



*Zentrum für Nordamerika-
Forschung (ZENAF)
Center for North American*

icd
institute for cultural diplomacy

Culture and International History III

Frankfurt am Main
Monday Dec 19th-Wednesday Dec 21st 2005

CONFERENCE REPORT

This conference is made possible thanks to a generous program grant from the:



and the significant financial support of:



The **United States State Department** and the **US Embassy in Berlin**

Culture and International History III: Summary Report - An Overview of Conference Panel Discussions

Frankfurt am Main, 19th-21st December 2005

The institute for cultural diplomacy (Director & Founder, Mark C. Donfried), in collaboration with the Center for North American Studies at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main, completed, in December 2005, the conference Culture and International History III. Launched by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht, this symposium has taken place every three years since 1999. This first two meetings took place at the Center for U.S. Studies at the Martin Luther Universität-Halle Wittenberg. The purpose of this conference is to bring together scholars from all five continents to discuss their research and identify new trends of investigation in the areas of culture and international relations. The following document is a holistic summary of the panel discussions and papers presented at the conference over the three days of dialogue between the distinguished participants.

Panel I: Cultural Relations between Europe and the United States in the Early Cold War

Mediator: Mark C. Donfried, ICD Berlin, Director and Founder

The cold war has served, in many ways, as the formative period for cultural diplomacy. It was during this period when many of the American strategies for "winning the hearts and minds" of foreigners were created and tested in Europe and beyond. In Max Friedman's paper "Atlantic Haze: The Distortions of Anti-Americanism in 1950's Franco-American Relations" he proposed that anti-Americanism, or the semblance of anti-Americanism was a causal factor in the making of American Foreign Policy, and perhaps even more so than the official French Foreign Policy at the time. Peter Kraemer contrasted Friedman's presentation by portraying the constructive and helpful role that one individual and one institution can play in bringing both sides of the Atlantic closer, in his paper "Jella Lepman, the International Youth Library, and the Rise and Fall of the Atlantic Community." Kraemer's paper fit in quite well to the context of exchange programs, which also played an instrumental role at strengthening transatlantic relations in the 20th century. Giles Scott-Smith developed this aspect through political analysis in his paper "Mapping the Undefinable: Exchange Programmes as a Topic for International Political Analysis." Scott-Smith used examples such as the US State Department's "International Visitor Program" to show that beyond serving the public diplomacy goal of one nation attempting to influence the policy of another, there has never been an example of successful public diplomacy, other than that of exchange programs. The final paper in this panel, from Jeff Stone developed one of the key challenges to cultural relations between Europe and the United States, by showing the at times very biased and propaganda-influenced ways in which one country portrays the other in News Journal Maps. His paper "Images of Germany as Presented in American National News Journal Maps in the Early Cold War Period, 1945-1955" provided numerous striking examples of maps which were manipulated in a variety of ways in order to reinforce a certain political point or agenda. One common thread tying these four papers together was the challenge of the often large gap between a country's "presentation" and "perception" within a certain host country. It was primarily this

challenge that inspired the cultural diplomacies of the cold war period, and this challenge still remains at the heart of cultural diplomacy research today.

Panel II: Theory and Philosophy

Mediator: PD Dr. Eckhardt Fuchs, Education, University of Mannheim

This panel outlined part of the theoretical framework in which our conference research can be analyzed, creating a crossroads between theory and philosophy. In his presentation, "After the Cultural Turn: IR Theory meets Area Studies," Morten Valbjorn highlighted one of the new trends in academia to focus more on specific area studies and less on strict IR theory. To then get more specific, Jean Terrier presented his paper "Culture and the Possibility of Exchange Internationalism and Cultural Transfers in the Work of Marcel Mauss." Terrier asked the question of what kind of notion of culture is required before one can envisage the possibility of exchange not only of goods and services, but of lifestyles, knowledge or world-views across national borders? He addressed this question through examples of thinkers such as Marcel Mauss in France to demonstrate that the concept of culture was forged in order to be able to account for the existence of commonalities of habits and beliefs between countries and civilizations. The paper of William Sokoloff on "Citizenship, Dialogue, and Intercultural Experience: Hannah Arendt's Theory of Politics" discussed that Hannah Arendt's concept of politics, promoting individualistic, strictly aesthetic and masculine conception of political action, provides the basis for a critique of liberalism and a re-conceptualization of democratic citizenship in a global society. In the final paper, "Culture and Democracy: A Comparative Perspective," Emmanuel Eze uses the countries of Nigeria, Benin, and Ghana and their constant "transitions" to democracy as examples of some generally misunderstood conceptual and historical relations between culture and democracy. We see through his research the ways in which political cultures of postcolonial Africa are producing newer understanding of the role of culture in the success or failure of democratic political institutions.

Panel III: Cultural Diplomacy in Eastern Europe

Moderator: Jessica Gienow-Hecht, Zentrum fuer Nordamerika Forschung, Johann Wolfgang Unversitaet, Frankfurt am Main

This panel investigated the role of cultural diplomacy in Eastern Europe.

John Prestia's paper "Understanding the 'War between Slavism and Germanism': Constructing Character Psychology in Neutral Romania, 1914-1916," looked at the myth of World War One as a battle between Slavism and Germanism with a focus on Romania. He argued that this was not a war of Slavs against Germans. In contrast, many pro-Slavs felt comfortable siding with German viewpoints and vice versa. Andrea Orzoff's paper, presented in the absence of the author, took a more general look at the role of cultural diplomacy in Eastern Europe in the interwar period. She showed how East European countries competed with one another for the sympathies of the West in an effort to join the "Castle" of Europe.

Anikó Macher looked at the reception of Western cultural action in Hungary in the late 1950s and early 1960s in the paper "The perception of Western cultural action in Hungary (1956-1963)." According to Macher, Hungarian cultural diplomacy represented a way to maintain relations with western countries whenever political

relations were out of question – this concerned, above all, France, Great Britain and Italy, all countries with which Hungary had traditionally maintained relations before the cold war. Annika Frieberg looked at the role of Non-State Diplomacy in the Bensberger Polen-Memorandum in the late 1960s in her paper "Catholics in Ostpolitik? Networking and Non-State Diplomacy in the Bensberger Polen-Memorandum, 1966-1970." She found that actors and agents such as the media and the Catholic Church contributed significantly to the reconciliation between Germany and Poland during this period.

In tandem, the papers demonstrated several insights: 1. the significance of cultural diplomacy in what has commonly been labeled “Eastern Europe” in no way resembled the role it played in “western countries”, notably during the cold war. While cold war cultural diplomacy in the West, above all in the United States, frequently developed along the lines of official diplomacy, Eastern countries often used cultural relations in order to maintain or create a liaison with nations that they could not or would not reach on the political level. 2. The role of NGOs, above all the Catholic Church as a quasi-state or other political actor seems as obvious in Eastern Europe as it became elsewhere, such as in the Middle East or Asia. In the 1950s and 1960s, communist states experienced a tremendous amount of internal pressure to be more open and more international. Governments countered these criticism by using international NGOs as an avenue for cultural (if not political) exchange.

Panel IV: Propaganda and Cultural Diplomacy in Italy

Moderator: David Ellwood, Associate Professor, International History, University of Bologna

Prof. Lorenzo Medici in his paper "From Propaganda to Cultural Cooperation: Italian Cultural Diplomacy after the Second World War," offered an historical contextualization of the efforts made by Italian governments since the 1930s to define a policy of cultural diplomacy for the nation. Beginning with a survey of Fascism's notable commitment to this field – as with all totalitarian regimes –the presentation went on to indicate how the post/anti-fascist governments of the years after the Second World War tried to adapt the projection of Italy's image in the world after the defeat and humiliation of Mussolini's grandiose nationalistic and racial project. Bereft of political or material resources for conducting an active foreign policy, the post-war era saw the emergence of a concept of ‘co-operation’ – non-nationalistic, third world and development-oriented, always open to connections with anyone – which would try to restore Italian legitimacy in the international system, and express an idea of what a middle-ranking power could and should do in the field of culture. This impulse was contrasted with the more power-driven cultural strategies of the leading nations in the West, ‘messianic’ in the case of the Americans and the French, compensatory in the case of the British.

Dr. Nicolo Tognarini in "Italian Cultural Propaganda: a Trans-national Perspective in the Development of Propaganda Practices in the 1930's," proposed a detailed examination of one particular Fascist propaganda operation, the programming directed towards the Middle East by the specially-constructed Radio Bari. The station had a special mandate to broadcast, in a version of the native language, material which would inflame the souls of the Arab nations against their imperial oppressors, particularly the British, in charge in Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, Jordan etc. The impact of

all this was measured via British documentation, which reveals His Majesty's Government, less and less secure in its hold on that particular part of the world, to have been significantly irritated by the Fascist activities (a major reason for the founding of the Empire radio service in 1932 and the British Council in 1935). The surviving documentation reveals though that the intensity of Radio Bari's efforts was directly correlated to the state of relations between Britain and Fascist Italy.

The two papers raised significant questions about the connections between nations, nationalism and propaganda, questions which are by no means limited to the era of the totalitarian regimes. The relationship between political strategies in foreign policies and the use of modern means of communication evolved very rapidly over the period between the world wars, and then again during the era of reconstruction and the Cold War. Italy shows though how difficult the transition from totalitarian to democratic purposes could be, how important new international institutions such as UNESCO could be in this task, but also how marginal cultural considerations always were, even in the case of a nation with a uniquely rich cultural heritage and so few other resources for recasting its place in the world.

Panel V: Cultural Relations in Russia and the Soviet Union

Moderator: Max Friedman, Assistant Professor, History, Florida State University
2005: Fellow, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, University of Cologne

These two presentations on Soviet cultural diplomacy demonstrated both the potential of multinational archival work and the special circumstances facing cultural diplomats serving dictatorships. Jean-François Fayet in his paper "Culture, Diplomacy and Political Lobbying," reported about VOKS, the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations Abroad, developed by the Soviet Union in 1925 to try to break out of its international isolation. This group was designed to improve ties to Western intellectuals and artists, in order to generate sympathy for a Soviet Union that felt itself threatened. This was an innovation, since initially the Soviets were more interested in reaching mass organizations of workers in foreign Communist Parties rather than the "petit-bourgeois intelligentsia."

The VOKS was quickly confronted by a proliferation of competitive groups of "fellow travelers," making it difficult to coordinate a consistent line. The dilemma of how to discipline networks of independent-minded thinkers and artists was resolved by the Stalinist terror in the 1930s, when many of the VOKS officials, now under suspicion for their ties to the West, were liquidated.

Rosa Magnusdottir described in her article "Mission Impossible? Soviet Cultural Delegations in the United States of America in the 1950s," a delegation of Soviet journalists and writers who came to the United States in 1955 and were immediately confronted with the deficiencies of Soviet propaganda. The post-Stalin thaw and "Spirit of Geneva" made such visits possible, but as they spent a month meeting Soviet friends such as Paul Robeson and ordinary Americans as well, the delegates realized their images of the United States were hopelessly outdated, caricatured, and far too dark. They expected a Dickensian nightmare of industrial exploitation, suffering masses and African-Americans in chains. But as they saw, levels of consumerist comfort were high, and Robeson urged them not to treat the "Negro Question" as though they were still in the days of Uncle Tom's Cabin – one of the

few American books they had been allowed to read. They reported both their surprise and their conviction that Soviet strategy had to make far-reaching changes, from establishing tourist bureaus in Soviet cities and improving passenger service on Aeroflot to allowing more open contacts between ordinary people in both countries. There was great demand for this in Russia, where hundreds of people wrote to the Kremlin to support Khrushchev's call for "peaceful coexistence" with the West.

But as the Soviet delegation of 1955 showed, when openness meant more access to American culture and the American people, making Soviet socialism appear as an attractive alternative could become a "mission impossible." The dilemma this time was not resolved by killing the messengers. Instead, the very survival of cultural diplomats returning from the West with a newfound skepticism shows just how much had changed between the Soviet Union of the interwar period and that of the post-Stalin era.

The delegation's request for better answers to use against the basic critiques of the Soviet system and its foreign policy they were encountering throughout the United States point to a problem faced by all cultural diplomacy programs in any national context: there is only so much selling one can do when the product is itself unattractive.

Panel VI: Art and Museums

Moderator: Michael Krenn, Professor and Chair, History, Appalachian State University

This session involved three papers that focused on the role of art and museums in the field of international cultural diplomacy. Ms. Isabell Claus from the International Child Art Foundation read the paper, "Creating a Global Culture for Peace," written by Dr. Ashfaq Ishaq who could not attend. The paper charted the development of the ICAF and its goal of developing "creative and imaginative global leaders" by setting up art programs for children around the world. Dr. Marie-Amelie zu Salm-Salm spoke on "The Interference of Private Artistic Events with the Official International Relations in 1945/55." The paper examined the development of private contacts between French and German artists following the war and the ways in which they attempted to "promote an international acceptance through the instrument of art."

Finally, Dr. Jean-Michel Tobelem presented his work titled, "Toward a non-governmental cultural diplomacy: the case of museums." He investigated the establishment of "branch" museums, particularly by MoMA and the Guggenheim, during the past few years and the implications this has for both the world of art and the world of international relations. All three papers, and many of the questions that followed, dealt with the interesting and sometimes tense atmosphere that art and museums have to work in, navigating between the cultural, political, and even financial demands to which they are subjected. Each paper illuminated both the difficulties and the possibilities that exist for art and museums in the field of cultural diplomacy.

Panel VII: Race and the Role of African-Americans in International Relations

Moderator: Petra Dolata-Kreutzkamp, Assistant Professor, North American History, Freie Universität Berlin

Prof. Jon Rosenberg (Hunter College – CUNY) started off the session with his paper titled “We Must All Be Citizens of the World: The NAACP’s Campaign for Justice in the Twentieth Century.” Using the concept of “color conscious internationalism” he presented his research on the NAACP’s international role. On an analytical level, he emphasized the significant link between domestic and international strategies as well as the importance of the world in shaping US historical experience. His case studies of international strategies of important NAACP figures like W.E.B. Du Bois were conceptualized against a Wilsonian framework to show similarities and departures from traditional internationalist approaches introducing the concept of race. World reform but also the idea of an “American mission” were characteristics of color conscious internationalism which strove for a peaceful order and practicable cooperation. He gave three main aspects of the NAACP’s concept of the international system and its importance to reinforcing their demands for race reforms: it was thought that international institutions had to play a role in the domestic realm (world opinion), that the new global order would be less oppressive but instrumental in reforming social relations and that the new international world order would allow cooperation with other activist groups.

While Rosenberg looked at the NAACP as an international actor the next presentation focused on race as an aspect of cultural diplomacy and transnational relations. Prof. Tim Schroer (University of West Georgia) in his paper on “Bringing African American Music to the Germans: Black Music and American Diplomacy in Germany, 1945-1949” offered an empirical case study of the transfer of jazz music as cultural diplomacy. He explained how popular culture became an integral part of reeducation programs in Germany and pointed to the introduction of African-American music as a soft power tool in foreign policy. He discussed the internal debate amongst policy-makers about high versus popular culture. In his eyes the crucial analytical debate should however center on the issue of race. How could Germany be reeducated through African-American music while in the United States African-Americans encountered discrimination? Domestic race relations clearly became a liability. The American discussion on educating Germans against racism partly pointed to this hypocrisy, especially since one of the US objectives was to promote diversity and plurality of culture. It also underlined the necessity of differentiating between numerous foreign policy actors. Not only were German émigrés central figures but there seemed to be a gap between the official US line and day-to-day decisions of mid-level and low-level officials in Germany.

The ensuing discussion centered on questions of Du Bois’ role in NAACP’s international strategy and his degree of representation, the relationship between American mission and race, and the specific race-oriented Cold War settings. Specific questions to the case study on jazz music pointed to the issue of German receptiveness to such culture as well as the discussion within US bureaucracy on the adequacy of the music programs as cultural diplomacy. While Rosenberg focused on non-state and Schroer on state actors, both papers similarly pointed to an important aspect when studying cultural diplomacy or international relations. Whenever one researches cultural diplomacy as transporting a specific American vision it is essential to delineate the contesting visions of what America means, especially when the vision itself contains a concept of diversity and plurality.

Panel VIII: British cultural diplomacy in the Nineteenth Century: Women and Language

Moderator: Marsha Siefert, Professor, Department of History, Central European University

This panel addressed two aspects of what might be called interpersonal cultural diplomacy --- international/intercultural relations through education and marriage. Almut Steinbach discussed “Imperial Language Policy” and “the spread of English under early British rule in Ceylon and the Protected Malay States” during the nineteenth century. In fact, calling it “language policy” implied a more structured approach than was actually practiced by colonial rulers, and her comparative study demonstrated that different arrangements of education and the choice of language of instruction were pursued in Ceylon and later in the Malay colonies, depending upon the situation on the ground. Among important factors were competing schools and models, such as indigenous schools and missionary schools (especially from the US); the importance of understanding the multicultural composition and local hierarchies in terms of who would be allowed/encouraged to attend school; and who would be allowed/selected to teach. Importantly, Steinbach’s response to questions confirmed that British colonial policy cannot be assumed or derived from the Indian example and that in fact Indian educators often mediated in the spread of English-language education.

Dana Cooper asked “What Difference Does a Spouse Make” in discussing the marriages of American heiresses and British aristocrats. Cooper attempted to go beyond the particular and well-known instances, such as Jennie Jerome Churchill and Mary Leiter Curzon, to investigate the parameters of the phenomenon and to detail its historical trajectory. As a solution to aristocratic pecuniary woes, it lost favor as American women were portrayed toward the end of the long nineteenth-century as having too strong an influence. In response to questions, Cooper affirmed that this type of “Anglo-American alliance” introduced the idea of divorce into British society. While not wanting to push the metaphor too far, the fact that many British aristocrats that divorced American wives later remarried another American “girl” was seen as illustrating the type of “foreign relations” that helped create impressions of America during the imperial period.

Overall, these two papers demonstrated the importance of looking at nineteenth-century modes of cultural interaction so that current-day models and practices are not simply read back into history. Further, by focusing on Britain, they reinforce the importance of imperial legacies, even after the major cataclysms of the twentieth century, since the debates over the use of English and educational practices as cultural diplomacy remain. Finally, the historical examples of empire, when imperialism was still thought to have a “civilizing mission,” provide opportunities to reexamine the complex interactions and negotiations between different cultures with an English accent.

Panel IX: Cultural Diplomacy in the Mediterranean and the Middle East

Moderator: Nick Cullather, Professor, History Indiana University

A distinctive feature of this panel was its temporal focus on the cultural politics of the interwar and World War II era, a period in which the cultural program of the

imperial age was in decline and the cold war cultural agenda had not yet been launched. The era was characterized by an ideology of trusteeship which allowed for a unique style of cultural negotiation.

Jennifer Dueck described in her paper "Cultural Channels for Diplomatic Competition in Syria and Lebanon," a pattern of interaction in Syria and Lebanon characterized by a cultural division of labor in which parties sought to preserve established institutions and modes of cultural transference through juridical, institutional, and diplomatic maneuvers. Education was at the heart of this process (the French, Italians, and Americans all had schools coexisting with each other and the new Arab nationalist schools), but it also involved film and radio as well. The stakes of cultural diplomacy in the Middle East were high, owing to the scarcity of economic and political instruments of influence. Cultural transfers were multisided, with French, British, American, Fascist, Free French, Arab nationalist, pan-Arabic, and Catholic actors. Much of the diplomatic activity consisted of an effort to draw boundaries to separate the activities of national groups, but the context also allowed possibilities for partnership. For instance, during World War II, mobile Franco-Anglo-American film trucks screened movies for Arab audiences. Where panels focusing on both earlier and later periods found processes of cultural dominance or conquest, this panel found processes better described as accommodation and collaboration.

Panel X: Recent Developments in the History of Culture and U.S. Diplomacy

Moderator: Scott Luca, Professor, American Studies, University of Birmingham

The panel consisted of three 20-minute papers: Professor Laura Belmonte (Oklahoma State University) addressing "Biology and Catastrophe: AIDS and U.S. Foreign Relations"; Professor Susan Brewer (University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point) considering "The Demise of the West/The Rise of the Western: Propaganda and the War in Iraq"; and Dr. William McAllister, (U.S. Department of State) setting forth "The Common Heritage of Mankind: Re-Defining the Boundaries of Diplomatic Intercourse in the Age of Interdependency".

Each paper, in its defined area, offered possibilities for advances in scholarship and analysis. Professor Belmonte's paper, presented at the outset of her research on a major project, surveyed the place of AIDS in US foreign policy from the 1980s to today. Considering the relationship between political, social, cultural, and ideological aspects, the work offers the prospect of complementing and extending scholarship on sexuality and foreign relations. It also raises possibilities of further interrogation, along the lines of the work of Melani McAllister, of US foreign policy, race, and "empire". Professor Belmonte does so by considering a simple but unprecedented question which is still unanswered: why, in the context of foreign relations, has a health epidemic which has taken 35 million lives failed to receive sustained attention and action on the part of actors such as the US Government?

Professor Brewer's examination of the presentation of the post-2001 US intervention in the War on Terror and Iraq, in the context of the genre of the Western film, drew upon widely-known cultural moments such as President George W. Bush's "Wanted: Dead or Alive" statement regarding Osama bin Laden. It considered how the form and content of the Western film lay behind political discourse, not only in its production but also in its reception by the US public. Professor Brewer's presentation brought to

mind the path-breaking work of Richard Slotkin on the Western, myth, and US political culture, but it offered a specific extension of Slotkin's analysis through its evaluation of how that discourse and mythology could serve as a cultural catalyst to establish and rationalize a significant shift in foreign policy.

Dr McAllister's presentation offered an optimistic contrast to those of his fellow panelists through his general emphasis on the possibilities of international diplomacy and his specific identification of the role of the US Government, in particular the State Department, in the fostering of that diplomacy. His central case was the negotiation of the Law of the Sea Treaty, where he argued that countries were willing to give up or reconcile national objectives with wider international interests. His argument about the continuing presence and significance of agreements such as the Law of the Sea Treaty provided an important counter-point to papers (and general perceptions) positing a contemporary breakdown in the international system.

Moderator Scott Lucas commented on the continuing importance of the CIH series. "No longer is scholarship focused on a 'cultural annex' or 'cultural turn' in foreign policy and/or international relations. No longer is it focused on the areas of the United States and Western Europe. We are in a new era for the examination of 'foreign relations' where culture and diplomacy should not (and are not) considered as separate aspects but are studied in dynamic tension, in sub-national national, multi-national, and international contexts. All of this points to the opportunities and challenges for research and analysis linking scholars across both geographic and academic borders."

Panel XI: The Global Community

Moderator: Fabrice Serodes, Deputy Director of the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Paris Bureau

This panel dealt with the general topic of globalization, but in a different way, defining the cultural aspects of a Global Community, and confirmed in a large way the role of non states actors, A trend that is deeply rooted in history of the 19th century.

The discussion began with two original case studies, which fitted well together, the first by Pr. Siefert ("Wiring the World: The International Telegraph Union and the Negotiation of a Technological Culture") on the necessity for nations to create standards in the frame of the International Telegraph Union in the mid 19th century, underlining the way communications forced non state actors to create a network, used only afterwards by states.

The second by Pr. Fuchs ("Searching for World Order: The Rise of a Global Educational Community in Early Twentieth Century", on the role played by NGO's and the League of Nations, in building a legislation in education matters at the beginning of the 20th century. The two papers argued against the historiography of a rise of nationalism at the end of the 19th century, and preferred dwelling on the will of associations to build a global community.

Mr. Nascimento invited, from a more philosophical viewpoint, to question the paradox of this only apparently obvious "global community" in his paper "Alternative Views of the Global Community: Going beyond the Dichotomy between the US and

Europe in International Relations." Not discussing the trends to create new standards, he however reminds his audience that "international" doesn't mean "transnational" cultural exchange yet, and may explain why the alluded exchanges were not sufficient to avoid the world wars. To reach the goal of productive cultural exchanges one has to go beyond the classical concepts based on simple oppositions like "unilateralism vs. multilateralism," or dichotomy between those supposed to those who love "Venus" and those who prefer "Mars." It was suggested that one has to promote carefully a new kind of world-citizenship, not based on state, but defined by the role each wants to play in a globalized world.

Panel XII: Technology as Cultural Diplomacy

Moderator: PD Dr. Marc Frey, Professor of Modern History, Department of History, University of Cologne

The papers by John Baesler on "The Campaign for Truth, the Polygraph, and the Uses of Lies in American Diplomacy", by Nick Cullather on "The Foreign Policy of the Calorie", and by Chad Parker on "Curing Antiquity: Aramco, Medicine, and Modernization in Saudi Arabia" address broader problems of interaction between different cultures and between actors from different social systems and focus on their underlying norms. They address procedures and developments with which regimes are established – regimes of the mind, regimes of culture, regimes of truth.

The creation of regimes and the role of science in shaping the mental maps of peoples around the globe are the topics addressed by Nick Cullather and Chad Parker. Nick Cullather looks at the evolving science of nutrition and the way its technological application served as an "instrument of power". Nutrition came to be regarded not only as a determining factor of warfare. Food, in the form of an aggregation of nutritional value, came to be regarded as a means for creating an American informal empire around the world. Research on food helped to create the notion of "malnutrition" and the link between food supplies, dietary richness or the lack of it, and population policies. As such Nick's paper discusses much about the evolution of bio-politics from the mid 19th century to more contemporary times. Bio-politics in the sense that science and politics create regimes that influence the lives of individuals and of societies as a whole. The science of nutrition and its technological application translated itself into a hierarchical system with which American politics set norms and standards from which other societies "deviated", and, accordingly, had to be uplifted.

While Nick's paper is more concerned with the societal implications of bio-politics, Chad addresses the individual level. His paper documents the efforts of an American oil company, the Aramco, to catapult a seemingly "traditional" and "backward" society into an American-defined modernity by means of western medicine. Chad demonstrates that medicine was an integral component of the American civilizing mission, a mission which held out the vision of modernity and technological progress. Medicine served as an important element of legitimacy.

John Baesler's paper about the polygraph is somewhat less concerned with technology as an element of the civilizing mission. He focuses more on the domestic aspects of the cult of technology and of American ideology in general. John addresses important aspects of social engineering and individual self-disciplining by technological means. In particular, in the post-war period, "truth" became a dominant

issue in the global struggle with communism. A commitment to “truth”, meaning in effect the belief in the superior values of the “Free World” and of the capitalist system, became measurable by means of the polygraph. John demonstrates the connection between the use of the polygraph and notions of national security as an outcome of a world view informed by self-perceived rationality and superior application of technology. His paper, however, also deals with fear – fear of the ultimate impossibility to control, fear of developments and human behavior beyond the structured perimeters of applied technology.

The three papers by Chat Parker, John Baesler and Nick Cullather are concerned with the tensions between science and human behavior, between rationality and emotion, and with the influence of social sciences and applied science on specific political mentalities and vice versa. Mediator Dr. Marc Frey commented that, "All three papers are fine examples of an international relations history that has moved well beyond the study of diplomacy and the interaction of state actors and that has reinvented itself as the study of interactions between various actors, ideas and regimes of cultures on the individual and collective level."

Panel XIII: Bridging Between Cultures: The Importance of Cultural Brokers in International History

Moderator: Petra Dolata-Kreutzkamp, Assistant Professor, North American History, Freie Universitaet Berlin - PD Dr. Marc Frey, Professor of Modern History, Department of History, University of Cologne

The first paper in this panel by Petra Dolata-Kreutzkamp (JFKI, FU Berlin) titled “Cultural Brokers in Transatlantic Economic Relations: The Example of Arnold, Fortas & Porter” introduced the concept of the cultural broker. She called for an application of a modified concept, which had first become prominent in ethno-history in the 1980s, which would allow for comparisons between very diverse transnational actors and help understand the processes of transmission, mediation and brokerage. She preferred the term cultural broker over cultural transmitter as the former indicates agency in the transfer process. In her eyes cultural brokers are not simply relay stations of knowledge. They place themselves in a specific spatial and power relation setting and recreate knowledge every time they transmit it. A cultural broker is not a black box which translates knowledge and information one to one. In the process of transmitting or mediating meaning can change. Also, cultural brokers do not necessarily transcend their own cultural or national loyalties.

She then offered one case study in the area of transnational economic relation outlining how in a crisis situation transnational actors who are merely deemed speakers for others and transmitters of knowledge and information become actors in their own right. While they may function as speakers, mediators, intermediaries, analysts, translators and interpreters they were not always successful in their attempts at cultural brokerage, especially because they did not realize that with respect to economic questions they were potential middlemen between different cultural spaces.

The following paper on “Vietnam War Photographers: Chroniclers, Propagandists, or Cultural Brokers?” by Peter Busch (King’s College, London) offered a different case study. Here, the work of three photo journalists from Britain, the US and Vietnam was presented in order to show how these actors who cross cultural spaces perceived their

own role as transmitters between these very spaces. Questions of objective journalism were central in this study. Through a close analysis of select photographs Peter Busch illustrated how the medium in itself became culturally encoded and how the photographers did not always realize their significance as transnational actors.

The third paper of the panel by Arne Kislenko (Ryerson University, Toronto) offered a study of a different set of individual and institutional actors who were potentially cultural brokers. In his "God, Guns, and Girly Bars: Cultural Brokers in U.S.-Thai Relations" Kislenko portrayed US-Thai relations as a complex network of very asymmetrical relations. He argues that despite the world power status of the United States the unique strategic position of Thai as one of the most important allies in Southeast Asia as well as its extremely closed society allowed Thailand to attain a disproportionate and surprisingly influential position. Thus, Thailand retained to a large extent control over its foreign policy decisions. With respect to the many cultural brokers this meant also that even though on the surface Americans were given the impression that they bridged the cultures and were accepted by Thai this never was the case, no matter how hard Americans would try to attain that position.

The discussion mainly focused on the concept of the cultural broker. One of the questions was in how far categories such as gender and race would appear in the concept. Also, it became clear that one should distinguish between intended brokerage (manipulation) and un-reflected, unintended brokerage. Especially the case of Thai prostitutes led to the question in how far power relations led to very asymmetrical transfers of exploitation. One of the interesting issues this panel addressed was the call for studying cultural transfers other than official cultural diplomacy. Applying a broad definition of culture allows studies on culture and international history to focus on professional and functional cultures as well as business cultures. The concept of cultural brokerage then combines both the individual and the structural approaches, it highlights issues of process and power relations.

Panel XIV: Negotiating 'Freedom': Political Warfare and the 'Private' Sphere from the Cold War to the 'War on Terror.'

Moderator: Laura A. Belmonte, Associate Professor, History, Oklahoma State University

This session brought together three studies illuminating the complexities and contradictions in U.S. propaganda efforts in the post-World War II era. Michael Krenn's examination of the Smithsonian Institution's role in exporting art on behalf of the State Department in his paper "The Good Grey Smithsonian: The Smithsonian Institution and International Cultural Relations in the Cold War, 1950-1970," demonstrates the difficulties in using "culture" as a tool in the battle for international public opinion. In the charged environment of Cold War politics, efforts to use the Smithsonian as an "apolitical" means of disseminating U.S. art inevitably faltered.

Ali Fisher's work "Playing for the same team? The role of philanthropy in distorting State attempts to define 'America' through the development of American Studies in Europe," further highlights these tensions. Subtleties and inconsistencies in definitions of "America" as well as heated debates over the proper role of the state are evident in his case studies on the Salzburg Seminar, the development of the British American Studies Association, and the Amerika Institute in Munich. Continuing this

vein, Scott Lucas in his paper "Enduring Freedom: Public Diplomacy and US Foreign Policy," explores the problematic nature of U.S. policies that simultaneously aspire to "liberate" the politically disfranchised while ensuring the "preponderant power" of the United States internationally. In this paradigm, "hard" power inevitably triumphs over "soft" power whether the context is the early Cold War or the post-9-11 "war on terror."

Panel XV: International Cultural Relations and the Experiences of Postwar Japan
Mediator: Mark C. Donfried, ICD Berlin, Director and Founder

Japanese Cultural diplomacy began in 1972 with the creation of the Japan Foundation. What is fascinating about the Japanese case of cultural diplomacy is that it has happened much later than in Europe or the United States. In Yoko Kawamura's presentation "Studying International Cultural Relations from the Japanese/Asian Perspective" we learned that after carefully studying the approach of the British Council and the US State Department the Japanese developed, immediately, an approach of inter-cultural exchange, as opposed to the more arrogant approaches of the British or Americans who were focusing more on "selling" their countries abroad rather than creating real dialogue with the other countries. As the Japanese looked into the European example of cultural diplomacy they realized that they couldn't apply the example of a national identity located within a regional identity, such as with the case of Germany within the European Context. As Maki Aoki-Okabe explained in her paper "Region as Identity. National Commitment to Regional Cultural Cooperation in Asia and Europe" Japan never had a real "regional" identity, in which it could define itself, therefore the focus of Japanese cultural diplomacy has traditionally always been on the nation. In a fascinating third paper of Toichi Makita we learned that civil society in Japan developed in the exact opposite way, as it did in the United States. His paper, "The Development of 'Civil Society' and International Cultural Relations in Postwar Japan: Discourse and Practice" showed that Japan used a top-down approach to create a civil society almost from scratch in the 1970s and 1980s with government-sponsored, government-initiated "civil society projects" and NGOs. This panel provided high-quality and fresh research into the field of Japanese Cultural Diplomacy, which up until now has been almost totally ignored by cultural diplomacy scholars. Clearly the case of Japan needs to be further explored by research and the potential is certainly there for other countries to learn from the example of the development of Japan's Cultural Diplomacy.

The conference organizers have selected a total of twelve papers to be published in a volume under the working title "Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy." We have approached a publisher in the United States and are confident that the book will appear within the next two years. Also, due to the success of CIH III, the organizers are planning the next conference, CIH IV, in December 2008.