Cultural Diplomacy and Cultural Heritage: Envisioned, Refused, Denied, Accomplished (1889–1969)

The International Commission on Historical Monuments and ICOMOS

1 Introduction

For the grand narratives of nation-state identity, rulers repeatedly referred to lines of tradition. Within that narrative the preservation of cultural heritage, especially monuments preservation, plays an important role as it preserves the tangible and widely visible heritage. Heritage conservation is primarily a matter for the nation state, as it helps to preserve traditional crafts, regional styles, and place-typical characteristics.

However, while nation-states were emerging, invoking typical and distinct histories, an internationally oriented discourse on how to preserve cultural heritage was developing at the same time in the 19th century. This internationality provides the breeding ground for the exercise of soft power. “Soft Power is more than just persuasion [. . .]. It is also the ability to entice and attract. [. . .] Soft Power is attractive power [. . .]. Soft Power resources are the assets that produce such attraction” (Nye 2008, 95). Countries become attractive by showing their treasures and beauties. State officials made use of this, for example, at world fairs that developed onwards the late 19th century (Leerssen and Storm 2022; Swenson 2013, 156–158). Cultural heritage itself can be a soft power resource (Winter 2015; Nakano and Zhu 2020). From the mere presentation of cultural heritage, the idea developed in the 19th century that what was presented had to be adequately preserved. Soon the preservation itself became a soft power asset that therefore developed attractiveness from which soft power emanated. The debates on this were channelled through international organisations that emerged at the end of the 19th century and ultimately led to the current organisations such as UNESCO, ICOM and ICOMOS. In current research the internationalisation of heritage studies has primarily been read through “the lens
of [those] intergovernmental bodies” (Winter 2014a, 336).1 Within that perspective the successes and failings of those bodies have been the centre of academic attention.

In this article, I trace the development of international spaces in which the preservation of cultural heritage functioned as an asset of cultural diplomacy. I begin my observations at the end of the 19th century when international space for debate on monument preservation during times of peace was slowly emerging. Although the institutions are “international” organisations, they have a euro-centric focus, both before and after the Second World War. I end in 1969, in the middle of the Cold War, with the successful admission of the National Committee of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) to the international heritage conservation organisation ICOMOS. This marks the beginning and end of German participation in international heritage conservation organisations. Within that development I examine two different but related case studies from a German perspective in the preliminary stages of political actors becoming effective in international organisations: In 1933 the German government refused to participate in the International Commission on Historic Monuments. The second case concerns the impeded participation of the monument preservationists of the GDR in the International Council on Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS, founded in 1964. Both scenarios illustrate the highly explosive political power that even supposedly nationally important matters such as monument preservation can unleash in times of political tension. They also testify to the continuity of ideas and in some cases even of personnel, but also to the fact that the Second World War and the regression to nationalism left a gap of almost thirty years in the field of international monuments conservation.

2 Envisioned Diplomacy: Cultural Heritage Preservation in the 19th Century

Monument Preservation is both a craft and a science that particularly affects aspects of cultural identity. The culture that is to be preserved and cultivated reflects traditions that play an important role not only for the national identity, but also for local identities (Speitkamp 1996, 187). At the local level, cultural organisations in the broader sense were formed at the same time as the development of

---

monument preservation, such as state administration, but also private historical societies, for example the “Gesamtverein der Deutschen Geschichts- und Altertumsvereine” (General Society of German History and Antiquity Associations, founded in 1852) or the British Royal Historical Society (founded in 1868). These administrations and associations developed very peculiarly in the nation states, in the traditions of the respective countries (Stubbs and Makaš 2011).

Nevertheless, the development in heritage conservation also fits into the globalised age (Herren 2009, 3) that progressed rapidly during the 19th century with the development of new communication channels (telegraphy, Esperanto) and the expansion of infrastructure (railways and port facilities). This led to migration of knowledge. When the preservation of historical monuments emerged as a scientific discipline at the end of the 19th century, those involved were immediately active comparing the different approaches in conservation practice and theories that developed differently in various European countries. The results of that comparison were used as suggestions in their own countries. When France passed the first monument protection law in Europe in 1887, legislative activities in the field of monument protection were triggered for example in Prussia. It was important not to lag the “great civilised states” such as France and England in comparison (Speitkamp 1996, 196). The international mobility of actors and the associated dissemination of theories and practices developed elsewhere played an important role since the end of the 19th century. Comparing was about looking beyond national borders, about inspiration and knowledge (Scheurmann 2018, 235; i.e. Brown 1912).

For the time being, however, the international dimension of monument preservation did not go beyond comparison. In times of peace, monument preservation was a profoundly “domestic affair” (Wolf 1924, 227). Truly inter-national were only acts of war. Jointly elaborated regulations therefore addressed the protection of monuments during war. The Brussels Declaration of 1874, for example, stipulated that any wilful destruction of a monument or work of art should be prosecuted by the competent authorities, Art. 8 p. 2 Brussels Declaration; in addition to hospitals and medical facilities, “buildings dedicated to art, [and] science”, Art. 17, should also be spared in the event of bombardment.

It was not until the end of the 19th century that the first forms of cultural diplomacy developed, whose practices also included interest in monuments. At world fairs and international art exhibitions in Paris, London, Vienna and

---

2 Recent research has followed this approach, even though the origin of the growing importance of “heritage” and the associated “monument preservation” has so far been sought rather in the nation-state endeavours of the late 19th century (Swenson 2013, 2).
Philadelphia between 1855 and 1889 sections on historic monuments showing architectural drawings have been presented (Swenson 2013, 156–158).

At the world fair in Paris in 1889 a first institutionalised, international initiative that explicitly dealt with the protection of historical monuments took place: the “Congrès international pour la protection des œuvres d’art et des monuments”. Many participants from European countries attended the congress, as well as representatives from Russia, Turkey, Egypt, Mexico, Brazil, the USA, India and China. The organisers stated that this meeting of experts was “a new and excellent idea” and that “the question of the protection of works of art and monuments is one that must be borne in mind by anyone who knows, respects and loves the traditions and glories of their country”.

The congress published some “wishes” for the protection of works of art and monuments (Langini et. al. 2012, 7). Among these wishes, the protection of monuments during wartime still played a significant role. It was discussed whether there should be an organisation, similar to the Red Cross, that defines monuments of art belonging to all mankind – appointed by representatives from the various governments – which should be protected in time of war by an international convention. This “Red Cross for Monuments” was adopted in subsequent agreements and treaties under international law, namely in The Hague Convention of 1899 and 1907 respecting the Law and Customs of War on Land, of which Article 27 stated in 1899: “In sieges and bombardments all necessary steps should be taken to spare as far as possible edifices devoted to religion, art, science, and charity, hospital, and places where the sick and wounded are gathered [...]; in 1907 “historic monuments” were explicitly added in that numeration. The Roerich Pact of 1935 and finally the Hague Convention for the

---

3 Programme and participants: https://www.tpsalomonreinach.mom.fr/Reinach/MOM_TP_071618/MOM_TP_071618_0004/PDF/MOM_TP_071618_0004.pdf, last access (for all following internet pages as well): 05.10.2021.
4 The original reads: “une idée neuve et excellente” and “la question de la protection des œuvres d’art et des monuments s'impose, en effet, à la pensée de qui-conque connaît, respecte et aime les traditions et les glorés de sa patrie”.
5 Published in German-speaking countries in 2012 as a “rediscovery” by Georg Germann through ICOMOS.
6 https://archive.org/details/hagueconventions00inteuoft/page/118/mode/1up.
7 The Roerich Pact, signed on 15 April 1935, was the first international treaty on the protection of art and scientific institutions and historical monuments, concluded in Washington because of the resolution of the Seventh International Conference of American States in Montevideo (16 December 1933). It regulated, “that the treasures of culture be respected and protected in
Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 1954,\(^8\) which is still in force today, also embrace this idea.

The “wishes” of 1899, however, went far beyond the subject matter of the war. They specifically concerned the handling of monuments and works of art and were primarily of a practical nature, but also formulated visionary ideas regarding education, the training of specialised personnel and the formation of international organisations. They included practices of restoration, such as for cleaning building facades, the wish for both an international archive and a publication to be initiated, as well as a desire for this first meeting to be perpetuated. The congress also expressed the wish that the tax commissioners of the countries should be urged to no longer calculate the tax of the house owners according to the number of mullioned windows, to better protect historical buildings with such windows. It was also suggested that the cultural education of young people should be pursued in religious and civil institutions, for example by visiting monuments and museums. These wishes can be described as the forerunners of the 1931 Charter of Athens, issued thirty years later.

After the turn of the century, “International Homeland Preservation Congresses” were held for the first time (“Internationale Heimatschutzkongresse”) (Swenson 2013, 189). The first took place in Paris in 1909 (Schlimm 2015), the second in Stuttgart in 1912 (Fuchs 1912). At the latter, Carl Johannes Fuchs – interestingly, a professor of economics and not of art history in his position as vice-chairman of the German Homeland Preservation Association (stellvertretender Vorsitzender des Deutschen Heimatschutzbundes) – addressed the obvious dialectic of the international dimension of a nationally determined preservation of monuments in his welcoming speech:

“International congresses for homeland preservation – are they not a paradox in the word itself? Is it even possible to do something as national in essence as heritage protection internationally?”\(^9\) (Fuchs 1912, 58). In accordance with the format of the congress, the participants came from many countries, but mainly from Europe. The honorary presidents of the congress were representatives from Brussels, Rome, Paris, London and Amsterdam, Christiania\(^10\) and Zurich. With Mr. Ishibashi, a professor from Kobe (Japan), a non-European country was also


\(^9\) The original reads: „Internationale Kongresse für Heimatschutz – sind sie nicht ein Widerspruch im Worte selbst? Kann man etwas so Nationales wie den Heimatschutz überhaupt international betreiben?“.

\(^10\) The Norwegian capital Oslo bared the name Christiania between 1624 and 1924.
They answered Fuchs’ question with an “emphatic yes” (Swenson 2013, 187). Fuchs also resolved the apparent contradiction himself in the following:

And while the homeland preservation movement will undoubtedly strengthen the national differentiation and separation of peoples, this will in no way harm their relations with each other. For only those who love and appreciate their own homeland and kind – not in raw, arrogant chauvinism, but in refined reflection and recognition of their cultural significance – will also respect the homeland and distinctiveness of others. (Fuchs 1912, 59)

Preserving national culture while simultaneously acknowledging other cultures is a difficult undertaking. At the international level, therefore, the preservation of cultural heritage has been and still is a process in which cultural differences must be negotiated. Constituting a new international order in this field therefore is an “intellectual adventure” (Herren 2009, 5). In times of international tension, this is a double burden. The First World War marked a caesura in the field of monument preservation as well.12

3 The Interwar Period 1919–1939

3.1 International Heritage Conservation within the League of Nations

Monument preservation during the twenty years of the interwar period is only slowly coming into the focus of research (Melman 2020; Spitra 2021; Glendinning 2013, 187 ff.).13 Characteristic of this era is the perpetuating internationalisation of the discourse on cultural heritage conservation (Melman 2020, 31). This was accompanied by an institutionalisation under the umbrella of the League of Nations, founded in 1919. Cultural cooperation was not mentioned in the League of Nations’ statutes. The construction of a possible European identity – as a

11 However, this was no longer unusual since Japan’s victory in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. Japan was already represented in the major administrative associations before 1914 and in the first decade of the 20th century “unmistakably” expressed its will to participate in shaping the international order. (Herren 2009, 34).
12 For the German discourse, Scheurmann (2018, 240) notes that it has not yet been researched which “consequences resulted from the wartime commitment for the professional self-confidence of monument preservation in the post-war period”. To speak only of an “interruption” of the positive pre-war developments in the field of monument preservation trivialises the First World War. (Scheurmann 2018, 253).
13 The topic will also be covered in a forthcoming publication: ARTIS ON No. 12, Special Issue: Heritage Conservation in the Interwar Period (1919–1939).
possible side effect of the unification of many European countries in a global institution – was not initially the aim of the unification.\textsuperscript{14} Three years later, in 1922, the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC) was founded within the League of Nations and based in Geneva, as were the League of Nations themselves (Vrdoljak and Meskell 2020, 16). The aim of the ICIC was to promote international cultural and intellectual exchange between scientists and researchers and to contribute to peace between peoples through cultural understanding. Culture was a medium for “mutual sympathy between ethnic groups and populations, as well as a means for controlling the unintended consequences of the modernization of society” (Rogan 2014, 176). The Committee consisted of 12, later 19 members.\textsuperscript{15} To support this Committee executively another three years later in 1925 the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC) was founded in Paris.\textsuperscript{16}

At that time, monument preservation was also slowly being perceived as a diplomatic instrument. This is evidenced, for example, by the entry in the “Dictionary of International Law and Diplomacy” published in 1924 (Wolf 1924; Spitra 2021, 205).\textsuperscript{17}

Concerning Heritage Preservation, the foundation of the International Museums Office (IMO), initiated by the IIIC in 1926, was a decisive step towards

\textsuperscript{14} Regarding mutual preservation of monuments, a far-reaching campaign was initiated – many years later – by the Council of Europe in 1975, which partly included the countries of the Eastern Bloc (Falser and Lipp 2015), to raise awareness of monument preservation, but in the individual nation states. There was, however, no common, European line. At the end of the campaign, the Amsterdam Declaration was adopted (https://www.icomos.org/en/and/169-the-declaration-of-amsterdam). In 2018, there was another attempt to hold a Europe-wide “European Year of Cultural Heritage”. This time it was initiated by the European Commission. The motto was “Sharing Heritage” (https://ec.europa.eu/culture/cultural-heritage/eu-policy-for-cultural-heritage/european-year-of-cultural-heritage-2018).


\textsuperscript{16} Bibliography on these institutions and “intellectual cooperation” see project by Martin Grandjean: http://intellectualcooperation.org/publications; Cladders, 2018, 74: All the directors of the Institute between 1926 and 1939 were French (UNESCO Archive, Finding Aid, IIIC: https://atom.archives.unesco.org/downloads/ag-1-international-institute-of-intellectual-co-operation-iiic.pdf); In addition, the IIIC was based in Paris and not, like many other international organisations, in Geneva, which is why it was suspected, especially by the Germans, of being part of French foreign cultural policy (Rogan 2014, 177, Fn. 2); the IIIC’s Statute: https://atom.archives.unesco.org/uploads/r/5c00m/7/5/7513/ag01sf00001f_compressed.pdf.

\textsuperscript{17} The dictionary was reprinted in 1960. Only half of the keywords of the first volume was also edited in the second edition, supplemented by 700 new terms (Ushakov 1964, 262). In the title, “diplomacy” was removed in this second edition, as was the keyword “monument preservation, international”.
institutionalisation for heritage issues (Cladders 2018, 74). This office was headed by Euripide Foundoukidis (Rehling 2014, 116; Melman 2020, 51).

The IMO can be seen as the forerunner of the International Council of Museums (ICOM), which still operates today under the umbrella of UNESCO. At that time, the IMO addressed cultural heritage issues, especially archaeological finds that ended up in museums after excavations. IMO organised what is today often to be considered⁸ the first explicit international conference on the conservation of artistic and historic monuments, named the International Experts Conference for the Protection and the Conservation of Artistic and Historical Monuments (Ohba 2017, 99) or First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments (ICOMOS) from 21st to 30th October 1931 in Athens. The conference realised the demand for an international meeting of monument preservation experts, which had apparently already been expressed for the first time ten years earlier at the archaeological Congrès Internationale d’Histoire de l’Art in Paris in 1921 and renewed in 1930 at the International Conference on Conservation of Works of Art in Rome (Iamandi 1997, 18). Vice-President of the conference in Athens in 1931 was the Director of the German Archaeological Institute (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, DAI) Georg Karo. One hundred and twenty experts, belonging to twenty-four countries, took part in the proceedings.

The official report following characterised the congress as a beginning for further cooperation in the field of cultural heritage:

This conference was, in a way, the introduction to the studies which the Office proposes to pursue in this field. It afforded the experts an opportunity of examining a number of questions to a general order and, at the same time, of drawing up a program for this future activity of the Office. (League of Nations 1932, 1827)

While the previous year’s conference in Rome (1930) focused on the conservation of works of art, the participants in Athens took up this idea, but explicitly

---

⁸ Swenson 2013, 187 points out that international conferences had already taken place in advance of this conference.


²¹ Director DAI in Athens from 1930 to 1936. The DAI was founded in 1829 and is an important player in German foreign cultural and academic policy. Karo was dismissed by the National Socialists in 1936 because of his Jewish origins: https://atom.archives.unesco.org/uploads/r/5c00m/h/2/b2b81cd5ae48094778abd452f71aba5a541f451002c3543ecd902251fc72c01af/0000002520.pdf.
expanded the topic to include the conservation and preservation of architectural monuments (Jokilehto 2011, 3). There were six main topics on the agenda: the statement of various legislative provisions concerning the protection and preservation of monuments of artistic and historical interest; general principles for the restoration of monuments; damage resulting from age and atmospheric influences; surroundings of monuments and protection of sites; the utilisation of monuments; the role of the international museums-office.\(^{22}\)

By the end of the congress conclusions were drawn, divided into (A) General Conclusions and the (B) Proceedings of the Conference on the anastylosis of the Acropolis monument in Athens (Ohba 2017, 99 f).\(^{23}\) The participants agreed to collect the already existing legislation in the individual countries.

At the fourteenth plenary session, the ICIC adopted a resolution on the Athens Conference, highlighting the international dimension of the conference that had been initiated:

\[
[\ldots]\text{the Athens Conference laid down the principle that in this matter, as in others, the peoples are interdependent, that this interdependence must give rise to a new form of international cooperation, and that, by a series of investigations ending in concrete proposals, this community of interests should be expressed in the form of international agreement.} \text{(League of Nations 1932, 1776 f.)}
\]

The conclusions drawn as Part A later led to the “Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments” (Ohba 2017, 99). At that time, the Charter did not bear the name by which it is known today. It was published in 1933 by the International Museums Office under the title “Carta del Restauro”.\(^{24}\) This 1931 Athens Charter is the basis and intellectual precursor for the Venice Charter, which was adopted in Venice in 1964 at the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments.\(^{25}\)

\(^{22}\) Agenda of the Athens Conference. *Office international des musées, La Conservation des monuments d’art et d’histoire*, English version, 3.

\(^{23}\) Agenda of the Athens Conference. *Office international des musées, La Conservation des monuments d’art et d’histoire*. English version, 18–23. Anastylosis refers to the partial reconstruction of a dilapidated ancient building using its original, preserved components.

\(^{24}\) https://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments. However, the designation “Carta del Restauro” is also not suitable for a reliable distinction, as there is a document also from 1931 with the same name, today known as “Carta del restauro italiana” (Iamandi 1997, 17).

\(^{25}\) The 1931 Athens Charter is not to be confused with another document, also known today as the “Charter of Athens”. This second “Charter of Athens” dates to the IV\(^{\text{th}}\) International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM), which was held also in Athens, however in the year
3.2 Refused Diplomacy: Case Study I – The Germans and the International Commission on Historic Monuments, 1933

The participants of the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in Athens 1931 agreed on establishing an “international organisation for Restoration on operational and advisory levels”. Following that agreement, the League resolved to establish an International Commission on Historical Monuments (own abbreviation: ICHM).

So far, little is known about this commission (Trötschel-Daniels 2022a). It was only active for a few years, from 1933 to 1937. It was the patron of the international excavation conference in Cairo on technical, administrative, and legislative issues, which took place from 8 to 14 March 1937. After that, there is no archival record.

The ICHM was to be operated by the IMO. The members of the commission were to be appointed by the respective governments of the countries (Melman 2020, 52). Euripide Foundoukidis, who was the Secretary of IMO at that time, was chosen to be Secretary General of the ICHM. Foundoukidis is certainly not widely known, but he is not “completely forgotten” either, as Melman stated (2020, 51). He held a key position at IMO and was an important coordinator and string-puller in the network of European cultural diplomats. Karo describes his contemporary as “extremely lively” (Karo 1932, 37), he was “multilingual and cosmopolitan” (Kott 2014, 210). Foundoukidis was born in Greece in 1894. However, he received his education in Paris, at the Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales and the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales. He worked as an editor for the Greek magazine Phos and as an advisor to the Greek embassy in Paris (Stöckmann 2015). In January 1929, Foundoukidis began working as an attaché at the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation. Only a few months later, in April 1929, he became Secretary of the International Museums Office and, from 1931, Secretary General there. He held this office for fifteen years until 1946 (Stöckmann 2015) and was thus an important link between the pre- and post-war

1933. The conclusions drawn there were published ten years after the conference, but initially published anonymously in 1943, by the architect Le Corbusier (Iamandi 1997).


27 Germany did not participate in this conference (Voss 2017, 162).


periods. Foundoukidis was entrusted with the task of installing a six-member expert group. This group was to meet in Paris in November 1933 to draw up a work programme for the ICHM. In October 1933, he had already asked for high-ranking and knowledgeable experts from Austria, France, Spain, Great Britain and Italy. Foundoukidis also was in constant exchange with Richard Graul, the former director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Leipzig, who had been the coordinator of the German delegation at the 1930 meeting in Rome (Cladders 2018, 76). Jointly, they considered either Robert Hiecke or Paul Clemen as German representative for the expert group. Foundoukidis finally addressed his enquiry to Hiecke, at that time a ministerial councillor in the Prussian Ministry of Science, Art and National Education based in Berlin. Hiecke was a trained architect, subsequently conservator of the province of Saxony for many years and from 1918 head of monument preservation in Prussia (Bornheim gen. Schilling 1953).

Foundoukidis’ request, however, came at a time when state restructuring by the National Socialists was in full progress in Germany. They had won the Reichstag elections in March 1933 and were pursuing a German-national programme. On 14 October 1933, the government under Adolf Hitler announced the withdrawal of Germany from the League of Nations. One day before the planned meeting in Paris, Hiecke announced by telegram that he would not attend. Foundoukidis wrote soberly to Graul that under “the present circumstances” he could resign himself to the absence of a German member of the expert group. The group of experts met in Paris on 21 and 22 November 1933 without a German delegate.

The meeting was chaired by the former Director General of Antiquities and Fine Arts and member of the Reale Accademia d’Italia Roberto Paribeni; Ricardo de Orueta y Duarte, Director General of Fine Arts Spain of the Dirección General de Bellas Artes, Leodegar Petrin, President of the Bundesdenkmalamt in Vienna, Ralegh Radford, Conservator in Great Britain and Louis Hauteceur, Conservator of the National Museums in Paris attended the meeting. These men were trained

---

30 Hiecke had taken over the chairmanship of the Denkmalpflegetag from Paul Clemen in 1932 and in this capacity chaired the Denkmalpflegetag, which took place in Kassel in 1933, for the first time (Meier 1933, 195).
31 It was the sixth (announced) withdrawal from the League of Nations. Costa Rica had already withdrawn in 1924, followed by Brazil in 1926. Their denunciations took effect after a two-year period had expired. The withdrawals of Spain (1926) and Mexico (1932) were withdrawn, and these two states remained in the League of Nations. Japan had also declared its intention to withdraw from the League of Nations in March 1933 (ZAÖR 1934, 148).
32 UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-XIV-5, Allemagne, IICI0000002520, Foundoukidis to Graul, 20.11.1933: “Etant donné la situation actuelle je ne pouvais que me résigner à l’absence d’un membre allemand à ce Comité.”
art historians (de Orueta, Hautecoeur) and archaeologists (Paribeni, Radford); only Petrin had been a law graduate, previously a bureaucrat in the Austrian Ministry of Education, and only came to his current position in 1931. All of them were born between 1868 and 1884 and had been working for a long time. Radford alone was only 33 years old when they met in Paris. Their professional composition illustrates the fact that at the beginning of the 20th century, monuments preservation on an international level was formed primarily from art historical and archaeological expertise. Although the men had experience in the field of fine arts, administration and also in excavations, only Petrin brought specific, long-standing knowledge of architectural heritage conservation with him. It is therefore not surprising that the only major conference held in Cairo in 1937 was on archaeological heritage management.

The expert group established a work programme for the ICHM to be set up. They informed Graul, they hoped the current situation would soon improve and that Graul would then be able to work with the International Museums Office again.34

They determined that the Commission’s activities will include “moral and educational”, “legislative and administrative” and “technical” measures.35 68 countries were finally invited to nominate a delegate to the commission.36 Half of the

34 UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-XIV-5, Allemagne, IICI0000002520, Foundoukidis to Graul, 20.11.1933: “Vous voulez bien exprimer l’espoir de voir s’améliorer proptement la situation actuelle afin de vous permettre de continuer votre collaboration à l’Office. C’est également mon plus vif désir.”
35 UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-XIV-1, Commission internationale des Monuments historiques. Circulaires IICI0000002516: “Il a été prévu que cette activité comporterait une action morale et educative – une action legislative et administrative – une action technique.” https://atom.archives.unesco.org/uploads/r/5c00m/ a/d/7/ad7c5ea692d8c1a1a9fa33f7a6dc1cf0695f04e8f7d3d7f9a4a512477fe631de/0000002516.pdf. The work programme: UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), https://atom. archives.unesco.org/uploads/r/5c00m/3/a/e/3aed6d1722c5e418e84f0045633f71a590dedec4cbdc19 c8eb71340b4e875dc7c45/0000004251.pdf.
countries contacted appointed a delegate. The German Embassy informed Foundoukidis that the German government would not participate in the ICHM.

The focus of the ICHM’s activities in the following was the patronage of the conference in Cairo (Vrdoljak 2006, 116–118) that took place in March 1937. The aim of this conference was to lay the foundations for an “ideal system of administration of excavations.” The Final Act of the Cairo Conference, published by the IMO in 1940 (IMO, 1940), was in many ways the basis for the postwar Recommendations on international principles applicable to Archaeological Excavations, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference on 5 December 1956 (Price 1995, 8).

After the conference in Cairo, the ICHM did not meet again. The beginning of the Spanish Civil War in 1936 had already shifted the focus of the work to monument conservation in wartime once again. In December 1937, Italy also withdrew from the League of Nations. The Italian expert, Roberto Paribeni, who had participated in November 1933 as one of the six members of the working group in the elaboration of the work program for the ICHM in Paris, submitted his request for withdrawal from the Commission in January 1938.

The example of the ICHM makes it clear, that – from a German perspective – the impact of Nazi policies in Germany on the work of ICHM led to intellectual isolation – long before the war started – with the national socialists coming to power in early 1933. From a more European perspective it has come clear that

37 South Africa, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, China, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, Estonia, United States of America, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Morocco and Tunisia, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Argentina, Romania, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria and Lebanon, Czechoslovakia; UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-XIV-70, Constitution de la Commission internationale des Monuments historiques. Généralités et correspondance, ICI0000002585, Liste des membres de la Commission international des monuments historiques.

38 UNESCO Archives, International Museums Office (IMO), FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-XIV-5, Allemagne, IICI0000002520, Memo from German Ambassador Kühn to Foundoukidis, 6.4.1934.

39 UNESCO Archives, FR PUNES AG 1-IICI-OIM-[CONF.Fouilles.1937]-O.I.M.71. 1937, 0000004291.pdf, Preliminary Report, Question 2, Administrative Organisation of Services https://atom.archives.unesco.org/uploads/r/5c00m/7/a/4/7a465ac5c5437f278652cd976472918884a75b642a0b881107e699b3ecf03b70/0000004291.pdf.


the rise of nationalism in general (Laqua 2018) in the early 1930s illustrate that international cooperation can only be successful and used as a platform for the exercise of soft power if this offer is also accepted by the actors. Despite the abstractness and aloofness that institutionalisation suggests, these organisations are associations of human beings, of politically active actors. The development of politics in international organisations is determined by the interests and impulses as well as the resources for action of the actors involved (Rittberger et al. 2013, 100), such as members of governments, other political figures, and cultural officials. The organisations depend on leaders and decision-makers in countries around the world recognising the value of cooperation and wanting to participate. This relates to Nye and his theory of soft powers: Nye has stated that there are three ways to exercise power: “threats of coercion (‘sticks’), inducements and payments (‘carrots’), and attraction that makes others want what you want” (Nye 2008, 94). By not sending a representative to the Commission and by withdrawing from the League of Nations, Germany used a fourth dimension of exercising power: power by omission. This active renunciation of international participation also leads to refused cultural diplomacy. It is precisely in times of crisis, in times of tension or war, that nation states and their actors withdraw from or refuse to participate in trans- and international associations, not only in history but also in recent times.42

4 After der Second World War 1949–1969

4.1 Continuities of the Pre-war Years in the Field of Monuments Preservation

The retreat into the national, which brought the efforts for international monument conservation to a stagnation at the end of the 1930s, left a gap in the institutionalisation of international monument conservation that lasted for almost thirty years.

As a result of the war’s destruction, monuments conservation had evolved from an art-historical discourse to an everyday visible challenge in which urban planners, architects and civil society now participated more than before the war. In the early post-war years, the reconstruction of war-damaged towns and

42 For example: In February 2020 President Trump announced the withdrawal of the USA from the World Health Organisation. Before the withdrawal would have taken effect in July 2021, the current President Biden resumed relations with the WHO in February 2021.
countryside led to questions of preservation, reconstruction and urban renewal being on the agenda of many regions in Europe. The discourse around these tasks gave rise to two new international organisations dealing with monument preservation: ICCROM and ICOMOS. The 9th session of the UNESCO General Conference in New Delhi in 1956 adopted the long-prepared proposal to establish a centre for practical monument preservation, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. The new organisation has intergovernmental character and is based in Rome. Since 1978, the acronym ICCROM has been in use. An international council that bundled ideas and national developments in the spirit of the ICHM was not successfully founded until 1964 when ICOMOS was initiated.

However, the cultural officials picked up on the ideas and thoughts of the ICHM quite quickly after the end of the Second World War. The UNESCO Constitution was signed by 37 states very soon after the end of the Second World War in November 1945 and entered into force in 1946. The founding states pointed out in the preamble of this UNESCO-constitution that “a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world”, to contribute to peace there has to be a collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture as well.

In this spirit, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) was founded just two years later as the successor to the International Museums Office. At the first General Conference of ICOM in Paris in 1948, the experts suggested, “to consider the establishment of an organisation exclusively devoted to historic monuments, modelled on ICOM and working in cooperation with ICOM and with the special division of UNESCO” (Jokilehto 2011, 11).

In parallel with this proposal, the General Assembly, in turn together with ICOM, suggested at the third General Conference of UNESCO in Beirut in December 1948 to establish a panel of experts to deal with questions of monument

---

43 ICCROM’s links to the GDR have rarely been the subject of research. The ICCROM website states that “Germany” has been a member of ICCROM since 1964, but this is only true for the Federal Republic. It is unclear when the GDR first established links with the International Centre for Conservation. However, there have certainly been connections since the mid-1970s: In 1977, Helmut Stelzer, then Secretary General of the ICOMOS National Committee of the GDR, was invited to Rome to give four lectures at ICCROM (Brandt 2015b, 366); in 1979, with financial support from the GDR and UNESCO, a workshop for monument preservationists was held within the framework of ICCROM (Jokilehto 2011, 73); in 1986, participants in a workshop conducted by ICCROM, which focused on design solutions for urban monument preservation, were invited to Wismar: ADN (1986, 4).
preservation of buildings and sites (Jokilehto 2011, 7). This body met in October 1949. Members included Foundoukidis, the former Secretary General of the International Museums Office and Stanislaw Lorentz from Poland, who would later play a leading role in the founding of ICOMOS (Jokilehto 2011, Fn. 22.). These lines of continuity from the League of Nations and its cultural organisations, such as the International Museums Office or the International Committee on Historic Monuments, to the new foundations after the Second World War, played a decisive role in the character of the post-war institutions. In the field of monument preservation, too, the expert networks of the interwar period that had already been identified for the International Labour Organisation (Kott 2011, 143), played an important role in the continuation of the ideas of the 1920s and 1930s. Although both the League of Nations and later ICOMOS as well, claimed to be global associations. In particular, the League of Nations is perceived today as the predecessor of the UN, but the League of Nations was primarily European (Löhr 2015). ICOMOS, at least in the early years, also operated as a pan-European organisation (Gfeller 2015, 116; Winter 2014b). The position of the League of Nations therefore goes far beyond being the predecessor organisation of UNESCO. Rather, through its strong European focus (headquarters, actors, etc.), it laid the foundation for the reconciliation of the two blocs in Europe in the years after the Second World War (Clavin and Patel 2010, 127).

ICOMOS is the International Council on Monuments and Sites. As a non-governmental organisation, ICOMOS works for the conservation and preservation of monuments and cultural-historical sites. Today, more than 10,000 individual members from 151 countries and 104 National Committees contribute to improving theory and practice of heritage conservation. ICOMOS has been working with UNESCO since 1966. Since the end of 1970, it has had “A status” and has thus become a direct working group of UNESCO. Although the considerations and demands for such an institution date back to 1948, it took until 1964 before the decision was taken to establish such an institution. The founding agreement of ICOMOS was finally signed in Venice in 1964, at the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments. The founding agreement was one of 13 resolutions adopted by the congress.

---

45 https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000131324.
47 Another resolution that has gained prominence is the Venice Charter, which has always been an important policy document for monument preservation (Brandt 2015a, 51).
The constitutional assembly from ICOMOS took place in Warsaw in 1965. This decision was based on a proposal by the art historian and director of the National Museum in Warsaw, Stanislaw Lorentz (Gfeller 2015, 115), that he had already made at the Venice Congress the year before. Lorentz worked closely with Piero Gazzola, the Italian Superintendent in charge of Monuments in Verona (1941–1973), on the programme for the constitutional assembly of ICOMOS. On the one hand, the venue Warsaw, on the other side of the Iron Curtain, was intended to emphasise the pan-European cooperation and the international orientation of the new association; on the other hand, the venue also served to legitimise the conservation strategy in the reconstructed Poland, which was not without controversy among monument conservators (Omilanowska 2011). In the run-up to the founding of ICOMOS, there was a strong Italian-Polish connection (Gfeller 2015, 116), which was also later reflected in the association, where Lorentz and Gazzola held high-ranking positions (Zaryn 1995). Representatives from twenty-six nations attended the constitutional assembly, twenty of which were European, both Eastern and Western European states, which was, at that time, not a matter of course. During the Cold War, the whole world, but especially Europe, was divided into two blocs. Parallel narratives took place in the two blocs, with a mediating narrative, namely one emanating from international organisations (Glendinning 2013, 259). At that time UNESCO and its advisory bodies had an important function in addition: not only did they offer spaces for international knowledge transfer, but they were also considered platforms, that were able to overcome the iron curtain, which divided Europe into two parts (Kott 2011; Trötschel-Daniels 2019). Clavin and Patel argue that international organisations (in their case the League of Nations and the European Economic Community) can be seen as “hubs that generated, contained, stabilised and modified specific ‘European’ positions” (2010, 110).

At ICOMOS, this mediating position is well illustrated. By the end of the election at the constitutional assembly every nation present at the assembly was represented with a delegate either in the ICOMOS-Bureau or in the Executive Committee. Elected members of the ICOMOS-Bureau were: President Piero Gazzola (Italy); three vicepresidents: Martin Almagro (Spain), Robert Garvey (USA), Vladimir Ivanov (USSR); Secretary General Raymond Lemaire (Belgium); Treasurer Maurice Berry (France) and President of the Consulting Committee Stanislaw Lorentz (Poland) (Zaryn 1995). Together with Alves de Souza (Brazil), Carlos Flores Marini (Mexico), B.A. Lal (India) and M. Sekino (Japan), who were members of the executive committee, Garvey and Ivanov represented the six non-European nations within the new organisation. Other members of the executive committee were Werner Bornheim gen. Schilling (Federal Republic of Germany), Gugliemo de Angelis d’Ossat (Italy), Dezső Dercsényi (Hungary), Lord
Euston (United Kingdom), Walter Frodl (Austria), Alfred Schmid (Switzerland) and Ivan Zdravkovic (Yugoslavia). The staffing of the posts shows that a real space for understanding across the bloc borders had been created, with India and Yugoslavia two states of the non-aligned movement were also represented. A politically balanced nomination for positions at ICOMOS became an unwritten rule (Bekus 2020, 1155).

4.2 Denied Diplomacy: Case Study II – The Difficult Access of the GDR to ICOMOS, 1964

After the end of the Second World War, two states existed in Germany: the (West German) Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the (East German) German Democratic Republic (GDR). While monument conservators from the Federal Republic were even among the driving forces of the new association (i.e. Werner Bornheim gen. Schilling), the representatives of GDR monument preservation had to travel a further way before they were finally successful in 1969. Both politicians and monuments preservationists were aware early on that the treatment of architectural heritage would be perceived in the other countries and could therefore be a soft power asset for the country. In an early policy paper on the future direction of monument preservation in the GDR it says:

Not only the population of our own country can experience the historical and artistic message of the monuments, but also guests from other countries can have an impressive experience of our national culture. As an inseparable part of world culture, our monuments also serve to promote respect and understanding between peoples. The existence and condition of our monuments and their dignified inclusion in the reconstruction of our country are thus essential for the representation of our state to the world.\footnote{48}{BArch, DY 27/7338, Bad Saarow Recommendations, 27.–30.11.1964.}

The GDR’s monument preservationists wanted to take the opportunity to exchange ideas with colleagues on an international level. From the very beginning, in 1964, the responsible monument preservationists therefore endeavoured to participate in the founding process of what would later become ICOMOS. Ludwig Deiters, the General Conservator of the GDR, argued to the responsible Ministry of Culture that it was important to exchange views on specialist issues with international colleagues. He also mentioned the political dimension: the monument preservation of the GDR was appreciated outside the GDR. The scientific exchange could be
intensified and consolidated through membership in such an association. A possible membership of the GDR in ICOMOS was therefore necessary.\footnote{BArch, DR 1/15881, Deiters to Roland Feix (Head of Department of Cultural Relations, Ministry of Culture), 21.02.1964.}

Before their reunification in 1989/1990, the two German states were in competition with each other – especially in the early years of the republics until around 1969. The FRG claimed to be the only legitimate German state. From 1955 onwards, the so-called Hallstein Doctrine determined its foreign policy actions in relation to the GDR. The doctrine was named after Walter Hallstein, then State Secretary in the Foreign Office. He had stipulated that the FRG would then restrict diplomatic relations with states if this state in turn established relations with the GDR (Gülstorff 2017; Kilian 2001). With that doctrine practiced, the GDR was mostly internationally isolated until 1972.\footnote{It was not until the social-liberal government under Willy Brandt (SPD) that the Hallstein Doctrine was abandoned. The Grundlagenvertrag (Basic Treaty) concluded between the Federal Republic and the GDR in 1972 finally abolished the Federal Republic’s claim to sole representation (Roth 2014, 69).} Even cultural organisations became more and more political, as the case of ICOMOS demonstrates. For the GDR leadership, however, independent membership in international organisations was essential, since such memberships symbolised recognition as a sovereign German state, either alongside or in place of the Federal Republic. An important foreign policy goal of the GDR leadership was therefore the GDR’s representation in international non-governmental organisations. As late as 1969, the GDR’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphatically pointed out to its staff that “the independent membership of GDR institutions in a large number of non-state international organisations represents a clear rejection of the West German pretence of sole representation.”\footnote{PA AA, MfAA/C/554-75, page 118, Submission of the MfAA to the Commission of the Council of Ministers of the GDR for the organisation of work in the field of science and culture to West Germany and West Berlin, 19.11.1969. It says in the original: „Unter Bedingungen, da die DDR noch nicht Mitglied der UNO und ihrer Spezialorganisationen ist, stellt die selbständige Mitgliedschaft von DDR-Institutionen in einer Vielzahl nichtstaatlicher internationaler Organisationen eine anschauliche Zurückweisung der westdeutschen Alleinvertretungsanmaßung dar“.

Even cultural organisations became more and more political, as the case of ICOMOS demonstrates. For the GDR leadership, however, independent membership in international organisations was essential, since such memberships symbolised recognition as a sovereign German state, either alongside or in place of the Federal Republic. An important foreign policy goal of the GDR leadership was therefore the GDR’s representation in international non-governmental organisations. As late as 1969, the GDR’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs emphatically pointed out to its staff that “the independent membership of GDR institutions in a large number of non-state international organisations represents a clear rejection of the West German pretence of sole representation.”\footnote{PA AA, MfAA/C/554-75, page 118, Submission of the MfAA to the Commission of the Council of Ministers of the GDR for the organisation of work in the field of science and culture to West Germany and West Berlin, 19.11.1969. It says in the original: „Unter Bedingungen, da die DDR noch nicht Mitglied der UNO und ihrer Spezialorganisationen ist, stellt die selbständige Mitgliedschaft von DDR-Institutionen in einer Vielzahl nichtstaatlicher internationaler Organisationen eine anschauliche Zurückweisung der westdeutschen Alleinvertretungsanmaßung dar“}
The memberships were both politically and professionally desired, but difficult to achieve due to the German-German question, as the case of ICOMOS membership illustrates.

Although monument preservationists from the GDR were invited to the 1964 Venice Congress, where the founding resolution for the new organisation, later called ICOMOS, was adopted, they were ultimately unable to attend: until March 1970, GDR citizens needed so-called travel passes for travel to NATO countries, which had to be issued by the Allied Travel Office (ATO), located in West-Berlin. These documents were denied to the invited monument preservationists.

The participation of representatives of GDR monument preservation in the founding assembly a year later in Warsaw also proved difficult. The organising committee responsible for the founding assembly decided that only countries that were already members of UNESCO should be admitted to the new association. Although the GDR had tried to become a member of UNESCO, it was not until their third application for membership in 1970 that ultimately led to success in 1972. Even before the founding assembly of ICOMOS in May 1965, UNESCO itself had decided that ICOMOS should “appear and function as far as possible without being bound by UNESCO.” The corresponding regulations in the draft statutes for ICOMOS were to be enforced “expressly without any commitment to UNESCO”, reported West German monument preservationist Werner Bornheim gen. Schilling to the Foreign Office of the Federal Republic of Germany of a discussion between representatives of UNESCO and the Secretary General of ICOMOS, Lemaire (Bornheim gen. Schilling 2017 [1965], 22).

However, Lemaire had argued to UNESCO that the statute of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) knew such a binding of the organisation to UNESCO. UNESCO countered this objection by saying that the ICOM statutes should be amended so that this link no longer existed. In fact, however, the ICOM Statutes of 1962 already did not know the requirement of UNESCO membership. Instead, Article 30 of the ICOM Statute-1962 explicitly distinguished between National Committees whose countries were already members of UNESCO and other countries. For countries

---

52 BArch, DR 1/15881, Report by Feix on the consultation in Warsaw on 6 and 7 April 1965 regarding participation in ICOMOS, 10.04.1965.
54 ICOM Statute, 06.11.1961, Doc. 61/82; adopted at the 7th General Assembly of ICOM in Amsterdam on 11.07.1962. For Member States at UNESCO, Article 30 para. 1 applied: “In all Member States of UNESCO, an ICOM National Committee may be set up, on the initiative of the country
that were not yet members of UNESCO, the Executive Committee had to decide on the admission of the National Committee to ICOM, Article 30 para. 2 of the ICOM Statute-1962. To justify the requirement of UNESCO membership of ICOMOS with the regulations of ICOM was therefore a misinterpretation on this part of Lemaire. The requirement of UNESCO membership was even not included in the statutes of ICOMOS that were finally adopted. But for the GDR this made no difference in the summer of 1965: access to the new organisation was denied to it with reference to its lack of UNESCO membership.

The preservationists worked hard to create the conditions to be accepted in ICOMOS: they created a new administrative institution, that later would be the national committee of ICOMOS in the GDR; They also focused on ensuring that their work was connectable to European debates, for instance with the preservation of urban areas or technical monuments. The decision on whether to admit the GDR monument preservationists was, however, less a professional than a highly political one.

The turning point in the long-standing efforts to gain admission to ICOMOS, came with developments in another organisation, namely ICOM. At the same time the preservationists tried to become a member at ICOMOS, the responsible experts at the GDR museums tried to become a member in ICOM. They succeeded in 1968 (Trötschel-Daniels 2022b, 156).

In 1964, Johannes Jahn, Director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Leipzig, was accepted as an individual member of ICOM. He was invited by the organisers to attend the ICOM General Assembly as an “observateur” and was able to make the trip to New York in September 1965, which was not a matter of course due to the travel restrictions imposed on GDR citizens. In the Ministry of Culture, the responsible officer was already pleased about the invitation: “If he [Jahn] is granted entry, this is already a form of recognition of the Museum Council [of the GDR] by ICOM”. From 1966, the Ministry of Culture paid Jahn’s membership fee for ICOM. The application for admission of the National Committee of the GDR to ICOM, submitted in March 1968, led to success in August 1968 at the 8th General Conference of ICOM, which took place on German soil in Cologne and Munich of all places. The GDR press placed the admission to ICOM in a global context: the admission concerned or at the suggestion of the President of ICOM, under the following conditions: a) a provisional list of members shall be drawn up or an organisation particular representative of museums shall be designated, after consultation with representatives of the appropriate organisations, e.g. the UNESCO National Commission, an association of museums, museums of national importance, . . .; b) the acceptance, by the National Committee in formation, of the Statutes and Rules of ICOM; c) the final approval of the Executive Committee.”

55 BArch, DR 1/23303, Feix to Hildegard Kiermeier (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), 03.04.1965.
meant “nothing less than that the far-reaching effectiveness of the work of our museums and the high level of scientific and cultural education in our country were emphatically confirmed and recognised before and by experts from all parts of the world” (KB 1968: 1).

The Federal Ministry of Domestic Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany feared that this action could represent a turning point for the further development of relations between the FRG and the GDR, because with the recognition of the state of the GDR, hopes for reunification of the two German states waned, when the division became consolidated through independent memberships. The representative of the Federal Ministry of Domestic Affairs hoped that a development like that at ICOM can be avoided “in the interest of safeguarding the interests of Germany as a whole”.56 But the situation at ICOM served as a precedent case for ICOMOS. The ICOMOS-Board could no longer argue that it would be obligatory to already be a member of UNESCO for the international work on monuments, when the international cooperation concerning museums was already possible without the membership at UNESCO.

5 Conclusion: Mission Accomplished

On 5 December 1969, the GDR’s National Committee was finally admitted to ICOMOS (ADN 1969: 4). The decision was unanimous, meaning that the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany had also agreed to the admission (Deiters 2014, 45).

Membership in ICOMOS was a great success for monument preservationists in the GDR. They were able to present their successes to an international audience of experts, for example in the organisation’s own publications and at conferences abroad and in the GDR itself. This created the conditions to generate precisely the attraction that comes from soft power assets. When the GDR’s new law on the protection of monuments was being drafted, the focus was always on international agreements and regulations in other countries (Trötschel-Daniels 2022b, 137). The desire for participation and the creation of the conditions for it have already decisively shaped monument preservation in the GDR.

The year 1969 thus marks the end point of a development that, from a German perspective, began as early as 1933. The Second World War and the preceding National Socialist rule, which spurred the break-up of the League of Nations, left an almost thirty-year gap in the internationalisation of monument preservation.

The internationalisation of monument preservation began as early as the end of the 19th century. Cooperation was initially limited to issues concerning the protection of cultural heritage in times of war. But by the end of the 19th century, the perspective changed and cooperation in times of peace, in which monument preservation had until then been a purely domestic, even nation-state matter, progressed to the centre of international movements. The first jointly elaborated paper for monument preservation was the Athens Charter of 1931. International cooperation was also codified in it. The International Commission on Historic Monuments was established as an instrument of this cooperation.

Although the ICHM was only active for three years, and no further impulses came from the Commission as early as 1937, it was possible to rely on expert networks at an early stage after the Second World War. ICOM was founded in 1948 and had monument preservation concerns in mind. Nevertheless, it took until 1964 for ICOMOS to be founded. The founding of ICOMOS in 1964 was a continuation of the work of the Historic Commission on Historical Monuments, which began its work in 1933. Two lines of research are intertwined in ICOMOS: the findings of Kott (2011), who identified international organisations as mediating spaces between East and West, and simultaneously the findings of Clavin and Patel (2010), who attributed a special contribution to the Europeanisation of Europe to international organisations in Cold War Europe.

Also, the two cases of the ICHM and ICOMOS illustrate the long lines of development in the field of monuments preservation. Thus, research into the development of monuments preservation in particular, but also in cultural diplomacy in general, should not start so much from the historical breaks but go beyond the usual division of epochs and historical cuts to look for networks of actors and ask about lines of continuity.

The two cases also tell us about the difficulties in using soft power assets. The ICHM began its work at a time when the National Socialist rulers in Germany were already beginning to isolate Germany internationally and nationalism spread throughout Europe. Germany (1933) and Italy (1937) refused to cooperate with the League of Nations and its organisations and were therefore not present in the Commission or withdrew from it. This shows that international organisations depend on being attractive to states for their part, so that states want to participate and actually use their soft power. The case of ICOMOS and the GDR shows how cultural diplomacy can be a driving force for nation-state developments. In view of the international isolation of states such as Taiwan, Kosovo or Northern Cyprus, it is to be hoped that where international participation is desired, it will also be made possible.
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