ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН

CULTURAL DIPLOMACY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY AND STUDIES ON DIPLOMACY

Anna Umińska-Woroniecka

Ph.D. Institute of International Studies Wrocław University.

Abstract. *This article analyses how the concept of cultural diplomacy has appeared in the theoretical debate on international relations and studies on diplomacy. As cultural diplomacy has long been present in the practice of diplomacy, it was examined primarily by its historians and practitioners. As a result, it was conceptualized and perceived mostly as an instrument with which states advance their interests and achieve political objectives. As far as theoretical perspective is considered, cultural diplomacy has appeared most of all in relation to the concept of «soft power». The goal of this paper is to present in a systematised way how this category has been present in the theoretical discourse. Furthermore, the article aims at determining whether the content of the concept has changed in response to processes and phenomena currently observed in international politics.*

Key words: *cultural diplomacy, culture in international relations, theory of international politics, public diplomacy.*

Introduction. Presenting a country through its culture is by no means a new phenomenon in diplomacy. States have always used their culture to transmit political, social, cultural and economic values, and yet cultural diplomacy was the «neglected part of foreign affairs» [1, p. 1]. Its marginal position as a research category within the theoretical discourse may be historically determined. First of all, for many centuries culture has been managed by non-governmental institutions. Secondly, according to a widespread belief, this form of activity has no clear and direct influence on a country's position in the international system. All these factors have made the concept rather unpopular among the academia. According to Simon Mark, there are several reasons why cultural diplomacy has attracted so little scholarly attention. One is the difficulty with judging its efficiency and genuine impact. Another is the lack of clear understanding of what it really is and what it entails [2].

Literature contains numerous definitions and perspectives on cultural diplomacy. This leads to a situation whereby the same activity is sometimes described by various terms. Cultural diplomacy may refer to institutions and activities that aim to spread certain ideas and values; it may signify the way in which a state (or other transnational entities) attempt to influence other actors; finally, it can describe the process of communication between actors of international relations. Dilemmas around this concept are only compounded by the emergence of new terms, such as «public diplomacy» or «new public diplomacy» [3, p. 7], as well as by continued controversies surrounding some long-known and commonly used terms – for instance, propaganda [4, p. 9; 5, p. 12]. The term «cultural diplomacy» has also been placed within cultural imperialism [6; 7], cultural policy and cultural relations [8].

The assessment of cultural diplomacy and its importance for foreign policies, a country's position on the international scene or the shape of relations between various participants of international politics is also highly divergent. Varying understanding of the concept means that its analysis is conducted mostly from the standpoint of its practitioners: governments, organizations, transnational actors or a broad international community. What is missing is a serious attempt at placing cultural diplomacy within theoretical approaches to international relations. This omission stems largely from the fact that the nature of interactions in the international environment, and of the environment itself, is still a highly debatable issue. The resulting lack of a single, commonly accepted ontology of international relations makes any comparative research in this area very difficult, if not practically impossible.

The purpose of this paper is to consider the significance of cultural diplomacy in the theoretical perspective, with particular focus on the liberal approach and constructivist assumptions about the identity of actors in international relations. Moreover, cultural diplomacy will be placed within the context of studies on diplomacy – an area somewhat excluded from the major theories.

Definitional issues. The aim of this part of the article is to determine the meaning of cultural diplomacy. A debate over definitions should be preceded by the explanation of the term «culture» itself, since it will be of crucial importance to understanding cultural diplomacy, cultural relations, policies or propaganda. The Oxford English Dictionary defines culture as both «the arts and other manifestations of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively» and «the ideas, customs, and social behavior of a particular people of society» [9]. In such a standpoint, the above-mentioned «manifestations» encompass a wide range of arts, educational opportunities, language, values, ideas, food, religion and more. Longman Dictionary, in turn, describes culture as «the beliefs, way of life, art, and customs that are shared and accepted by people in a particular society» [10].

Any further considerations depend on an answer to one key question: what exactly is cultural diplomacy? In order to answer it, I shall refer to the most frequently cited definition presented by Milton Cummings, who specified cultural diplomacy as the exchange of ideas, information, art and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual understanding [11, p. 1]. It is also worth noting that Cummings goes on to state that it can also be more of a one-way street, as when one nation concentrates its efforts on promoting its language, explaining its policies and point of view, or «telling its story» to the rest of the world (ibidem). Cultural diplomacy includes activities that aim at presenting a country's broadly understood cultural heritage. Furthermore, as explained by Patricia Goff, it «rests on the assumption that art, language and education are among the most significant entry points into a culture» [12, p. 420].

Practices designed to spread one's own culture among other societies encompass the presentation of cultural heritage, lifestyle and beliefs. One key component of cultural diplomacy is cultural exchange – i.e. all kinds of art programmers, exhibitions, concerts, spectacles etc. that are usually prepared directly by cultural institutions. In this perspective, dimensions of cultural diplomacy include, among other, musical diplomacy [13, p. 71] arts diplomacy (focused on the so-called high arts: music, literature, painting), historical diplomacy, as well as teaching and popularizing languages. The target groups for such exchange are foreign societies, groups (scholars, artists) or even individuals. One key difference between the «standard» diplomacy and cultural diplomacy is that the latter engages foreign audiences.

When referring to Cummings definition, one should consider a broader context of his deliberations. Cummings focused on U .S. government's initiatives related to cultural exchange.

Searching for the roots of cultural diplomacy, he noted these initiatives «came in response to Nazi Germany's «cultural offensive» in Latin America during the 1930s». He emphasized the intense effort of U. S. diplomatic services was undertaken in the face of well-organized activities supported by the German government and aimed at damaging cultural relationships between the USA and Latin American countries. Talking about U.S. government's engagement in cultural diplomacy, he stated that the exchanges of people envisioned as its part «were to be used to strengthen cultural relations and intellectual cooperation among the United States and other nations. The exchange should be truly reciprocal and should involve nongovernmental unofficial groups and organizations, such as labor unions, college faculty members, youth groups, and social service organizations».

Cultural diplomacy implemented in the 1950s and 1960s by the British diplomatic service had a similar genesis. As explained by J. Lee, «contemporaries preferred to use such terms as «the influence overseas of a British presence», «nonmilitary action», «information effort», but the term «cultural diplomacy» appeared in Foreign Office documents as early as 1950s. «In the paper on the subject drafted in 1960 by the Foreign Office, cultural diplomacy was defined generally as using the contacts made between different peoples in order to further the line of policy being taken in relations between governments» [14, p. 112-134]. In both approaches mentioned here, the dominant role in shaping cultural diplomacy is assigned to governments, with the caveat that other entities, including non-governmental ones, also influence «foreign audiences».

A narrower view is proposed by Arndt, who pointed out that «cultural diplomacy can only be said to take place when formal diplomats, serving national governments, try to shape and channel this natural flow to advance national interests» [15, p. 18]. In such picture, cultural diplomacy is placed within the context of politics, with the crucial role assigned to governmental bodies which, as representatives of their respective states, pursue their particular interests in international relations. Similar line of thinking is evident in Tim Rivera's writing who, referring to Great Britain's practices aimed at spreading its culture, noted several vital difference between cultural diplomacy and cultural relations. He observed that «it is the introduction of government, national interest and support of policy which makes such exchange cultural diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy utilizes cultural content in its programming, but takes as «advocacy» approach to support policy objectives and advance national interests» [16, p. 11]. Rivera believes that since cultural relations are less entangled in political influences than cultural diplomacy, the former ensure broader participation of non-governmental actors.

Today, cultural diplomacy is often linked to the influence of actors other than states. As noted by Simon Mark, one would be wise to consider a fairly wide scope of practices and look at cultural diplomacy through the lens of activities undertaken by various states. «It is useful to begin by setting out briefly the core characteristics of the practice. Simply stated, cultural diplomacy is «the deployment of a state's culture in support of its foreign policy goals or diplomacy». It is a diplomatic practice of governments – mostly single governments, but also groups of governments such as the European Union, and sub-national governments»[17, p. 1-45]. Hence, it is clear that activities that fit within the scope of cultural diplomacy can be undertaken by entities other than states. The EU provides a model example, as it initiates academic and cultural exchange programmes and thus directly engages in spreading certain value, ideas and norms.

Following Cummings' definition, several authors note the need to establish goals that fall outside the scope of political interests or building relations of trust between societies, communities or individuals. The goal of cultural diplomacy is to help initiate or continue a dialogue, exchange cultural information, signal cooperation and «reach» the people.

It seems that defining cultural diplomacy requires us to establish its purpose. If one adopts the view linking it to political activity of state institutions, then cultural diplomacy remains one

of the instruments for advancing national interests. The latter category is strongly rooted in theories of international relations. Its complexity aside (it becomes more complex when it represents a combination of features, one should make note how the concept is reconsidered, particularly through the lens of social constructivism. While in neorealist rhetoric national interest comes down mostly to physical survival, other theories broaden its scope to include economic welfare, or prestige and image of a country among the international community.

The above-mentioned definition by Cummings emphasises two-ways exchange, but also indicates that such exchange should be aimed at explaining a state's policies and point of view, or «telling its story» to the rest of the world. This means that cultural diplomacy is inextricably linked to the pursuits of various actors: states, IGOs, NGOs, as they try to shape a positive perception of their actions among foreign audiences.

It seems that theoretical approaches indicated in the introduction can suggest a way of defining cultural diplomacy. Specifying its practitioners, initiators and recipients is paramount to creating any definition. Of equal importance is determining to what extent cultural diplomacy influences behaviours of particular actors.

Cultural diplomacy in the theoretical perspective. For a long time cultural diplomacy remained outside the main scope of research on international relations. Such marginalisation resulted largely from its position among the major theoretical approaches – primarily from the fact that until the end of the 1980s realism was the dominant theory.

Realism and neorealism. Cultural diplomacy fell completely outside the scope of interest of classic realism. Being an intangible factor, it did not have any direct impact on a country's power and position in the international system. According to this approach, the main actors of international relations are states that focus on advancing their interests. They are only able to do so effectively if they possess sufficient power. The key goal of each state is to ensure its own security which, in turn, guarantees sovereignty. In pursuing their interests, states are constantly conflicted with one another, with international politics being the plane on which the conflict is played out. In realism, a country's power is based on strictly materials factors: military power, natural resources, population [18, p. 7]. Hence, cultural diplomacy – whatever definition one adopts – cannot be of interests to realist scholars. Placing it within the instruments of foreign policy does not help either. As Hans Morgenthau pointed out, diplomacy is the only defence against war – which is not seen as an anomaly – since to fail in any of these four tasks may mean «to jeopardize the success of foreign policy and with the peace of the world» [19, p. 4]. Morgenthau distinguished four basic goals of diplomacy that should support the pursuit of national interests: to define the major objectives of the state and the power available to fulfil these objectives, to assess the goals and powers of other nations, to determine the level of compatibility of these different goals and pursue the goals with the appropriate means. Therefore, he did not see diplomacy as a constitutive factor of international relations. The national interest itself was usually defined in terms of survival, power and relative capabilities. Finally, there was the matter of prestige and reputation. For Morgenthau, prestige was a crucial explanatory concept in international politics. He argued that perceptions held by actors about one another were as important as their actual strength. All in all, classic realism simply omitted cultural diplomacy altogether and did not consider it even as a tool of foreign policy.

Structural realism also skipped over cultural diplomacy, albeit for different reasons. Neorealists consider systems analysis as an appropriate tool for analyzing international politics. Essentially, attributes of individual entities (states) do not affect the structure of the system. Therefore, theory of international politics does not necessarily entail (or require, for that matter) the existence of foreign policy [20, p. 54-57]. For this reason, neorealists do not view the analysis of actors and interactions between them (including foreign policy and diplomatic prac-

tice) as important. Waltz has stressed that his theory of international politics cannot account for or explain the foreign policies of states and offered a wide range of choices for state behaviour by pointing out that states «at a minimum, seek their own preservation and, at a maximum, drive for universal domination». Still, there is no need to theorise diplomacy or foreign policy and its instruments. To conclude, neorealists assume that the structure of international politics is determined by anarchy and the distribution of material capabilities. This way, they exclude from their scope of interest mutual influences that societies exert on one another through cultural norms, values and beliefs.

Due to their basic assumptions about the nature of state and the structure of international system, both classic realism and neorealism fail to consider cultural diplomacy as a valid factor, regardless of how exactly this concept is defined.

Liberalism. Different assumptions about the international environment are espoused by the broadly defined liberalism and its various variations. Andrew Moravcsik offered the following classification of liberal theories: «Classical liberal thought have found their way into contemporary international relations, of which the following can be distinguished: republican liberalism holds that liberal democracies tend to be more pacific than other forms of government, pluralist liberalism [known also as sociological liberalism – A. U-W.] argues that the maldistribution of social power or the existence of deep social cleavages creates incentives for international conflict; commercial liberalism asserts that economic interdependence creates incentives for peace and cooperation and regulatory liberalism contends that international law and institutions promote international accommodation» [21, p. 513-553]. Essentially, liberalism moves away from a conflicted, egoistic environment of states and toward cooperation between numerous participants of international relations. State remains an important actor, but does not represent some general, all-encompassing national or social interests, nor does it pursue an abstract raison d'état; instead, it reflects a certain configuration of interests and aspirations expressed by various social groups.

Several concepts and assumptions within liberalism are particularly useful for building a theoretical framework of cultural diplomacy. The first one refers to the possibility of mutual influence between actors other than states, referred to as transnational. Transnational relations – i. e., the relations between people, groups, organisations belonging to different countries – have become one of the basic research categories in sociological liberalism. James Rosenau argues that seeing states as the only actors makes it impossible to understand the functioning of regimes or global governance in which many entities play important roles. He defined transnationalism as «the processes whereby international relations conducted by governments have been supplemented by relations among private individuals, groups and societies that can and do have important consequences for the course of events» [22, p. 1]. Accounting for a broad range of actors resulted in a changed perception of their mutual influences. Most of all, the conflict between states emphasised by liberalists has been replaced with the strive toward peaceful coexistence, aided by the process in which societies, groups or individuals from various countries interact with and affect each other. Hence, international relations are no longer an area available exclusively to states – in the liberal view, they encompass also communities, international institutions and individuals.

If one analyses cultural diplomacy in the liberal theoretical framework, one concept worthy of attention was developed by Joseph Nye, who juxtaposed the neorealist «hard power» with an entirely different set of factors and resources that he termed «soft power». According to Nye, power is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes you want. One can affect their behaviour in three main ways: threats of coercion («sticks»), inducements and payments («carrots»), and attraction that makes other want what you want. A country may obtain the outcomes

it wants in world politics because other countries want to follow it. It is also important to set the agenda and attract others in world politics, and not only force them to change through the threat or use of military or economic weapons. «soft power» – getting others to want the outcomes that you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them. «soft power» rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others» [23, p. 5]. By establishing what «soft power» is, Nye fills the gap stemming from shortfalls in the neorealist interpretation of international relations – most of all, the issue of differentiating various types of assets and the multi-actor nature of contemporary international politics.

As Nye put it, «in international politics, the resources that produce «soft power» arise in large part from the values an organization or country expresses in its culture, in the examples it sets by its internal practices and policies, and in the way it handles relations with others». Analyzing the importance of «soft power», Nye identifies its three sources – three mechanisms through which a country may develop or engage its «soft power» with other countries: its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (when it lives up to them at home and abroad), and its foreign policies (when they are seen as legitimate and having moral authority [24].

As part of distinguishing the latter two, it is important to define diplomacy and establish it as fundamentally an activity of governments. In order to employ various dimensions of «soft power», actors of international politics (particularly states) try to spread their immaterial resources (such as norms and cultural values) or ideologies that together with these immaterial resources can induce positive attitude in other governments and societies [25]. As opposed to hard power, «soft power» emphasizes the possibility of cooperation rather than the ever-present danger of war. It utilizes the power of ideas rather than the power of weapons.

When analyzing the role of cultural diplomacy, Nye treats culture as a resource of «soft power». As a form of «soft power», cultural diplomacy had existed long before it was put forward as a new concept within the framework of international relations. However, although it had been employed by practitioners of diplomacy, it was only after Nye developed the concept of «soft power» that the soft resources have been attributed greater role in contemporary international politics.

It seems that the liberal theoretical approach has vital implications for the way cultural diplomacy is defined – most of all, because it takes account of the multi-actor nature of the international environment. As a result, it links cultural diplomacy to the pursuit of interests on the part of groups of governments (e. g. the EU) or sub-national governments as much as on the part of single nation-states.

Finally, it is prudent to acknowledge how cultural diplomacy is defined within the context of a broader term – public diplomacy. The latter is one of «soft power's» key instruments [26]. There is many similarities and overlaps between the two «visions». In both of them, diplomacy is addressed at broad groups of audiences and engages various entities, rather than being reserved solely for the representatives of national governments (like in traditional diplomacy). Most scholars view cultural diplomacy as, conceptually and practically, a subset of public diplomacy. Instead of analysing a rich body of literature on public diplomacy, I shall only refer to the genesis of this term. One definition that is widely used by academics all around the world came from Edmund Guillion. Referring to Guillion's work, Cull stated that «Public diplomacy (...) deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another (...)» [27]. In such view, the purpose of public diplomacy is transnational flow of information and ideas. As pointed Eytan Gilboa Classic Public Diplo-

macy uses several channels or techniques including international broadcasting; cultural and scientific exchanges of students, scholars, intellectuals and artists; participation in festivals and exhibitions; building and maintaining cultural centres; teaching a language; establishing local friendship leagues and trade associations [28, p. 715-747]. Currently, it is perceived through the lens of democratisation that occurs in numerous processes in international relations, i. e. transnationalism and globalization [29, p. 192-208]. Following the above-signaled trend, cultural diplomacy is treated as one of several dimensions of public diplomacy [30, p. 8-21]. It is described as a way in which governments and other actors communicate with other societies in order to advance their interests in international politics. Cull names four elements that together constitute today's public diplomacy: cultural diplomacy, listening, advocacy and international broadcasting [31].

Putting cultural diplomacy within a broader framework of public diplomacy is a fairly widespread custom among today's scholars, although there are some who call for complete separation of these two concepts, arguing that the needs of public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy are not always complementary [32, p. 1-29].

Constructivism. When one considers the importance of cultural diplomacy for relations between various actors of international relations, it is worth to refer to constructivism – a theoretical approach that presents an alternative to both neorealism and neoliberalism. Proponents of constructivism [33, p. 420] have questions ontological and epistemological assumptions of previous major IR theories. They emphasise the role of norms, institutions and identity and point to interdependencies between various agents and structures. As indicated by Wendt, constructivism is a social theory on which constructivist theories of international politics – e. g. about war, cooperation and the international community – are based. Constructivism views the core of international relations as an interactive process in which the ideas and their communication among agents (individuals, groups, social structures etc.) serve to create structures such treaties, laws, international organizations and other aspects of the international system [34]. These structures in turn influence the ideas and communication between the agents. It its variants, this approach – for it is too unspecified to be a theory – directs us towards how the positions of international actors come to be as they are, while taking an eclectic view as to which influences might be most important: ideas, language, history, memory, institutions, norms, interests [35]. «While they accept the notion that there is a real world out there, constructivists believe that it is not entirely determined by physical reality and is socially emergent. More importantly, they believe that the identities, interests and behaviour of political agents are socially constructed by collective meanings, interpretations and assumptions about the world» [36, p. 324]. According to Wendt's interpretation, international anarchy does not shape states' motivations. To the contrary – it is states that create an environment akin to anarchy by defining their interests and identities in a pluralist international system. Constructivists are also attributes with a notion that the articulation of national interest is simply a specific expression of a country's identity in international relations. Of all public institutions, governments possess the biggest range of means to assess what solutions are optimal for the state and its citizens in a given set of circumstances. Interpretations of raison d'état always depend on a government's understanding of the environment in which it operates and factors that shape it. This, in turn, comes from its knowledge, experience, cognitive sensibility and ideology it espouses. Wendt stresses that apart from physical survival championed by realists, there are at least three other «objective» national interests: autonomy, economic welfare and a collective self-esteem [37, p. 112].

If one understand cultural diplomacy as a mutual influence exerted by spreading ideas, values and beliefs, constructivist framework puts it as a form of influence that can be exercised on both agents and actors of international relations. Immaterial resources become key elements that

shape actors' attitudes and actions. In the context of cultural diplomacy, these resources are distributed by means of cultural exchange and other forms of interaction. Another crucial factor here is the way actors understand and perceive each other, e. g. due to their beliefs and visions of the world. This aspect is linked particularly strongly to ideas, which Tannenwald describes as social constructs espoused by individuals, or sets of beliefs, principles and attitudes that direct our behaviours and policies [38, p. 13-42]. In such view, ideas and opinions of foreign audiences can be shaped through cultural exchange conducted as part of cultural diplomacy.

One particularly interesting approach to cultural diplomacy stems from constructivist premises as to the shaping of actors' identity in international relations. Constructivists consider identity as being socially constructed. Hence, they object the notion that it is a «primal» characteristic given «once and for all». Acknowledging that identities may change has further implications, especially with regard to international image. As pointed out by Davis Cross, «identity creation and international image are actually mutually constitutive in significant ways and there is a continuous feedback loop between image and identity» [39, p. 1-13]. Identity is constructed by ideas and values which, if seen as attractive by foreign audiences, may shape a country's positive international image. Here, image is an outcome of subjective views as to the attractiveness of the language, culture, norms, ideas and values attributed to a given actor. In such approach, cultural diplomacy directly reflects the identity of the people it represents. At the same time it conveys a credible message about a country's culture and so shapes the way it is perceived, both by the international environment and by the originating society. Cultural diplomacy fits well into this theoretical approach, as it is ultimately representative of a complex, social process. It gives credit to the notion that foreign public's perceptions are crucial to determining a state's behaviour and outcomes in international relations.

To conclude, one might argue that this in perspective on international relations identity, policies, image and cultural diplomacy are all interrelated. From the constructivist point of view, the social identity not only affects the way a country is seen by foreign societies, but also stems from attitudes shared by its inhabitants [39, p. 8]. It seems that social constructivism, understood solely as an explanatory meta-theory [40, p. 147-182] and gives new level to explanation of public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy as well.

Cultural diplomacy in studies on diplomacy. Another approach to cultural diplomacy worthy of attention is that in the broader framework of studies on diplomacy. For a long time, the latter field was treated largely as marginal to the overall scholarly work on international relations theory. This was true in both American and European academia. «It is therefore curious that, unlike scholarship elsewhere, American IT has long overlooked diplomacy, generally showing little interest in what diplomacy is, in what diplomats do, and, indeed, in what diplomats should do» [41]. As pointed out by Jönsson and Hall, the root of the marginalization of diplomacy in IR theory can be found in the «bottom-up conceptualization of political space, in which anything «international» emanates from autonomous states» [42, p. 195-210]. As theorists were uninterested in in-depth research on diplomacy, the subject came under the scrutiny of historians and practitioners. This has been clearly reflected in how diplomacy has been described: «practitioners tended to be anecdotal rather than systematic, and diplomatic historians idiographic rather than nomothetic» [43, p. 15-28]. As a result, definitions of diplomacy (and, later, cultural diplomacy as well) took account of actions undertaken by representatives of governments and states. One example of such trend is Satow's description of diplomacy as «the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states, extending sometimes also to their relations with dependent territories, and between governments and international institutions; or, more briefly, the conduct of business between states by peaceful means» [44, p.1]. Such approach is characterised by a very narrow range of entities entitled

to conduct diplomacy. Maintaining contact with other states (or with the public at large) was an exclusive task of consuls and diplomats, who were supposed to act strictly according to instructions from their home governments. In this view, diplomacy included work related to cultural promotion and public relations exercises, in which «the consul will be expected to take his cue from the appropriate departments of his embassy, draw their attention to opening for new initiatives, and, at his discretion, take such initiatives himself» [44, p. 1-2]. Hence, cultural diplomacy is merely an expression of institutionalised relations between states and basically comes down to the implementation of bilateral agreements. Both diplomacy as a whole and cultural diplomacy specifically are narrowed down to being an instrument of foreign policy, with cultural diplomacy given only a marginal role compared to other tools. Geoffrey Berridge's definition also elaborates on the instrumentality of diplomacy for governments: «Diplomacy is an essentially political activity (...) Its chief purpose is to enable states to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resorting to force, propaganda, or law. It follows that diplomacy consists of communication between officials designed to promote foreign policy» [45]. Again, diplomacy is viewed as limited to activities undertaken by representatives of a state: its head, members of its government or its diplomats.

One author to place cultural diplomacy within the overall picture of diplomatic activities on the part of governments and their representatives was Anthony Haigh, who pointed out several possible definitions of this term. Haigh famously stated that if seen as a verb, cultural diplomacy had a singular, dual and plural form. «In the period between the two world wars, when intervention by governments in international cultural relations became common practice, cultural diplomacy was mainly, if not entirely, limited to the singular number, recognizable under the now outmoded title of «cultural propaganda». To some persons, this association has given to cultural diplomacy a pejorative sense, so that they do not like to use the term as a means of describing the more recent developments in the collective cultural co-operation (...)» [46]. Haigh suggested that equating cultural diplomacy with propaganda was unjustified, and that those who do so overlook the development of collective cultural cooperation which is essentially free of the bias characteristic for propaganda. For Haigh, cultural diplomacy constituted a method or technique of diplomacy that could be utilised for both good and malevolent purposes and, as such, was neutral in its connotations. The fact that cultural diplomacy was often used as a synonym to propaganda had its origins in the cold-war rivalry of two political blocks [47]. Scholars who analysed it in this context saw it as an instrument of foreign policy, but one that, unlike all other methods, allowed governments to engage with foreign societies. They considered it a tool focused on the pursuit of national interest and directed by government representatives.

The transformation of international political environment, acknowledged most of all by the liberal theorists, has determined the way of defining diplomacy. From being a strictly limited to the activities of official representatives, diplomacy as an academic concept developed into a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional network of interconnections, with communication at its heart.

Diplomacy is no longer treated as a domain reserves exclusively for governmental bodies. Analyzing the changing nature of diplomacy, Barston emphasised that it is unwise to see diplomacy from a narrow, traditional perspective in the sense of being the sole preserve of foreign ministries and diplomatic staff. Diplomacy, instead, has many participants such as politicians, advisors, civil servants etc. from a plethora of national departments and also between international organizations and multinational companies and various governments as well as with NGOs and with normal people [48, p. 7]. The same author introduced the category of «players» in diplomacy and indicated that numerous other, non-state, interests have become increasingly involved, such as special interest groups and groups representing criminals, terrorists, the environment, natural resources, aid organizations, various religious groupings as well as international

foundations, medical organizations etc. One immanent feature of cultural diplomacy that points to an evolving nature of diplomacy as a whole is the fact that relations maintained by governments have always been supplemented by relations among private individuals, groups and societies. New communication channels have redefined the ways a country may influence other actors – one example being the renaissance of public diplomacy and the emergence of other forms, e.g. city diplomacy, citizen diplomacy [49, p 131-150].

As K. J. Holsti indicated, «diplomacy is a procedural institution of international politics because it is a common and patterned practice in the sense that thousands of government officials are in daily contact for the purpose of exchanging information, persuasion, and formal negotiations» [50, p. 16]. He also distinguished between such procedural institutions (which he considered «derivative») and foundational institutions which, in a state-centric system, include states, sovereignty, territoriality and fundamental norms of the international law. He understood procedural institutions (including diplomacy) as those repetitive practices, ideas and norms that underlie and regulate interactions and transactions between the separate actors. Furthermore, he stressed that while diplomatic practices may change in many ways (for instance by inviting representatives of NGOs or individual citizens to join diplomatic representations), this does not prove that the institution of diplomacy itself has been reshaped or replaced, as «ideas, norms, regulations and conventions of diplomacy remain largely intact» [50, p. 17].

Such thinking signals a potential understanding of cultural diplomacy. Its practice indicates it was seen as one of several instruments with which a state can influence other actors of international relations. The one-sided nature that some authors attributed to cultural diplomacy resided mostly in the nature of messages a government was sending to other nations – it used these messages, which sometimes amounted to manipulation, to achieve its own (and only its own) political goals. At the same time, the most important, if not the only, subject of diplomacy was the state. This could lead to equating cultural diplomacy with propaganda employed «in the service» of a specific ideology. However, as Haigh rightly noted, the fact that cultural diplomacy engaged foreign audiences and provided for exchange (e. g. between cultural institutions or artistic groups) determined its nature in a way that was free of negative connotations.

Currently, although cultural diplomacy has a clear two-ways character, employs new technologies and involves a wide variety of entities, it is still considered as a tool and instrument of modern diplomacy [51]. Nevertheless, unlike other instruments, it has a social context related to the identity of actors and agents of contemporary international relations.

Conclusions. The above analysis of cultural diplomacy in the theoretical discourse on international relations reveals the evolution in how this concept has been understood. Although cultural diplomacy has long been present in the practice of diplomacy, realism and neorealism have completely overlooked it. It reappears in studies on diplomacy, where it is seen as one of the diplomatic tools used by states and their governmental bodies to pursue national interests. However, studies on diplomacy still see it as a marginal feature in the overview of activities conducted by state representatives, while reserving the most important role for negotiations and direct diplomacy by cabinet members and heads of states.

As far as theory is concerned, rethinking of cultural diplomacy had been undertaken most of all in relation to the concept of «soft power». In Nye's vision, culture constitutes a vital part of a state's «attractiveness», and hence has the ability to affect the preferences of other actors. In international politics, the source of «soft power» lies with the values embedded in a country's (or organisation's) culture. One channel through which these values are distributed is cultural exchange that is a key element of cultural diplomacy. Consequently, an actor's position is affected by its hard power – i. e. its military and economic potential – and its «soft power». In the light of constructivist assumptions as to identities of actors in international relations, cultural diplo-

macy can be considered as one of the social elements that create and shape these national identities. The way an actor is perceived – its international image – is a function of its identity and the role it is attributed with. Identity, in turn, can be shaped through a dynamic process driven by specific norms, values and ideas.

References

1. Frankel Ch. The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs: American educational and cultural policy Abroad / Ch. Frankel. – Washington D. C. : The Brookings Institution, 1966. – 156 p.
2. Mark S. A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy / S. Mark. –Clingendael Institute, Discussion Paper, 2009. – 51 p.
3. Melissen J. The New Public Diplomacy, «soft power» in International Relations / J. Mellisen. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 240 p.
4. Gienow-Hecht J. What Are We Searching For? Culture, Diplomacy, Agents and the State. Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy. Ed. Jessica Gienow-Hecht and Mark Donfried / J. Gienow-Hecht. – New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010. – 265 p.
5. Haigh A. Cultural diplomacy in Europe, Strasburg, Council of Europe; Sales agent / A. Haigh. – Manhattan: Pub. Co., 1974. – 252 p.
6. Ferguson N. Colossus: The Price of America's Empire / N. Ferguson. – New York : Penguin Press. Intro, 2004. – 384 p.
7. Topić M. Cultural diplomacy and Cultural imperialism European perspective(s), Peter Lang / M. Topić & C. Sciortino. – New York, Oxford, Wien, 2012. – 243 p.
8. Wyszomirski M. International Cultural Relations: A MultiCountry Comparison / M. Wyszomirski. – Washington, D. C. : Centre for Arts and Culture, 2003. – 67 p.
9. Oxford Dictionaries: «Culture: Definition of Culture in Oxford Dictionary (British & World English)», 2015 [Electronic source]. – Access mode: http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/culture.
10. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, «Culture: Definition of Culture in Longman Dictionary (British & World English)», 2015 [Electronic source]. – Access mode: http:// www. ldoceonline.com/dictionary/culture_1.
11. Cummings Milton C. Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey / C. Milton Cummings. – Washington, D. C. : Centre for Arts and Culture, 2003. – 15 p.
12. Goff P. Cultural Diplomacy / P. Goff, A. F. Cooper / Ed. J. Heine, R. Thakur // In book: The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy. – Oxford University Press, 2013. – P. 420.
13. Statler K. The Sound of Musical Diplomacy / K. Statler // Diplomatic History. – 2012. – Vol. 36 (1). – P. 71-75.
14. Lee J. M. British cultural diplomacy and the cold war: 1946–61 / J. M. Lee // Diplomacy & Statecraft. – 1998. – Vol. 9. – Isssue 1. – P. 112-134.
15. Arndt R. T. The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century / R. T. Arnd. – Washington, D. C. : Potomac Books, 2005. – 602 p.
16. Rivera T. Distinguishing Cultural Relations From Cultural Diplomacy: The British Council's Relationship With Her Majesty's Government, Figueroa Press / T. Rivera. – Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 2015. – 53 p.
17. Mark S. A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy / S. Mark. – Clingendael Institute Discussion Paper, 2009. – 51 p.
18. Mearsheimer J. Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War, International Security / J. Mearsheimer. – 1990. – Vol. 15. – № 1 (Summer). – P. 5-56.

19. Morgenthau H. Politics Among Nations / H. Morgenthau / 5th ed. – New York : Knopf. 1978. – 15 p.

20. Waltz K. International Politics Is Not Foreign Policy / K. Waltz // Security Studies. – 1996. – Vol. 6. – Issue 1. – P. 54-57.

21. Moravcsik A. Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics Author(s) / A. Moravcsik // International Organization. – 1997. – Vol. 51. – № 4 (Autumn). – P. 513-553.

22. Rosenau J. N. The Study of Global Interdependence. Essays on the Transnationalization of World Affairs / J. N. Rosenau – London: Frances Pinter, 1980. – 334 p.

23. Nye J. S. Jr., «Soft power»: The Means to Success in World Politics / J. S. Jr. Nye. – New York : Public Affairs, 2004. – 208 p.

24. Dolan Ch. «Soft power» and Cultural Exchange: Assessing the Global Influence of U.S.-hosted Higher Educational Exchange Programs (Presented at ISA-Toronto 2014) / Ch Dolan, C. Escudero [Electronic souse]. – Access mode: https://www.academia.edu/9861893/Soft_Power_and_Cultural_Exchange_Assessing_the_Global_Influence_of_U.S._hosted_Higher_Educational_Exchange_Programs_Presented_at_ISA-Toronto_2014.

25. Nye J. S. Get Smart: Combining Hard and «soft power» / J. S. Nye // Foreign Affairs. – 2009. – Vol. 88 (July/August). – P. 160-163.

26. Melissen J. The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice / J. Melissen // The New Public Diplomacy, «soft power» in International Relations / J. Melissen. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – P. 3-27.

27. Cull N. J. Public Diplomacy before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase, 2009 [Electronic source] / N. J. Cull. – Access mode: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.com/index.php/newsroom/pdblog_detail/060418public_diplomacy_before_gullion_the_evolution_of_a_phrase.

28. Gilboa E. Public Diplomacy: The Missing Component in Israel's Foreign Policy / E. Gilboa // Israel Affairs. – 2006. – Vol. 12. – № 4. – P. 715-747.

29. Melissen J. Public diplomacy / J. Melissen // In book: Diplomacy in a Globalizing World Theories and Practices / Ed. P. Kerr and G. Wiseman, 2013. – P. 192-208.

30. Leonard M. Public Diplomacy / M. Leonard, C. Stead, C. Smewing – London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2002 – 183 p.

31. Cull N. J. Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past, CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy / N. J. Cull. – Los Angeles, CA : Figuera Press, 2009. – 62 p.

32. Feigenbaum H. B. Globalization and cultural diplomacy / H. B. Feigenbaum – Center for arts and culture, Culture & the National Agenda Issue Paper, 2001. – 29 p.

33. Wendt A. Social Theory of International Politics / A. Wendt. – Cambridge, 1999. – 477 p.

34. Finnemore M. National Interests in International Society / M. Finnermore. – Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1996. – 176 p.

35. Hill Ch. The National Interest in Question: Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies / Ch. Hill – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – 336 p.

36. Adler E. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics / E. Adler // European Journal of International Relations. – 1997. – Vol. 3 (3). – P 319-363.

37. Wendt A. Social Theory of International Politics / A. Wend. – Cambridge, 1999. – 477 p.

38. Tannenwald N. Ideas and Explanation: Advancing the Research Agenda / Eds. N. Tannenwald and W. C. Wohlforth «The Role of Ideas and the End of the Cold War,» Special Issue of // The Journal of Cold War Studies. – 2005. – Vol. 7. – № 2 (Spring). – P. 13-42.

39. Cross Mai'a K. Davis Conceptualizing European Public Diplomacy / In book: Mai'a K. Davis Cross, J. Melissen European Public Diplomacy : «soft power» at Work. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan. – 2013. – P. 1-13 p.

40. Guzzini S. A reconstruction of constructivism in International Relations / S. Guzzini // European Journal of International Relations. – 2000. – Vol. 6. – № 2. – P. 147-182.

41. Jönsson Ch. Essence of Diplomacy / Ch. Jönsson, M. Hall – London–Houndmills : Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 218 p.

42. Jönsson Ch. Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy / Ch Jönsson, M. Hall // International Studies Perspectives. – 2003 – Vol. 4. – P. 195-210.

43. Jönsson Ch. Theorising diplomacy / Ch. Jönsson // In book: Routledge Handbook of Diplomacy and Statecraft / Ed. B. J. C. McKercher. – London : Taylor Francis Ltd, 2012. – P. 15-28.

44. Satow E. M. A guide to diplomatic practice / E. M. Satow. – London : Longman, 1932. – 542 p.

45. Berridge G. R. Diplomacy: Theory and Practice / G. R. Berridge / 4th ed. – London: Palgrave Basingstoke, 2010. – 282 p.

46. Haigh A. Cultural diplomacy in Europe / A. Haight. – Strasburg, Council of Europe; Sales agent, Manhattan Pub. Co, 1974. – 251 p.

47. Barghoorn C. The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy / C. Barghoorn – Princeton, N J : Princeton University Press, 1960. – 353 p.

48. Barston R. Modern diplomacy. Pearson Education / R. Barston / 4th ed. – London: Routledge, 2013. – 454 p.

49. Sharp P. Making Sense of Citizen Diplomats: The People of Duluth, Minnesota, as International Actors / P. Sharp // International Studies Perspectives. – 2001. – Vol. 2 – Issue 2. – P. 131-150.

50. Holsti K. J., The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory / K. J. Holsti // Institute of International Relations The University of British Columbia. Working Paper. – 1998. – № 26-21 p.

51. Cooper A.F. The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy / A. F. Cooper, J. Heine, R. Thakur. – Oxford University Press, 2013. – 990 p.

КУЛЬТУРНА ДИПЛОМАТІЯ В ТЕОРІЇ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН І ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ

Анна Умінська-Воронєцка

Доктор філософії Інституту міжнародних досліджень Вроцлавського університету.

Анотація. *В статті проаналізовано наявність концепту культурної дипломатії в теоретичному просторі міжнародних відносин і студій над дипломатією. Автор вказує на довготривалу наявність культурної дипломатії в дипломатичній практиці держав, що знаходило віддзеркалення у зацікавленості цією формою дипломатії істориків та практиків-дипломатів. Це детермінує її концептуалізацію і використання в дійсності як інструменту реалізації цілей держави або знаряддя до осягнення державного інтересу. В теоретичній перспективі культурна дипломатія з'являється в першу чергу в контексті «soft power». Метою статті є спроба усистематизування категорії культурної дипломатії в теоретичному дискурсі міжнародних відносин, а також вияснення чи її зміст підпорядковується змінам, з огляду на актуальні процеси і явища в міжнародному середовищі, між іншим такі як транснаціоналізм та мультіакторовість.*

Ключові слова: *культурна дипломатія, культура в міжнародних відносинах, теорія міжнародної політики, публічна дипломатія.*

Список використаної літератури

1. Frankel Ch. The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs: American educational and cultural policy Abroad / Ch. Frankel. – Washington D. C. : The Brookings Institution, 1966. – 156 p.
2. Mark S. A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy / S. Mark. – Clingendael Institute, Discussion Paper, 2009. – 51 p.
3. Melissen J. The New Public Diplomacy, «soft power» in International Relations / J. Mellisen. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 240 p.
4. Gienow-Hecht J. What Are We Searching For? Culture, Diplomacy, Agents and the State. Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy. Ed. Jessica Gienow-Hecht and Mark Donfried / J. Gienow-Hecht. – New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2010. – 265 p.
5. Haigh A. Cultural diplomacy in Europe, Strasburg, Council of Europe; Sales agent / A. Haigh. – Manhattan: Pub. Co., 1974. – 252 p.
6. Ferguson N. Colossus: The Price of America's Empire / N. Ferguson. – New York : Penguin Press. Intro, 2004. – 384 p.
7. Topić M. Cultural diplomacy and Cultural imperialism European perspective(s), Peter Lang / M. Topić & C. Sciortino. – New York, Oxford, Wien, 2012. – 243 p.
8. Wyszomirski M. International Cultural Relations: A MultiCountry Comparison / M. Wyszomirski. – Washington, D. C. : Centre for Arts and Culture, 2003. – 67 p.
9. Oxford Dictionaries: «Culture: Definition of Culture in Oxford Dictionary (British & World English)», 2015 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www. oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/culture
10. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, «Culture: Definition of Culture in Longman Dictionary (British & World English)», 2015 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/culture_1.
11. Cummings Milton C. Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey / C. Milton Cummings. – Washington, D. C. : Centre for Arts and Culture, 2003. – 15 p.
12. Goff P. Cultural Diplomacy / P. Goff, A. F. Cooper / Ed. J. Heine, R. Thakur // In book: The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy. – Oxford University Press, 2013. – P. 420.
13. Statler K. The Sound of Musical Diplomacy / K. Statler // Diplomatic History. – 2012. – Vol. 36 (1). – P. 71-75.
14. Lee J. M. British cultural diplomacy and the cold war: 1946–61 / J. M. Lee // Diplomacy & Statecraft. – 1998. – Vol. 9. –Isssue 1. – P. 112-134.
15. Arndt R. T. The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century / R. T. Arnd. – Washington, D. C. : Potomac Books, 2005. – 602 p.
16. Rivera T. Distinguishing Cultural Relations From Cultural Diplomacy: The British Council's Relationship With Her Majesty's Government, Figueroa Press / T. Rivera. – Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 2015. – 53 p.
17. Mark S. A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy / S. Mark. – Clingendael Institute Discussion Paper, 2009. – 51 p.
18. Mearsheimer J. Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War, International Security / J. Mearsheimer. – 1990. – Vol. 15. – № 1 (Summer). – P. 5-56.
19. Morgenthau H. Politics Among Nations / H. Morgenthau / 5th ed. – New York : Knopf. 1978. – 15 p.
20. Waltz K. International Politics Is Not Foreign Policy / K. Waltz // Security Studies. – 1996. – Vol. 6. – Issue 1. –P. 54-57.

21. Moravcsik A. Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics Author(s) / A. Moravcsik // International Organization. – 1997. – Vol. 51. – № 4 (Autumn). – P. 513-553.

22. Rosenau J. N. The Study of Global Interdependence. Essays on the Transnationalization of World Affairs / J. N. Rosenau – London: Frances Pinter, 1980. – 334 p.

23. Nye J. S. Jr., «Soft power»: The Means to Success in World Politics / J. S. Jr. Nye. – New York: Public Affairs, 2004. – 208 p.

24. Dolan Ch. «Soft power» and Cultural Exchange: Assessing the Global Influence of U.S.-hosted Higher Educational Exchange Programs (Presented at ISA-Toronto 2014) / Ch Dolan, C. Escudero [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: https://www.academia.edu/9861893/Soft_Power_and_Cultural_Exchange_Assessing_the_Global_Influence_of_U.S._hosted_Higher_Educational_Exchange_Programs_Presented_at_ISA-Toronto_2014.

25. Nye J. S. Get Smart: Combining Hard and «soft power» / J. S. Nye // Foreign Affairs. – 2009. – Vol. 88 (July/August). – P. 160-163.

26. Melissen J. The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice / J. Melissen // The New Public Diplomacy, «soft power» in International Relations / J. Melissen. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – P. 3-27.

27. Cull N. J. Public Diplomacy before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase, 2009 [Електронний ресурс] / N. J. Cull. – Режим доступу: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.com/index.php/newsroom/pdblogdetail/060418_public_diplomacy_before_gullion_the_evolution_of_a_phrase.

28. Gilboa E. Public Diplomacy: The Missing Component in Israel's Foreign Policy / E. Gilboa // Israel Affairs. – 2006. – Vol. 12. – № 4. – P. 715-747.

29. Melissen J. Public diplomacy / J. Melissen // In book: Diplomacy in a Globalizing World Theories and Practices / Ed. P. Kerr and G. Wiseman, 2013. – P. 192-208.

30. Leonard M. Public Diplomacy / M. Leonard, C. Stead, C. Smewing – London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2002. – 183 p.

31. Cull N. J. Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past, CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy / N. J. Cull. – Los Angeles, CA: Figuera Press, 2009. – 62 p.

32. Feigenbaum H. B. Globalization and cultural diplomacy / H. B. Feigenbaum – Center for arts and culture, Culture & the National Agenda Issue Paper, 2001. – 29 p.

33. Wendt A. Social Theory of International Politics / A. Wendt. – Cambridge, 1999. – 477 p.

34. Finnemore M. National Interests in International Society / M. Finnermore. – Ithaca : Cornell University Press, 1996. – 176 p.

35. Hill Ch. The National Interest in Question: Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies / Ch. Hill – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – 336 p.

36. Adler E. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics / E. Adler // European Journal of International Relations. – 1997. – Vol. 3 (3). – P 319-363.

37. Wendt A. Social Theory of International Politics / A. Wend. – Cambridge, 1999. – 477 p.

38. Tannenwald N. Ideas and Explanation: Advancing the Research Agenda / Eds. N. Tannenwald and W. C. Wohlforth «The Role of Ideas and the End of the Cold War,» Special Issue of // The Journal of Cold War Studies. – 2005. – Vol. 7. – № 2 (Spring). – P. 13-42.

39. Cross Mai'a K. Davis Conceptualizing European Public Diplomacy / In book: Mai'a K. Davis Cross, J. Melissen European Public Diplomacy: «soft power» at Work. – New York : Palgrave Macmillan. – 2013. – P. 1-13 p.

40. Guzini S. A reconstruction of constructivism in International Relations / S. Guzzini // European Journal of International Relations. – 2000. – Vol. 6. – № 2. – P. 147-182.

41. Jönsson Ch. Essence of Diplomacy / Ch Jönsson, M. Hall – London–Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 218 p.

42. Jönsson Ch. Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy / Ch Jönsson, M. Hall // International Studies Perspectives. – 2003 – Vol. 4. – P. 195-210.

43. Jönsson Ch. Theorising diplomacy / Ch. Jönsson // In book: Routledge Handbook of Diplomacy and Statecraft / Ed. B. J. C. McKercher. – London : Taylor Francis Ltd, 2012. – P. 15-28.

44. Satow E. M. A guide to diplomatic practice / E. M. Satow. – London: Longman, 1932. – 542 p.

45. Berridge G. R. Diplomacy: Theory and Practice / G. R. Berridge / 4th ed. – London : Palgrave Basingstoke, 2010. – 282 p.

46. Haigh A. Cultural diplomacy in Europe / A. Haight. – Strasburg, Council of Europe; Sales agent, Manhattan Pub. Co, 1974. – 251 p.

47. Barghoorn C. The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy / C. Barghoorn – Princeton, N. J. : Princeton University Press, 1960. – 353 p.

48. Barston R. Modern diplomacy. Pearson Education / R. Barston / 4th ed. – London : Routledge, 2013. – 454 p.

49. Sharp P. Making Sense of Citizen Diplomats: The People of Duluth, Minnesota, as International Actors / P. Sharp // International Studies Perspectives. – 2001. – Vol. 2 – Issue 2. – P. 131-150.

50. Holsti K. J., The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory / K. J. Holsti // Institute of International Relations The University of British Columbia. Working Paper. – 1998. – № 26. – 21 p.

51. Cooper A.F. The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy / A. F. Cooper, J. Heine, R. Thakur. – Oxford University Press, 2013. – 990 p.

КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ В ТЕОРИИ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ И ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯХ ДИПЛОМАТИИ

Анна Уминская-Воронецка

Доктор философии Института международных исследований Вроцлавского университета.

Аннотация. *В статье проанализировано наличие концепта культурной дипломатии в теоретическом пространстве международных отношений и исследованиях дипломатии. Автор указывает на длительное наличие культурной дипломатии в дипломатической практике государств, что находило отражение в заинтересованности этой формой дипломатии историков, а также практиков-дипломатов. Это детерминирует ее концептуализацию и использование в действительности как инструмента реализации целей государства или орудия к постижению государственного интереса. В теоретической перспективе культурная дипломатия появляется в первую очередь в контексте «soft power». Целью статьи является попытка систематизации категории культурной дипломатии в теоретическом дискурсе международных отношений, а также выяснение – подчиняется ли ее содержание изменениям, учитывая актуальные процессы и явления в международной среде, между прочим такие как транснационализм и мультиакторность.*

Ключевые слова: *культурная дипломатия, культура в международных отношениях, теория международной политики, публичная дипломатия.*