

these predicates: 1) that Cultural Relations are essentially a field distinct from general information, 2) that the Department of External Affairs is convinced of the need for Canada to pursue full-fledged operations in the cultural relations field, i.e., logically, that External has thus a plan or programme worked out for France and other countries. These I take to be the pillars of this temple. I also take them to be basic misunderstandings, which weaken the purpose of the memorandum. 3) The idea is generally implied through the report that Cultural Relations are a separate undertaking, unrelated to general information (except perhaps in the relationship of a nobler form of information to a meaner one dispensed under the same roof). I do not agree. Cultural Relations, in the accepted sense, are nothing more startling than the special development given to one section of the national body of information. Considered in this relationship of the part to the whole, their role is easily understandable and determined. They assume their appointed place in a balanced information programme, enjoying more or less emphasis according to national possibilities.

Whatever the merits, pro and con, of cultural relations as distinct from information programs, Mr. Bellemare's comments about any assumptions of governmental or departmental plans for a developed cultural program were certainly accurate at the time. He drives the point home at a later point in his memorandum:

As to what I consider the second basic misunderstanding of the memorandum, that it is External's intention to implement a Cultural Relations plan, I can find nothing on which to base such an assumption. The memorandum's frequent references to lack of support by the Department and to the confusion resulting from unsupported action on the part of the Cultural Attaché or rejection of his proposals, might be considered as sufficient evidence of the contrary, if need be.