavi, S. (Eds). 2013. *Iranian foreign policy since 2001: alone in the world*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Kaefer, F., 2020. Country branding: a practitioner perspective, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.
Kamal, N. and M. Chung, 2022. Cuisines of diaspora: expressions of Iranian food ways and culinary traditions, *Journal of Gastronomy and Tourism*, 7: 1–20.
Katzman, K., 2016. Iran's foreign policy, *In* Beck, L. (Ed). 2016. *Iranian foreign policy: context, reginal analyses and U.S. interests*, Nova publishers, New York, NY, USA .
Kazemzadeh, M., 2020. *Iran's foreign policy: elite factionalism, ideology, the nuclear weapons program, and the United States*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK.
Klotz, A. and D. Prakash, (Eds). 2008. *Qualitative methods in international relations: a pluralist guide*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA .
Klotz, A., 2008. Introduction, *In* Klotz, A. and Prakash, D. (Eds). 2008. *Qualitative methods in international relations: a pluralist guide*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.
Kotler, P. and D. Gertner, 2002. Country as brand, product, and beyond: a place marketing and brand management perspective, Journal *of Brand Management,* 9(4/5): 249-261
Kozymka, I., 2014. *The diplomacy of culture: the role of UNESCO in sustaining cultural diversity*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA .
Lamont, C., 2015. *Research methods in international relations*, SAGE, London.
Lauden, R., 2015. Dining with Darius: The Persian kitchen and the spread of empire, *Cairo Review*, 18: 58-63.
Leonard, M. C. Stead, and C. Smewing, 2002. *Public diplomacy*, The Foreign Policy Centre, London.
Lipscomb, A., 2019. Culinary relations: gastrodiplomacy in Thailand, Taiwan, and South Korea, *The Yale review of international studies*, 17-39.
Loskota, B. and R. Flory, 2013. Why religion still matters in the world, *In* Sieb, P. (Ed). 2013. *Religion and public diplomacy*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, NY, USA.
Low, K.E.Y., 2021. Gastropolitical encounters and the political life of sensation, *The Sociological Review*, 69(1):190–205.
Luša, D. and R. Jakešević, 2017. The role of food in diplomacy: communication and 'winning hearts and minds' through food, *Media Studies*, 8 (16): 99-119.
Maloney, S., 2015. *Iran's political economy since the revolution*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA.
Manor, I., 2019. *The digitalization of public diplomacy*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham, Switzerland
McGlade, J., 2009. More a plowshare than a sword: the legacy of US cold war agricultural Diplomacy, Agricultural *History*, 83(1): 79-102
McMillan, T., 2016. The global cooking class that promotes diplomacy, [online] available at https://www.nationalgeographic.com/culture/article/from-iran-with-love-virtual-lessons-in-cooking-and-diplomacy (accessed 09/06/2023)
Mellisen, J. (Ed)., 2005. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.
Mellisen, J., 2005. The new public diplomacy: between theory and practice, *In* Mellisen, J. (Ed). 2005. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.
Mendelson, J., 2016. Foreign policy in the kitchen, *E-International Relations*, 1-6.
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark (MFAD). 2017. *The agriculture and food market in Iran: Opportunities and challenges for Danish companies*, The Royal Danish Embassy in Tehran, Tehran.
Moilanen, T. and S. Rainisto, 2009. *How to brand nations, cities, and destinations: a planning boom for place branding*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.
Moma, R. and D. 2018. Gastrodiplomacy: the politics of food, [online] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uvd6gxzq3So (accessed 06/10/2022).
Morgan, N., A. Pritchard, and R. Pride, (Eds). 2004. *Destination branding: creating the unique destination positioning*, 2nd edition, Elsevier, Oxford, UK.
Motamed, M., 2017. *Developments in Iran's agriculture sector and prospects for U.S. trade*, USAID.
Mousavian, S.H. and M.R. Chitsazian, 2020. Iran's foreign policy in the Middle East: a grand strategy, *Middle East Policy*, 27(3): 99-114

Nau, H.R., 1978. The diplomacy of world food: goals, capabilities, issues and arenas, *International Organization*, 32: 775-809.

Nirwandy, N. and A.A. Awang, 2014. Conceptualizing public diplomacy social convention culinary: engaging gastro diplomacy warfare for economic branding, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 130: 325 – 332.

Nye, J.S., 2008. Public diplomacy and soft power, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616: 94-109.

Ohnesorge, H.W., 2020. *Soft power: the forces of attraction in international relations*, Springer, Cham, Switzerland.

Olins, W., 2005. Making a national brand, *In* Mellisen, J. (Ed). 2005. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.

Olins, W., 2002. Branding the nation- the historical context, *Brand management*, 9(4-5):241-248.

Oo, H.M., 2017. Why food is a great diplomatic tool, [online] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ExjbmAD02HQ (accessed 06/10/2022).

Osiewicz, P., 2021. *Foreign policy of the Islamic republic of Iran: between ideology and pragmatism*, Routledge, Abingdon, UK.

Papadopoulos, N. and M. Cleveland, (Eds). 2021. *Marketing countries, places, and place-associated brands: identity and image*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.

Papadopoulos, N. and M. Cleveland, 2021. Introduction: the 'country' vs. 'place' and 'marketing' vs. 'branding' conundrum, *In* Papadopoulos, N. and Cleveland, M. (Eds). 2021. *Marketing countries, places, and place-associated brands: identity and image*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.

Papaioannou, K., 2017. Cultural diplomacy in international relations, *International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences,* 3(9):942-944.

Parasecoli, F., 2022. How countries use food to win friends and influence: gastrodiplomacy has gone mainstream, Foreign Policy, [online] available at https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/08/20/food-diplomacy-countries-identity-culture-marketing-gastrodiplomacy-gastronativism/ (accessed 31/05/2023).

Pesaran, E., 2011. *Iran's struggle for economic independence: reform and counter-reform in the post-revolutionary era*, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Persian Hospitality Network. 2023. Persian hospitality network, [online] available at https://www.persianhospitalitynetwork.co.uk/about (accessed 11/06/2023).

Persianrestaurant.org, 2023. Top and best Persian restaurants, [online] available at https://www.persianrestaurant.org/ (accessed 11/06/2023).

Persian Restaurants Network, 2023. Persian restaurant near your city, [online] available at https://persianrestaurant.net/ (accessed 11/06/2023).

Pham, M.J.A., 2013. Food as communication: a case study of South Korea's gastrodiplomacy, *Journal of International Service*, 22(1):1-22

Pigman, G.A., 2016. *Trade diplomacy transformed: why trade matters for global prosperity*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Pinterest, 2023. Persian restaurants all over the word, [online] available at https://www.pinterest.com/jeanie402/persian-restaurants-all-over-the-world/ (accessed 11/06/2023).

Polk, W.R., 2009. *Understanding Iran*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Raghfar, H. and M. Babapour, 2016. Poverty, inequality, and income mobility in Iran: a pseudo-panel approach, *In* Farzanegan, M.R. and Alaedini, P. (Eds). 2016. *Economic welfare and inequality in Iran: developments since the revolution*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.

Ramazani, R.K., 2013. *Independence without freedom: Iran's foreign policy*, University of Virginia Press, London.

Ranta, R., 2015. Food and nationalism: from Foie Gras to Hummus, *World Policy Journal*, 32(3): 33-40

Rashidghalam, M. (Ed). 2020. *The economics of agriculture and natural resources: the case of Iran*, Springer, Singapore.

Rashidghalam, M., 2020. Introduction to the economics of agriculture and natural resources, *In* Rashidghalam, M. (Ed).2020. *The economics of agriculture and natural resources: the case of Iran*, Springer, Singapore.

Rashidghalam, M., (Ed).2019. *Sustainable agriculture and agribusiness in Iran*, Springer, Singapore.

Rashidghalam, M., 2019. Introduction to sustainable agriculture and agribusiness in Iran, *In* Rashidghalam, M. (Ed).2019. *Sustainable agriculture and agribusiness in Iran*, Springer, Singapore.

Reynolds, C., 2012. *Diplomatic gastronomy: the convivial nature of the power of prestige, cultural diplomacy and soft power*, University of South Australia.

Ritzer, G. (Ed)., 2012. *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopaedia of globalization*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Rockower, P., 2020. A guide to gastrodiplomacy, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Rockower, P., 2014. The state of gastrodiplomacy, *public diplomacy magazine*, 11: 13-16

Rockower, P. 2012. Recipes for gastrodiplomacy, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 8(3): 235–246.

Rugh, W.A. (Ed). 2011. *The practice of public diplomacy: confronting challenges abroad*, Palgrave McMillan, New York, NY, USA.

Rugh, W.A., 2011. Conclusion: field experiences and best practices, *In* Rugh, W.A. (Ed).2011. *The practice of public diplomacy: confronting challenges abroad*, Palgrave McMillan, New York, NY, USA.

Samuel-Azran, T., 2020. Nation branding in the Arab world, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Schneider, C.P., 2006. Cultural diplomacy: hard to define, but you'd know it if you saw it, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 13(1):191-203.

Schneider, W., 1975. Agricultural exports as an instrument of diplomacy, *Food Policy*, 23-31.

Seib, P. (Ed). 2013. *Religion and public diplomacy*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.

Selim, L., 2016. Food is not only culture, it's diplomacy, [online video] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-eyROTdBUs4 (accessed 27/03/2023).

Senyurt, A.H., 2012. Iran seeking for alternative foreign policies against the prevailing global political-economic system, *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 4(2):43-51.

Seyf, A., 1996. Foreign trade and the economy of Iran in the nineteenth century, *Journal of Persian Studies*, 35: 117-128.

Shah, R., 2010. Culinary diplomacy at the Axis of Evil Café, [online] available at https://www.salon.com/2010/06/09/conflict_kitchen_restaurant/ (accessed 09/06/2023).

Sharp, P., 2005. Revolutionary states, outlaw regimes and the techniques of public diplomacy, *In* Mellisen, J. (Ed). 2005. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, USA.

Snow, N. and N.J. Cull, (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Snow, N., 2020. Rethinking public diplomacy in the 2020s, *In* Snow, N. and Cull, N.J. (Eds). 2020. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, 2nd edition, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Snow, N. and P.M. Taylor, (Eds). 2009. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Snow, N., 2009. Rethinking public diplomacy, *In* Snow, N. and Taylor, P.M. (Eds). 2009. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*, Routledge, New York, NY, USA.

Solleh, F.M., 2015. Gastrodiplomacy as a soft power tool to enhance nation brand, *Journal of Media and Information Warfare*, 7:161-199.

Spence, C. 2016. Gastrodiplomacy: assessing the role of food in decision-making, *Flavour*, 5(4): 1-16.

Suntikul, W., 2017. Gastrodiplomacy in tourism, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-19

Taher, A. and H. Elshahed, 2020. The shortest way to a nation's heart: culinary diplomacy patterns among Egyptians, *Cultural and Religious Studies*, 8(9): 498-509.

Tettner, S. and B. Kalyoncu, 2016. Gastrodiplomacy 2.0: culinary tourism beyond nationalism, *Journal of tourism research*, 6(2):47-55

The Sun Daily. 2021. Strengthening Iran-Malaysia friendships through food and cultural diplomacy, [online] available at https://www.thesundaily.my/local/strengthening-iran-malaysia-friendships-through-food-and-cultural-diplomacy-EX7473745 (accessed 09/06/2023).

Tracy, S.J., 2020. *Qualitative research methods: collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*, 2nd edition, John Wiley and Sons, Inc, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA.

TRVI World. 2022. The chef ambassador: Iranian cuisine, [online] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gcCtEgWHCvI (accessed 05/10/2022)

Tussie, D., 2013. Trade diplomacy, *In* Cooper, A.E., Heine, J. and Thakur, R. (Eds). 2013. *The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Tyler, M.C. and C. Beyerinck, 2016. Citizen diplomacy, *In* Constantinou, C. M., Kerr, P. and Sharp, P. (Eds). 2016. *The SAGE handbook of diplomacy*, SAGE, London.

United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR). 2019. Greece discovers the best of Iranian cuisine, [online] available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dbJ0aGK4bUs (accessed 10/06/2023).

van Bergeijk, P.A.G., 2009. *Economic diplomacy and the geography of international trade*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Vatanka, A., 2021. *The battle of the Ayatollahs in Iran: the United States, foreign policy and political rivalry since 1979*, I.D. Taurus, London.

Viktorin, C., J.C.E. Gienow-Hecht, A. Estner, and M.K. Will, (Eds). 2018. *Nation branding in modern history*, Berghahn Books, New York, NY, USA.

Viktorin, C., J.C.E. Gienow-Hecht, A. Estner, and M.K. Will, 2018. Beyond marketing and diplomacy: exploring the historical origins of nation branding, *In* Viktorin, C., Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., Estner, A, and von Maltzahn, N. (Eds). 2013. *The Syria-Iran axis: cultural diplomacy and international relations in the Middle East*, I.B. Taurus, London.

Wang, J., 2005. Localising public diplomacy: the role of sub-national actors in nation branding, *Place Branding*, 2(1): 32-42.

Waldfogel, J., 2020. Dining out as cultural trade, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 44: 309–338.

Wastnidge, E., 2015. The modalities of Iranian soft power: from cultural diplomacy to soft war, *Politics*, 35 (3-4): 364-377.

Wells, L.T. and A.G. Wint, 2000. *Marketing a country: promotion as a tool for attracting foreign investment*, IFC, World Bank, Washington D.C.

White, P., 2009. *Developing research questions: A guide for social scientists*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Will, M.K. (Eds)., 2018. *Nation branding in modern history*, Berghahn Books, New York, NY, USA.

Wolf, E., 2020. Gastro-diplomacy in Iran, World Food Travel Association, [online] available at https://worldfoodtravel.org/gastrodiplomacy-in-iran/ (accessed 07/10/2022).

World Bank, 2022. *Iran economic monitor: managing economic uncertainties*, Washington D.C.

Zhang, J., 2015. The foods of the worlds: mapping and comparing contemporary gastrodiplomacy campaigns, International *Journal of Communication*, 568–591.