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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This thesis will examine Australia's international and domestic cultural and information activities as conducted by Australian governmental instrumentalities since 1966. This period is examined because 1966 was the first year in which cultural and information activities were reported on by the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA). In the examination distinction will be made first, between international and domestic cultural and information activities conducted or directed by DFA and second, between international cultural activities conducted by DFA and the Australia Council.

Australian cultural activities

Cultural activities as conducted by DFA are seen to have a political role in that their primary purpose is the furthering of foreign policy. For this reason this type of cultural activity is often referred to as 'cultural diplomacy'. DFA in a statement published in 1981 has recognized the importance of its cultural programs to its overall political objectives.

The international cultural relations program of the Department of Foreign Affairs is an integral part of Australian foreign policy. The program seeks to develop respect for Australia through its attainments in sport, the visual and performing arts and literature, and through academic exchanges and visits by people under the Special Overseas Fund and the Cultural Awards Scheme. The program aims to project the strength and vigour of Australian cultural and intellectual life, and to promote mutual understanding.
and goodwill... Priorities in the cultural program are directed to Japan, China, the ASEAN countries and India." 

DFA also noted in a brief to the Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration in 1976 that

Cultural relations promote mutual understanding and assist in the furtherance of foreign policy objectives. The whole thrust of diplomacy is to advance the national interest by negotiation of political, economic and defence issues. By promoting mutual and reciprocal understanding through cultural programmes, we create an atmosphere in which these objectives can more hopefully be pursued. In short, if we are to work with and achieve results from people very different from ourselves, we must understand them and they must understand us.

These two statements show how DFA cultural activities are clearly linked to the foreign diplomatic objectives of DFA. Since the 1950's, Australia's economic, diplomatic and strategic policies have been increasingly directed toward states in its region. During the period 1966-84 Australian cultural diplomatic concerns have also rested on states in the region. Those states include Japan, China, the five ASEAN nations and India.

The focussing on Southeast and East Asia of Australian diplomacy represented a significant development of Australian foreign policy. The deliberate use of Australian culture to further its diplomatic objectives was also a further development in Australian foreign policy history. Before 1966 representative Australian cultural diplomatic initiatives included the production of Hemisphere by the Department of Education from March 1956, the cultural diplomatic role Radio Australia has
played since World War II, the 'Colombo Plan' since the early 1950s, and the SEATO initiatives.

Links with Asia through cultural diplomacy began modestly in 1956 with the Asian Visits Fund. The Fund was created to bring the elite of the Asian nations to Australia and by doing so create a cadre of influential Asians sympathetic to Australia's cause. Today, DFA has Cultural Sections in Australian missions in Japan, China and Indonesia. The Australian Development Assistance Board provides funds for people from nations in the Asian-Pacific region to come to Australia to train in development related fields. And the Australia-Japan Foundation, Australia-China Council, and Australia-New Zealand Foundation conduct cultural exchanges between Australia and the respective nations to which they address themselves. The decision to initiate cultural exchanges with these states reflects the appreciation of their importance to Australia. Although these programs began modestly, they have expanded since 1966 to encompass the majority of total funds available to Australian cultural diplomatic initiatives.

The programs no longer deal with only the elite of the foreign states. Since 1972 Australian cultural diplomacy has become more broadly-based. Significant portions of the publics of these states have now become the target of cultural diplomacy. The Australia-Japan Foundation in particular, has attempted to reach a broader cross-section of the Japanese population by bringing to Australia people from the media, sports, trade unions and other diversified fields in an attempt to give such people a direct
experience of Australia. Indirect contacts through the mass media have also been fostered.

The use of cultural agents as a means by which inter-state relations can be influenced, in general is not unique to the post World War II period. Cultural diplomacy was used in the period of global colonization by the European powers. The use of cultural diplomacy was a significant part of the whole colonizing process. A program of education, usually in the language of the colonizing power, was often undertaken to acculturate the colonized population into the culture of the colonizing state. Education was sometimes provided for the elite of the colonized state in institutions within the colonizing power's own borders. In this way it was hoped that the ideals and customs of the colonizing power could be passed on or imprinted on the colonized state in the event of indirect rule.

France was first among modern states to actively engage in promoting its own culture abroad and has used cultural agents to influence its relations with other states since before WWI. In the inter-war period, culture was seen as a means by which competition with neighbouring European states could be continued in a peaceful fashion on a global scale. A direct link between the extent of French cultural influence and French economic relations was seen to exist. Expansion of this influence was held to hold the future of the French state itself. In doing so, France raised the question of whether, 'when blood ceased to flow, the struggle between nations is over; whether their influence, their respective cultures, their commerce, their
language, their thought do not remain formidable weapons which in the future may decide the conflict.

In the post World War II period, global cultural diplomatic relations have been dominated by the USA and USSR. The cultural diplomatic initiatives of both nations have left few states untouched. Resources made available to these programs have been immense and a high degree of importance has been attached to their success. As a small power, Australia neither has comparable amounts of resources available to cultural diplomatic initiatives nor the ability to extend these programs on a global scale. Australia has shown an interest, however, in extending its cultural diplomatic programs into its region (concentrating on Japan, China, the five ASEAN nations and India).

The term 'cultural diplomacy', as practised by the Australian DFA, is used to refer to a narrow diplomatic function whereby Australian foreign policy objectives are furthered by the use of cultural agents representative of Australia. Those cultural agents are used to raise awareness among the public (since the initiation of 'grass-roots diplomacy' by organisations such as the Australia-Japan Foundation) and the elite (by programs such as the Asian Visits Fund) of the foreign state with which international relations are being conducted. It is hoped that by creating understanding of one's own state among the public of the foreign state, domestic pressure will be placed on the government of that state to be more amicable towards one's own foreign policy.
Cultural diplomacy also has an important symbolic value. That is, it attempts simply to be more amicable towards foreign states, and assumes that such a disposition assists the achievement of foreign policy goals. This function of cultural diplomacy may have more significance to Australia, which has scant resources available to its cultural diplomatic programs, than any attempt to influence the opinions of the large publics of states in its region. This question will be examined further in later sections.

International cultural relations

Williams distinguishes between 'cultural diplomacy' as 'the practice of using cultural resources to facilitate the achievement of foreign policy objectives' and 'international cultural relations' as 'the practice of using diplomatic resources to facilitate the achievement of cultural policy objectives.' This distinction describes very well the state of international cultural activities in Australia.

In Australia, as already discussed, cultural diplomacy is conducted by DFA through the Cultural Sections in Australian diplomatic missions in Japan, China and Indonesia; through the Australian Information Service; through the Australia-Japan Foundation, the Australia-China Council and the Australia-New Zealand Foundation. International cultural relations are conducted by the Australia Council. There is a common element in both activities: the use of cultural agents to further
understanding between Australia and one or more foreign states. Although the International Program (established in 1973) of the Australia Council is arranged in consultation with DFA, the objectives of the two approaches differ in that international cultural relations are conducted for 'culture's sake', whereas cultural diplomacy uses cultural agents to further political objectives. It may be argued that cultural and political objectives should be kept separate. This is because it may be difficult to combine the aspirations of the domestic cultural community and the political objectives of the government. It may also be argued that 'cultural diplomacy' and 'international cultural relations' can co-exist and even complement each other under certain circumstances. There is a strong inter-relationship between the two.

It is fair to state broadly however, that the Australia Council is responsible for the management of international cultural relations. The Council operates outside the jurisdiction of DFA. Its role is interpreted as being 'to foster the artistic life of the nation'. In the international sphere the Australia Council is 'charged with increasing the range and quality of the arts and their accessibility in the Australian community' and to 'promote in other countries a knowledge and appreciation of Australian arts'. Although many of these activities are organised with the cooperation of the Cultural Exchanges Section of DFA many of the goals of these activities remain autonomous from DFA policy objectives.
In practice, the Australia Council is heavily influenced by domestic cultural policy considerations. The ideas and direction of the domestic cultural community are reflected in the focus of the Council's activities. The aspirations of the Australian cultural community, creatively and economically therefore become the objectives of the Council. Because of the influence of domestic cultural policy, international cultural relations conducted by the Council tend to be directed toward Western Europe and North America. Total expenditure by the Australia Council involving interaction with Western Europe, North America and the United Kingdom in 1981-82 amounted to 75 per cent of the Council's international arts budget of A$1.7 million. In comparison, 70 per cent of the 1982 parliamentary appropriation for DFA's cultural program was spent on Japan, China and the five member states of ASEAN.9

Australian international and domestic information activities

The final area of interest in this thesis will be DFA information activities. DFA provides an information function separate to its cultural activities in both the international and domestic spheres. The division of responsibility between cultural and information functions is made clear in the following DFA statement.

The Department's main functions in the information and cultural relations fields are three: first, to make known and to explain, both at home and abroad, Australia's foreign policies, attitudes, and interests; secondly, especially through its overseas posts, to provide information of a general nature designed to make Australia better known and understood abroad; and,
thirdly, in the cultural field, to assist the presentation overseas of Australian works of art and of performances of Australian music, drama and ballet groups, and thereby to help create respect abroad for Australian achievements in the arts, and to co-operate with other governments in enabling other countries and their cultures to be better understood by Australians.

In the domestic sphere a major aim of the information section of DFA is to assist the development of a broader public understanding of Australian foreign policies. Emphasis is also given to the provision of factual information and background guidance to the media. It is thereby hoped that the creation of an informed environment covering Australian foreign policies will avoid as far as possible the publication of inaccurate statements about Australian policies which might be damaging to Australia's interests.

DFA information activities lie to a great extent in coordinating and complementing the work of other government departments or agencies and of non-government bodies. In the domestic sphere DFA cooperates with organizations interested in Australia's external relations such as the Australian Institute of International Affairs. Internationally DFA activities are closely linked with and assisted by the Australian Information Service. Coordination of this type of cooperative work with other departments is maintained through inter-department committees when appropriate.

This sub-thesis, through discussion of the divided functions of Australian cultural and information activities, will attempt to analyse the effectiveness of these activities. Primarily, the
sub-thesis will be concerned with the allocation of scant resources and will assume that an inevitable shortage of funds requires DFA to make choices between international and domestic cultural and information activities. The implications of these choices, although difficult to examine empirically, will be appraised in the light of their perceived ability to affect international relations.

The process of examination is made more complex by the fact that it is not always possible to draw clear distinction between the four functions of cultural and information activities as outlined briefly in this introduction. There are international cultural activities conducted primarily to further foreign political objectives as there are cultural activities conducted for 'culture's sake' alone. It is not clear however that institutions deal with either one or the other and the sub-thesis will necessarily include discussion of the overlapping responsibilities of institutions dealt with here.

The development of the argument will work through the following sections. First, the extent of Australian DFA cultural and information activity for the period 1966-84 will be examined in Chapter II. The activities of other representative cultural institutions will also be outlined in an attempt to build up a picture of the total effect of this type of activity. Those institutions examined will include the Australia Council, Australian Information Service, Australia-Japan Foundation, Australia-China Council and Australia-New Zealand Foundation.
Chapter III will examine the role and importance of cultural and information activities. The implications of certain policy directions in the cultural and information field will be dealt with in the light of this examination. One difficulty in the analysis of cultural and information activities which is drawn out in this chapter is that of assessing the success of cultural and information programs. This has led the author to conduct a survey of past recipients of Australia-Japan Foundation travel grants in an attempt to assess the success of this program. The data collected from the survey and conclusions are presented in Chapters IV and V.
CHAPTER II
DFA CULTURAL AND INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Present DFA cultural activities

Australia's dealings with the international community in the post-War period have been characterized by a growing awareness of Asia. This awareness has been prompted by developing economic relations with the countries of the Asian-Pacific region and by a broadening of the cultural identity of Australia. In 1966, in the first DFA Annual Report in 27 years, DFA stated:

Australia's growing involvement in Asia has been a feature of her post-war international relations. Day-to-day contacts through diplomatic missions, parliamentary visits, activity under the Colombo Plan, the presence of Asian students in Australia and cultural exchanges reinforce and are reinforced by the growth in Australian trade with Asia and membership of Asian regional organisations.

This statement by DFA of its fundamental interest in the Asian-Pacific region was qualified in the same Annual Report by the following:

The greater part of Australia's population and of its cultural heritage derives from Europe, particularly from Britain. In addition to the demographic and cultural links, there is a wide range of historical, political, financial and trade associations that link Australia with Britain and the countries of continental Europe. The continental European elements entering into Australia's culture are being reinforced and broadened by the increasing numbers of people from European countries who have chosen to settle permanently in Australia. The significance can be gauged by the fact that about 10 per cent of Australia's population has arrived from continental European countries since the second World War. Australia has progressively increased its diplomatic and consular missions in European countries to 18 (including London).
At the time that these two statements were released, DFA was subject to domestic cultural pressure as well as to pressure from its own interests to expand relations in the Asian-Pacific region. Domestic cultural politics demanded continued links with the states of Western Europe and Britain. DFA, through its diplomatic and consular representation overseas, found itself burdened with the task of facilitating these continued links. This state of affairs was not remedied until 1973 when the Australia Council for the Arts, an advisory body and distributor of funds to the various art organisations was established. The body was later transformed in 1975 to a statutory body under the name of the Australia Council. DFA was then freed to continue cultural diplomacy which would, as it saw it, promote Australian foreign policy objectives more specifically.

As early as 1968 DFA was contemplating the form that this type of cultural diplomacy should take. During 1968, the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the Minister for External Affairs appointed an inter-departmental committee of three departments, chaired by External Affairs (DFA), 'to consider the Government's cultural relations programme in the context of Australia's foreign policy objectives'. The appointment of this committee made clear DFA's desire that cultural relations should be developed in the overall context of Australia's international relations generally, and with due regard to foreign policy objectives.

Table 1 divides DFA cultural diplomatic activities since 1966 into geographic regions. Although data for the years 1940-1966
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South East Asia</th>
<th>North Asia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India &amp; Pakistan</th>
<th>Western Europe &amp; Britain</th>
<th>Eastern Europe &amp; USSR</th>
<th>Americas &amp; Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>cultural agreement signed with Indonesia</td>
<td>book gift to 2 uni's in Indonesia</td>
<td>- book gift to uni's &amp; student hostels in Indonesia</td>
<td>- book donation to Indian Parliamentary Library</td>
<td>- book donation to Indian Parliamentary Library</td>
<td>- book donation to Indian Parliamentary Library</td>
<td>- book donation to Indian Parliamentary Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2 Indonesian publishers to Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Adelaide Woodwind Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Adelaide Woodwind Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Adelaide Woodwind Quartet</td>
<td>- performances by Sydney String Quartet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Thailand</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Indonesia</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Japan</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Japan</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Japan</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Japan</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td>North Asia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>India &amp; Pakistan</td>
<td>Western Europe &amp; Britain</td>
<td>Eastern Europe &amp; USSR</td>
<td>Americas &amp; Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>- major photographic exhibit</td>
<td>- major photographic exhibit</td>
<td>- exchanges of sports teams, artistic groups &amp; language students and teachers</td>
<td>- tour by Sydney Conservatorium Chamber Orchestra</td>
<td>- cultural agreement signed with Yugoslavia</td>
<td>- Sydney String Quartet tours Central and South America</td>
<td>- participation in US bicentenary celebrations - Chair of Aust. Studies at Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tour by Marionette Theatre</td>
<td>- establishment of Australia-Japan Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. Ballet performs in Manila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tour by Sydney Conservatorium Chamber Orchestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Philippines</td>
<td>- New England Ensemble tour</td>
<td>- Australian film event</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with France seminars on Aust. literature in Scotland and Venice</td>
<td>- cultural agreement with Romania</td>
<td>- Aust. film event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New England Ensemble tour</td>
<td>- Bob Barnard Jazz Band tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. film event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- tour by 'Ten Australian Jewellers'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bob Barnard Jazz Band tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- pottery tour of US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Judy Bailey Quartet tour</td>
<td>- Galapagos Duck Jazz group tour</td>
<td>- exhibit of Aust. fauna</td>
<td>- sport clinics held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Galapagos Duck Jazz group tour</td>
<td>- sport clinics held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sport clinics held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- art tour of Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>- sports coaching assistance tour</td>
<td>- Oenpelli Aboriginal art exhibit</td>
<td>- Aust. ceramic film events</td>
<td>- Sydney Dance Co. tour</td>
<td>- Aboriginal Theatre Co. tour of USA - Indigenous Theatre Co. tour of Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Early Music Duo tour</td>
<td>- Aust. literature seminars</td>
<td>- Aust. ceramic film events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. literature course estab. at Uni. of Indonesia</td>
<td>- Oenpelli Aboriginal art exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. Chamber Orchestra tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. artists to European exhibits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. architecture to Paris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 (continued)

**DFA CULTURAL ACTIVITIES (FOCUSED ON FOREIGN PUBLICS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South East Asia</th>
<th>North Asia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India and Pakistan</th>
<th>Western Europe and Britain</th>
<th>Eastern Europe and USSR</th>
<th>Americas and Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aust. writers tour Japan</td>
<td>- landscape painting tour</td>
<td>- teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1 A

**PROGRAM OF DFA FUNDED VISITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of visitors to Australia</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-1967</td>
<td>78 (SOVF)</td>
<td>75 from 14 Asian nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1968</td>
<td>80 (SOVF)</td>
<td>63 from Asian nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>72 (SOVF)</td>
<td>majority from Asian nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>133 (SOVF) 9 (CAS)</td>
<td>SOVF - scope world-wide CAS - only from Asian nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>107 (SOVF) 22 (CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>34 (SOVF) 9 (CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>30 (SOVF) 14 (CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>37 (SOVF) 13 (CAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>50 (SOVF)</td>
<td>all from ASEAN nations (following the Government's decision to give greater attention to assisting their leading personalities to visit Australia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c | Special Overseas Visitors Fund |
| b | Cultural Awards Scheme |

Source: DFA Annual Reports
and 1970-1973 are unavailable due to Annual Reports not having been published at all, it is clear from cultural and information sections provided in DFA Annual Reports that at least since 1966 Australian cultural diplomacy has been concentrated in the Asian-Pacific region. This focussing of Australian cultural diplomacy culminated in 1978 in the statement that:

priorities in the cultural program [of the Department] are directed to Japan, China, Indonesia and other ASEAN countries, and India.15

Subsequently the Australia-Japan Foundation (a statutory body formed under the Australia-Japan Foundation Act of 10 May 1976) and the Australia-China Council were established. Both bodies were given substantial budgets under which to operate and further finely defined the direction of Australian cultural diplomacy in general. Because of this important role as 'lenses' further focussing DFA objectives, both bodies will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

Table 2 also represents DFA cultural diplomatic activities since 1966. Together with Table 1 it indicates the total number of representative DFA cultural diplomatic activities, or DFA supported activities. Table 2 represents those activities, which have been focussed on the Australian public. It is clear from comparison of the tables that the primary aim of Australian cultural activities is to influence the opinions of the publics and elites of those foreign states considered important to Australia, and not to introduce those respective cultures to Australians.
**DFA CULTURAL ACTIVITIES (FOCUSED ON AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South East Asia</th>
<th>North Asia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>India &amp; Pakistan</th>
<th>Western Europe &amp; Britain</th>
<th>Eastern Europe &amp; USSR</th>
<th>Americas &amp; Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1967</td>
<td>funding to Cambodia to stage 'Cambodia Trading' exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967 - 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian print exhibit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - 1969</td>
<td>$14,000 to AJRCC for scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian historical exhibit in Sydney &amp; Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanghai Philharmonic Society tour of Aust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student exchange with China (5 each year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>visits by artists and crafts people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Idemitsu exhibit in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Xian exhibit in Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DFA Annual Reports
Table 1 shows how proportionately cultural activity in the South East and North Asian regions, China, and India and Pakistan encompass the majority of total resources available to DFA cultural activities. Originally these regions were covered by the Special Overseas Visitors Fund and the Cultural Awards Scheme. Under these programs the elite of the nations Australia considered most important to its foreign policy were brought to Australia in an attempt to create a cadre of informed people, mainly Asian, who were sympathetic towards Australia. These programs were abandoned in 1979.

To the extent that programs which specifically attempt to influence the elite of these states have been reduced it can be said that DFA cultural activities have become broader-based. The populations of these states, however, are large, and it may be the case that attempts to influence the opinions of such vast publics, given scant resources, is basically futile. Under these conditions, the symbolic value of Australian cultural activity is perhaps more important than any dedicated attempt to influence the public opinion of foreign states.

From Tables 1 and 2 it can also be seen that there is no pattern to the actual type of cultural activity conducted within specific countries or regions. This observation is supported by the DFA statement in 1979 that it was 'guided by missions abroad as to what was required [as far as the provision of information and cultural activities were concerned]'. That is, there was little central policy guiding the content of cultural activities abroad.
Due to limited funds in 1977 cultural exchanges were confined to small groups and individuals - music teachers, soloists and sporting coaches - and regional tours. DFA stated that

No attempt is made to provide a uniform pattern of activities; in some instances the focus is on student and teacher exchanges and academic activities; in others, visits by sports coaches or gifts to libraries are seen to be more worthwhile.  

Table 1 also shows how in 1980 policy direction changed and emphasis in the cultural sphere was shifted to the US, states with which Australia had signed cultural agreements, China and ASEAN. High priority areas for information were the US, Japan, Southeast Asia, Europe and China. Some positive control of policy direction was evident during the Whitlam government years but this diminished after 1975 with policy becoming more sporadic and susceptible to budgetary constraints. Table 1 shows how this focus was lost, with representative cultural activities being almost totally sacrificed during 1980 and, thereafter, a piecemeal approach being taken to the type of cultural activities chosen during the time of the Fraser government. The tour by the Australian Dance Theatre of South East Asia was in fact the only representative cultural activity conducted in that and the North Asian region for the period 1979-80.

Cultural activities appear to be susceptible to budgetary constraints to the point where total activities for a particular year may be sacrificed. It is possible that as far as cultural diplomacy is seen to have symbolic importance and cultural activities are a means by which one can act more amicably towards
foreign states and expect foreign states to be amicable in return, the postponement of such activities may have a negative effect on the ability of Australian diplomats to conduct Australian international relations. That is because diplomats may, on the basis of the simultaneous conduct of more amicable cultural activities with a state, allow for more elasticity in their negotiations of difficult matters such as balance of trade concerns. The postponement of cultural activities may be of negative value during times of difficult negotiations.

A more consistent policy would be more appropriate because negative symbolic effects would be avoided. Also as far as cultural diplomacy attempts to influence the opinions of the elite and general publics of foreign states a more consistent policy would stimulate areas of interest which may develop to be independent of further government funding. Therefore, although it is difficult to criticize DFA's ad hoc approach to date on the grounds that each program is seen to have been tailored to specific national circumstances it is possible that more direct central control of cultural activities may lead to the concentration of scant resources in useful areas over a period of time. An interesting concept which a centralized controlling body might also consider is the commercialisation of cultural activities which would further free Australian government funds for continued concentration in other areas. The sale of Australian art, distribution of Australian films, and production of Australian theatre, are all projects of possible commercial potential.
Finally, from Table 2 it can be seen that only small amounts of resources are made available for the introduction of foreign cultures to the public of Australia. The activities outlined in Table 2 include activities which DFA have helped coordinate. Therefore, although DFA states that it 'co-operate(s) with other governments in enabling other countries and their cultures to be better understood by Australians' as part of its cultural activities, very few real resources are spent on this task. DFA considers the education of the Australian public in matters of foreign policy primarily as a separate 'information function'. The following section will examine the effectiveness of that function.

**DFA information activities**

Although DFA cultural activities are not primarily focussed on the public of Australia, as documented above, DFA has recognized the importance of educating the Australian public in matters of foreign policy. For example, in 1980 the major reorganisation of DFA included the formation of a new Public Affairs Branch which was responsible for the management of DFA's public information activities within Australia. At the time its formation was seen as 'reflect[ing] the priority attached by the Department to encouraging public awareness and understanding of developments in Australian foreign policy'.

Within the present structure of DFA the task of providing the Australian public with information concerning its activities is
performed by the Information Branch of DFA. This branch is grouped together with cultural relations as indicated in Figure 1. In 1980 this structure was changed slightly when the consular function of DFA was grouped together with public affairs and cultural and information and, as already discussed, a separate Public Affairs Branch was created (Figure 2). Public affairs, that is dealings with the Australian public, is therefore considered separate from cultural relations.

In 1974 DFA stated the desire to maintain direct contact with the Australian public and the media. Direct contact with the public was facilitated by upgrading DFA offices in every Australian state and extending contacts with the media, the universities, organisations and community groups. During this period, DFA made it a practice to respond positively to requests from community, academic, religious and other institutions throughout Australia for DFA officers to fulfil public speaking engagements. These activities were sharply curtailed in the period after 1975 due to budgetary constraints. Contact with the media was maintained.

DFA information activities are directed at both overseas and domestic targets. Internationally, the aims of the Information Branch are to 'portray Australia as a medium power with a responsible role, to make known the Government's policies on international issues and to generate interest in developments in Australia.' During 1977 most DFA information activity, including all work at posts, was directed at overseas targets.
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Source: DFA Annual Report 1979, 1983-84
It appears that although provision for the education of the Australian public is accounted for within the DFA structure and although DFA makes regular statements of its concern for the provision to the Australian public of correct information about Australian foreign policy, the actual provision of this information is now only provided by briefings to the media. In 1977 there were only 18 full-time officers working domestically in the information field compared to 141 full-time officers working in the international field (130 at posts and 11 at central office). The resources devoted to educating the Australian public are small compared to those spent overseas.

DFA states in its Annual Reports that within the domestic field its aims are:

- supporting Ministerial action to develop public understanding of and debate on policy issues;
- informing the public about Departmental expenditures, especially those overseas;
- informing travellers about passport requirements;
- and answering inquiries within the Minister's portfolio.

However, despite the stated objective of attempting to make available as much information about foreign affairs as it can, consistent with the need for proper conduct of the affairs of government and the need for confidentiality in dealings with foreign governments, DFA has continually sacrificed the direct education of the Australian public in matters of foreign policy to other information providing priorities. For example, during
1977 DFA persisted with its domestic information program of giving priority to Parliament.24 DFA was concerned primarily with providing information to the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence and the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence and with providing the Minister with information to enable him to answer questions on and without notice in Parliament.

Although these activities are included in the activities of the Information Branch, the author sees them as essential activities of DFA, and not as information activities which should or should not be given priority over other information activities. If foreign policy of a democratic state is to be properly judged by its electorate then correct information should actively be fed to that electorate and an informed awareness of the state's foreign policy created. Also, the education of the Australian public in itself is desirable for reasons other than objectives of foreign policy.

The abolition of the not long formed Public Affairs Branch (see figure 3) due to budgetary constraints also reflects the relative priority DFA gives to domestic information activities during times of budgetary contraints. Therefore, although the DFA stated primary aim of the Information Branch is the provision of information to the Australian public, this is not occurring. It can be seen that budgetary constraints on DFA are resulting in DFA sacrificing domestic information activities for international information and cultural activities. DFA recognizes the importance of educating its own electorate about matters of
foreign policy but when faced with the problem of the allocation of scant resources to these programs it appears to consider the furthering of its foreign political objectives through international cultural and information activities of priority over domestic public opinion.

DFA publications

DFA has a large publications program which has continued to provide Australia's overseas posts with public information material on Australia's foreign policies. To a lesser degree, DFA provides material to meet inquiries from the Australian press, governmental and non-governmental bodies and members of the Australian public.

From 1935 to December 1972 DFA produced a monthly publication Current Notes on International Affairs. In 1967 circulation was 10,200 of which 1500 went to institutions and influential individuals overseas. In 1973 production of Current Notes ceased and it was replaced by Australian Foreign Affairs Record (AFAR). In 1975 distribution of AFAR was 12,200. It was primarily sent to centres providing general information services such as libraries, universities, newspapers, radio stations and community associations. In 1976, due to budgetary constraints, the size and distribution of AFAR was reduced.

For a number of years, until suspended in 1975, DFA produced two series entitled Outline and Backgrounds. These series provided general background information on other countries, and on
international developments of current significance. They were distributed widely in Australia, principally to schools, universities, and to individuals who play a part in the shaping of public opinion and debate on foreign affairs issues.

DFA presently produces a weekly series Backgrounder. This is distributed to Members of Parliament, the media, business and academic leaders and interested members of the public. Apart from these regular publications, DFA produces a number of booklets and pamphlets each year on subjects of special interest. A major program for DFA has been the production of a number of volumes entitled Documents on Australian Foreign Policy 1937-1949. This project began in 1970 and provides a comprehensive and nonpartisan record of Australia's foreign policy during an important formative stage.

The DFA publication program appears to be a positive attempt by the Australian Government to keep its electorate informed of Australia's involvement in the international arena. However, the provision of this material is directed at those people already interested in Australian foreign policy. Apart from the past wide distribution of Outline and Backgrounds there is no direct attempt to stimulate added awareness of foreign policy within the Australian public. Therefore, the DFA domestic information-providing function is inadequate in creating a more informed public in matters of foreign policy. Although it is at present providing information in large quantities, this information function is not directed at a broadly-based audience.
The DFA information function is insufficient because, although the Australian Government has made a commitment to educate (i.e. encourage public awareness and understanding of developments in Australian foreign policy) its public, it has been shown that this is not occurring. An examination of the implications of this type of policy will follow in Chapter IV.

The Australian Information Service

The international information activities of DFA through its missions overseas are assisted by the Australian Information Service (AIS) and Film Australia (contained within the Australian Film Commission) which is responsible for the provision of documentary films on Australia. AIS is considered the Australian Government's principal information organisation. It had its origins during World War II as the then Department of Information. It became the Australian News and Information Bureau in 1950 when the Department of Information was disbanded. Under the Department of Media, created by the new Whitlam Government in 1972, it was given its present title.

In its first Annual Report in 1970, AIS's primary function was described as to 'present a contemporary and authentic picture of Australia to the world, explaining national policies and furthering Australian objectives internationally.' The Service itself has 34 officers at 21 AIS posts in 18 countries. Generally these posts are contained within DFA missions. Other countries are serviced through 55 DFA missions whose offices co-ordinate information activities with AIS material and support.
Cooperation between AIS and DFA is naturally and necessarily close. For example, the functions of Australian Information Service officers at overseas posts include the following:

- placement of articles, photographs, television, radio and other information material provided by the Australian Information Service, other Government departments and approved organisations
- compiling weekly newsletters and distributing regular newsletters based on Australian supplied information, Radio Australia reports and local activities
- arranging news conferences as required
- advice to the Head of Mission on information and public relations matters, and duties at his direction, as required
- reporting to the Head of Mission and appropriate Australian departments through the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Australian Information Service on local media activity and trends
- correcting misleading or damaging reports about Australia when considered necessary and after consultation with the appropriate authorities
- developing and maintaining contacts with local media (the importance of personal contact cannot be stressed too highly)
- writing and issuing press releases as required
- maintaining a close liaison with representatives of other departments at the post particularly those from Foreign Affairs, Overseas Trade and Immigration
- maintaining a close liaison with representatives of other organisations stationed in the area such as Qantas and the Australian Tourist Commission
- maintaining contact with Australian nationals resident or visiting the region
- providing advice, guidance and answers to inquiries about Australia made by mail, telephone and personal calls
- meeting and assisting as required, visiting members of the Australian media
assisting and briefing representatives of the media visiting Australia

- maintaining pictorial files to meet requests
- maintaining a film library for showings to schools, colleges, universities and various other institutions
- negotiating the use of Film Australia films by local television, theatres and cinemas, the sale of prints and the provision of footage for film and television producers in liaison with locally or Australian-based Film Australia representatives
- maintaining a reference library, records of new books and borrowings
- maintaining files of Australian newspapers for reference
- mounting and providing material and guidance for exhibitions and displays
- supplying speech notes for senior members of the post where required
- providing talks on Australia where required
- generating a continuing interest in Australia at all levels of local society
- maintaining and updating mailing lists
- maintaining distribution and local supplies of Australian Information Service and other departmental publications
- maintaining a continuing liaison with the Australian Information Service, Canberra.

At the same time, the information section of DFA has the stated aim of making known abroad Australia's foreign policies and endeavouring to ensure that Australia's attitudes and interests are correctly understood. DFA attempts to achieve this objective by distributing information designed to give an accurate picture of Australia and to correct misconceptions based on lack of knowledge, or outdated or erroneous information.
Therefore, in the international sphere the information activities of AIS and DFA complement each other and to a certain degree are repetitive.

DFA information activities have a domestic function as well. However, as already mentioned, resources have been diverted away from the domestic sphere. Therefore, although an international information function is adequately provided for by AIS, scant resources are being further focussed on the international sphere by DFA to the deprivation of the Australian public.

The Australia Council

The Australia Council spends a small proportion of its budgetary allocation on funding international cultural activities. The international program is contained within a sub-section of activities of the Council known as 'Council Programs'. Originally the program was governed by a committee of Board Chairmen and specialist advisors but now consists of a small staff operation responsible to the general manager. This reflects the increasing importance placed on the program by the Council. The program competes for about four per cent of the Council's appropriation along-side the Council's research, information and education activities.

The International Program is arranged in consultation with DFA and many of its undertakings are jointly funded with DFA. For example, the Literature Board of the Council and DFA have continued to contribute to support an Associate Professor of
Australian Literature at the University of Venice and to arrange and fund Australian Literature seminars overseas. However, as mentioned before, projects funded by the Council are not necessarily married to foreign political objectives. To the extent that some projects are DFA co-funded there exists an overlap of interests. However, the Council is mainly concerned with the interests of the Australian arts community.

The Australia-Japan Foundation

The Australia-Japan Foundation is one of three government instrumentalities closely linked to the cultural diplomatic objectives of DFA (the other two being the Australia-China Council and the Australia-New Zealand Foundation) which also actively encourage the education of the Australian public about the states with which their nation is interacting. The formation of the Australia-Japan Foundation was a deliberate attempt to focus DFA cultural activities on the Asian-Pacific region made by the Whitlam government. The Fraser government also approved the objectives of the Foundation and arrangements were formalised under an Act of Parliament known as the Australia-Japan Foundation Act on 10 May 1976. It followed the ratification of a cultural agreement concluded in November 1974 and ratified in February 1976 between Australia and Japan. Whereas a cultural agreement expresses the desire to facilitate cultural exchange it is not intended that an elaborate inter-government framework be established under the agreement. The Australia-Japan Foundation Act, however, was a concrete expression by the Australian
Government of its desire to increase the amount and quality of knowledge of Australians and Japanese of each other's country.

The origins of the legislation to establish the Foundation are in the recommendations of a Committee under the Chairmanship of Sir John Crawford, which was appointed in 1974 by the Whitlam government, to report on the arrangements needed to enable a wider spectrum of relations to be established between the peoples of Australia and Japan. The Committee concluded that the fostering of closer relations between the two nations on all levels and between varying people from all walks of life was necessary.

In the first annual Report of the Foundation, the broad objectives were set out:

To deepen and strengthen relations between Australia and Japan by fostering greater mutual awareness and understanding through people-to-people contacts and by promoting study and other activities to elucidate to each other the character, culture, language and outlook of the two peoples and the social, political and economic organisation of the two countries. In general, the Foundation's attention will be directed at the contemporary aspects of the two societies.31

The same Report states that:

The Foundation will place emphasis on improving or creating awareness and understanding on the part of the other country by selected Australians and Japanese citizens at all levels including those who would not normally become familiar with the other country as part of their ordinary occupational activities.32

At the outset, the activities of the Foundation were divided into five major programs. These were:
- educational support program,
- media support program,
- travel and associated grants program,
- sport program,
- and, community liaison program.

In 1979 a publications program was initiated and in 1980, with the establishment of the Tokyo office of the Foundation, a library program was also initiated.

Apart from the educational support program which encourages research on Australia and Japan by academics, the programs of the Foundation have been of a broad-based nature. The media support program, for example, has led to a number of journalist exchanges. There is no evidence available to determine whether this program has led to an increase in the number of newspaper articles related to Australia and Japan. However, the development of an informed cadre of journalists interested in Australia and Japan improves the educative role that newspapers have within both the Australian and Japanese publics. This is because articles will be more accurate due to the increased knowledge and experience of the journalist who has spent extended periods in the other country under the Foundation program.

The travel grants and sport programs are good examples of 'grass-roots-diplomacy'. They are broadly-based programs which attempt to reach those members of the public of the two states without available institutions upon which to base cross-cultural interaction. They attempt to provide institutions by basing
cultural exchange upon areas of common interest to both cultural groups. A well-cited example of the travel grants program is the provision of a grant to an Australian fireman to study Japanese fire-fighting facilities for a number of weeks. The grants initiated under this scheme will be examined in detail in Chapter IV.

Representative projects conducted under the sports program have been the annual Australia-Japan Foundation Golf Tournament and the participation by the Sydney and Melbourne University rowing teams in the Keio-Waseda Regatta on a biennial basis. In alternate years, the teams from Keio and Waseda Universities have participated in the Australian Inter-Varsity rowing competition. It can be said that rowing is a very minority, up-market sport. It is difficult to see the point of spending money on so specialised a cross-cultural interaction. This point will be drawn out further in a later detailed examination of Foundation activities. At this time it is sufficient to note the attempt to base cross-cultural interaction on some common institution.

Finally, the community liaison program has attempted to facilitate communication and the flow of information between groups which have the common purpose of strengthening Australia-Japan relations. In this way, the Foundation has not acted in isolation from other agencies and organisations, government and non-government, presently involved in Australia-Japan relations.

The more recently-initiated Library and Publications programs act as supplementary information-providing activities to DFA. With
the establishment in April 1980 of its Tokyo office, the Foundation set up a public Australian Studies library. This library, which is accessible to many Japanese living and working in the Tokyo area, has holdings of approximately 6000 books and is used by an average of 25 persons per day. The publications program has resulted in a number of Australian academic titles being translated and published in Japanese (e.g. Solomon; Australia's Government and Parliament).

The activities of the Australia-Japan Foundation have been examined here because they have, in the past, provided information on a foreign culture to the Australian public in a broad-based manner. The Foundation stated in 1978, not long after its inception, that its aim was:

> to allocate its budget in approximately equal portion between activities designed to increase Australian understanding of Japan and Japanese understanding of Australia; in accordance with the two-way exchange envisaged by the Australia-Japan Foundation Act.\(^33\)

However, in 1983 it was announced that grants made available through the Foundation would no longer be made tenable in Australia. This action was rationalized by the statement that because knowledge of Japan in Australia was greater than of Australia in Japan resources were to be concentrated on the Japanese public in an attempt to redress this imbalance.\(^34\)

The view that there is a greater awareness of Japan in Australia than vice versa should be accompanied by a clear statement of the revised objectives of the Foundation. It is not. It should be accompanied by such a statement because we need to judge whether
the interests of the Australian taxpayer are better served by spending the entire Foundation budgetary appropriation in Japan.

The fact is that there is no reliable means of measuring the effectiveness of Foundation programs conducted towards Japan, nor has the Foundation made any attempt to assess the success of its activities in Japan. In devoting its entire resources to the education of the Japanese public about Australia the Foundation is not acting in accordance with the two-way exchange envisaged by the Australia-Japan Foundation Act.

The Foundation has not revised the Act to make clear the objectives of its future programs. Therefore the Foundation should still act in accordance with the original act and continue to devote some of its resources to directly educating the Australian public about Japan. This does not mean that the Foundation should cut its programs in Japan, but that parity in the allocation of its budget should be maintained until evidence can be provided that Australian public monies are better spent in a different proportion.

In the next few years the Foundation has made clear its intentions to devote the greater part of its resources to academic programs (i.e. the provision of grants to Japanese scholars to visit Australia). This type of program does not provide institutions for cross-cultural interaction to a broad section of the Japanese and Australian publics. Again, the Foundation has not redefined its original Act, which aspires to the provision of knowledge of each country to those people who
would not normally attain that type of experience, to account for this redirection of its programs. Its past programs in Japan have also now been abandoned for this narrower approach without their success having been assessed.

The Foundation has recently stated that 'the work of the Foundation [in Japan] might be regarded as even more important than its function in Australia'. Again there is little empirical evidence, or any other type of evidence, provided to substantiate this claim. What is clear is that cultural programs aimed at educating the Australian public have been sacrificed - directly, by the cutting of all Foundation grants to Australians, and indirectly, by awarding grants in Japan to a narrow range of academics who will come to Australia and associate with other academics. It appears to be a simple procedure for DFA to allocate resources away from the education of the Australian public. Unfortunately it appears that a pattern has arisen within which choices in the allocation of scant resources are leading to the cutting of the domestic cultural and information function of DFA.

The Australia-China Council

Australia gave China diplomatic recognition in December 1972. Since then, contacts on an official level have continued to increase and since 1976, the political climate in China has been conducive to greater extension of exchanges. Prime Minister Fraser visited China in 1976 and following this visit a working
party to report to the Minister for Foreign Affairs on the establishment of a body to promote and develop relations with China was set up. Subsequent to a report submitted by this group, the Australia-China Council was set up by Order in Council under DFA in 1978.

The budgetary appropriation for the Council was $500,000 in 1979. This was about half that of the appropriation for the Australia-Japan Foundation. Table 3 sets out the comparative appropriations made to the Australia-Japan Foundation, the Australia-China Council and the Australia-New Zealand Foundation.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budgetary appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AJF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>$150 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$535 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$1000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$1000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$900 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AJF/ACC/ANZF Annual Reports

a Plus $444 609 (balance from 1979)
In 1982-83, the Council's programs consisted of:

- media program,
- information program,
- arts program,
- science, technology and medicine program,
- social science, humanities and education program,
- institutional links program,
- language development program,
- sports program,
- community and common interest program.

There are obvious constraints on the activities of the Council which would not affect the operations of, for example, the Australia-Japan Foundation. Activities tend to be more institutionalized and focused on reputable organisations and prominent persons from both states. Of importance here is the notable tendency again to concentrate funding on the public of China and not Australia. For example, in the travel grants program of 1981-1982, $6,657 was awarded to Australians to travel to China while $47,034 was awarded to Chinese to visit Australia.

The Australia-New Zealand Foundation

The Australia-New Zealand Foundation was established in 1978. Its terms of reference specify that it shall

- work in close cooperation with the parallel New Zealand body
- seek to focus attention on the bilateral relationship between Australia and New Zealand with the objective of developing a greater awareness of the broad range of
important issues within the context of the bilateral relationship, as well as in matters of common interest in international affairs

- seek to stimulate interest and exchanges in a broad range of activities
- encourage the study and discussion of issues of interest to both Australia and New Zealand
- promote increased cultural and other exchanges between the two countries
- suggest, initiate, assist in, sponsor or fund activities and be a source of advice on the relationship between Australia and New Zealand

Appropriation to the ANZF has been small. The 1982-83 Trust Account Allocation was $100,000. This reflects the relative priority given in the past to the ANZF in its perceived ability to provide cultural diplomatic activities which would substantially aid Australian foreign policy objectives. However, in 1985 New Zealand disallowed the entry of US nuclear war-ships into its ports and in doing so weakened the ANZUS alliance connection. This event may cause an increase in the priority Australia places on the activities of the ANZF.
CHAPTER III
THE ROLE AND IMPORTANCE OF CULTURAL AND INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

This sub-thesis has examined the conflict inherent in the allocation of scant resources by the Australian DFA to cultural and information activities. It has been shown that a pattern has arisen whereby scant resources have tended to be allocated away from DFA domestic cultural and information functions towards DFA international cultural and information functions. This chapter will examine the importance of these functions and focus on the implications of this type of allocation of resources.

Cultural diplomacy is significant because of its symbolic function. It allows states to be amicable towards each other on a cultural level even though difficulties may be experienced at the same time in relations on other levels (e.g. trade negotiations). As already discussed, negotiators and diplomats may find difficult negotiations easier to conduct if there is an established depth to the overall relationship between two states. Second, there is the notion that cultural diplomacy is significant because, as Bull argues, public opinion has a markedly increasing influence on the formation of foreign policy in democratic states and to a lesser degree in non-democratic states. Under this function, cultural diplomacy aims to influence the publics of foreign states because of their increasing influence over foreign policy in their states and thereby further the foreign political objectives of ones own state.
The assumption that the public of a state has increasing influence over foreign policy, inherent in this second function of cultural diplomacy, needs further examination. Bull has drawn attention to the 'political activisation of previously inert masses of people in most countries of the world'. Nicolson has also concerned himself with the increasing influence of the masses on interstate relations in his examination of 'open' or 'democratic' diplomacy. The question is whether, as Bull and Nicolson suggest, that increasing influence has yet come anywhere near the point of being a decisive influence on policy-makers?

It is true that, as Nicolson suggests, the ordinary voter does not apply 'to the general theory of foreign affairs that thought and intelligence which he devotes to domestic matters'. This is because the ordinary voter is mostly not required to give as much priority to foreign affairs as to domestic matters which usually, in times of peace, affect him or her more directly and critically. It can be argued that the ordinary voter should devote more attention to foreign affairs. However, at times when he or she is not required, domestic matters lead the issues for political defeat or triumph in most democratic states.

There are examples however, where foreign affairs have been prominent issues in election campaigns in democratic states. Public opinion during the Vietnam War, for example, was a decisive influence on policy-makers in the USA and was also an important issue in US election campaigns during the late 1960s and early 1970s.
Therefore, although the increasing influence of the public over foreign policy may not be equally true for all states (democratic and non-democratic), and may not always be a decisive influence on policy-makers, it appears that there are situations when public opinion is an important issue in the formation of a state's foreign policy. It is these times when a consistent cultural diplomatic policy conducted over an extended period of time and in a broadly-based manner may help further a state's foreign policy by influencing the formation of another state's foreign policy indirectly via the public opinion of that state.

Domestic cultural and information activities are important to a government as a means by which its public can be educated and indoctrinated in the matters of its foreign policy. A better informed domestic public is desirable in itself for reasons other than objectives of foreign policy. However, as far as the public is in a position to influence the formation of foreign policy, it is in a government's interest to see that its public be equipped to deal effectively with questions of policy placed before it.

Whether or not the recent accelerated rate of cross-cultural interaction due to improved communications and tourism has improved the ability of the public to deal with questions of foreign policy placed before it is related to the type of domestic information activities a government will conduct. Traditionally, inaccurate information has been fed to the public through sources such as popular literature, cultural ignorance, and private travels. Diplomats are frequently victims of these
constraints too. However, are these constraints as evident today as they were in the past?

Popular literature still has a strong influence on the formation of public opinion. Some studies of image formation, particularly on American images of Asia have been completed by Ramsdell, Iriye and Johnson. Among them Ramsdell's study on US best-sellers on Asia, 1931-1980, is of particular interest. He identifies frequently occurring themes:

Asian women are sexually subservient and available to Westerners. Tied to this is the normally implicit notion that Asian women prefer Western men as lovers, presumably because they are more 'manly', 'virile' and 'less childlike'.

and,

people of Asia regard human life cheaply.

He also recognised that most best-sellers on Asia feature heavy doses of warfare and other kinds of violence. The more recent best-sellers on Asia, Shogun, Dynasty and The Far Pavilion, are all good examples of this. The ill-informed public which has no framework within which it can make informed criticisms of these portrayals may be susceptible to the images conveyed in the popular literature at its disposal.

Tourism, although often claimed to herald the coming of a 'world culture', can still feed this ignorance also. The fact that the tourist's judgement often is based on emotions rather than informed opinion makes him or her vulnerable to any chance encounter or any accidental conversation. In Nicolson's words:
The fact that some impatient policeman may have pushed Effie that day at Hildesheim may well render Effie's parents 'anti-German' for life. The fact that the hotel porter at Ragusa presented Arthur with three interesting pre-war postage stamps, may well convince Arthur's father that the Jugo-Slavs are the kindliest and most gentle race on Earth. A slight controversy with the **ouvreuse** of a Paris theatre may, within the space of five minutes, turn a British citizen into a passionate Francophile. Even such accidents as bad weather or a missed railway connection may permanently influence an elector's attitude towards foreign affairs.43

Granted that this quote was made a long time ago. However, there are far more tourists now than there were at the time of this quote, so in absolute terms there are probably more ill-disposed, isolated, ill-informed and insular tourists who when Nicolson was writing would have stayed at home. Therefore, this quote is still likely to be valid.

In Australia tourism to the Western rim of the Pacific has increased by 90 per cent over the last five years.44 Of a total 1.2 million travellers in 1981, one quarter of them travelled to this area. A national opinion poll conducted in March 1976 found that Australians felt most threatened45 by China (21 per cent), Russia (28 per cent), Indonesia (21 per cent), Japan (10 per cent), Vietnam (5 per cent), and India (2 per cent). Those who thought that Australia would be threatened within the next 15 years rose from 36 per cent in February 1974 to 51 per cent in March in 1976. Apart from the Soviet Union, states of the Western Pacific and East Asia were seen to present the largest threat to Australia.43
A more recent public opinion poll conducted in May 1984 surveyed responses to the question 'An increasing proportion of migrants are coming from Asia compared with the United Kingdom and Europe. Do you approve or disapprove of this?' 62 per cent of respondents disapproved, 30 per cent approved and eight per cent did not know. It appears that despite recent increased tourism towards Southeast and Northeast Asia, xenophobic attitudes towards this region have not changed a great deal.

The March 1984 immigration debate has also proven that it takes very little to translate immigration concerns into an issue displaying attitudes which appear to be a central part of the White Australian tradition. When examining statistics on the attitudes of Australians towards East and Southeast Asia, the problem of regional as well as racist setting needs to be considered. It is not correct to judge Australians as being more racist than other nationalities. The point to be made here is that increased interaction through tourism has not provided guidelines to the Australian public within which their xenophobic fears can be alleviated.

Diplomats are frequently victims of constraints similar to those which affect the public. However, the professional diplomat generally is dealing with the elite of foreign states. Therefore, the diplomat's dealings with diverse cultural/political groups are different from those of the general public. Diplomats have created norms within which they can expect and deal with diplomatic confrontation in a prescribed fashion. This is what is known by Galtung and Ruge, and
Nicolson, as 'diplomatic culture'. In order to foster diplomatic culture foreign ministries staff their missions with career diplomats. In doing so, it is hoped that the manner of negotiation can safely be left to the professional diplomat.

Within a system of states it is useful for states to base international relations upon some recognized system or procedure. Diplomacy is an entrustment of the execution of the procedure to a permanent staff of professional negotiators. Diplomacy is an essential part of international society. However, diplomatic culture involves a minority. It is not representative of the general society from which the diplomat comes. Other groups (for example in the cultural field, the musician, artist, sports coach) are not necessarily any more representative of the general society than the diplomat, but the larger the number of groups that interact the greater likelihood there is that a more representative picture of a society will be presented.

'Diplomacy' refers to the business or art of the diplomat. It is of a professional nature. Bull states that 'diplomacy is the conduct of international relations by persons who are official agents.' The diplomat is in a unique position to gather a particular kind of information that is essential to the conduct of international relations. It is a knowledge of the personalities of those in his own diplomatic culture, and his personal dealings with the leading political strata in the host country that enables him to interpret nuances of foreign policy. However, although recently diplomats have become more sensitive
to the cultures and social structures of the host countries, the information they provide must be supplemented by others. As Bull states, professional diplomats are not the best source of 'knowledge of basic continuities and long-term trends, as distinct from assessments of the current scene'.

In its educative role, domestic cultural and information activities can supplement the information-providing function of traditional forms of diplomacy. Through the deliberate dispatch of 'envoys' from its own electorate for purposes of 'education', the government is extending the information function of the diplomat. This supplementary task is important when one considers the limitations of traditional forms of diplomacy.

This does not imply that a more informed general public would be a better source of this knowledge. It would mean that other specialised groups, namely academic researchers, and very good resident journalists, would become involved. These groups are no more representative of the general public than diplomats, but again there is a greater likelihood that many groups will present a more representative picture than one does.

As far as the general public is concerned domestic cultural and information activities can provide norms upon which groups other than diplomatic ones can conduct cross-cultural interaction. The recent increasing rate of cross-cultural interaction at levels other than a diplomatic one has meant that the importance of domestic cultural and information activity has also increased. Therefore, apart from the fact that a better educated public is
desirable in itself, a government through its domestic cultural and information activities can provide explanation of its foreign policy and act to ensure that its policy can be judged effectively by its public.

It is clear that both international and domestic cultural and information activities have important roles to play within the system of interacting states. It is impossible to say that one is more desirable or more important than the other. It has been shown, however, that the Australian government has made choices in the allocation of scant resources whereby it is implicitly stating that it considers its international cultural and information activities more important than the education of its own public in foreign affairs.

The Australian public is not well educated in the matters of foreign policy. A major portion of Australian foreign policy objectives is focussed on the Asian-Pacific region. The attitude of the Australian public toward this region is uncertain. As already discussed, there still exist within the public, xenophobic attitudes towards this region. Renouf has stated:

There is a clear need to develop a much better informed public opinion in Australia about foreign relations and to a subsidiary degree a knowledge of what the Department does.50

In order to be able to evaluate in an informed manner the direction of Australian foreign policy the Australian public's awareness and understanding of foreign policy should be increased. If resources available to DFA cultural and
information activities are not increased to accommodate this need then present forms of cultural and information activities must be changed. In the light of recent budgetary constraints, this subthesis will assume that increased resources to cultural and information activities will not be made available. Under this condition, the two alternatives available are to continue the present form of devoting most resources to international cultural and information activities or to devote more available scant resources within the Australian public in an attempt to increase its understanding and awareness of foreign policy.

How does one go about choosing which of these directions to take? The latter direction is desirable because of the increased awareness and level of education it would create within the Australian public. However, would it necessarily be more beneficial to Australian foreign policy objectives? One would answer this question by conducting a detailed assessment of the success of Australian international cultural and information activities to date and estimating the effect of a direct reduction in this type of activity. As already discussed, however, the effect of international cultural and information activity is very difficult to assess.

Opinion polls are not very useful in assessing the success of international cultural and information activity. For example, this sub-thesis has shown the importance which the Australian government attaches to the increasing of awareness about Australia in Japan. The Australia-Japan Foundation has had large budgetary appropriations and has conducted cultural diplomatic
activities in Japan for nearly ten years. A public opinion poll on diplomacy produced by the Japanese Prime Minister's office in October 1984 has concluded that awareness about Australia is still very low. The survey found that the proportion of those polled who professed a strong interest in Oceania had grown from 3.5 per cent in 1980 to a still low 6 per cent in 1984, level with Africa and a little above Latin America. When pressed, 14.2 per cent of respondents agreed that relations with Oceania were 'very important' and 45.6 per cent that they were 'fairly important'.

The findings of this opinion poll do not reflect the success of the Foundation's activities. Nor do they imply that an even larger input of resources would be required if Australia-Japan Foundation programs are to increase awareness in Japan about Australia in a substantial way. This is because lack of strong interest in, or unwillingness to see as important relations with, a particular region are not synonymous with very low awareness. They often may result from plain ignorance, but equally they may indicate that the average Japanese voter quite sensibly regards the United States, Soviet Union, China and perhaps also Korea as both/either more interesting and/or more important.

The fact is that the success of ad hoc cultural activity as conducted by DFA (outlined in Tables 1-3) is very difficult, if not impossible, to assess. The Australia-Japan Foundation's activities which are more controlled and specifically targeted
may be easier to evaluate but as mentioned previously no attempt
has been made to do this yet.52

It remains also that the public of a state is known best by its
own government. The Japan Foundation (a Japanese Government
funded cultural body conducting Japanese cultural diplomatic
activities on a world-wide scale) prefers to be directed in its
decisions as to what activities are most cost-effective in the
United States by an indigenous Advisory Council. The Japan
Foundation feels it is not best placed to judge the needs of the
North American public.53 The same can be said about the
Australian Government's ability to judge how best to educate the
Japanese public about Australia. The Australian government would
be reluctant to hand over its cultural diplomatic initiatives to
similar indigenous advisory bodies. To this extent, it may be
that some resources are being wasted on certain programs of
education in the public of foreign states due to the inherent
difficulty of the Australian government to judge what is best for
foreign publics.

The very size of the populations of the states upon which
Australian activities have been focussed (India, China, Japan and
the five ASEAN nations) also means that any attempt to influence
public opinion in these states is made extremely difficult.
Although DFA cultural activities have concentrated resources in
the past on the education of the elite of these states, more
recent programs have been broader-based. This state of affairs
makes the assessment of DFA cultural activities even more
difficult.
Under these conditions it is difficult to rationalise DFA's recent allocation of resources to its cultural and information activities. There is no evidence to suggest that resources are better allocated to international activities to the exclusion of domestic activities. The 'equality' of the importance of both international and domestic cultural and information functions has been outlined in this sub-thesis. DFA itself makes numerous statements of the importance of educating its own electorate in matters of foreign policy. Why does DFA therefore allocate resources away from domestic cultural and information activities?

An explanation of why DFA chooses to allocate resources away from cultural and domestic information activities may be found in the nature of DFA's overall activities. What would happen if, for example, the suggestion was made that DFA abandon completely its international cultural and information activities and devote available resources totally to domestic cultural and information activities? This postulation would probably be disregarded as an unreality. That is because DFA's specific reason for existence is the conduct of foreign relations. To even consider that DFA should totally abandon that function in respect of cultural relations and spend the money in Australia instead is unrealistic. That is why it is more acceptable to devote resources towards international cultural and information activities, perhaps even to the exclusion of domestic cultural and information activities.

Present Australian cultural diplomatic activity has for the large part, a role which is of symbolic value. It attempts simply to
be more amicable towards foreign states, and assumes that this type of disposition assists the achievement of foreign policy goals. That symbolic value would not be sacrificed if more resources were to be focussed on the Australian public. Domestic cultural and information activities focussed on the Australian public would remain an attempt to involve the Australian public in matters of foreign affairs and to create institutions upon which Australians could base cross-cultural interaction. To this end, the publics of foreign states would still be involved in this process and a symbolic value would be maintained.

Domestic cultural and information activities would still include bringing visitors to Australia to enlighten the Australian public. Members of the Australian public would also still be required to travel overseas. Visitors brought to Australia would perform a cross-cultural function in their own societies after return. Conversely, there is a cross-cultural function in sending members of the Australian public abroad as part of their 'education'. Only the focus and primary function of some of DFA's cultural activities would be different - that of educating the Australian public. The readjustment of spending patterns towards the Australian public would produce a large increase in that public's awareness while only somewhat diminishing the impact on the foreign publics - which is low anyway, but could perhaps be prevented from becoming even lower by more careful 'targetting' of the foreign publics and an abandonment of the present scattered approach to cultural activities.
CHAPTER IV
ASSESSMENT OF DFA INFORMATION ACTIVITIES - AUSTRALIA-JAPAN FOUNDATION TRAVEL GRANTS

This chapter will examine the success of the Australia-Japan Foundation travel grants program in achieving the objectives of a domestic cultural and information function as defined in this sub-thesis. The purpose of the travel grants program is to:

enable individuals to visit the other country to carry out some useful project whereby the grantee will be able either to learn about or study some aspect of the society of the other country and disseminate that information on returning.\textsuperscript{54}

If this purpose is put in context with the broader Foundation objective of 'improving or creating awareness and understanding of ... [Japan] ... as part of their ordinary occupational activities'\textsuperscript{55} then the purpose of the travel grants program is similar to that role given domestic cultural and information activity in this sub-thesis. In the light of this examination, suggested changes to the manner in which the program is conducted are made.

Sources of Data

A questionnaire was sent by the author to Australian recipients of Australia-Japan Foundation travel grants. These grants, usually of between $A2000 and $A3000, are designed to allow the recipient to travel to Japan for a short period of time, usually for between three and four weeks. The program was advertised in newspapers nationally. Table 4 indicates the year of each series
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Number of applicants</th>
<th>Number of successful applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...of grants, the number of applicants and number of successful applicants.

The survey did not include information about Japanese who came to Australia under Foundation grants. Table 4 shows that there were far more applications and successful applications from Australia than from Japan. This reflects, to a certain extent, the greater Australian interest in Japan than Japanese interest in Australia and the initial concern held by the Foundation that its activities be of a two-way nature. As already mentioned, however, no grants of any form have been offered to Australians since 1983. Of the 137 questionnaires sent, 71 were returned and the information provided in 66 of those was usable. The questionnaire and data received from the questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.
Interpretation of data

(a) Period of time spent in Japan on grant

The period of time spent in Japan on the Foundation travel grant averaged four weeks. Only 32 per cent of respondents spent less than four weeks. The varied periods of time are due to the nature of the travel grant. It is not given within any institutional framework. Grantees are left completely to their own devices. No assistance in developing contacts is afforded by the Foundation. If the grantee has success in developing contacts and 'enjoys' himself or herself in Japan then the period of stay can expected to be longer.

Time spent in Japan was for the most part taken within leave periods from work. This may be unfortunate. If time spent in Japan was taken extra to leave time then the grantee could be expected to take a more professional attitude towards developing contacts and spending his or her time usefully. For this to occur, the Foundation would have to approach the grantees' employers directly to obtain permission. It can be seen that the disinterest of the Foundation in the direct circumstances of the grantee has meant that the grant is not likely to be used in a professional manner. Indeed, from many respondents it was discovered that difficulties in developing professional contacts of a useful nature led them to spend their time in Japan in a more relaxed, 'holiday' fashion.
(b) Socio-economic background of respondents

The occupations of the respondents make clear the inevitable difficulty in reaching broad-based sections of the public. Most of the respondents were involved in the arts, education, the media or the public service. These sections of the public are important because they are the traditional educators of the public. The purpose of the travel grant program, however, was obviously to reach a broader section of the public than just these few select groups. The attempt to do this has failed perhaps because information about the availability of grants only reached select sections of the public. A solution to this problem would be the initiation of a program which actively involved the Foundation in seeking out suitable persons from a broad-based section of the electorate.

This solution could perhaps be couched in the following framework. The Australia-Japan Foundation could approach representative groups of the Australian public (e.g. farmers co-operatives, sports groups, trade unions) to recruit suitable candidates for travel grants. The candidates would be chosen by these groups under guidelines drawn by the Foundation. Possible guidelines could be that the candidate be young, well-liked by colleagues, and representative of the group. The Foundation would develop similar contacts with counterpart organisations to these groups in Japan. The Foundation could then act as an initial institution upon which cross-cultural interaction could be based.
Only 2 per cent of respondents worked in multi-national corporations and only 12 per cent worked in wholly-owned Australian companies dealing with overseas companies. From this it can be assumed that the majority of respondents could not be considered part of a transnational group on the basis of their employment situation. However, because a person is a member of a transnational group does not necessarily mean that he or she will have all-encompassing institutions available upon which to base cross-cultural interaction. It is one role of cultural and information programs to reinforce these institutions. In the use of scant resources, however, it may be more pressing to focus most resources on sections of the public without any institutions available to them.

Ages of respondents and corresponding income levels divided into groups by number of dependants is represented in Figure (i) in Appendix A. 53 per cent of respondents were between 36 and 60 years old and earned more than $25,000 per annum. A study of socio-economic backgrounds was undertaken in the context of attitudes towards foreign policy. It was not undertaken in order to criticize the approval of grants to applicants from higher income brackets than average. A higher income does not necessarily mean that a person has institutions available to him or her. However, as long as the nature of the grant is the simple distribution of funds, and not the provision of contacts or institutions then it may be the case that public money would better be utilised on those persons who could not afford to travel to Japan anyway.
The same can be said of the academic qualifications of the respondents. 10 per cent of the respondents had doctorates, 14 per cent had masters degrees and 32 per cent had bachelor degrees. This means that 56 per cent of the respondents were graduates. This is not representative of the Australian public as a whole. Most of the respondents had travelled abroad before the grant. 41 per cent had travelled extensively both on business and on holiday. 39 per cent of the respondents had had professional contact with Japan before the grant. This means that to a certain degree the Foundation has been 'preaching to the converted', that is, making grants of public money to those people who could have afforded to go to Japan anyway, had had contact with Japan before the grant and who had institutions upon which cross-cultural interaction could be based upon available to them due to their academic backgrounds. This is obviously not achieving the stated goal of reaching those persons of the electorate 'who would not normally become familiar with the other country as part of their ordinary occupational activities'.

(c) Invisibility of members of the Australian public without norms available to base cross-cultural interaction upon

Section B was designed to discern whether the respondents had readily available to them norms upon which they could base cross-cultural interaction upon. The background of the majority of respondents displayed, to a high degree, trans-national characteristics. For example, 70 per cent of respondents had travelled overseas on business trips (31 per cent extensively).
56 per cent had bachelor degrees or higher levels of education. 39 per cent had had professional contact with Japan before the grant. Less than one quarter of respondents could be identified as having few institutions upon which to base cross-cultural interaction (see Table 5).

Most of the respondents (62 per cent) learnt of the travel grants program from newspaper advertisements. Of the 9 per cent who learnt of the grants from friends 50 per cent were academics and 50 per cent were public servants. Of the 20 per cent who learnt of the grants from colleagues approximately one third were academics, one third involved with the arts and one third public servants.

It is evident that a newspaper advertisement is the cheapest method by which a grants program can widely be advertised. Other sources restrict the applicants to select sections of the electorate (e.g. academics, artists, public servants). It remains that advertising of the travel grants program through newspapers has not reached many members of the public without norms to base cross-cultural interaction upon. This does not mean that if the Foundation were to take a higher public profile it would reach these people. They must actively be sought out by the Foundation. As already discussed, this could be achieved by establishing links between the Foundation and groups which are representative of the Australian public as a whole.

It is important to note that no one stated as their only reason for applying for the grant the thought that the Foundation itself
would provide contacts for them in Japan. 24 per cent stated, along with other reasons, the desire that the Foundation could have provided contacts for them in Japan. Overall, there was a low expectation placed on the Foundation for it to provide contacts or to act as an institution upon which to base cross-cultural exchange.

The low expectation placed on the Foundation to provide contacts is due to the conditions under which the grants are administered. The conditions of the grant specifically state that the Foundation's function is only to administer the financial side of the grant. To become eligible for a grant, an applicant must have demonstrated some ability to develop contacts in Japan for him or herself. Members of the Australian public without available norms would tend to be excluded from this type of selection process (this may be a contributing factor to their low number in total number of respondents).

(d) Grantees' attitudes towards foreign policy

It is very difficult to discern whether a respondent's attitudes towards foreign policy have been stimulated by the experience of the grant. However, it is possible to discern general attitudes amongst the respondents and assess whether these are positive or negative. It is also possible to relate the respondents' present attitudes towards foreign policy and his or her socio-economic backgrounds.
Most of the respondents (91 per cent) stated that they believed relations between Australia and Japan had become more friendly over the last decade. This attitude reflects the actual development of the Australia-Japan relationship and also reflects the personal attitudes of the respondents towards Japan. The remaining 9 per cent who answered otherwise may have also based their judgements on informed personal opinion.

32 per cent of respondents stated that the cultural relationship between Australia and Japan should be developed and 44 per cent stated that both the cultural and economic relationship should be developed. Therefore, the majority of respondents believed that the imbalance between the cultural and economic relationship should be redressed. This of course has been widely stated amongst those circles of people actively involved with the Australia-Japan relationship. It is important to note here that the respondents at least have an opinion about the Australia-Japan relationship and for the most part this appears to be based on informed opinion and is of a positive nature.

An important section of the questionnaire was that one designed to assess those things which were seen to have influenced the respondents' positions on foreign policy. Seven possible influencing elements were given (mass media, family political attitudes, education, employment, religion, residence, and the grant visit to Japan). The percentages of respondents who gave the listed categories as most important as having influenced their positions on foreign policy were:
Almost one third of the respondents stated that the AJF grant was most important as having influenced their position on foreign policy. This is an unusually high proportion. It is important to look at what type of respondent felt most influenced by the grant. Table 5 is a detailed list of professions and levels of education of that 30 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Level of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diploma/Diploma/BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diploma/Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diploma/Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diploma/Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diploma/Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Diploma/BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that, from the group of respondents, those who stated that the grant experience was most important in influencing their position on foreign policy were the least educated and came from employment situations which did not provide them with norms upon which they could base cross-cultural interaction.

It is unlikely that a short visit to Japan of two to four weeks would substantially alter a person's attitudes towards foreign policy. These attitudes are formed under far more complex circumstances and the attempt made in the questionnaire to break these factors down into seven underlying factors is a simplification of the real situation. However, it has been seen that some respondents appear to believe that the grant experience was very important in influencing their attitudes towards foreign policy.

Respondents who stated that the grant experience had not influenced their position on foreign policy were the better educated respondents (in this case, those respondents with Masters degrees and PhD degrees) and those respondents who could be clearly seen as possessing norms to base cross-cultural interaction upon.

Therefore, the grant has had most impact on members of the public without these types of norms available to them. To them it has become an important experience in their process of education and has strongly stimulated their attitudes towards foreign policy. It could be said that more effective use of available public money is made by awarding grants to this type of person. That is
because, if the purpose of the travel grants program is to increase awareness and understanding of foreign policy, a greater increase will be achieved if they are candidates for the grants.

The newspapers read by the respondents reflected their positions in Australian society, with most respondents (61 per cent) reading two or three of the most reputable of available Australian newspapers. It is interesting to note that 20 per cent of respondents did not know whether the articles they were reading on Japan were accurate or not. 21 per cent said that articles on Japan were not accurate. There was no relationship between those respondents who stated that they did not know and their position in Australian society. Therefore, this information was not usable in discerning whether the grant had influenced the respondents knowledge and perceptions of foreign policy by making them more critical of information placed before them. It could be said that because 80 per cent of respondents stated either yes or no, they at least had some opinion and were therefore more discerning in their views of information placed before them than the norm.

(e) Dissemination of information

To make most efficient use of scant resources, it is important that the grantee is able to disseminate the information that he or she gained as widely as possible. It will be most difficult for those grantees who are members of non-transnational groups to disseminate the information gained. This is because the peers of the grantee themselves will have had little experience of dealing
with information about foreign cultures. Therefore it is important when choosing applicants from sections of the public which have few institutions available to base cross-cultural interaction upon that the applicant be most representative of his or her group so that on return the grantee will be well placed to disseminate knowledge gained.

Most respondents (91 per cent) stated that their work environment was conducive to the exchange of ideas and all respondents stated that they had discussed the details of their trip with their colleagues. 47 per cent of respondents said that they had influenced their colleagues' images of Japan greatly, 47 per cent moderately and 6 per cent not at all. Those respondents who thought they had been unable to disseminate any knowledge on Japan were either retired, unemployed, or in obscure occupational fields such as radiography. Most respondents (57 per cent) felt that they had been able to influence their families' images of Japan greatly.

This information reflects some of the difficulties in choosing candidates for grants from widespread sections of the public. Most respondents appear to have been able to disseminate knowledge they gained well. This reflects their position in Australian society. However, it has been stated that these respondents are not representative of the Australian public as a whole and it could be expected that more problems in knowledge dissemination would arise if more diversified sections of the public were involved (that is, if more people without available
norms for cross-cultural interaction had been recipients of grants).

The concept of the travel grants program is close to suggestions made in this sub-thesis for increased provision of information to the Australian public. Two problems have been identified with the way in which the Australia-Japan Foundation conducts this program. First, the choice of respondents is at present seen to exclude many sections of the Australian public. The Foundation should actively involve itself in the choice of respondents rather than taking the more passive stance of waiting for applications. Second, the respondents are not guided in their activities in Japan and many fail to develop useful contacts by themselves. The Foundation should assist respondents in developing contacts in Japan. It should itself act as an initial institution upon which cross-cultural interaction can be based.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The Australian Department of Foreign Affairs conducts cultural and information programs as an integral part of its overall objective of furthering Australian foreign policy objectives. Cultural programs consist of international and domestic activities, however, the majority of resources available to these programs are spent on portraying Australia overseas (i.e., international cultural activities or 'cultural diplomacy'). Resources spent on introducing Australians to foreign cultures under domestic cultural programs are small. Therefore Australian DFA cultural activities have the primary purpose of furthering foreign political objectives by being more amicable to other states and by influencing opinion in foreign states.

DFA information programs also have international and domestic functions. They have the primary purpose of ensuring that information concerning Australian foreign policy and Australia in general which is distributed both internationally and domestically is accurate. The international function of DFA information programs is supplemented and to a large degree repeated by the Australian Information Service. Domestically DFA aims to inform the Australian public about foreign affairs in general and the activities of the Department. Budgetary constraints have meant that it has not been able to do this directly and recently domestic information activity has consisted of maintaining contacts with the media and servicing governmental committees.
Resources allocated to DFA cultural and information programs are scarce. Discussion of the way in which DFA allocates these scant resources has revealed a trend in which resources are being allocated away from domestic cultural and information activities towards international cultural and information activities. Also, resources made available to these programs in some years may be so small that international programs are also reduced.

DFA's decision to allocate resources away from domestic cultural and information activities should be based on evidence which suggests that Australian foreign political objectives are furthered more by this type of policy. No statement or evidence is provided by DFA to support that suggestion. This is because of inherent difficulties in the assessment of cultural and information activities abroad - public opinion polls may provide good parameters within which public interests can be gauged, but it is more difficult to subject public awareness to polls; and because no attempts by DFA have been made to collect this information. Although DFA makes numerous statements of the importance of educating its own electorate it is not performing this function, nor is there rationale for not doing so.

An explanation why DFA tends to allocate resources away from domestic cultural and information activities may be found in the nature of DFA activities as a whole. DFA exists because of Australia's international relations with other states. Therefore there will be a natural tendency to allocate resources away from domestic programs in respect of cultural and information
activities if that allocation will allow further funding of international activities, regardless of whether or not that allocation will necessarily further foreign political objectives better. Diplomats who are removed from a domestic political environment for large parts of their careers may naturally tend to consider international cultural and information activities more important. However, domestic public opinion, and the education of the domestic public as an end in itself, are also important considerations.

The domestic public is susceptible to misleading information from a number of sources. This is so even though cross-cultural interaction and communication is increasing on levels other than purely diplomatic ones. The publics of democratic states also have varying degrees of influence over the formation of foreign policy in their respective states. Even if this influence is small, it is in a democratic government's interest to ensure that its public understands its foreign policy. As already stated, the education of the domestic public is also admirable as an end in itself. Therefore, in Australia, DFA should not act so quickly to allocate resources away from domestic cultural and information activities. This is so particularly when it is the case that foreign political objectives may be furthered more effectively by the continued allocation of some resources to the domestic public in Australia.

There are a number of inherent difficulties in conducting Australian international cultural and information activities. First, the Australian government is not placed to judge what
programs are best tailored to suit particular national circumstances. Second, the publics of the states Australia conducts cultural relations with are large and any attempt to influence the opinions of these vast publics given scant resources is basically futile. Therefore, Australian cultural and information activities are largely symbolic. It is not the case that increased funding of domestic cultural and information programs will detract from this symbolic value if these programs continue to involve interaction with the societies and cultures of foreign states.

DFA resource allocation towards domestic cultural and information programs may have a greater effect on international relations than continued devotion of almost total resources to international programs. DFA international information activities could become less repetitive of AIS programs. DFA international cultural activities would remain symbolic if programs became less sporadic and more focussed and if domestic cultural programs consisted of interaction with foreign states. For example, domestic cultural programs would involve sending Australians abroad on grants for purposes of education and would also require bringing to Australia prominent educators from foreign states. The programs would be similar to those conducted initially by the Australia-Japan Foundation and examined in Chapter IV.

The examination of Australia-Japan Foundation travel grants contained in Chapter IV revealed that programs might be more effective if institutions became more involved with providing
contacts for the grantees in the foreign states and did not remain simply administrative distributors of these grants. Also, the greater the number of people chosen who do not have readily available norms upon which cross-cultural interaction can be based the higher the cost-effectiveness of the grants is likely to be - due to the greater impact the experience of the grant will have on these people. This type of programmed activity will also be easier to assess which is important. Programs to date have not been easy to assess due to their sporadic and ad hoc nature.
APPENDIX A

AUSTRALIA-JAPAN FOUNDATION

QUESTIONNAIRE TO TRAVEL GRANTEES

SECTION A

1) Name: ____________________________ (confidentiality is guaranteed, however, those grantees wishing to remain anonymous due to the nature of any of the following questions may feel free to do so.)

2) Year/Month of grant: _______________

3) Period of visit (in weeks): __________

4) Name of project: __________________

SECTION B

5) What is your present occupation? ____________________________
   If you are employed in a company:
   Are you employed in a wholly owned Australian company dealing with overseas companies? □ Yes □ No
   Are you employed in a wholly owned Australian company not dealing with overseas companies? □ Yes □ No
   Are you employed in a foreign owned or partly foreign owned company? □ Yes □ No

6) What is your age in years? ______

7) How many dependants do you have? ______

8) Please indicate your present income range by ticking the appropriate box.
   □ below $15,000 p/a
   □ $15,000 - $20,000 p/a
   □ $20,000 - $25,000 p/a
   □ $25,000 - $30,000 p/a
   □ $30,000 and above

9) Please indicate details of your education.
   Place of primary education (including name of school) ________________ 19__ to 19__
   Place of secondary education (including name of school) ________________ 19__ to 19__
   Place of tertiary education (including name of school) ________________ 19__ to 19__

10) Please state any professional/academic qualifications you may have obtained. __________________
11) What countries have you visited and why? (Please indicate year of visit to particular country in either business or holiday column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>BUSINESS</th>
<th>HOLIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Had you had any professional contact with Japan before the grant?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

13) If the grant had not been awarded to you, would you have travelled to Japan to undertake the project anyway?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

SECTION C

14) How did you first learn of the AJF activities?
☐ Newspaper advertisement
☐ From friends
☐ Advice from colleagues
☐ Other ____________________________
☐ Can not remember

15) Why did you apply for a grant from the AJF?
☐ Financially needed the assistance
☐ Felt that the official backing of the Australian Government would be useful when attempting to create contacts in Japan
☐ Thought that the AJF itself would provide contacts for me in Japan
☐ No other organization to which I could apply
☐ Other ____________________________

SECTION D

16) Have relations between Australia and Japan changed over the last decade?  ☐ No change  ☐ More friendly  ☐ Less friendly  ☐ Do not know

17) What direction do you think the Australia-Japan relationship should take?  ☐ Continue as is  ☐ Develop economic relationship  ☐ Develop cultural relationship
18) Please rank in order of importance (1 to 7) those things which have influenced your position on foreign policy.

☐ Mass media
☐ Family political attitudes
☐ Education
☐ Type of job you have
☐ Religious beliefs
☐ Residence (i.e.: because you live in city, country; West coast/East coast)
☐ Visit to Japan on AJF grant

19) What newspaper(s) do you read? _______________________

20) Do you think that coverage of Japan in the newspaper(s) that you read is accurate?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Do not know

SECTION E

21) Is your work environment conducive to the exchange of ideas?
☐ Yes
☐ No

22) Did you discuss the details of your trip to Japan with your colleagues?
☐ Yes
☐ No

23) Do you feel you influenced your colleagues' images of Japan:
☐ a great deal
☐ moderately
☐ not at all

24) Do you feel you influenced your colleagues' images of:
☐ Japan's position in the world
☐ Japan's relationship with Australia
☐ Japan's culture
☐ Japan in (some other way) _______________________

25) Do you feel you influenced your family/friends' images of Japan:
☐ a great deal
☐ moderately
☐ not at all

SECTION F

26) Please list the 'follow-up' dealings you have had with Japan through people or organizations you came in contact with due to the grant.

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
The questionnaire was divided into six sections. Section A outlined general data concerning the grant. 17 per cent of respondents spent four weeks in Japan on the grant, 5 per cent five weeks, 2 per cent seven weeks, 9 per cent eight weeks, and 11 per cent ten weeks and over. The majority of respondents (61 per cent) spent between two and four weeks in Japan on the grant.

Section B outlined data concerning the respondents' position in Australian society. Table (i) outlines occupations of respondents.

Table (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor/writer/journalist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public servant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 per cent of respondents stated that they worked in wholly-owned Australian companies dealing with overseas companies. 12 per cent stated that they worked in wholly-owned Australian companies not dealing with overseas companies. 2 per cent of respondents worked in foreign owned or partly foreign-owned companies. Figure (i) outlines ages of respondents (as at November 1984) and corresponding income levels divided into groups by number of dependants.
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Figure (1)

% of total respondents

Salary (see below)

Age of respondent (in years)

20 - 30   31 - 40   41 - 50   51 - 60

a - below $15,000 per year
b - between $15,000 and $20,000 per year
c - between $20,000 and $25,000 per year
d - between $25,000 and $30,000 per year
e - above $30,000 per year

* Numerals inside graph blocks represent number of dependents
* 11 per cent of grantees were over 60 and no longer receiving salaries
3 per cent of respondents had no more than primary education. 9 per cent of respondents had matriculated from high school. 32 per cent had diplomas or certificates from technical colleges, institutes of technology, or teachers colleges. 32 per cent had bachelor degrees from universities. 14 per cent had masters degrees and 10 per cent had doctorates.

Table (ii) indicates the extent of overseas travel by the respondents. 'Moderate' travel is considered between one and four separate visits overseas. 'Extensive' travel is considered five or more visits overseas. The respondents' visits to Japan on the grant are not included in this data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>No holiday trips overseas</th>
<th>Moderate holiday</th>
<th>Extensive holiday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No business trips overseas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate business trips overseas</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive business trips overseas</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61 per cent of respondents had not had professional contact with Japan before the grant was administered. 85 per cent of respondents stated that they would not have travelled to Japan if the grant had not been awarded to them.
Section C was designed to determine how invisible a person without available norms to base cross-cultural interaction upon is. It examines whether interest in the grants has reached this type of person (as determined in section B) and if so, the method by which attention was caught. It also examines the way in which the existence of grants was made known to respondents who have shown that they are already members of some trans-national group. The section was also designed to examine the reasons why respondents applied for the grant. It should be possible to determine from this data the expectations placed by the respondents on the Australia-Japan Foundation.

62 per cent of respondents first learnt of the Foundation's activities through newspaper advertisements. 9 per cent from friends, 20 per cent from advice from colleagues, and 8 per cent from other sources (including radio interview with Executive Director, and Foundation newsletter). One respondent could not remember.

86 per cent of respondents stated their reason or one of their reasons for applying for the grant was need of financial assistance. 6 per cent stated that their only reason for applying was because they felt that the official backing of the Australian Government would be useful when attempting to create contacts in Japan. No one stated that their only reason was the thought that the Foundation itself would provide contacts in Japan. 2 per cent stated as their only reason that there was no other organisation to which they could apply. 6 per cent stated some other reason (none of which was usable in the survey).
Of the 86 per cent who stated need of financial assistance as their reason for applying for the grant, 34 per cent (of the total) gave this as their only reason, 20 per cent gave this as one reason as well as the feeling that the official backing of the Australian Government would be useful when developing contacts in Japan, 5 per cent gave this and the thought that the Foundation itself would provide contacts in Japan, and 8 per cent gave this and the fact that there was no other organisation to turn to as their two reasons. 19 per cent gave three reasons, 16 per cent saying they needed financial assistance, official backing, and contacts provided by the Foundation and 2 per cent saying they needed financial assistance, official backing and that there was no other organisation to turn to.

Section D was designed to test whether the respondents' thoughts on foreign policy had been stimulated by the grant experience. Although it was not possible to compare the respondents' thoughts on foreign policy before and after the grant, it was possible to test whether the respondents had active thoughts on foreign policy now and what priority they gave to the experience of the grant in influencing those thoughts.

3 per cent stated that relations between Australia and Japan have stayed the same over the last decade, 91 per cent stated that they had become more friendly, 3 per cent stated that they had become less friendly, and 3 per cent stated that they did not know.
14 per cent stated that the direction of the Australia-Japan relationship should continue as it is. 3 per cent stated that the economic relationship should be developed. 32 per cent stated that the cultural relationship should be developed and 6 per cent did not know. 44 per cent stated that both the economic and cultural relationship should be developed at the same time.

12 per cent of respondents thought that the mass media was most important in influencing their position on foreign policy. 8 per cent family political attitudes, 26 per cent education, 24 per cent type of job you have, 3 per cent religious beliefs, no one stated residence, and 30 per cent stated that the visit to Japan on the grant was most important in influencing their views on foreign policy.

Of the total, 15 per cent stated that the visit to Japan was second most important in influencing their attitudes on foreign policy, 18 per cent third, 19 per cent fourth, 12 per cent fifth, 3 per cent sixth, and 3 per cent seventh.

Table (iii) indicates the number of respondents who read specified newspapers as a percentage of the whole. 5 per cent read no newspapers, 24 per cent read one, 32 per cent read two, 29 per cent read three, 9 per cent read four, and 1 per cent read six. 59 per cent of respondents thought that coverage of Japan in the newspaper (s) that they read was accurate. 21 per cent thought not accurate and 21 per cent did not know.
Table (iii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Daily Courier Mail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Canberra Times</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Times</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>London Times</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Herald</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mirror</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Guardian Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertiser</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Daily News</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Australian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Japan Times</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asahi Shimbun</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Melbourne Herald</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section E was designed to test how well the respondents had been able to disseminate the knowledge that they had gained on the grant visit. From information gained it was hoped that it may be possible to discern whether or not the respondent is apart from his or her peers.

91 per cent of respondents said that their work environment was conducive to the exchange of ideas. 9 per cent said that it was not conducive. 100 per cent of respondents stated that they had discussed the details of their trip to Japan with their colleagues.

47 per cent of respondents stated they felt that they had influenced their colleagues' images of Japan a great deal, 47 per cent said moderately, and 6 per cent said not at all.

8 per cent of respondents felt that they had influenced their colleagues' images of Japan's position in the world, 6 per cent Japan's relationship with Australia, 30 per cent Japan's culture and 2 per cent in some other way. 19 per cent said that they had
influenced their colleagues' images of both Japan's relationship with Australia and culture. 11 per cent Japan's culture and in some other way, and 3 per cent Japan's position in the world and Japan's relationship with Australia. 6 per cent gave in all ways and 15 per cent Japan's position in the world, Japan's relationship with Australia and Japan's culture.

57 per cent of respondents stated that they felt they had influenced their family/friends' images of Japan a great deal, 38 per cent moderately, and 5 per cent not at all.

The final section of the questionnaire was designed to examine whether the respondents had been able to develop or continue their relationship with Japan which had arisen due to the grant. This section was included for Australia-Japan Foundation information purposes and information gained was not used in this thesis.
FOOTNOTES

1. Although the formal title used by the Department changed in 1972, we will be consistent throughout this paper in using 'Foreign Affairs' as the title.


5. Williams makes this distinction in the full knowledge that other observers and practitioners use the two terms interchangeably. This thesis also makes similar distinction but recognizes the interrelationship between the two.


12. ibid, p.17.


14. Australia has a range of cultural agreements totalling 16. A cultural agreement expresses the desire to facilitate cultural exchange and it is not intended that an elaborate governmental framework be established under the agreement.


22. ibid, p.75.
23. ibid, p.76.
24. ibid, p.76.
26. ibid, p.2.
29. ibid, p.71.
32. ibid, p.5.
34. AJF Newsletter, No.7 October 1983, p.1.
37. ibid, p.173.
39. ibid, p.80.
40. see Iriye (1975), Ramsdell and Johnson (1975).
42. ibid, p.6.
44. ABS (1983).
45. The question was not couched in terms of type of threat (e.g. military economic) but in broad terms. It can be assumed, however, that most respondents to the questionnaire answered the question in terms of a military threat.
47. see 'The 1984 Immigration Debate' for discussion.
49. ibid, p.182.


52. The author's own survey contained in the attached Appendix is the only assessment made to date on Foundation programs.


54. AJF flyer on travel grants program.
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