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Abstract
In the troubling sixteenth century political and religious turmoil in Europe - and particularly in France - the cosmopolitan personality of Michel de Montaigne is not only indicative for acknowledging the more and more meddling resources of culture within the realm of politics, but is also explanatory for reforming and expanding the instruments of traditional diplomacy. Specifically, the consequential insights of Montaigne's post-Renaissance humanist stance highly impacted upon certain salient developments in the field of cultural diplomacy that could be analytically framed as i) a personal imprint on reforming political culture(s) tantamount to a conspicuous signature in the field of cultural pedagogy, and ii) a commendable approach to cultural pluralism, and an influential modus operandi in the practice of cultural relations. The present study purports to reflect upon the rise of modern cultural diplomacy through highlighting the impact of the above-mentioned traits on further developments of the field in one of the most characteristic figures of early modernity, Michel de Montaigne.
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Within the confines of early modern diplomatic practices and international relations, the French intellectual humanist Michel de Montaigne stands as an exemplary figure of innovative trends and developing paths, mostly consistent with a momentous crisis in the field of diplomatic responsiveness to the troublesome historical events of sixteenth-century Europe and particularly France. An outstanding forerunner of modern cultural diplomacy, Michel de Montaigne inaugurates a notable and longstanding tradition of European intellectual-diplomats, encompassing famous personalities such as Descartes, Voltaire, Diderot or Hugo - to mention but a few in the case of France only - whose commitment to diplomatic affairs have brought about the sophistication of diplomatic agency per se, and have also been referential about a certain cultural turn of diplomatic affairs and, to a certain extent, the cultural rehabilitation of international relations.¹

Neither a career diplomat properly, nor carrying out his public duties in the mainstream spirit of traditional diplomatic conventions, Montaigne genuinely opened new paths of reflection upon the instrumental role of culture within routine diplomatic activities. He eminently contributed to the operation of modern cultural diplomacy as a complementary exercise to the narrow and old-fashioned understanding of both the jargon and agency of traditional and secret diplomacy in international relations. Curiously enough, the hermeneutic and exegetic efforts of scholars and researchers have mostly focused on highlighting Montaigne’s excellence and influence on humanistic culture and post-Renaissance development of literary modernity, while giving a rather minor consideration for his consequential role in opening new cultural and behavioural paths in the field of international relations. In addition to extensive philological examination and assessment of his literary legacy and/or cultural interpretations and critical contextualization of his Essays, a comprehensive investigation of Montaigne’s inspiring contribution from the standpoint of cultural international relations is unaccounted for and rather restricted to historical biographies recounting his political life. This study aims to construct Montaigne’s profile as a pioneering personality of early cultural diplomacy, with a view to concoct the complex puzzle of recurrent meanings in the field, ultimately related to his activism and legacy. Moreover, the present inquiry does not only stand as an explanation of how a cultural way of life could significantly impregnate political behavior, but also purports to identify actual dimensions and tools of cultural diplomacy in Montaigne. Considering the historical context of international relations in the sixteenth century, the present investigation puts to work some recent historical and literary studies of Montaigne through the lens of the cultural history of diplomacy and suggests that contemporary practices in the field of diplomacy should follow Montaigne’s creed and commitments to diplomatic facts.

Notwithstanding Montaigne’s personal inclination towards solitude and self-didacticism, his bona fide activism as a cultural attaché and his specific commitment to the idea of public service should become inspirational for present and future generations of (cultural) diplomats. It is probably accurate to maintain that Montaigne’s influence as a cultural diplomat surpasses his political career and routine public responsibilities both as a magistrate in the Parliament of Bordeaux (1557–1570) and his two terms as mayor of Bordeaux (1581–1585). Consequently, certain approaches in the field of diplomacy are highly relevant and explanatory for contemplating on Montaigne’s performance as an outstanding cultural diplomat: his participation in household and curia, his activism as messenger and emissary in various conjunctures, and - last, but not least - his role as facilitator, mediator and negotiator. In all these circumstances, Montaigne plainly exerted his skills with “tact, dissimulation and interested service”² and predominantly used his vast cultural capital to achieve punctual ends in various diplomatic encounters. Specifically, Montaigne’s household activities included dinners with the French official ambassador in Rome and the spokesman cardinal of the Roman Catholic League, among other meetings with French and Papal representatives. His liaisons to curia events encompassed unofficial consultations, discussions on momentous cultural policies and/or tactics for religious conflict mediation.³ As messenger and emissary, Montaigne dutifully played several roles: connecting person between the Parliament of Bordeaux and the Royal Court of France, loyal Kingman in the attempt to defend Catholicism and to tackle the destructive religious warfare with Protestants within a highly repressive context of


³ On the plethora of Montaigne’s involvement in diplomatic activities, see Warren Boucher, The School of Montaigne in Early Modern Europe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 266.
religious bigotry in sixteenth century France, royal councilor and high-level unofficial envoy. Finally, as facilitator, mediator and negotiator, Montaigne earned his reputation as a moderate and educated man, who could alleviate the frictions between Catholic and Protestant leaders, on the one hand, and between the French royal court and the Pope, on the other. In the above-mentioned contexts and other diplomatic encounters, Montaigne took a predominantly cultural command of his commitments, as a truly cosmopolitan figure of cultural diplomacy in Europe. Until the proper institutionalization of cultural diplomacy in nineteenth century Europe, one could grasp the instantiations of Montaigne’s approaches to cultural diplomacy in accordance to nowadays versatile meanings in both the theory and practice of the field.

---

4 For a brief and illuminating account of the entire political and religious environment of sixteenth century France, see Ulrich Langer, “Montaigne’s political and religious context,” in The Cambridge Companion to Montaigne, ed. Ulrich Langer (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 10-15. As a diplomat properly, one could find Montaigne’s membership in the delegation of the French embassy in Rome; the cultural humanist even hoped to be appointed ambassador to Venice in the 1580s (see Donald M. Frame, Montaigne’s Discovery of Man: the Humanization of a Humanist (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955)).

5 Even if uncertain, Montaigne’s participation at the royal marriages between the Duke of Savoy and Margaret of France, and between Philip II of Spain and Elisabeth, the daughter of French King Henri II, on April 3, 1559, were possible, considering the French King’s appreciation of Montaigne as a valuable cultural councilor (Philippe Desan, Montaigne: A Life, trans. Steven Rendall (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2017), 84). In recognition of his merits in cultural diplomacy, Montaigne was appointed “gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du roi”, around 1575 (Desan, Montaigne, 86).


7 The first professionalized institution in the field of cultural diplomacy was Alliançe Française, created in 1883.

8 Apart from a rigid and merely positivist understanding which renders the applicability and pertinent meanings of cultural diplomacy to cultural policies properly, the multifaceted ways through which its concepts have durably permeated the practices and language of both diplomacy and international relations amount to an intricate narrative of subtle developments that go beyond stereotypical and linear interpretations. Preceding by a long shot the belated institutionalization and professionalization of the field, groundbreaking actions and styles of early modern cultural diplomats – Montaigne included – have significantly contributed to the gradual growth in complexity of both the practices and the vocabulary of the present-day domain of cultural diplomacy. Concepts such as cultural pluralism, cultural tourism and cultural relations – to which Montaigne consistently devoted to - currently belong to the core canon of cultural diplomacy. Out of the multifarious perspectives on the recent impact of culture in the field of diplomacy, I would consider, for instance, certain salient works of the 1990s: Marc Fumaroli, L’État Culturel: Une Religion Moderne (Paris: Fallois, 1999), Jim McGuigan, Culture and the Public Sphere (New York: Routledge, 1996), Robert Fox, Cultural Diplomacy at the Crossroads. Cultural Relations in Europe and the Wider World (London: The British Council, 1999). More recently, in the 2000s, works such as: Shaun Riordan, The New Diplomacy: Themes for the 21st Century (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003), Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart, Cosmopolitan Communications: Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), and Hilary du Cros and Bob McKitichen, Cultural Tourism (London and New York: Routledge, 2015) revamp the conceptual intersections between culture and diplomacy, inspired and anticipated by early modern pioneers of cultural diplomacy. Moreover, the concept of international cultural relations, epitomized by Montaigne’s thankworthy contribution to diplomacy, has turned into the paragon of a germane interdisciplinary idiom (see, for instance, Richard Ned Lebow, A Cultural Theory of International Relations (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), Valerie M. Hudson, ed., Culture and Foreign Policy (London: Lynne Reinner, 1997), Jongsuk Chay, ed., Culture and International Relations (New York: Praeger, 1990), and Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil, eds., Return of Culture and Identity in International Relations Theory (Boulder: Lynne Riener, 1996)).


11 Out of the vast number of editions, translations and commented versions of Montaigne’s works worldwide, I use the English monumental Everyman’s Library edition - Michel de Montaigne, The Complete Works: Essays, Travel Journal, Letters, seventh edition, trans. Donald M. Frame with an Introduction by Stuart Hampshire, New York and Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003. Within the limited and rather synoptic view of the present essay, a thorough analysis of Montaigne’s writings could not be achieved: the references to his works are rather illustrative than systematic, and the relevant episodes of his diplomatic activity – in the works of biographers and intellectual historians – are indicated for side explanations of the historical contexts only. Other perspectives may also illuminate on both the personality of Montaigne and his time, but they would have complicated the substance and purposes of this text.

In the following sections, I examine this working hypothesis through a synoptic investigation of Montaigne’s contribution to certain transformations in the realm of French (and European) political culture tantamount to his conspicuous cultural pedagogy, and his forward-looking thoughts on cultural pluralism, doubled by a commendable modus operandi in the field of cultural relations, respectively. The underlying presupposition of this investigation is that, beyond the liberal and juridical agency of Montaigne in diplomatic matters and public duties, there is a more significant and substantive self-commitment to cultural agency in Montaigne that both informed his activism and opened prospective resources of cultural diplomacy, in “a bit dissonant [fashion] from [his contemporary] ways”. Eventually, the present essay stands for a synopsis of Montaigne’s manifold commitments to the practice of cultural diplomacy, and, accordingly, does not purport to achieve scrupulous results, neither in regard to a detail-oriented analysis of his works, nor by thorough conceptual investigation of his approaches in the field of diplomacy. It goes without saying that this type of overview is just a vector for more systematic and comprehensive assessments of Montaigne’s impact upon further developments in the history of diplomacy, and of his instructive legacy for future generations of cultural diplomats.

**Montaigne’s cultural ecumenism**

From the standpoint of the present investigation, not only in his groundbreaking collection of Essays, but also in his Travel Journal and Letters, Michel de Montaigne’s practical skepticism and epistemic relativism were useful methodological tools for coping with contrarieties, crises and frictions of his time. Specifically, in line with present purposes, Montaigne fundamentally remarked a sweeping crisis of tactical moves and procedures in the field of international relations and
diplomacy, as sheer unresponsiveness and impotence in regard to settlement of catastrophic political and religious strife, especially in France. Rooted in the new cultural impetuses of the intellectual mindset of the age, both skepticism (e.g., in Descartes, Pascal or Vico) and relativism (inspired by the scientific spirit of Nicholas of Cusa, Copernicus or Giordano Bruno) have highly contributed to the dissolution of the Renaissance ethos and the emergence of post-Renaissance modern cultures in Europe. One of the most competent scholars on Montaigne, Pierre Villey, included the personality of Montaigne on the prestigious list of cutting-edge reformers at the dawn of modernity, eulogizing him as one of the outstanding cultural humanists, positivists and pedagogues, in line with the liberalizing spirit of the age. Secularism, paradigmatic changes in the realm of knowledge and the awareness in regard to the instrumental role of culture in real life informed the dominating spirit of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe. The new ethos generated favourable transformations of political cultures and mentalities with a view to embrace multiculturalism, moral relativism and epistemological uncertainty. Unmistakably, Montaigne was not only a prominent representative of this movement in Western cultural history, but also one of the leading promoters of the cultural turn in public life and societal affairs.

One could discover piecemeal suggestions for a consistent interpretation of Montaigne’s reverberation concerning the above-mentioned transformations precisely through a close reading of the insights composing the famous collection of Essays. Having acknowledged the fact that the act of reading the Essays presupposes a previous familiarization with specific issues in the fields of state businesses, military science and diplomatic affairs, Montaigne explicitly delved into a genuine exercise in cultural ecumenism by endorsing self-referentiality as a moral experiment of understanding “the other”: his ruminations on human fallibility through confronting others’ political cultures have ascertained the prominence of Montaigne as the first modern ethnographer and anthropologist. In fact, in his foreword “To the Reader” of the Essays, Montaigne explicitly mentions his “respect for the public”, thoroughly committing himself to pursue an experiment of honest cultural exchanges with other people, regardless of civilizations, social statuses, times and places. Eventually, Montaigne achieved this methodological prerequisite by a careful consideration of others within his ventures in cultural pedagogy and in full recognition of variances and specificities of political cultures. One valuable and explanatory facet of cultural ecumenism is plainly visible in Montaigne’s extensive insights on customs (“costume”) throughout his works: from food cultures and clothes in distant times and spaces, to military, juridical, architectural and religious (ancient and contemporary) traditions. Dominated by naïveté and frankness, ideological freedom of expression, back-and-forth vacillation of thought, arbitrary arrangement of subject-matters, playful anecdotes and vague titles, and ample and heterogeneous quotations from (especially) Latin classics, Montaigne’s speculations on habits, customs, manners and morals can serve a two-way-street cultural agenda. One side of his narrative works suggestively to express Montaigne’s reluctance to take for granted the cultural validity of customs that could inflict upon freedom of judgment; the other side could probably endorse the effectiveness of customs and traditions as a commendable cultural understanding of politics and political cultures. By and large, Montaigne’s meditation on the role of cultural artifacts and traditions stands for a seminal experiment in cultural pedagogy, very much consistent with current perspectives on the origins of cultural policies. Moreover, Montaigne purposely envisaged a progressive model for the education of young generations, based on meaningful cultural exchanges and encounters.

In various periods of his life, one could find the exemplary figure of Montaigne as cultural facilitator: as councilor in the Parliament of Bordeaux, in the late 1550s, Montaigne promoted local policies in the field of education (e.g., development policies at his alma mater Collège de Guyenne, or his diligence to enhance the prestige of the college through the naturalization of the Portuguese humanist André de Gouvêa as principal). Later on, we find out about Montaigne’s dedication to cultural exchanges...
tutoring for the children of Diane de Foix, Countess of Gurson, not to mention his cultural transactions with the Vatican Library, during his mission as a high-level personal envoy of the French king in Rome, between 1580–1581. Montaigne’s Essays could be properly assessed as cultural products designed for “conversation and reformation” of traditional political and diplomatic practices. His Travel Journal could be read as the application of a new modus operandi in the field of cultural diplomacy, and the Letters could be deemed to the obliteration of classical sagesse in diplomatic matters, including ingenious approaches of ceremonial communication and tactics as “a fundamental aspect of diplomatic practice in the late sixteenth century.” Montaigne’s innovative undertaking of cultural diplomacy has not only paved the way for new forms of achieving diplomatic goals with cultural means, but has also led to a de facto breach within the jurisdiction and standard idiom of traditional diplomacy founded on secrecy, strategic negotiation and realist-driven resolution. Incongruent with famous contemporary treatises in political theory, authored by Machiavelli or Hobbes, Montaigne’s works employed the refined vocabulary of cultural ecumenism in cogitations about justice and law, reinterpretation of (public) virtue, plea for religious tolerance and the understanding of the political as a genuine expression of cultural experience.

Cultural pluralism and cultural relations in Montaigne

If cultural ecumenism in Montaigne reveals the efforts of the French humanist to reform the political cultures of his age, characterized by violence, cruelty, intolerance, deep factionalism and even barbarianism, his approaches to cultural pluralism and cultural relations unveil the activism of Montaigne in order to instill a new ethos in the fields of diplomacy and international relations. In brief, Montaigne the cultural reformer is doubled by Montaigne the diplomatic agent. In the latter respect, Montaigne’s advocacy of cultural pluralism and his pursuit of cultural relations, respectively, are relevant advancements in the field of early modern cultural diplomacy in Europe.

To defend cultural pluralism in a historical context dominated by a permanent state of outright belligerence was tantamount to act in order to abate dogmatism, authoritarianism, fanaticism of religious persecutions and momentary illusions of political domination. Moreover, in order to promote the progressive idea of cultural pluralism in the strenuous contexts of sixteenth century international politics, it was imperative to move beyond gentle cultural criticism, and prove the futility of contemporary diplomatic arrangements. In this way, Montaigne actively advocated the idea of cultural diversity, and ultimately encouraged political change. The following explanatory occurrences claim that Montaigne epitomized all these forms of agency during his practice of cultural diplomacy in the troublesome environment of sixteenth century international relations.

Accordingly, cultural criticism in Montaigne stood for the soft version of what the post-Renaissance humanist had seized as a deep cultural crisis of his time. His persuasive critiques of modern barbarity, injustice, bigotry, as well as his contemplation on the nature of European colonization were not enough to surmount the critical situation of early modern civilization in Europe, whereby factions and frictions, values, morals and ideals were at odds with the stirring liberal and secular spirit in politics and societies. Recent (ideological) interpretations of Montaigne as the early champion of cultural relativism delineate his type of cultural criticism at the harbinger of its post-Marxist and post-modern species.

However, it was more than what Montaigne’s cultural criticism could possibly convey. Basically, his more or less digressive endorsement of cultural pluralism emerged as a peculiar type of intellectual jeremiad against the frailties and irresolute- ness of international relations and diplomatic negotiations. The solution of cultural pluralism was envisaged as the only way out of the anti-diplomatic ambience of the age, for Montaigne strongly moved to spreading the idea of diversity of human kind. In this way, sound arguments in defense of cultural diversity - convincingly disseminated through his entire works - functioned as a kind of methodological tool used to promote cultural pluralism as the antidote to international politics stalemate. Montaigne took his mission of promoting a

---

24 Boucher, School of Montaigne, 264. For a meticulous account of Montaigne’s diplomatic experience in Rome, see especially Montaigne, “Travel Journal,” in The Complete Works, 1112–1270.
25 Boucher, School of Montaigne, 32.
26 Boucher, School of Montaigne, 181. Historians and literary theorists have provided quite insightful perspectives on the subtle interconnections between the literary and diplomatic cultures in the age of early modern humanism, in their attempt to explain the “close resonances between the representational and performative nature of the two activities” and to explain how and to what extent the experience of writing has impacted upon diplomatic agency and perceptions regarding diplomatic practices (Tracey A. Sowerby and Joanna Craigwood, “Introduction: Literary and Diplomatic Cultures in the Early Modern World,” in Cultures of Diplomacy and Literary Writing in the Early Modern World, eds. Tracey A. Sowerby and Joanna Craigwood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 3).
program of cultural dialogue seriously, by popularizing his travel experiences in Germany, Switzerland and Italy, and specifically authenticating local customs, living traditions, and cultural habits of the various communities he encountered. The pivotal creed of his cultural diplomacy agenda precisely pointed to the idea that only mutual understanding between cultures and straightforward cultural communication could contribute to overcoming political and religious intolerance, dogmatism and violence. Moderation, tact, honesty and natural curiosity were germane qualities in Montaigne’s exemplary conduct in cultural diplomacy, even if - considering at least two circumstances of his experience - such an unconventional commitment to cultural diplomacy generated hardships: once, Montaigne had to confront theological censorship because of the confiscation of his writings at the city gates in Rome; post hoc, he was arrested by order of the Roman Catholic League - and immediately released - precisely for his moderate stance in the negotiation of peace between Catholics and Protestants. Unequivocally, diplomatic tact and moderation were quintessential qualities that propelled Montaigne as momentous cultural mediator in the internal disputes for power and religious strife in France, on the one hand, and suitable envoy of the Pope in the relationship with secular kingdoms.

Ultimately, Montaigne gave a tremendously important impetus to the emerging practices in the field of cultural diplomacy through his tireless agency in the area of cultural relations. Specifically, his Travel Journal still stands as a valuable repository of instructive experience and good practices: the trope of travel in Montaigne has become the paragon of critical thinking, liberation from traditional constrictions of the “old ways”, and opening of new horizons in diplomacy through the medium of culture. It is probably accurate to assess the Travel Journal as Montaigne’s diplomatic testament of vivid encounters, insightful cultural and medical tourism, and cosmopolitan intersubjective exchanges. Montaigne’s compelling admonition - “polish [your] brains by contact with those of others” - stands as the basic motto for his approach in the area of cultural relations: in his view, meaningful contact and instructive exchanges should prevail over institutional reform in education and/or scientific excellence. Moreover, his correspondence significantly contributed to the creation of a solid network of human connections and cultural relations, within the crucial (cultural) context of the shift from manuscript culture to printed culture. By and large, one intellectual historian of the sixteenth century astutely observed that the humanistic writings of the age epitomized “acts of hospitality and conviviality, of information trade and exchange”, decisively impacting upon the rise of early cultural diplomacy in Europe.

Montaigne’s legacy in cultural diplomacy

Invertebrate approaches in the interpretation and analysis of traditions, texts and historical facts have resulted in two basic types of dealing with the subject-matters of analyses/interpretations: on the one hand, there is the “poeticist” (i.e., productive, in the sense of Aristotle) or the discovery pattern of analysis/interpretation that either brings innovatory information, or illuminate on rather inexplicit or hermetic pieces of knowledge, based on some sort of discharge in regard to historical textual evidence; on the other, there is the so-called contextualist analysis/interpretation grounded on “translations” of the subject-matter into “hospitalable idioms”, fashionable renderings of the past and/or critical scrutiny (often) informed by ideological thrust. Whatever the case, the value of perspectivist readings goes beyond sterile disputes regarding what types of scientific explorations are valid, remaining that only robust methodological justifications should be disclosed as sufficient criteria for deciding on the relevance of various analyses/interpretations. The present “construction” of Montaigne aims to shed a light upon the explicit discovery of the historical and textual Montaigne as a pioneering cultural diplomat in line with the first pattern of investigation, and to canvass the actuality

---

52 Frame, Montaigne’s Discovery, 110–119.
33 Mary E. Gregory, Free Will in Montaigne, Pascal, Diderot, Rousseau, Voltaire and Sartre (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 38. Elsewhere, Gregory specifically mentions that Montaigne’s views on tolerance and moderate conduct were derived from his strong belief in cultural diversity (Free Will in Montaigne, 30), probably prompting his innovative agenda in cultural diplomacy.
54 Despite intransigent service and honest loyalty to Catholicism and the French king, Montaigne and his best friend Etienne la Boëtie neither approved, nor supported the witch-hunting and massacres against Protestants (Desan, Montaigne, 90).
35 As a relationship builder in secular matters, one could mention, for instance, his mediation skills in achieving the diplomatic rapprochement between the parties of Navarre and the king of France (see David Maskell, “Montaigne mediateur entre Navarre et Guise,” Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance 41 (1979): 541–553); as Papal emissary in religious matters, Montaigne’s foreignness could have been quite useful in the strategic attempts to achieve a balance of power between the Spanish and the Habsburg monarchies, to promote good offices between the Pope and the French representation in Rome, and even to reclaim his Roman Catholic renewal in order to reassure the Pope of his loyal services (Boucher, School of Montaigne, 268–269). In recognition of Montaigne’s merits as a genuine cultural attaché, Pope Gregory XIII granted him citizenship of Rome in 1581 (Boucher, School of Montaigne, lxixii). By and large, Montaigne’s agency for the promotion of cultural moderation, tolerance and peace has been recognized by historians and cultural critics alike as the very strategy to stop political and religious wars (see Elena Bonora, “Peace and Religion,” in A Cultural History of Peace in the Renaissance, ed. Isabella Lazzarini (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), 72).
36 Philippe Desan, one of the most competent monographers of Montaigne’s life and achievements, ascribed a predominant political and diplomatic significance to Montaigne’s cultural tourism (Montaigne, 620).
38 Boucher, School of Montaigne, xv.
of Montaigne from the fashionable standpoint and vocabulary of cultural diplomacy in line with the second type of approach.

Either way, Montaigne’s precepts and legacy in the field of cultural diplomacy have made room for a plethora of readings in regard (but not limited) to: i) his practical commitment to a cultural type of diplomatic activism in international relations; ii) his lucid criticism of traditional diplomacy and political cultures of his age, and iii) his ideological mindset in confronting the characteristic political, religious and cultural discords of sixteenth century Europe. Accordingly, at least three possibilities of accommodating Montaigne’s works and achievements to the contemporary vocabulary of cultural diplomacy might be effective in order to endorse his relevance and leverage in the field: i) a behavioral and pragmatic reading of his cultural agency as mediator, attaché, facilitator, relationship builder, unofficial envoy and/ or cultural preceptor and tutor; ii) a post-modern and cultural reading of Montaigne as a forerunner of cultural criticism and cultural pluralism/multiculturalism, and iii) an ideological and contextualist reading of his contribution to the emergence of modern political approaches especially in the area of cultural policies, respectively. Among other (probable) complementary interpretations, all these three methodological appropriations of Montaigne are to be found in the present-day language of the “umbrella concept” of cultural diplomacy.

On the one hand, the behavioral and pragmatic approach has become instrumental in postulating different types of cultural agency and standards of good practices/ offices in cultural diplomacy. On the other, the multifarious activism of Montaigne authenticated present-day professional profiles and institutional arrangements in the field. This model of interpretation further illustrated how the narrow understanding of culture as an ancillary political tool has expanded to encompass the diversity of cultural functions in the field of international relations that have refined cultural diplomacy as an autonomous and distinct set of practices. Moreover, the emblematic figure of Michel de Montaigne in the fields of international public and cultural diplomacy has become inspirational for the emergence of non-governmental organizations and think tanks, such as the Paris-based Institut Montaigne, founded in 2000.41

A certain identification of Montaigne at the roots of European cultural criticism has nurtured a tradition of epistemological relativism and methodological skepticism characterized by political dissent, power distrust and basic rejection of mainstream learning.42 Very much in the spirit of Montaigne’s views on cultural diplomacy as a way of dismantling mainstream traditional undertakings in the field, the interpretation of his works43 as paragons of cultural criticism has led to considering him the founding father of multiculturalism, cultural relativism, ethnography, functionalism and structuralism.44 At the climax of the intellectual tradition of cultural criticism, the postmodern sagesse associated with the cultural deconstruction of the political has not only inspired an intellectual paradigm of traditional power politics rejection, but also shaped both the theories and practices of cultural diplomacy as new patterns of thinking about the nature of power, effectiveness of cooperation and negotiation, and/ or a certain “cultural turn” in international relations.

Last but not least, Montaigne’s legacy has been claimed inside certain “ideological battlefields”: competing political readings mostly vacillate between assessing Montaigne as a defender of legal conservatism due to his preeminent views on the importance of cultural liberation from dogmatism, authoritarian dominance and fanaticism, and his subsumption to a social liberal tradition based on his advocacy of the values of pluralism and egalitarianism.45 Mixed readings identified his views at the crossroads between social conservativism and liberal individualism.46 One way or another, basically all cultural activists nowadays may recite their ideological pledge as a lucid self-acknowledgement of their accountability to their cultural mentor Michel de Montaigne.

Data availability
No data are associated with this article.


42 See, for instance, Antoine Compagnon’s reading of Montaigne as a suspicious master in regard to standardized forms of knowledge (Le Seconde Main, ou le Travail de la Citation, Paris: Seuil, 1979), 299).

43 One commentator characterized the Essays as a “book to think with”, precisely pointing to Montaigne’s critical insights and impactful influence on the intellectual movement of cultural pluralists (Terence Cave, How to Read Montaigne (London: Granta Books, 2007)).

44 Lévi-Strauss, From Montaigne, 58–59.


Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:  🚫

Version 1

Reviewer Report 30 August 2022

https://doi.org/10.21956/stomiedintrelat.18709.r27092

© 2022 Helmers H. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Helmer Helmers
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If I understand it correctly, this article argues that Michel de Montaigne (which here seems to mean both the man and his work) was a model for modern cultural diplomacy, for various reasons: because he criticized the political culture of his time, because he favoured "cultural ecumenism" and as a "cultural facilitator" or mediator was some sort of cultural diplomat himself; because he favoured cultural dialogue; and because of his legacy.

The notion of Montaigne as a cultural diplomat is intriguing and worth pursuing, but in the present form, the article does not achieve its promises. It does not persuade for several reasons:

1. The claim is very broad, and it remains unclear to which scholarly debate the author intends to contribute. The observations on the cultural relativism or "pluralism" in the Essays seem well-known, while the article is completely unacceptable as a contribution to the study of early modern diplomacy. Perhaps it is meant as an incentive to practitioners of modern diplomacy to study and be inspired by Montaigne - if so, this should be stated at the beginning.

2. The author does not enter into specifics. The article offers hardly any primary evidence (historical or literary) to substantiate its claims (no new readings of Montaigne's written work, no archival evidence on Montaigne's "diplomatic" activities, and presents sweeping historical statements about "the time" and Montaigne's "age" that are simplifications at best.

3. The article seems to be based on a vague notion of early modern diplomatic practices and diplomatic history at large and of early modern cultural diplomacy in particular. The author claims about "the futility of contemporary diplomatic arrangements" and "traditional diplomacy" betray little knowledge of diplomatic culture in 16th century Europe. I would recommend the author to engage with proper diplomatic history, from Mattingly to Anderson, Sowerby, Lazzarini, and especially of course scholars of French diplomacy at the time, foremost Lucien Bely. One cannot contrast Montaigne with "traditional diplomacy" since such a thing did not exist; the claim that cultural diplomacy was institutionalized only
in the nineteenth century is dubious; the claim that Montaigne was the "first cosmopolitan figure of cultural diplomacy in Europe" baseless - one might claim the same about Erasmus and be equally right or wrong.

4. Literature on early modern humanism in the reformation, on the Republic of Letters, on early modern moderation, or cultural exchange would seem to be crucial to the argument, but is not referenced.

5. The language is slippery and occasionally vague. To name but a few examples: what does it mean to speak of the "elevation of political cultures"? What is "the post-Renaissance modern culture in Europe", when did it happen? Who or what were "M's avatars"? What does the author mean when they discuss Montaigne's cultural diplomacy? Is it the diplomacy undertaken by the man, or the work done by his texts or both? Is it actual diplomacy or metaphoric or both at the same time?

All these issues should in my view be remedied before the article can be indexed.

Is the topic of the essay discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?
Partly

Is the work clearly and cogently presented?
Partly

Is the argument persuasive and supported by appropriate evidence?
No

Does the essay contribute to the cultural, historical, social understanding of the field?
No
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I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.
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Gabriel Gherasim, Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Dear Dr. Helmers, I have carefully read your review, reflected upon it and answered back with a new version of my article. I briefly address your main points as follows:

1. Since my text is designed as an essay and not as a rigorous investigation of a specific type of scholarly research in the field of cultural diplomacy, it is rather a synopsis of Montaigne's commitments to core practices associated with the present vocabulary of cultural diplomacy. In the new version I have mentioned this more explicitly, in
addition to mentioning its purpose in line with your cogent observation that "it is meant as an incentive to practitioners of modern diplomacy to study and be inspired by Montaigne".

2. and 4. My essay mostly uses references to academic works at the crossroads between historical and cultural biographies of Montaigne, on the one hand, and recent scholarly literature in the field of cultural diplomacy, on the other, with a view to highlight the present relevance of his agency for current practices in the field. Your remark that the study of Montaigne covers a plethora of references - from literary, intellectual and cultural research, to investigations on modern humanism and moderation, etc. - and is worth pursuing is a serious challenge that goes far beyond the above-mentioned scope and undertaking of my essay.

3. Throughout my text I have used 'traditional diplomacy' in the very restrictive sense of the so-called G2G ('government to government'/'polity to polity') model as referenced in the literature of international relations, and I think that Montaigne's commitment to cultural diplomacy was radically dissonant with this type of approaching international relations.

4. I have tried to remove the textual ambiguities, inconsistencies and convoluted statements exemplified in your report. Hopefully, the new version is more clear. Thank you for your insightful remarks.

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.
I recommend that Stosunki Międzynarodowe – International Relations accept the proposed article, following significant revisions.

**Argument**
The author argues that “Montaigne genuinely opened up new paths of reflection upon the instrumental role of culture within routine diplomatic activities” (page 2). Additionally, the author states: “This study aims to construct Montaigne's profile as a pioneering personality of early cultural diplomacy” (page 2).

This argument on the rise of modern cultural diplomacy is very broad and too ambitious to be developed in an eight-page article. The argument needs to be refined to assert that the essay will interpret recent historical and literary studies of Montaigne through the lens of the cultural history of diplomacy.

**Sources and Analysis**
The article is essentially a historiographical essay using secondary sources. There are only a few quotes of Michel de Montaigne's writings.

The article cites key works on the cultural history of diplomacy in the modern period in footnote 7. But, the article really needs to draw on key cultural studies of early modern diplomacy by Isabella Lazzarini, Timothy Hampton, John Watkins, Eric Dursteler, Filipo DeVivo, Paul M. Dover, Nicholas Scott Baker, Brian Maxon, Tracey Sowerby, and other scholars. One of the major recent studies of early modern diplomacy by Timothy Hampton is cited, but not really addressed.

The article's main sources are recent studies of Montaigne by Warren Boutcher, Ullrich Langer, Philippe Desan, John O'Neill, Felicity Green, Zahi Zalloua, Biancamaria Fontanta, and Mary E. Gregory. The article needs to quote more extensively from these author's studies and assess their findings critically, using methodologies drawn from the cultural history of diplomacy.

**Organization and Style**
The essay's organization needs to be tightened to focus on key themes of Montaigne's approaches to diplomacy that can be effectively analyzed using findings from the recent studies and reinterpretations of Montaigne.

The essay makes a number of broad generalizations that could be tightened and refined, as well as better supported by evidence. Providing additional quotes and extended analysis would enhance clarification of the author's arguments and claims.

The style could be improved in places with more streamlined phrasing. Sometimes, word choices seem to be problematic, obscuring the author's intended meaning.

**Is the topic of the essay discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?**
Partly

**Is the work clearly and cogently presented?**
Partly

**Is the argument persuasive and supported by appropriate evidence?**
Partly

**Does the essay contribute to the cultural, historical, social understanding of the field?**
Yes

*Competing Interests:* No competing interests were disclosed.
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I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.
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**Author Response 08 Nov 2022**

**Gabriel Gherasim**, Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Dear Dr. Sandberg, I have carefully read your review, reflected upon it and answered back with a new version of my article. I briefly address your main points as follows:

1. Since my text is designed as an essay and not as a rigorous investigation of a specific type of scholarly research in the field of cultural diplomacy, it is rather a synopsis of Montaigne's commitments to core practices associated with the present vocabulary of cultural diplomacy. In the new version I have mentioned this more explicitly, in addition to mentioning its purpose in line with your cogent observation that "the essay will interpret recent historical and literary studies of Montaigne through the lens of the cultural history of diplomacy".

2. My essay mostly uses references to academic works at the crossroads between historical and cultural biographies of Montaigne, on the one hand, and recent scholarly literature in the field of cultural diplomacy, on the other, with a view to highlight the present relevance of his agency for current practices in the field. Moreover, within the limited and rather synoptic view of the present essay, a thorough analysis of Montaigne's writings could not be achieved: the references to his works are rather illustrative than systematic, and the relevant episodes of his diplomatic activity - in the works of biographers and historians - are indicated for side explanations of the historical contexts only. Other perspectives may also illuminate on both the personality of Montaigne and his time, but they would have complicated the substance, purpose, and brevity of the essay. Following your suggestion, I have included in the new version of my essay some very instructive references to recent collective works edited by Isabella Lazzarini and Tracey Sowerby.

3. I have tried to remove the textual ambiguities, inconsistencies and convoluted statements to the best of my ability. Hopefully, the new version is clearer. Thank you for your insightful remarks.
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