

UDC 30(4)“1871–1914”(327.2+325.36):930.85(1871–1914)

PROJECTING CULTURE: CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OF EUROPEAN STATES IN THE AGE OF INDUSTRIAL IMPERIALISM (1871–1914)

D. A. KRYVASHEI^a

^aBelarusian Research Centre for Electronic Records, 51 F. Skaryny Street, Minsk 220141, Belarus

Industrial imperialism set the stage for the emergence of cultural diplomacy and its institutions. Departments responsible for cultural diplomacy proliferated in the foreign ministries of multiple European countries, and many colonial powers and imperial states scrambled to establish their overseas cultural institutions. Countries viewed schooling as one of their most effective instruments for the pursuit of their civilising mission. At the beginning of the 20th century, education, academic exchange and research came to the central stage of the global competition among countries for economic and political influence. Where the government was too cautious to proceed, non-government actors (organisations and individuals) filled the void. Countries relied on diplomats to steer the work of their overseas cultural institutions but used considerable discretion in doing so.

Keywords: foreign cultural policy; cultural diplomacy; industrial imperialism; cultural institutes abroad; cultural propaganda.

ВНЕШНЯЯ КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ПОЛИТИКА КОНТИНЕНТАЛЬНЫХ СТРАН ЕВРОПЫ В ПЕРИОД ИНДУСТРИАЛЬНОГО ИМПЕРИАЛИЗМА (1871–1914 гг.)

Д. А. КРИВОШЕЙ¹⁾

¹⁾Белорусский научно-исследовательский центр электронной документации,
ул. Ф. Скорины, 51, 220141, г. Минск, Беларусь

Период индустриального империализма положил начало институционализации внешней культурной политики отдельных (особенно имперских) государств. В министерствах иностранных дел некоторых стран были созданы подразделения, занимающиеся культурно-образовательным сотрудничеством, открыты первые постоянно действующие учреждения культуры за рубежом. Эффективным инструментом цивилизационной миссии империализма стали школы. В начале XX в. школы и научные учреждения превратились в средство борьбы за политическое и экономическое влияние в определенных регионах. В условиях ограниченной государственной инициативы общественные институты и организации, а также отдельные лица являлись важными субъектами внешней культурной политики. Дипломаты поддерживали деятельность культурных учреждений за рубежом, хотя государство старалось не афишировать этот факт.

Ключевые слова: внешняя культурная политика; культурная дипломатия; индустриальный империализм; культурные учреждения за рубежом; культурная пропаганда.

Образец цитирования:

Кривошей ДА. Внешняя культурная политика континентальных стран Европы в период индустриального империализма (1871–1914 гг.). Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Международные отношения. 2022;2:8–15 (на англ.).
<https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6848-2022-2-8-15>

For citation:

Kryvashei DA. Projecting culture: cultural diplomacy of European states in the age of industrial imperialism (1871–1914). *Journal of the Belarusian State University. International Relations*. 2022;2:8–15.
<https://doi.org/10.33581/2521-6848-2022-2-8-15>

Автор:

Дмитрий Антонович Кривошей – кандидат исторических наук, доцент; ученый секретарь.

Author:

Dzmitry A. Kryvashei, PhD (history), docent; scientific secretary.
kryvasheidz@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9240-6440>

Introduction

Industrial imperialism accelerated colonial expansion. The rise of monopolies intensified competition among the world's industrial nations. The great powers escalated their struggle for supremacy in the world's regions. In this competitive environment, culture was quickly emerging as a flexible and effective tool in the pursuit of political and economic objectives, and cultural diplomacy entered the mainstream of international relations. Many states proceeded to establish overseas cultural missions and institutions.

The era of industrial imperialism was the time when cultural diplomacy was beginning to take shape. K. Düwell observes: "From a historical perspective, an instrumentally developed foreign cultural policy as a sub-discipline of foreign policy only came about after a certain "critical mass" of cultural or cultural-political external activities and (or) institutions had been put in place"¹ [1, S. 63]. European states were pursuing different strategies of cultural diplomacy, but each formed an integral part of this "critical mass".

There is a dearth of generalised historical reviews on the pursuit of cultural diplomacy in specific regions or countries during the period of industrial imperialism. The works of A. Haigh are rare examples of such research [2]. A wider body of scholarship exists on foreign cultural policies of individual countries [3–7], cultural aspects of the colonial policy of imperial states [8; 9], international activity of cultural institutions [10–12], and policies to support the cultural life of the diasporas [13]. Some scholars have overed specific areas of cultural diplomacy in certain countries, such as education in the colonies [14–17], overseas cultural institutions [18], and academic exchange [19].

Based on a review of facts and events specific to select countries and regions, we map the approaches to cultural diplomacy in an era of industrial imperialism and identify the main trends in the practice of cultural diplomacy, with a focus on colonial and imperial states.

Governmental institutions for cultural relations

During the period under study, countries were creating within their government structures divisions responsible for cultural relations. For example, the Imperial Fund for the Promotion and Support of German Schools Abroad (*Reichsschulfond*) was established in 1878 under the German foreign ministry [20, S. 307]. Likewise, the Bureau for French Schools and Works Abroad (*Bureau des écoles et œuvres françaises à l'étranger*) was formed in 1909 within the structure of the Ministry of foreign affairs of French Republic, and the National Bureau for French Universities and Schools (*Office national des universités et écoles françaises*) was instituted in 1910

[21, p. 34]. The German foreign ministry founded the subdivision of schools and school education abroad (*Schulreferat*) as a unit within its legal department and transformed it into a full-fledged department in 1906². Previously, in about 1896, the German foreign ministry had created a department of art and science (*Referat für Kunst- und Wissenschaft*). However, as F. Schmidt remarked, "the department of art and science never pursued any cultural and political activities until it was closed at the end of the World War I. It did not even manage to organise German art exhibitions, which the commercial department reserved for itself" [5, S. 252].

Non-governmental institutions as actors in cultural diplomacy

In cultural diplomacy, non-government actors also played an indispensable role. Schools and cultural institutions relied on the support of non-governmental sponsors to operate overseas. The *Alliance Française*, established in 1874, became a vehicle for projecting French culture worldwide. By propagating its culture abroad, France was hoping to reverse its decline as a world power and recover its political influence. The geographical priorities of the alliance expanded. In 1890 it established a separate Levant-Egypt commission, and a year later a commission for Africa. Previously, it had been pursuing extensive activity in its committees. In 1885, alliance committees were established in Cairo and Alexandria. There was also a committee in Thessaloniki, active from 1886, and Constantinople and Smyrna, from 1888. By 1913, the alliance had 13 active

committees in the Ottoman Empire alone. As of 1914, its total number of committees was estimated at 274, with roughly 50,000 members in France and abroad [10, p. 768]. For a time, the alliance remained a key vehicle for the exercise of French influence in Latin America, where French diplomatic presence remained limited despite the large numbers of French immigrants [10, p. 768, 777].

Initially, the alliance worked in two main areas. It supported schools and evening courses, administered scholarships and evaluated academic credentials. These functions were predominant in the work of the Levant, Spain, and South America committees. It also organised cultural and academic events, including conferences and theatrical performances, and maintained libraries. The latter set of activities was most prominent for the alliance's committees in the United States. In 1894,

¹Hereinafter translated by us. – D. K.

²Waibel J. Die deutschen Auslandsschulen – Materialien zur Außenpolitik des Dritten Reiches : Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades. Frankfurt (Oder) : Europa-Universität Viadrina, 2010. S. 64.

the alliance launched its summer school programme as a distinct new area of its operations [10, p. 773–774].

Not infrequently, the work of the committees was steered by French diplomats. In its two circular letters, in 1884 and 1885, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of French Republic instructed members of French diplomatic missions to assist the alliance committees unofficially [10, p. 772]. F. Chaubet observes: “Pretty much everywhere, consuls made themselves indispensable to the committees, first of all by creating them, by calming the discords, by blowing on the embers of a dying group, by delivering conferences, and above all, by distributing the subsidies from the ministry of foreign affairs” [10, p. 772–773].

As the main vehicle for spreading Germany’s cultural influence, the German unions began to spring up across the world in the 1880s. About 50 unions were active at the beginning of the World War I. Some notable examples included the Pan-German Union (*All-deutscher Verband*, 1891–1939), the German Colonial Society (*Deutsche Kolonialverein*, 1887), the Society for Ethnic Culture (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für ethnische Kultur*, 1892) [22, p. 26], Association for the Propagation of German Culture in East Asia (*Ausschuß Zur Förderung der Deutschen Kulturarbeit in China*, 1906) [15, S. 139], succeeded by the German-Chinese Union (*Deutsch-Chinesischer Verband*), in 1914, the German-Turkish Society (*Deutsch-Türkische Gesellschaft*) in Berlin and the Turkish-German Society in Tehran [22, p. 31].

One of the leaders of the German-Turkish society E. Jäckh noted the goals of the organisation as follows: “We should start exporting spiritual goods in order to bind the hearts and minds of the local population to us. Every Ottoman who speaks our language, who reads German books, who found convalescence in a German hospital, becomes a friend of our culture, abuyer of German goods. <...> Cultural policy has the task of promoting German economic policy. Germany should also compete with other powers in cultural policy” [23, S. 200].

The French Secular Mission (*Mission laïque française*), established in 1902, was a new type of organisation distinct by its global reach. It aimed to spread the French language and culture throughout the world through secular, multilingual and intercultural education [24]. To strengthen the global appeal of French culture and way of life, the International Union of Friendship with France was founded in 1909 [20, S. 63].

For many European states, the end of the 19th century was a period of intense nation-building and consolidation of nation-states. Many of these states chose to target national diasporas outside their borders with cultural diplomacy. Italy was a case in point. At the turn of the 20th century, a movement for the annexation of the borderline regions of Austro-Hungary with

predominantly Italian population was gaining ground. These irredentist aspirations were reflected in the founding declaration of the Dante Alighieri Society of 3 July 1889, which stated: “To achieve the political unification of the nation, we Italians seem to have forgotten so far that the mother country was not yet wholly within the physical boundaries of the state”³. The society maintained its presence mostly in countries of Western Europe, and North and South America with significant émigré communities. Only two branches, in Tripoli (1898) and Benghazi (1906) operated in Italy’s colonies [18, p. 277–278].

After a few decades of independence, cultural diplomacy of Greece was also influenced by irredentist sentiments. It targeted in large part the Greek population in Macedonia, then a part of the Ottoman Empire [25, p. 96]. The communiqué of the Greek minister of foreign affairs to the Greek consuls called for support to Greek schools in large Macedonian communities. The funds for the undertaking came from Greek charities, the government of Greece and the Association for the Propagation of Greek Letters (*Συνελλογος προς διαδοσιν των Ελληνικων Γραμμασεων*), established in 1869. The latter supported multiple education projects in Macedonia and Thrace, scenes of the national struggle of Bulgarians and Greeks for independence from the Ottoman Empire. In 1888, the president of the association asked the Greek minister of foreign affairs to provide scholarships for the training of priests, teachers and other local activists in Macedonia [25, p. 93]. Between 1878 and 1905, the number of Greek schools in Macedonia increased by 81 % [25, p. 97].

Cultural diplomacy in united Germany upheld the ideology of *Deutschtum* (Germanness), which meant, *inter alia*, promoting the German language and culture among the German expatriates. In 1881, the General German School Union (*Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein*) was founded (renamed in 1908 to the Union for German Abroad (*Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland*)) [12, S. 165, 169]. It financed the construction and upkeep of German schools abroad, supported cultural activities outside the empire (such as the establishment of kindergartens and libraries), and facilitated student exchange.

G. Paschalidis views these activities of the Italian, Greek and German organisations as clear examples of anti-assimilationist nationalist politics: “...politics that aim to prevent expatriate or same-language communities from being integrated into foreign states, and to maintain them as potential foreign policy instruments, either in relation to territorial claims or to the procurement of economic and political advantage” [18, p. 278].

Individuals and non-government players often conducted cultural diplomacy in areas that governments found too sensitive. In July 1913, the German chancel-

³Manifesto di fondazione della Società Dante Alighieri [Risorsa elettronica]. URL: <https://ladante.it/images/attualita/2016/07-lug/ManifestoFondazioneSDA.pdf> (data di accesso: 04.04.2022).

lor T. von Bethmann-Hollweg issued a circular decree to the Reich offices outlining further steps on cultural diplomacy and instructing them to revise their present strategies by involving corporate bodies, societies, clubs, academics and businessmen interested and able to fund cultural activities abroad. In effect, T. von Bethmann-Hollweg confirmed the broad approach of the Wilhelmstrasse to funding the activities of German institutions on propagating the German culture and language among non-Germans. F. Stremmel reports:

“Bethmann also instructed the state secretaries in the ministries that independent bodies should be used... to create the impression that there was no official German cultural diplomacy. The Reich ministries were expected to provide some financial support and, indirectly via the boards, steer the course of the societies and clubs that engaged in cultural activities abroad. The reason for this, of course, was the fear of antagonising western neighbours, which an aggressive expansion of cultural diplomacy might trigger” [26, p. 54].

Education as a target for the exercise of soft power

As suggested by the names of the various divisions of foreign ministries responsible for cultural policy, the world's empires were devoting much of their attention to education, as a part of their “civilising” mission. For a long time, education had been the mainstay of religious missionaries. Now, governments were stepping in to establish public school networks. Britain was the first colonial power to reform education in its dominions. The reform began in 1835. In India, it lasted until 1882 for secondary education (Indian education commission) and 1904 for higher education (Government resolution on education, Indian University act) [14, p. 8–12]. The Spanish government planted the roots of the modern system of education in the Philippines in 1863 [27, p. 508]. The two-tiered system of Indonesia was established by a decree of the king of the Netherlands in 1893 [14, p. 70]. In French West Africa, the school system took shape in 1903⁴, and in 1906, the colonial administration implemented an education reform in French-occupied Vietnam⁵.

Support for missionary schools and their public funding was still common practice. At the time when the Belgian parliament took control of the Congo in 1908, Roman Catholic missionary schools were receiving state subsidies and enjoying privileged official status⁶.

Yet some metropolises implemented drastic changes. For example, a decree of 1871 prohibited state subsidies for denominational schools in Dutch India [28, p. 12]. The colonies began to create non-denominational public schools, funded by the budget of the metropolis. The unintended effect of such policies was the decline of mass primary education. Aware of the risk, France continued to support religious congregations despite the prevalence of anti-clerical and secular sentiments at home. When the legal separation of the church and state became law in 1905, the government continued to subsidise French Catholic schools abroad out of necessity: there were simply not enough secular schools in the

colonies to replace the Catholic ones. De-funding them would have diminished access to education, and with it, the cultural influence of France [2, p. 31].

Colonies differed in the way they were implementing public education systems, but all did so for the same reasons: to teach the population the language of the empire, attune them to European values and the culture of the metropolis, and train local administrators to fill lower-ranking positions in the colonial administrations. J. Furnivall observes: “...education had a more practical side. It furnished government with cheap subordinates and the people with well-paid jobs. The government wanted schools to train clerks, and the people wanted schools to obtain clerkships. There was an economic demand for schools. <...> Educational progress was dominated by the economic laws of demand and supply” [29, p. 123].

Some colonial schools (termed propaganda schools by their critics), used a combination of the language of the metropolis and the local language as languages of instruction. The French opened the first Franco-indigenous school in Kohichin, South Vietnam, in 1861⁷. A plan to establish Russian-indigenous schools was implemented in the Turkestan region of the Russian Empire in the 1880s. The schools combined the traditional curriculum of a Muslim school (Mekteb) with that of a Russian literacy school (Russian and indigenous classes) [3, p. 82]. Still, the number of such schools was small by comparison with public primary schools, with instruction in the local languages and the language of the empire taught as a separate subject. For example, Dutch-indigenous schools in Indonesia had a total of 1308 students in 1914, and primary schools had 713.5 thousand [30, p. 264].

In 1909, there were 98 Russian-indigenous schools in Turkestan, with 3077 students [3, p. 320]. To encourage the students of these schools to study the Russian language, the Turkestan authorities arranged excursions for them to Central Russia [3, p. 216].

⁴Education in British colonies and former colonies [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/education/Education-in-British-colonies-and-former-colonies> (date of access: 12.04.2022).

⁵Indochine française. Enseignement [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indochine_française#Enseignement (date de la demande: 04.04.2022).

⁶Education in British colonies and former colonies [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/education/Education-in-British-colonies-and-former-colonies> (date of access: 12.04.2022).

⁷Indochine française. Enseignement [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indochine_française#Enseignement (date de la demande: 04.04.2022).

In most places, however, secular schools still represented a small minority of schools, and missionary or traditional schools remained prevalent. The British dominions of Africa were a typical example. In 1899, only 33 of 8,154 primary schools in Nigeria, were secular. Only 9 out of 136 secondary schools, and 13 out of 97 normal schools were government-run. Similarly, in the Gold Coast in 1914, the government was responsible for only 8 % of the schools. In Kenya and Uganda, all the schools were run by religious missions⁸.

In the 20th century, colonial decision-makers began to give added weight to ethics and the welfare of the subjects in their policies. The Netherlands pioneered the transition by abandoning its old doctrine of winge-west, which viewed profit for the metropolis as the key consideration for policy-making. Instead, it adopted a new set of principles more in line with the present views on international development. Other colonial powers, however, still held on to the old approaches, which viewed the colonial powers as fulfilling a civilising mission towards its colonies. The old approach emphasised the spread of culture, but the new strategy relied more on education⁹.

In Germany, the priorities for cultural policy also shifted from *Deutschtum* (i. e. keeping the German language and culture alive among its expatriates) to bringing schooling and German culture to non-Germans. To Germany, education also became an instrument of soft power, which it engaged with the primary aim of fomenting pro-German sentiments and maximising Germany's economic and political influence [26, p. 50].

Germany's approach was informed in large part by the successes of France in using schools as instruments of political and economic influence in regions such as

the Ottoman Empire. In 1868, France reached an agreement with the Ottoman authorities to establish its first lyceum in Galata-Sarai with instruction in French [23, S. 33]. Other countries joined the struggle for influence. This struggle reached peak intensity by 1914, as evidenced by a large number of foreign schools. Of a total of 1000 active schools with 90 000 students, 67 were Italian with 5000 students, 126 with 10 000 students were English, 273 with 18 000 students were American, 530 with 54 000 students were French and 23 with 3000 students were German [23, S. 200].

China was another region with a growing educational presence of the world's big powers. In 1907, the Prussian ministry of spiritual, educational and medical affairs (*Preußischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Volksbildung*) opened a Chinese-German university and medical school in Shanghai [5, S. 253]. In 1909, a German-Chinese university opened in Qingdao (Shandong province) [31, S. 245]. To prepare a contingent of prospective students of German universities, the German foreign ministry launched a network of German-Chinese preparatory schools (*Zubringerschulen*) in 1907. According to F. Schmidt, the establishment of these schools was the first cultural and political event engineered by the German foreign ministry. The Imperial school foundation financed the schools, the school department of the ministry administered them, and the German consuls in China supervised the schools [5, S. 254].

As a counterweight to Germany, France established in 1908 a Franco-Chinese university in Shanghai [21, p. 33]. In secondary education, Britain was the obvious leader, with 241 active schools in 1912, as compared to Germany's 15¹⁰.

Research and academic exchange

Academic institutions and exchanges were also a tool for projecting culture. F. Schöbe writes: "The rivalry (perceived in an almost Darwinian way) between certain major research institutions, especially archaeological ones, between schools established abroad, and ultimately between the languages themselves that have become instruments of expansionism, became one of the elements of common European consciousness" [10, p. 770].

As early as March 1878, B. von Bülow, then attaché of the German embassy in Paris and a member of the secretariat of the Berlin Congress, called for a programme of cultural expansion abroad, citing as an example the German Archaeological Institute in Rome [10, p. 770]. Founded in 1829, the institute became an imperial institution in 1874. According to the agreement on cultural

cooperation of 1874 (which, incidentally, was Germany's first international agreement in the field of culture), German archaeologists received the right to conduct excavations in Greek territory, and in 1875 the Institute established a branch in Athens [3, p. 106]. From 1902, Germany provided regular support to the Institute of Art History in Florence (Villa Romana), through its ministry of interior (the institute was registered in Berlin) [3, p. 104]. From 1894, the German imperial budget allocated funds to the African fund (*Afrikafonds*), to facilitate the study of Central Africa and other countries [3, p. 106].

In this academic expansion, Germany was taking its cue from its rival France. From 1846, France financed the French Archeological Institute in Athens through its foreign ministry. It had also established a similar

⁸Education in British colonies and former colonies [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/education/Education-in-British-colonies-and-former-colonies> (date of access: 12.04.2022).

⁹Dutch ethical policy [Electronic resource]. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dutch_Ethical_Policy (date of access: 15.04.2022).

¹⁰Stenographische Berichte zur Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstags, XIII. Legislaturperiode, I. Session, Bd. 289 (von der 131. Sitzung am 3. April 1913 bis zur 150. Sitzung am 26. April 1913). Berlin, 1913. S. 4808.

institute in Cairo (1880, *Institut français d'archéologie orientale*) and for the Far East (1898, *École française d'Extrême-Orient*) [32, p. 125].

The Eastern Seminary (*Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen*) based at the University of Berlin trained teachers and colonial officials, with half of the cost borne by the German state. F. Stremel observed: "The institution was unique, as neither France nor any other country that conducted cultural diplomacy had a government-run training institute. The only institution that came close to the Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen in training colonial officials was London's School of Oriental Studies, which was not founded until 1916" [26, p. 57].

In 1905, the English ministry of education signed agreements with France and Prussia on the exchange of teaching assistants. Similar agreements were reached with Scotland in 1906, Saxony and Austria in 1907, and Bavaria and Hessen in 1912. All held great promise for cultural diplomacy. Under their terms, the teaching assistants taught their language in a participating school, and also shared their culture. They also studied the language of the host country, which they would teach after their return [2, p. 31].

In 1904, a group of German scientists and educators travelled to Buenos Aires at the invitation of the Ar-

gentine government to assist it in establishing a system for the training of teachers for Argentine's secondary schools. The members of the group formed the core of the teaching staff at the National Institute of Secondary School Teachers (*Instituto Nacional del Profesorado Secundario*) [5, S. 252].

In 1910, the newly founded Imperial University in Beijing received a large group of professors from German universities. In Persia, a German school was established with government funding to educate Persians. The Turkish University in Istanbul admitted a group of German professors to its staff. North American universities were expanding their academic exchanges with the universities of the German Reich, which reached its highest point at the beginning of World War I [33, S. 111].

Simultaneously, French lecturers and professors also went to teach at foreign universities, facilitated by the French culture centres (*Instituts Français*). From the beginning, these French institutes had a dual purpose: to enable French research students to conduct on-site research and to enable French-speaking natives to deepen their knowledge and understanding of French culture. The first centres of French culture opened in Athens (1907)¹¹, Florence (1907)¹², Madrid (1909)¹³, London (1910)¹⁴, New York (1911)¹⁵, and Saint Petersburg (1911)¹⁶.

Conclusion

Industrial imperialism set the stage for the rise of the institutions of cultural diplomacy. Divisions responsible for international cooperation in culture and education proliferated in the foreign ministries, and many states opened their first overseas cultural institutions.

Schools provided an effective tool for colonial powers in the pursuit of their civilising mission. Colonial education systems and school networks were modelled on the metropolises. Some European states targeted their cultural diplomacies at their diaspora. For Germany, it was an element of the *Deutschtum* policy. In Italy and Greece, where irredentist sentiments were influential, the emphasis was on education in the neighbouring states. At the dawn of the 20th century, cultural diplomacy became a means for the exercise of soft power, and schools, research and academic exchanges were its primary vehicles. Imperial powers were vying to promote their achievements in science and culture in as many countries and to as many people as possible. This new approach had

a favourable response from the recipient societies and also enhanced the economic and political influence of the European states. The Netherlands made its presence in education a part of its new development policy.

Where government activity in cultural diplomacy was limited, non-governmental institutions and individuals stepped in to fill the void. Multiple non-governmental groups active in cultural diplomacy emerged, e. g. *Alliance Française*, *Mission laïque française*, *Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein zur Erhaltung des Deutschtums im Ausland*, *Società Dante Alighieri*, and *Συνελλογος προς διασδοσιν των Ελληνικων Γραμματος*, among others. Individuals, not the state, provided funding, and strategic and day-to-day management of these organisations. The geographical presence of these institutions reflected the foreign policy aspirations of a particular state, such as nation-building or the struggle for global influence. Countries relied on diplomats to support their overseas cultural institutions while using considerable discretion in doing so.

¹¹Institut français de Grèce [Ressource électronique]. URL: [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Institut_français_de_Grèce](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institut_français_de_Grèce) (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

¹²Institut français de Florence [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institut_français_de_Florence (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

¹³Collignon M. L'inauguration de l'Institut Français de Madrid [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://www.persee.fr/doc/jds_0021-8103_1913_num_11_5_4060 (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

¹⁴Institut français du Royaume-Uni [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institut_français_du_Royaume-Uni (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

¹⁵L'Alliance française de New York, un écrin pour la culture française aux Etats-Unis [Ressource électronique]. URL : <https://www.canalacademies.com/emissions/partager-le-savoir-le-francais-en-partage/les-alliances-francaises/lalliance-francaise-de-new-york-un-ecrin-pour-la-culture-francaise-aux-etats-unis> (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

¹⁶Institut français de Saint-Petersbourg [Ressource électronique]. URL: https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institut_français_de_Saint-Petersbourg (date de la demande: 03.05.2022).

Библиографические ссылки

1. Düwell K. Zwischen Propaganda und Friedensarbeit – Geschichte der deutschen Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik im internationalen Vergleich. In: Maaß Kurt-Jürgen, Herausgeber. *Kultur und Außenpolitik. Handbuch für Wissenschaft und Praxis*. Baden-Baden: Nomos; 2015. S. 57–99.
2. Haigh A. *Cultural diplomacy in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation; 1974. 223 p.
3. Бендриков КЕ. *Очерки по истории народного образования в Туркестане (1865–1924 годы)*. Москва: Издательство Академии педагогических наук РСФСР; 1960. 508 с.
4. Burrows M. “Mission civilisatrice”: French cultural policy in the Middle East, 1860–1914. *The Historical Journal*. 1986; 29(1):109–135.
5. Schmidt F. Anfänge deutscher Kulturpolitik im Ausland. *Zeitschrift für Politik. Neue Folge*. 1956;3:252–258.
6. Ferrara M. *The cultural policies of Great Britain towards its colonies: culture, domination and empire*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing; 2012. 96 p.
7. Rolland D, González E, Niño A, Rodríguez M. *L’Espagne, La France et L’Amérique Latine: Politiques culturelles, propagandes et relations internationales, XXe siècle*. Paris: L’Harmattan; 2001. 495 p.
8. Moore BL. *Neither led nor driven. Contesting British cultural imperialism in Jamaica, 1865–1920*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press; 2004. 475 p.
9. Staliūnas D. *Making Russians. Meaning and practice of russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863*. Amsterdam: Rodopi; 2007. 480 p.
10. Chaubet F. L’Alliance française ou la diplomatie de la langue (1883–1914). *Revue historique*. 2004;4:763–785.
11. Brueziere M. *L’Alliance Française 1883–1983: histoire d’une institution*. Paris: Hachette; 1983. 247 p.
12. Weidenfeller G. *VDA, Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland, Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein (1881–1918)*. Bern: Peter Lang AG; 1976. 507 S.
13. Lepiorz J. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Auslandsschulwissens. *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch*. 1979;1:18–29.
14. Basu A. *Essays in the history of Indian education*. New Delhi: Concept; 1982. 105 p.
15. Kim CS. *Deutscher Kulturimperialismus in China. Deutsches Kolonialschulwesen in Kiautschou (China) 1898–1914*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 2004. 272 S.
16. Kelly GP. *French colonial education: essays on Vietnam and West Africa*. New York: AMS Press; 2000. 283 p.
17. Reynaud-Paligod C. *L’école aux colonies – entre mission civilisatrice et racialisation 1816–1940*. Paris: Champ Vallon; 2020. 348 p.
18. Paschalidis G. Exporting national culture: histories of cultural institutes abroad. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 2009;15(3):275–289.
19. Ritter GA. Internationale Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und auswärtige Kulturpolitik im deutschen Kaiserreich. In: Düwell K, Rehs M, Herausgeber. *Interne Faktoren auswärtiger Kulturpolitik im 19 und 20 Jahrhundert. Teil 1*. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen; 1981. S. 5–16.
20. Düwell K. *Deutschlands auswärtige Kulturpolitik 1918–1932. Grundlinien und Dokumente*. Köln: Böhlau; 1976. 402 S.
21. Косенко СИ. Генезис и эволюция культурной дипломатии Франции на протяжении эпох. *Вестник МГИМО-Университета*. 2013;4:29–37. DOI: 10.24833/2071-8160-2013-4-31-29-37.
22. Космач ВА. *Внешняя культурная политика Веймарской Германии в политической жизни страны и на международной арене (1919–1932 гг.)*. Витебск: ВГУ им. П.М. Машерова; 2006. 390 с.
23. Gencer M. *Bildungspolitik, Modernisierung und kulturelle Interaktion. Deutsch-Türkische Beziehungen (1908–1918)*. Münster: Lit Verlag; 2002. 314 S.
24. Thévenin A. *La Mission laïque française à travers son histoire, 1902–2002*. Paris: Mission laïque française; 2002. 242 p.
25. Karakasidou A. *Fields of wheat, hills of blood. Passages to nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870–1990*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; 1997. 370 p.
26. Stremmel F. An Imperial German battle to win over Mesopotamia: the Baghdad Propagandaschule (1909–1917). *Middle Eastern Studies*. 2015;51(1):49–71.
27. Delgado CB. *Historia de la educación en España y América: la educación en la España contemporánea (1789–1975)*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata; 1994. 974 p.
28. Frankema E. *Why was the Dutch legacy so poor? Educational development in the Netherlands Indies, 1871–1942*. Utrecht: Centre for Global Economic History at Utrecht University; 2014. 21 p.
29. Furnivall JS. *Colonial policy and practice. A comparative study of Burma and Netherlands India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1948. 575 p.
30. van Leeuwen B. *Human capital and economic growth in India, Indonesia and Japan: a quantitative analysis, 1890–2000*. Utrecht: Box Press Shop; 2007. 336 p.
31. Mühlhahn K. *Herrschaft und Widerstand in der “Musterkolonie” Kiautschou*. Oldenbourg: Wissenschaftsverlag; 2000. 474 S.
32. Djian JM. *Politique culturelle: la fin d’un mythe*. Paris: Editions Gallimard; 2005. 196 p.
33. Abelain M. *Die Kulturpolitik des Deutschen Reiches und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Ihre verfassungsgeschichtliche Entwicklung und ihre verfassungsrechtlichen Probleme*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag; 1968. 312 S.

References

1. Düwell K. Zwischen Propaganda und Friedensarbeit – Geschichte der deutschen Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik im internationalen Vergleich. In: Maaß Kurt-Jürgen, Herausgeber. *Kultur und Außenpolitik. Handbuch für Wissenschaft und Praxis*. Baden-Baden: Nomos; 2015. S. 57–99.
2. Haigh A. *Cultural diplomacy in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation; 1974. 223 p.

3. Bendrikov KE. *Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniya v Turkestane (1865–1924 gg.)* [Essays on the history of public education in Turkestan (1865–1924)]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR; 1960. 508 p. Russian.
4. Burrows M. "Mission civilisatrice": French cultural policy in the Middle East, 1860–1914. *The Historical Journal*. 1986; 29(1):109–135.
5. Schmidt F. Anfänge deutscher Kulturpolitik im Auslande. *Zeitschrift für Politik. Neue Folge*. 1956;3:252–258.
6. Ferrara M. *The cultural policies of Great Britain towards its colonies: culture, domination and empire*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing; 2012. 96 p.
7. Rolland D, González E, Niño A, Rodriguez M. *L'Espagne, La France et L'Amérique Latine: Politiques culturelles, propagandes et relations internationales, XXe siècle*. Paris: L'Harmattan; 2001. 495 p.
8. Moore BL. *Neither led nor driven. Contesting British cultural imperialism in Jamaica, 1865–1920*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press; 2004. 475 p.
9. Staliūnas D. *Making Russians. Meaning and practice of russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863*. Amsterdam: Rodopi; 2007. 480 p.
10. Chaubet F. L'Alliance française ou la diplomatie de la langue (1883–1914). *Revue historique*. 2004;4:763–785.
11. Brueziere M. *L'Alliance Française 1883–1983: histoire d'une institution*. Paris: Hachette; 1983. 247 p.
12. Weidenfeller G. VDA, Verein für das Deutschtum im Ausland, Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein (1881–1918). Bern: Peter Lang AG; 1976. 507 S.
13. Lepiorz J. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Auslandsschulwissens. *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch*. 1979;1:18–29.
14. Basu A. *Essays in the history of Indian education*. New Delhi: Concept; 1982. 105 p.
15. Kim CS. *Deutscher Kulturimperialismus in China. Deutsches Kolonialschulwesen in Kiautschou (China) 1898–1914*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag; 2004. 272 S.
16. Kelly GP. *French colonial education: essays on Vietnam and West Africa*. New York: AMS Press; 2000. 283 p.
17. Reynaud-Paligod C. *L'école aux colonies – entre mission civilisatrice et racialisation 1816–1940*. Paris: Champ Vallon; 2020. 348 p.
18. Paschalidis G. Exporting national culture: histories of cultural institutes abroad. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 2009;15(3):275–289.
19. Ritter GA. Internationale Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und auswärtige Kulturpolitik im deutschen Kaiserreich. In: Düwell K, Rehs M, Herausgeber. *Interne Faktoren auswärtiger Kulturpolitik im 19 und 20 Jahrhundert. Teil 1*. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen; 1981. S. 5–16.
20. Düwell K. Deutschlands auswärtige Kulturpolitik 1918–1932. *Grundlinien und Dokumente*. Köln: Böhlau; 1976. 402 S.
21. Kossenko SI. The genesis and evolution of the France's cultural diplomacy through centuries. *MGIMO Review of International Relations*. 2013;4:29–37. Russian. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2071-8160-2013-4-31-29-37>.
22. Kosmach VA. *Vneshnyaya kul'turnaya politika Veimarskoi Germanii v politicheskoi zhizni strany i na mezhdunarodnoi arene (1919–1932 gg.)* [Foreign cultural policy of Weimar Germany in the political life of the country and in the international arena (1919–1932)]. Vitebsk: Vitebsk State University named after P. M. Masherov; 2006. 390 p. Russian.
23. Gencer M. *Bildungspolitik, Modernisierung und kulturelle Interaktion. Deutsch-Türkische Beziehungen (1908–1918)*. Münster: Lit Verlag; 2002. 314 S.
24. Thévenin A. *La Mission laïque française à travers son histoire, 1902–2002*. Paris: Mission laïque française; 2002. 242 p.
25. Karakasidou A. *Fields of wheat, hills of blood. Passages to nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870–1990*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; 1997. 370 p.
26. Stremmel F. An Imperial German battle to win over Mesopotamia: the Baghdad Propagandaschule (1909–1917). *Middle Eastern Studies*. 2015;51(1):49–71.
27. Delgado CB. *Historia de la educación en España y América: la educación en la España contemporánea (1789–1975)*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata; 1994. 974 p.
28. Frankema E. *Why was the Dutch legacy so poor? Educational development in the Netherlands Indies, 1871–1942*. Utrecht: Centre for Global Economic History at Utrecht University; 2014. 21 p.
29. Furnivall JS. *Colonial policy and practice. A comparative study of Burma and Netherlands India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1948. 575 p.
30. van Leeuwen B. *Human capital and economic growth in India, Indonesia and Japan: a quantitative analysis, 1890–2000*. Utrecht: Box Press Shop; 2007. 336 p.
31. Mühlhahn K. *Herrschaft und Widerstand in der "Musterkolonie" Kiautschou*. Oldenbourg: Wissenschaftsverlag; 2000. 474 S.
32. Djian JM. *Politique culturelle: la fin d'un mythe*. Paris: Editions Gallimard; 2005. 196 p.
33. Abelain M. *Die Kulturpolitik des Deutschen reiches und der bundesrepublik Deutschland. Ihre verfassungsgeschichtliche Entwicklung und ihre verfassungsrechtlichen Probleme*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag; 1968. 312 S.

Received by editorial board 23.05.2022.