Abstract

The paper will explore the co-relation between diplomacy and culture when States seek for power in the international arena. We postulate that countries with an interest to push the current power structure – and change today’s established order – can try to use cultural assets to enforce their own interests and values at the international arena. Considering that culture becomes an apparatus to achieve power and transform international society, we hypothesize that emerging powers - introduced lately at International Society - could articulate their positions by associating culture and diplomacy – an essential institution of international society. The instrumentalization of culture by Cultural Diplomacy contributes to these countries becoming more reputable in the international environment and tends to re-structure the balance of power. We propose to use the Brazilian case to illustrate our proposition. In this way, the paper will especially work with literature about International Cultural Relations and its intersection with Cultural History. The works of Robert Frank, Pascal Ory and Anaïs Fléchét will offer the main contribution for this argument.

Introduction

The research presented here intends to be a contribution to International Relations research field, especially by incorporating elements of Cultural History and by reflection on identity issues and on Brazilian international projection in the twenty-first century. Thus, from the study of the Brazilian cultural diplomacy strategies in the beginning of this century – period of major changes in the organization of international relations of Brazil –, we aim to demonstrate how countries considered ‘emerging poles’ (LIMA, 2010) can and make use of mechanisms created by States established in International Society.

We postulate that one of the ways in which states seek power – and this mostly from the 1990s with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the strengthening of bodies such as the United Nations – is from an active participation in the international arena in which contributes the articulation of national cultural factors with those proceeding from international “culture”.

We consider here that political participation of a country, in international relations scope, leads to the formation of several images of the State, presented and / or represented
in the international arena. There is a need for projection that, when not achieved by weapons means, tends to be supplied in other ways. One of them would be from international cultural relations or the way the movement of representations, practices, ways of life and symbolic objects that cross borders (FRANK, 2012, p. 373) and help State's image internationally.

Identity, Imaginaries and International Cultural Relations

To understand the foreign policy of a State and its integration strategy adopted over time, we must, first, understand what values are governing domestic politics and are linked to the foreign policy of this country. This brings us to the question of national identity and also of cultural identity: given the world's cultural diversity, it is possible to postulate also that national identity and national imaginaries circulating in the international arena are of great importance for the establishment of dialogue between the States.

The transmission of customs, values and ideas is possible as the country defines what it considers most important or strategically efficient to represent itself abroad. The attempt would be not only to understand other's action, based on cognitive variables that affect this action, as also to realize to what extent a country seeks to instrumentalize its culture and transmit it to their counterparts in the international society. Thus, language, music, dance, theater, cinema, science and technology, become extremely important axes for national identity transmission on a supranational level. As well considered Milza (1980), the culture is a factor or an agent of International Relations in so far as it is able to shape mentalities and to guide public sentiment in relation to the Other.

In inscribing our work in the field of International Cultural Relations, it is necessary a brief description of it, within the International Relations domain. In International Relations field, the analysis of States’ manipulation of cultural factors as power projection mechanism has held, until the present time, a peripheral place as pointed out by some authors (RIBEIRO, 1989, NYE, 2002, 2004, MONTIEL, 2009). Strictly in History field, it is clear that not only the cultural history analysis has been presented as an extremely fruitful research field, as well as its parameters have been important to understand the political use that is made of cultural history itself. This is an issue highlighted by recent authors such as Dennis Rolland (1999, p. 12). It is precisely the combination of these two fields, foreign policy and reworking of
cultural history, that emerges from the political government sphere of action, identified in the international relations context, and which we are very interested in research: the History of International Cultural Relations (CHAUBET; MARTION, 2011; DULPHY et al, 2010).

International Cultural Relations are, then, the relationships that are forged as long as two or more States are in contact. The first objective of such relations is not to produce unilateral advantage, but to create a fruitful environment for multilateral benefits, marked by understanding and cooperation between national societies for their mutual benefit (MITCHELL, 1986, p. 3 4). This because, when creating a cultural exchange environment, the country establishes with other States a standard dialogue with shared symbols, presenting, thus, important results, not only in the cultural as well as economic, commercial and political scopes (RIBEIRO, 1989), so much domestically and abroad.

Thus, the transmission of culture from one country to another, carried out intentionally through specific policies, through the so-called "Cultural Diplomacy", is linked to values and national meanings - elaborated in every State, often with State apparatus support - that seek to shape the relationship between nationals and foreigners. This internal collective framework, based on shared values, rites and myths; or simply symbolic goods that, shared worldwide, ultimately represent a Nation-State for the rest of the world. The success of cultural diplomacy depends on the ability to generate an atmosphere of confidence by developing the ability to listen to others, recognizing the value of other cultures, showing a sincere desire to learn and implementing programs that actually facilitate equitable communication in both the directions.

So, we conceive that questions of cultural identity and representations are essential to the formation of circulating imaginaries not only nationally. Used as mechanism of achieving power in the international arena, the culture becomes valued and promoted by States to the extent that it can serve to its interests. As stressed by Ribeiro (1989), this is not, however, a strategy that seeks immediate results: by relying on the development of shared knowledge about each other and the formation of an intercultural dialogue, any mechanism based on culture should seek lasting objectives, possible to achieve in long term. It seems important to note, then, how is the application of this concept to Brazilian cultural diplomacy scenario.

The entry of emerging regions in a prominent space in the International Society is quite difficult. One of the reasons would be precisely the difficulty to suit a strongly Christian
Western European context that ignores types of collectivity beyond the established standards (JACKSON, 2006). To be part of contemporary International Society, non-European States - and even European-peripherals, such as Russia and Turkey - should demonstrate the ability to follow the pre-existing rules and show that share the values of that Society. Let us, then, to an overview of the Brazilian case.

**Brazil and International Society dynamics: The images that is wanted to diffuse**

In considering the history of Brazil, we realize insistent attempt to join the International Society since Empire’s time - as the name itself, in the period of colonial independence, in 1822, indicates. It was not lived a break with European political and social organization patterns. On the contrary, what we see is a gradual attempt to copy such standards and achieve excellence in them. That would be the keynote of the whole nineteenth century and much of the twentieth century. Therefore, when participating of international events, the Brazilian attempt would base their stance by the European model: first, with the Empire and, then, with the Republic. By doing so, as noted by Monique Goldfeld (2012), Brazil would be considered a sort of 'Neo Europe'. Hence, throughout Brazilian history, the rulers attempted, in one way or another, to create a favorable image of the country internationally.

This attempt has, as basic principle, the construction of a moral impression of the country (State-owned ethos) in favor of its performance with the other States. An example would be the historic attempt of Brazilian representatives to participate, at international level, in most of the decision-making bodies that have a peaceful negotiation as main axis. That is, to create a good reputation, the Brazilian representatives stake in speeches that highlight the existence of a peaceful character and the search for consensus of Brazilian foreign policy that would be based on social justice and equitable development.

To that extent, there is a coordination of national and international values, exalted in multilateral forums. As observed by Robert Frank (1994), the system of representations is important for cross-sectional images that have established: themselves, abroad; and from the other, internally. There is, according to the author, something of collective psychology, myths’ formation, and international character stereotypes that must be observed. So, what
we see is that, in search for an international leading role, Brazil makes use of strategies that combine the representations that other actors make about the country and patemization effects. This can be seen in the performance of Brazilian representatives in forums such as the UN, who take a conciliatory stance, from an ethos internally built and that is based also on the representations that other nations make about Brazil. Thus, understanding Brazilian international strategy development necessarily involves the perception of how decisions are made within the country’s internal policy.

It is understood, in contemporary times, an attempt to reorganize Brazil’s imaginary externally, relying on internal identity restructuring that would facilitate, even further, the country’s projection internationally; without denying the issue of miscegenation and national identity (SCHWARCZ, 1994), what is perceived is that it is currently accompanied by a multi-identity discourse that was established in the country in the last two decades. It has to be emphasized the affirmation of a government discourse marked by cultural and ethnic pluralism, which led to debate about government actions and has become quite iconic in Lula government. In this context, diversity is no longer confined to racial democracy, and the Brazilian official rhetoric goes, then, to be projected internationally, as if the country was a step forward in global debates on diversity and multiculturalism. An example is the Brazilian demonstration of respect about cultural exception in a Brazilian way inside international organizations such as UNESCO. Brazil passes, therefore, to an international proactivity in defense of multiculturalism and multiple representation for itself.

In this way, in our thesis, to assert the plurality of ““Brazils”” in diplomatic discourse of the first decade of this century, we seek to understand how the issue of miscegenation, without being destroyed, it is reworked in order to allow exactly a greater reverberation of a multicultural discourse. As noted by Schwarcz (1994), there is no recreation of the Brazilian imaginary, but an extension of identitary discourse, being the identity fluid, relative, contrasted, and situational (CUNHA, 1985 as SCHWARCZ, 1994). Thus, considering the issue of miscegenation as an inherent part of the country's identity, Brazil's image promoters in the recent period can, then, expand it, saying the external cultural traits that would have formed such identity in a discourse of diversity comprehension. We, therefore, consider that miscegenation was politically used in the most recent period by Brazilian government, not with the aim of hiding racial markings, but to make room for statements about Brazilian "cultural exception", giving voice to others ““Brazils””.
In this sense, whatever the weight deemed to have a priori collective identity, the role of governments must not be overlooked in the development of identitary traits since it is precisely through State’s machinery and its determination to circulate a national identity that bases its power, that myths and rites will be produced and disseminated, forging a solidarity that transcends the barriers of class and religion, among others.

In the late twentieth century, the country would be better placed in international dynamics, even occupying still peripheral place due to the unequal distribution of power in international arena (HURRELL, 2007). The search for a more effective participation and a leading position in this scenario as a strategy of Lula da Silva’s government (2003-2010). Thus, from the beginning of the first term, the president in question set that Brazil should not assume subservient stance towards more developed countries, power holders and creators of International Society’s rules. It would require a position markedly of a country in political and economic rise, pillar of any order that could be established, by their dialogues with all members of such Society. In view of this goal, the country would rearticulate identities and images in view of the image it was wanted to produce to achieve political empathy. In this sense, one of the strategies to do so, it would be the articulation of cultural diversity at international level as from Cultural Diplomacy. Let us turn to a brief analysis of the Brazilian cultural projection policy abroad conducted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to detain, later, in the case study of the Year of Brazil in France, flagship of the Brazilian Cultural Diplomacy in Lula da Silva’s period.

**The development of Brazilian Cultural Diplomacy**

In Brazilian case, cultural diplomacy occupied, historically, a very restricted space: it is perceived the realization of specific events in the early twentieth century and an attempt to systematize the cultural projection via culture in the 1930s. In that moment, there are also changes in domestic politics context, with the reorganization of the State during the called Vargas Era, a State-owned effort in the creation and sedimentation of a national feeling where none exists. It is also, in this period, that the country miscegenation is seen less negatively.

Internationally, Elysée Montarroyos supported the need for the country to provide a
positive image of the country and seek the development of cultural activities to put Brazil in evidence. Following the French model, the country precedes United States and Great Britain in their internal debates about international projection through culture. Montarroyos believed in intellectual cooperation to offer the propaganda Brazil needed, with exchange programs and international institutes of high culture that would ensure the desired contact. This concern with the cultural dimension as a way of Brazil’s image projection was important for the historical moment between the World Wars, in which Brazil sought to take active stance towards the European powers and the United States, called by Gerson Moura (1980) the pragmatic equidistance period of Brazilian foreign policy.

During the decades from 1960 to 1980, some important changes have been made in view of the development of Cultural Diplomacy. Once again, domestic policy influenced the action externally: dictatorial period, the cultural projection of the country was perceived as a necessity to counter the image of violence that was attributed to the country. In this way, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would use Brazilian embassies abroad to promote some artists, mostly exiled abroad, in search of a Brazilian cultural image.

The political opening period, from 1985, was of reorganization of State functions with the creation, at national level, of the Ministry of Culture and of rethinking the strategies of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We postulate that was a period of inactivity in relation to international cultural relations of the country, which explains, for example, French difficulty to put into action the pilot project of a Brazilian season in 1986.

Thus, what we see is that, despite the Brazilian attempt to build a profitable scenario for the development of its cultural diplomacy during the period extending from the beginning of the republic until the late 1990s, there were difficulties in the establishment, management and financing of such strategies. This phenomenon was related to concerns about other issues for purview of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, especially related to trade and economic stability from external financing. Therefore, even possibilities offered by other countries, as the French invitation to Homage to Brazil in the Book Fair 1998, were treated as secondary, without a real engagement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The cultural issue would continue to occupy a peripheral place. At the end of Fernando Henrique Cardoso government, in 2001, the possibility of a Brazilian season in France is designed, being a Brazilian government’s idea, as a continuity of the "500 Years of Discovery" festivities. This proposal did not meet French pretensions, in view of the interest to carry out a cultural
season that exposes the cultural diversity of the country. Thus, even if approved, the realization of a cultural season project raised no passion in Brazilian representatives responsible for it. It is with the beginning of Lula government that we will see significant changes in the routing of the Year of Brazil in France.

This is because it is realized that Brazilian cultural projection, longed for since the beginning of the Republic, underwent changes from the direct action of a group of thinkers and political articulators in first decade of this century, meeting the common demands of the government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This occurred in favorable domestic and external environments for this type of policy coordination. Internally, we postulate that, from Lula da Silva’s government, was a reworking of the Brazilian identity toward the "defense of cultural and ethnic diversity" based on proposals approved in the Resolutions of Meetings and Party Congress (1999). This re-articulation of multiple identities for the country's representation can be seen in cultural activities promoted by Brazil abroad, in a way that State policy and government policy are in preparation of events, such as the cultural season of Brazil in France.

In this way, there was increasing international projection of Brazil, for a widest exposure of Lula government’s propositions and high visibility of Brazilian politics in international arena, especially in the initial period of the government. Domestically, the period was marked by the recognition of ethnic diversity and conflicts resulting from it, as well as the expansion of social policies in order to overcome structural inequalities that affected groups considered minorities (blacks, Indians and women). Brazilian politics of restructuring State apparatus aroused great interest in French government, since it faced for years, problems related to its integration model. Thus, Lula da Silva government seemed also present possible solutions for international policy issues, reopening the debate of questions about the relationship between race, gender, justice, and social equality, treated in the 1988 Constitution (GUIMARAES, 2006).

The new multiculturalism in a Brazilian way and the affirmative action policies - which were originated in Fernando Henrique Cardoso government of and were settled in both Lula governments - appear, to France, as possible points of discussion in the debate on citizenship and social integration among the French themselves. The realization of the Year of Brazil in France was inscribed like this: at international level, in a deepening of joint actions, put into practice in arenas such as the United Nations and in actions such as the Alliance Against
Hunger and Malnutrition (2003); at bilateral level, by strengthening trade, scientific and technological exchanges and mutual understanding between Brazil and France; and at national level, in the logic of discussion over French society future in the early twenty-first century.

In the new project, presented by President Lula da Silva, from joint actions of the Ministry of Culture (with direct participation of Minister Gilberto Gil) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (with the figure of Chancellor Celso Amorim), a new Brazilian Commissariat was composed for the event, with participation of personalities from the cultural and diplomatic circles that had shown previous interest in country's Cultural Diplomacy or held expertise on the promotion of cultural events. The affirmation of cultural diversity of the country, as evidenced in the title "Brésil, Brésils" came to be, as well, something that took international proportions. From Lula da Silva’s presidential speech on the multiplicity of countries living in Brazil, considering all economic and cultural differences, and the proclamation of the need for acquaintanceship, learning and sharing of national wealth and cultures. From domestic level, the proposal would follow to international level by means of authorities’ speeches, which affirmed the vocation of Lula government for dialogue in international environment (AMORIM, 2004).

Thus, the Year of Brazil in France organization opened, also, for something important to Brazil: French recognition of the Brazil’s active participation in the consolidation of international contemporary society, in which despite internal adjustment actions to solve problems like the withdrawal of Brazil from "hunger map" and the search for an internationally effective participation – to be considered on a possible reform of the UN Security Council, in which it was thought that France would support the Brazilian claim. Let us turn, briefly, to a description of the Brazilian season in France.

The “Saisons culturelles” in France and the propaganda of Brazil

Starting in March 2005, and having its official end in November of same year, the Year of Brazil in France had more than 700 events held in almost all French locations. It is estimated that at least one quarter of French population actively attended to season’s events, considered, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France, an exceptional season of cultural
mobilization.

In addition to cultural objectives, it is necessary to highlight the great interest of Brazilian government to create a projection platform for trading Brazilian products internationally and promote country’s economic development. This proposal would suit the goals proposed by Edgard Telles Ribeiro (1989), who participated in the Brazilian Commissariat created for the season and for whom cultural diplomacy has a political, economic and commercial character that must be noted.

As the author observes, to sell an idea of a country able to actively participate in world since its culture, this is also accompanied by cultural artifacts subject to capitalization. Thus, according to Ribeiro, Brazil would be acting according French logic created more than a century ago. Added to these claims the discursivity of President Lula, marked by the need to show Brazil’s industrial value of and use French market as a gateway to a wider market, wherein the idea of a more modern, plural, Brazil should be the tonic, precisely because of its ability to dialogue with other cultures and recognize diversity as richness. Such discursivity would have, therefore, political, economic and commercial purposes of projection internationally the country. Lula stressed that Brazil would be able to deal with equality parameters with the great nations of the world due to its potential in cultural and industrial fields, as well as its advances in social field. Thus, industrial entrepreneurs and Brazilian brands were urged to participate in the conquest of the international market.

We would like to highlight here the role of the figure of President Lula da Silva in Paris. Known and admired by the people in France since the 1980s – as pointed out by Inathèque research of the range of media information published by French media –, the President actively participate in events of the Year of Brazil in France, especially during the festivities of 14 July – the Bastille Day. His passage through Paris would be widely publicized so that more than 70% of this month’s news, disclosed by French media, were related to his visit to the hexagon.

Two moments of the visit are worth mentioning. First, his speech to French academics and industrial entrepreneurs, which aroused great admiration of the participants. Second, in concert held in the Bastille Square in the morning between 13 and 14 July. With repertoire that sought to emphasize Brazilian cultural plurality and rupture the concern with civility to
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1 See attachments.
the existing European way in Brazilian diplomacy (FLECHÉT, 2013), the concert was peculiar. As a cultural diplomacy strategy, with the presentation of artists from Rio / Bahia circuit and the political engagement that was placed, with a strong presence of French-Brazilian left at the stage, reaffirming their partnership.

The event was noteworthy also because its proportions: the estimated public was 60 thousand people, and the media make account over 100,000 participants. Thus, the event deserves also to be highlighted by becoming one of the possible effectiveness measurer of cultural events promoted by Brazilian government abroad and of sedimentation of cultural exchange, from the establishment of Brazilianness overseas territories. The great interest of French media in the event was also decisive to project the image of Brazil that was wanted to produce. This because, if French case, the season was extolled as an episode of success even with all political and economic obstacles faced, what was perceived was certain neglect from Brazilian press, heavily criticized by French media.

**Final Considerations**

Considered the positive balance of the season of Brazil in France, it is clear that, during Lula da Silva government, the government has incorporated Cultural Diplomacy as a mechanism of international projection of the country. In this sense, it would be opened other seasons of the country in Europe - such as Europalia / Brésil in Belgium and the Year of Brazil in Italy, in the Netherlands, in Portugal and in Germany – and in Asia - India and China, as well as a strong cultural promotion of the country within the Community of Portuguese Language Countries - CPLP. In addition to the Brazilian seasons, in attempt to maintain reciprocity, Brazilian government would establish in 2009 that it would be organized the Year of France in Brazil. The event, although smaller, was considered by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of both countries something quite significant in settling bilateral relations.

What is perceived, in a further analysis of the available data to this date, is that Brazilian Cultural Diplomacy during Lula da Silva government should be considered a laboratory for action of subsequent government. In this way, more than the establishment of a State policy, guided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the event should be considered as government policy in a view of maintaining and strengthening Brazil's relations with other
States of International Society in search of a possible international protagonism.

Based on the multiple existing identities domestically, Brazilian government took for itself the debate over diversity in international environment, an area where the great powers met interlocution’s difficulty. Thus, we can conclude that, for a short period of country’s immediate history, the attempt to international projection was anchored, also, in a cultural visibility strategy of the country articulated within the government.
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