Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai

The Faculty of European Studies

PhD Thesis

History

The Cultural Diplomacy of Romania in the interwar period

-The representation of History-

ABSTRACT

PhD Supervisor

Professor Nicolae Păun

PhD Candidate

Bogdan Lucian Jora

CONTENT

Chapter VIII

8.Internal considerations regarding the utility of own cultural propaganda materials.
8.1   The Brochures
8.2   The Press articles
8.3   The Radio Stations
8.4   The Honorific consuls
8.5   The Conferences

Chapter IX

9. The Universal Expos as Cultural Diplomacy/Propaganda actions
9.1   Romania's participation at the World Expos in Paris
9.2   Other participations

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Abstract

Key words: *cultural diplomacy, public diplomacy, international relations, history representation*

In a way or another the issue of cultural representation and representation of ideas into political and educational materials have marked my professional career. Cultural diplomacy trough the representation of History as a conflict prevention strategy was a research direction with a particular significance in Romania of the late 90'es and my native region Transylvania. I came from a country which as W. Churchill use to say is often producing more history that it can consume. In the PhD research (with the additional publications specified in the publication list) I tried to investigate the way different representation techniques are suitable to historical circumstances or the cultural mindsets of the individuals.

Our work was from the very beginning difficult considering the many theoretical and methodological problems we had to face to name just the limited resources, limited time and in general the suspicion among the professionals regarding a new and unconsolidated field of study. The Romanian cultural diplomacy cannot be studied as a separated form the cultural diplomacies of the neighbouring countries, the necessary comparison being an additional challenge.

This research remains basically a historical one having in mind its basis on primary archival sources. We tried to avoid theoretical models which for various reasons are not pleasant to historians.

Trough Cultural Diplomacy or Propaganda the Culture is instrumental with the aim to obtain Security of Hegemony. Integrating cultural dimensions into foreign policy analysis may add an additional dimension still neglected by most analysts. Most of the works we have consulted so far are focussed almost exclusively on descriptive methodologies. There are usually missing the in depth analysis in terms of methodologies and strategies when we are dealing with Cultural Diplomacy or Cultural Propaganda.

The research is an attempt to enlighten what was understood trough Cultural Propaganda in the interwar period as shown by archive documents from the Romanian Central Historical Archive and the Archive of the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The term „Propaganda" as used in the diplomatic reports at that time in many respects has a different meaning as compared with the

present meaning. In its use in the diplomatic reports it often covers also what is meant today by Cultural Diplomacy.

The thesis is structured in 9 chapters, 67 under chapters and 14 annexes.

Research Methodology Challenges

- Difficult to measure attitudes & opinions
- Unrepresentative or missing opinion pools
- Would cultural diplomacy campaign substitute, for what is perceived, as bad politics?
- Bad reputation of a political leader an impact on the entire country
- Observable changes to a desirable outcome within the own model
- How to measure visibility, impact & how to evaluate it?

The Sources

The archival funds consulted offer an information with many gaps. There are years for which the documentation is missing regardless the fact that there were supposed to be monthly reports send to the Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Headquarter by the Cultural or Press attaches of by the Ambassador. Some reports are very extensive, consisting on very detailed information exposed in dozen of pages, with detailed descriptions, recommendations etc. We suppose an action of deliberate destruction of many archival sources somewhere in time, or some of the sources may be still dissipated among different archival funds. The Archival fund of the Romanian Ministry of Propaganda was archived during the mid 60's using perhaps what was left available from another funds. There is not available an unified archival fund for key institutions of the Romanian Cultural Diplomacy at that time such as *Academia di Romania* or the Romanian Academy in Paris (Fontenay aux Roses), the activity of those two institution being reconstituted from various archival funds and sources (personal letters, and documents form the Romanian Ministry of Education Fund, The Romanian Academy Library). The archivist material is very unequal as far as the quality of information is concerned. Some reports are detailed and sophisticated (the reports of Blaga, Gugler, Cisek, Haralamb) whille others are very formal with few routine sentences.

The Terms

The first chapter is an attempt to define the terms Cultural Diplomacy and Propaganda, their meaning in different context and in particular what distinguish them in various contexts. We were particularly concerned to see the circumstances in which a cultural diplomacy action became or is perceived as propaganda. The term Cultural Diplomacy is rarely used in the interwar documents, usually the term Cultural Propaganda or Propaganda covering the term Cultural Diplomacy as used today. Of course we are talking about a certain kind of Cultural Propaganda, "bad one" or "good one" as expressed by Nicolae Iorga. Today the terms Cultural Diplomacy and Cultural Propaganda have very different meanings. The difference consists in the aims, tools, strategies, language, approach etc. Cultural Diplomacy involves the desire to perform art for the love of art, spontaneity, subtlety. It does not have as primary goal a political one as in the case of Propaganda. Cultural Diplomacy involves decentralisation, is performed mainly by independent non-state actors. Every citizen of a certain country in a way or another is a cultural diplomat of its country, and would have a certain story to tell to a foreign audience. Although I found the term Cultural Diplomacy/Public Diplomacy used in a number of circumstances in the interwar period (in Romanian diplomatic reports) it came after 1965 as a good substitute for Propaganda.

The number of published books, the number of conferences, permeability among the general public from a foreign country, the number of cultural exchanges…insures for a country according with the present meaning of the term Cultural Diplomacy not a Propaganda. Certainly those actions need even if were designed or are in fact cultural diplomacy actions need to be perceived as such by the target audience.

Cultural Propaganda involves:

- Monolog - one way flow of information
- Availability to talk not to listen
- Paternalism and Arrogance: real or perceived as such?
- Strategies design to convince the own public opinion that something is done
- The goals in terms of efficiency
- Short term/immediate visible political results
- The size of the audience less important than the influence of the audience

- Expressions: *"is clear", "everybody knows", " it's well known"*

Cultural Diplomacy involves:

- Dialog & willingness to listen - two ways flow of cultural influence
- Willingness to listen in order to facilitate the mutual understanding
- Willingness to modify own opinions as a result of the dialogue/debate
- Involves spontaneity, discretion & the genuine interest to 'do art for art'
- Political outcome different then in the case of cultural propaganda
- Decentralization & *de-diplomatisation*
- Direct and un-intermediate access to the others culture
- Modesty & discretion vs. parade & arrogant perceived manifestations
- Pattern of communication & the logic of argumentation
- Relaxed attitude vs. a rigid attitude
- Complexity vs. artificial simplicity
- Narrowing the intellectual horizon vs. expanding the horizon
- Emotive selective narration & manipulation of images vs. the accent for debate.

The Practitioners – The Writers as practitioners within the Romanian Cultural Diplomacy

Some of the most famous Romanian writers at the time (Lucian Blaga, Mircea Eliade, Eugen Ionescu, Aron Cotrus, Emil Cioran, Eugen Ionsecu, Sextil Puscariu) were involved as representatives of the Romanian state in various capitals of Europe. All of them appear as excellent civil servants. Their diplomatic reports are different, more complex, and more comprehensive, with a more expressive language.

The Practitioners typology - The Adventurers
According to the information extracted from the archival files we can distinguish a certain category of cultural diplomacy/propaganda practitioners, a non conventional one. We call them here „the adventurers". Most of them are free lancers, people with a shadowed past, without a stable social position, they travelled often, change the profession and often changed their name.

Most often they are intellectuals, university graduates, members of different international political movements (most often left oriented). We find them offering their services to various publications as counsellors, lobbyists, experts etc. Many are playing a double game publishing under different names for various causes. It is a time when the permanent fight for image and influence in the big capitals proved to be a „golden mine" for those with the necessary skills to exploit it. Within our research we pointed few interesting cases as they appear in the Romanian archives. Most of the adventures are permanently asking for money or other favours to lobby or counter-lobby various actions especially episode from the Romanian –Hungarian continuous diplomatic „war".

The typology of Cultural Diplomacy/Propaganda actions

Drafting various print publications strictly coordinated from the centre was an important step towards the coordination of efforts as far as Cultural Propaganda is concerned. However it is difficult to measure the real impact for such publications. For example in Rome the publication *Romania* use to be distributed for free to various diplomatic missions only. More efficient seems to have been publications like *Revue du Monde Latin* whose content was appealing for a much broaden audience and group interests and ideologies. As far as the quality is concerned most annalists recommend the use of native speakers. The language quality of various cultural propaganda materials drafted in the centre was often a serious problem. The periodic subventions and other financial agreements granted to various foreign publications are another enigmatic aspect of the cultural diplomacy/propaganda. The amounts as such are very different according with the power of persuasion, the interests and the subject. The comparison is even more complicated having in mind the changing value of different currencies over the time. Many reports notice that the subventions once started must be continued on a regular base otherwise the once friendly newspaper may become suddenly open for enemies views. The practice of „subventions" make even more complicated the mission to evaluate the real impact of a cultural diplomacy campaign, and the real image of a certain problem in a certain country.

Choosing the target group for cultural diplomacy propaganda actions was a major concern for the cultural attaches. Targeting organisations and (cultural or political) trough influential members was also important. University professors, heads of mass media, members of the parliament (in

the democratic countries) were classic actions. The influence in various circles and the multiplicity effect insured were arguments invoked most often by the cultural attache's reports. Trough the various actions and techniques can be noticed the distinction between the strategy of cultural propaganda designed for immediate political results and the strategy of cultural propaganda which is more diffuse with the results expected in a long term perspective. The diffuse non aggressive characteristic of cultural diplomacy actions made it less interesting at that particular time for most diplomats. The political problems were very pressing (the revisionism above everything) and the various embassies were requested immediate results to immediate problems, without a long term strategy. Within the research in the next sub-chapters are analysed the following propaganda techniques as they appear in the Romanian archives: the manipulation of numbers and statistics data; the selection and negation (denial); the obsessive repetition, the use of opponent's arguments, the counter manifestations, the double standard, the search for historical parallelisms, the argument of mutual knowledge, the visual propaganda, the historical arguments, the geographical arguments, the religion arguments, the economic arguments, the use and abuse of stereotypes.

The Romanian Cultural Institutes in the interwar period

The archival material is scarce including the leading two Romanian cultural institutes, The Romanian School in Paris (Fontenay aux Roses) and *Academia di Romania* in Rome. Apart from these two institutions in the interwar period there were other few cultural institutes organised in other capitals in across Europe. Their existence would be ephemeral (in Berlin, Warsaw, Madrid). Quite illustrative for the way things use to work seems to be the fact that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were unable to tell in a report what is the legal base at the foundation of Romanian Cultural Institute in Berlin (lead by Sextil Puscariu in june 1940). The Romanian Cultural Institute in Madrid was similar to the Spanish Cultural Institute in Bucharest and a consequence of the cultural convention signed between Bucharest and Madrid. I t was organised as a centre to coordinate the activity of Romanian professors in the Spanish Universities, to be a documentation centre, library, courses and conferences location, it was also meant to coordinate the activity of Romanian students in Spain (at least in the future). In fact the institute form Madrid stops its activity in December 1944 *de iure*, because de facto exactly a week after the inauguration was left without any financial support. For almost a year the director Alexandru

Busuioceanu and a group of students succeeded to launch two books (Al. Busuioceanu: *Dacios y Rumanos en los Carpatos*; M. Eliade: *Los Rumanos. Breviario Historico*), to advance the works far a Romanian-Spanish dictionary and to organize a small Romanian library.

The published works and sources about *Academia di Romania* and *The Romanian School at Fontenay aux Roeses* are scarce. In the last two decades in Romania were published to our knowledge two works 100 and 130 pages. In 1996 the book of Gh Lazarescu „The Romanian School in Rome" is published. However compared with he study of professor Petre Turela about the Romanian School in Paris published in 1992 this one is not using archival sources, interviews with former alums, and in general first hand new sources.

What distinguish the Romanian School in Rome from the Romanian School in Paris

They were both created by the same Law and with an equal statute. However their evolution was different in many respects. Financially was favourite the School from Rome by most governments in Bucharest. Petre Turcanu speaks about the rival ties and the attitude of most political adversaries of Nicolae Iorga who had the entire control over the School form Paris.

The number of bourses and the amount af money was similar but the cost of life vas higher in Paris adding to this the distance form the *Fontenay aux Roses* while *Accademia di Romania* was located in the very canter of Rome. The difference between the two buildings hosting the Schools was visible. Nicolae Iorga use to consider „too luxurious" the location *of Accademia di Romania*. Also the publications of the School in Rome were printed in luxury conditions. The rules at *Accademia di Romania* imposed by Vasile Parvan were more severe going as far as a strict dress code.

Romanian cultural diplomacy in the interwar time. Proofs form the Archives of the Romanian Ministry of Propaganda and The Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In this chapter we tried to investigate the evolution in administrative terms of various structures in charge with the cultural diplomacy in the given period. The most criticized aspect is the useless twinning of several activities between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Propaganda. The recommended organisation in 1940 of the Ministry of Propaganda as a result of several recommendations regarding the need for unity and concentration, in fact have had several weaknesses. I did not have its own building, different department being scattered across the Romanian capital. As a general rule the Centre use to intervene periodically with recommendation in order to impose a unitary and uniform style for the press article. Mass media answers etc. Often those instructions are contradictory or to general. An important task was to collect periodically suggestions and opinions for improvement coming directly form the various diplomatic missions. Those reports are a first class documentary source, because many press attaches will not hesitate to reveal the problems and to offer recommendations. The nature and consistence of these recommendations differs according with the experience and personal skills of various press attaches.

Cultural propaganda in other countries as reflected by Romanian Diplomatic reports

In this chapter we tried to investigate the way cultural and press attaches from various embassies scattered across the world use to see their mission, their targets their challenges, and the way they propose various measures to improve a certain image. The reports as such are very different in terms of quality, perhaps directly proportional with the quality of the reporter. We succeeded to find in the archives reports belonging to three different information campaigns solicited from the Centre in 1927, 1933, 1938.

The Hungarian Cultural Propaganda reflected by Romanian Ministry of Propaganda

We tried to real the way Hungarian cultural propaganda is seen by the Romanian one. We succeeded to find few synthesis reports analyzing the content of various Hungarian Propaganda as written for a foreign audience. There are also various reports reflecting the way different

cultural attachés and heads of diplomatic missions understood to counter-attack various Hungarian cultural propaganda actions perceived as hostile to the Romanian state. Romanian referents use to organise those materials on different categories: Publications against the Romanian state; Publications against the Yugoslavian state, General Hungarian Propaganda Works

The best reports are trying to explain the functional mechanism of Hungarian Propaganda considered by the Romanians highly effective. Among the main ingredients we have noticed: The Protestant Action, The Catholic Action, the „Race" identity, The personal experiences in Transylvania.

The Antirevisionism of the Romanian cultural diplomacy/propaganda actions

This under chapter analyse the Romanian antirevisionist propaganda actions practiced by various legations across the world, as they appear in various diplomatic reports regularly transmitted to the Central. We were trying to synthesise the most used motives used against the Hungarian Propaganda, but also against the Soviet and Bulgarian one.

Other ways of cultural diplomacy/propaganda - The language of cultural propaganda materials

The language of propaganda materials for today's listener seems to be pathetic, and strange. Often is difficult to see to which extent certain materials published in Paris or Rome are original materials or materials inspired and sponsored by the Romanian embassy. The Romanian cultural diplomats were well aware about the most desirable way to court the public opinion particularly in some countries (France, Italy Portugal, Spain). Ideas like the cultural patronage (mostly France) Latinity (mostly Italy) defenders of the western civilisation (mostly in Spain) were widely use in practically every discourse or press article. The efficacy of the used methods cannot be assessed in particular in countries with a rich cultural life (Italy, France, Spain).

The Romanian cultural tourism in the interwar period

One of the most recommended methods of cultural propaganda was to encourage foreigners to come and see for themselves Romania and the Romanian people. There were several initiatives to encourage the direct contact especially among the journalists, professors, students (travel facilities, small scholarships). In 1925 in Bucharest was created a commission to systematise the trips abroad. Within our research we have selected only those actions which may correspond to the concept of cultural tourism as understood today. Starting with 1930 the Direction of Press within the ministry of Foreign Affairs would be in charge with the visits of any foreigner with a foreseeable propagandistic apport. The Office use to provide various grants (accommodation, travel). It uses to make recommendations regarding the content of tourist brochures, tourist tours. A common recommendation is related with the general idea to avoid those places without a decent infrastructure and also to guide discreetly the tourists to those regions where the Romanian population is in majority. Interesting enough some embassies like the one from US, recommend to abort entirely any tourism propaganda as far as the country does not provide decent conditions for tourism at the standard expected by the westerners, otherwise the so call „cultural tourism" would be in fact a counter-propaganda. We succeeded to find the data about the experience of a German university professor whose experience in his car trip across Romania was a continuous battle with the various authorities thirsty for bribes the last bribe being requested at the Romanian Hungarian border, and being paid by the Hungarian border policeman as the German tourist was left penniless (perhaps another episode form the Romanian – Hungarian propaganda war).

Considerations regarding the utility of materials and propaganda actions

Here we were trying to focus on utility considerations as they appear on various diplomatic reports send by various embassies as well as on different internal reports. From Washington we founded the most critical ones. The effects of propaganda materials are none as far as it is perceived as propaganda. Most brochures are useless because the broken English they are written. From Istanbul we are told that propaganda brochures are useless in Turkey simply because the Turkish people don' read brochures, more useful being a more extensive campaign in the main Turkish newspapers.

The universal exhibitions as Cultural Diplomacy events

They were at the time unique international events, perhaps the only capable to create for a certain amount of time an unique globalised environment. The strategies of representation prepared by different countries were expressed in images and messages more or less ingenious constructed. The main task was to transpose at the global level priorities of the internal or external political agenda. It is a research subject useful for today's practitioners.

The participation of Romanian at Universal exhibitions in Paris

This is a subject we stepped after the recent researches of Laurentiu Vlad. The study of those participation is very useful as it was seen by the Romanian organisers as an ideal occasion to transpose in an imagistic discourse a mechanism designed to validate towards a foreign audience the national discourse in the search for validation and acceptance in the „civilised club".
We were mostly concerned here by three aspects:
The way identity discourse is constructed and its representation techniques.
The way to popularise trough different representation techniques this identity discourse.
The extent various strategies had insured the success or failure of their initiator.

Concluding Remarks

Where do culture start and the domain of culture end to be replaced by *Propaganda* in cultural policies? This is not an existential question, but rather a policy question, integrally connected to how best to harvest, manage and distribute cultural resources.

The term "*Cultural Diplomacy*" is often a euphemism for state political "*Propaganda*". However the proliferation of information in open societies (and not only) makes it more difficult for governments to control information. The end of the Cold War did not meant "*The End of History*" but in fact it meant a new era when the cultural diplomacy as a form of public diplomacy became in some respects preeminent towards classical intergovernmental diplomacy. The spread of democracy in many countries which went hand in hand with an unprecedented access to news and information, and the rise of several non governmental actors whose voice can

constrain several governments are evolutions which impose a reconsideration and adaptation of an old theoretical framework. Most ideas absorbed today by people are beyond the classical instruments of national government control. New concepts are used to cover the new approaches. The "*old*" universal concept of "*Propaganda*" is often replaced with specific specialized terms most of them borrowed from marketing, such as "*Branding*". In the information era, the power to inform to modify images, to spread across the globe ideas and ideologies has been specially designated with a new concept, "*soft power*"[1].   Soft power is important for the Cultural Diplomacy because the concept is based on the idea that within the international environment for an actor the attractiveness of its culture can prove to be a more powerful influence tool than its economic and military strength. Although their actions are supported by various states they have their own priorities, interests and policy agendas. The term "*soft power*" directly proportional with the international image, and build by cultural diplomacy various actions has moved from the international relations scholarly papers and debates to the concrete state political agendas.

Cultural diplomacy is most often incorporated   into the more broaden concept of *Public Diplomacy*, (in English language sources). Public diplomacy refers to a diplomatic discourse and negotiations addressed to the general people not to a government, with other words negotiating not with foreign country official representatives but directly to its citizens. The term was used for the first time in 1965 and adopted immediately as a good substitute for *Propaganda* and *Psychological Warfare*. The real new relevance for the image making and representation of culture came with after the end of Cold War once the contribution of ideas and cultural models was widely recognized as a tool as powerful as the latest generation weapons. The generalization of mass information through satellite television and latter internet added a new dimension to the art of cultural representation towards a foreign audience.

Cultural diplomacy to be distinguished from *Propaganda,* must involve reciprocity. But can we talk about reciprocity when we have do deal with unequal partners? It can be a matter of proper balance. Also true that often the refusal of participation in a reciprocity exchange program is motivated by lack of confidence, and complexes of inferiority towards the strength of own culture. Strategic communication involved in cultural diplomacy strategies when aiming short term political goals when use persuasion techniques often become cultural propaganda. This

---

[1] See Joseph S Nye, *Soft Power*, New York: Public Affairs Press, 2004

evolution from cultural diplomacy to propaganda can be perceived when just like in a political campaign it develops a set of comprehensive messages and symbolic events and to reinforce them. Cultural diplomacy means above everything performing *art for art.* It is not advertising, or branding although the term "*branding a nation*", constructing a country brand has become popular and even a successful business for different media groups. Advertising involves the capacity to synthesize in basic simple concepts what is considered as most representative for a certain national culture, and then repeat it again and again, like advertising any other market product. Although the market experts are using this technique for decades the results are questionable (not to say opposite) in the case of more sophisticated concepts as those involved by a nation's branding and representation.

Some analysts would sustain that public/cultural diplomacy may become propaganda when used for "*immoral*" purposes. A risky statement as it would drag the debate towards and endless road: what is moral and immoral in politics and international relations.

Public Diplomacy/Cultural Diplomacy sometimes is conceptualized as a form of *Psychological Warfare*, at least in its *Propaganda* dimension. Anyway *Psychological Warfare* defined as the use of communication with the enemy's public to achieve an objective in war time, is an uncomfortable and exaggerated label for *Public Diplomacy* even for the cases of "*silent diplomatic wars*". It implies the use of aggressive communication and symbols to break the enemy's will and determination to resist or to attack. Although not excluded, the association between *Psychological Warfare* and *Public/Cultural Diplomacy* is so damaging to the whole subject that most analysts would rather avoid it.[2]

Probably one of the most obvious distinctiveness between cultural diplomacy and propaganda is the genuine search for mutual influence, the two ways flow of cultural influence, and above all the willingness of those studying the target audience to adapt and to accept being transformed by the target audience in order to facilitate the mutual understanding. Studying the audience in order to create more effective ways to influence them is practiced since immemorial times but it was

---

[2] Nicholas J. Cull, Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, April 2007, p. 20

not cultural diplomacy in its today's meaning. In these approaches the dialogue was often practiced, but not in order to negotiate something or to find the lowest common denominator, but as a skilful pedagogical technique to facilitate the audience's acceptance[3]. In a *zero sum game* perception there is no place for genuine dialogue. In this case the biggest problem for practitioners (in our case cultural attaches) seems to be the ignorance of the opposite side's audience. In this scenario the practitioner's mission is to convince the foreign audience about the indisputable arguments of its cause. In the case of many small and poorer countries we may have a case of misrepresentation and incapacity to deliver enough information. But in the case of bigger actors often public diplomacy does not fail to deliver large amounts of information. Rather, it has failed to deliver information convincingly. The leaflet style propaganda and declamatory messages which are not engaging dialogues is ineffective. The infectiveness is even more accentuated when it address the ordinary people a story which is not pleasant to their ears.

Moving cultural diplomacy beyond propaganda implies: an understanding of the "*enemy*" audience, confronting hostility towards own culture with balanced arguments, proving to the target audience that their opinion is relevant, counts and can make a difference in a debate. Public diplomacy is a part of the political game, and its Cultural Diplomacy component must not just simply deliver a message to an audience; it has to obtain a desirable result. Getting a desirable result is again not simply about delivering what the cultural attaches think the target foreign audience would like to hear but about the need to acknowledge that the listener's point of views is acknowledged and discussed.

Another traditional dimension of cultural diplomacy involves developing relationships with key individuals through exchanges, training, conferences, and access to local media channels. In order to be effective these relationships have to be developed not chaotic or just by interpersonal feelings and intuition but between peers (politicians-special advisors, business people-cultural entrepreneurs or/and academics).

Several cultural diplomacy campaigns are rather design to conquest and convince the own public opinion that something is done and there are plenty of arguments to favours the own point of view instead of creating the type of discourse which would persuade sceptical audience and

---

[3] Nicholas J. Cull, Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, April 2007, p. 20

would sound unconvincing back home. Also not only the politicians but the media as well in a certain country may select and debate only what they and the public are pleased to hear.

The major practical questions both practitioners and theorists are trying to give an answer is the impact and efficiency of a Cultural Diplomacy action. Metaphorically for many analysts attempting to evaluate cultural diplomacy can seem: "*like a forester running out every morning to see how far his trees grow over night*"[4]. Although we are not that radical and models with viable indicators can be founded even for the distant past, an awareness of the inevitable distortions is a must. For Nichollas J. Cull[5] the size of the audience may be less relevant than the influence of the audience. We would say that even this well known example is too simplistic. The influence of the of the audience may be a variable for a short term perspective (propaganda like) while the number of audience may be one of the essential ingredients (among many others) for more in-depth, fruitful results (cultural diplomacy relevant) results in a long term perspective. Although most authors insist for an exclusive emphasis on evidence-based evaluation rather than narrative reporting. The "evidence based" evaluation may prove as being too inflexible considering the complexity of human behaviour and the multitude of variables to deal with. We would rather advocate for a mix approach which include: a) a constant media survey which seeks to identify changes in the nature and tone of coverage of targeted issues, and, where possible, the reasons for these changes; b) the opinion change among public opinion "influencers" on specific topics representative for cultural diplomacy.

Cultural Diplomacy's evaluation framework need to be a long term one with intermediate targets (short and medium term) according to different specific goals. The articulation of the links between each stage and the next is critical to the validity of the evaluation process[6]. The "links" consists in "intermediate outcomes", which for the evaluation process allow impact to be evaluated from a shorter-term perspective while still enabling general main "course" to be assessed in relation to longer-term outcomes. The viability of this model consist in the capacity

---

[4] Nicholas J. Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, April 2007, p. 45
[5] ibid
[6] ibid

to use and advocate even negative or disastrous intermediate results as intermediaries towards the long term final positive outcome.

And finally we have noticed:

- No correlation between a county wealth or size & its power of representation.
- The effective cultural capital weight less than the impact of its representation abroad.
- Not direct correlation between direct allocated funds & effective cultural presence abroad.
- Efficacy of cultural diplomacy discourse affected by the instinctive tendency to address the message to a favourable public.

The usual elements explaining the hostility towards own culture:

- Paternalism – identified often with an arrogant attitude complexes of superiority vs. complexes of inferiority. Most people would be offended if they are told what or how to think.
- Perceived libertarianism & decadence (Muslim countries)
- Perceived artificiality often associated with commercialism (Europe)

Additional recommendations

- Cultural diplomacy relations develop rather between peers than chaotic
- Different kind of engagement
- Niche cultural diplomacy
- Double-standard of analyzing & approaching others culture
- The quality and credibility of the messenger is equally important to the quality & credibility of the message
- Understanding what is relevant for the local cultural environment
- *Multiperspectivity*