

---

The lessons of French diplomacy in this field are many: the teaching of language; the dissemination of information and knowledge about French civilization; the administration of programs; the negotiation and execution of agreements; the operation of schools, institutes and centres abroad; and effective planning for the future. However, what shines through all this is the French desire to reap the advantages of international cultural relations and to acquire the specialists, counselors and attachés — often through secondments from the private sector — to translate these advantages into hard realities. Without doubt, France's commitment to cultural diplomacy has already paid, and continues to pay, handsome dividends.

Mr. Schafer also notes that about 70 per cent of the budget of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs goes to the Directorate-General for Cultural, Scientific and Technical Relations.

While the French do indeed have great faith in the intrinsic cultural worth of the French Language and system of education, their carefully orchestrated promotion of French culture abroad is pursued in the confident assumption that such policy pays. The financial well-being of their cultural industries provides ample proof. Similarly, it was not the mass conversion of the British establishment into Groupies which resulted in the Beatles being awarded OBEs. Increased standards of living and education in the industrialized world have resulted in a dramatic increase in the demand for cultural consumables. Canada has only begun to participate in this market. Most industrialized countries and many developing countries have created elaborate institutional machinery with which they pursue the same objectives.

The Alliance Française was founded in the nineteenth century, and shortly thereafter various organizational changes in the French Foreign Ministry were brought about to further the coherent promotion of French language and culture abroad. The foundations for both the British Council and the Goethe Institute were laid in the 1930s and while both, along with the French administrative machinery for cultural promotion, have had neo-colonial motives ascribed to them, they have survived a transition to more enlightened (and more subtle) times. These institutions and their homologues in Sweden, Italy, Holland, Israel and the U.S.S.R., to name but a few, are fundamental pillars of each country's foreign-policy establishment. Within these countries it is no longer necessary either to explain or justify the existence of such apparatus, although they are not totally immune to the rites of periodic bureaucratic and budgetary blood-letting. Canada, for the most part because of the particular constitutional realities that make such centralized co-ordination impossible, has, of course, no similar vehicle for international cultural self-expression and promotion — no instrument for the homogenization of a Canadian image. The result has been a somewhat diffuse cultural identity and probably a less well-defined international impact. Nevertheless, the very lack of cohesion of our international image allows separate cultural communities within Canada to form closer ties with regions of the world for which they have a particular affinity, and the totality of the impact might accordingly be just as strong.

---