**Đorđe Tomić, M.A.[1]**
*Faculty of Political Science*
*Banja Luka*
*djordjetomicbl@yahoo.com*

# Cultural diplomacy as a political tool of european integration

### Abstract

*Social, political changes, and especially those in communication, have given birth to new dynamics in terms of political actors and their relations in Europe. Culture is thus reinvented, in a new way, as a political content and cultural exchange can be placed at the heart of the politics. Overcoming the national borders, the phenomenon of cultural diplomacy marks the beginning of the 21st century. It consists essentially of communicational exchange, aims at gaining influence or at cooperation, and its actors are more diverse than ever. Can this type of political international relations be used as a model in European integration and, especially, in the European Union enlargement?*

**Key words:** *cultural diplomacy, intercultural communication, international politics, European integration, enlargement.*

### Introduction

The questions that we will be dealing with, those concerning the role of the cultural diplomacy in European integrations, rely here on two assumptions. First of them is the one about the complexity of international politics. Although it is not justified to write off the national state as the dominant actor of international relations, the multiplication of the (important) actors in the world political scene is obvious. The second premise is that on such a various scene, a lot of non-state participants have the communication technology and other resources that make it possible to overcome the state borders by acting, even without the mediation or significant intervention of the state.

---

[1] The political scientist, senior research assistant at the Faculty of Political Sciences in Banja Luka. E-mail: djordjetomicbl@yahoo.com

Specifically, we wonder if the characteristics of the modern world stress the importance of the diplomacy which is led through the culture aid, and continuing the same logic, do the different social and political actors on the world level have the benefits because of those characteristics. Special case at which this analysis points are the processes of the European integrations and the enlargement of the European Union. Sensitive in terms of culture and identity, the European project could represent the special area for the use of (inter) cultural communication in order to meet diplomatic goals.

The changes in modern age, in different social and political areas, stress the dynamic of international relations and are imposed as an essential element of the world politics. New technologies, that are either followed or are preceded by the novelties in sciences and the reflection of social reality, emphasize the importance of exchanging information, messages of all kinds. The flow of these messages has become the key element of society at the beggining of the 21st century. The age of information is reflecting in the sources, methods and the choices of the procedures of the actors of world politics, the most powerful actors as much as the small and emerging ones.[2]

The dialogue between subjects of international relations has become more direct, as the roads of informations were openning for participants of this big symbolic exchange. In order to keep up in that mechanism, actors decide how to adjust to the new circumstances, while the new participants are appearing.

Even if it is not a big discovery to point at these communicational processes, still the task to understand their consequences, values that they bring, political effects or possible use remains. That attempt represents the main goal of this text, which deals with special activity in communication between social and political subjects at the world level. That special activity is *cultural diplomacy*, as one of the possible paradigms of international communication today. So, we illuminate the cultural diplomacy as a specialization of international politics in the world after the Cold War, even after the american dominance which marked the end of the 20th century.[3] The question asked here is how the culture can be conceptualized as a means of international politics?

Neither the diplomacy has been spared of changes in the politics. Actors and symbolic content of diplomacy have significantly changed from the fall of the Berlin Wall. Adam Watson systematizes those transformations into three categories: a) scheme by which the modern world works (with one superpower and several competitors, appearance of signs of global governance through cooperation of powers); b) diplomatic channels (new technologies which enable more

---

[2]  Nye, J.S., *Power in the Global Information Age*, Routledge, New York, 2004, pp. 81/90.
[3]  F. Zakaria describes the contemporary global situation by the term of "postamerican world"; Zakarija, F., *Postamerički svet*, Heliks, Smederevo, 2009.

direct contact between the ruling, with little mediation of traditional diplomatic representatives); and c) span and the subject of the diplomatic exchange (contacts which are far beyond the communication between the governments and are spread over a wide range of actors with different types of messages).[4]

One basic thought in this classification must be specified here. Watson keeps the formal and traditional understanding of diplomacy – it is according to him different from the diverse symbolic and cultural exchanges between different levels of social and political organization, among other things, for being tha state also. However, reality calls for new conceptualization of *diplomacy*. Because, on one hand, many non-state subjects of international politics gain on importance and, on the other hand, state themselves are prone to change their cross-border effects.

To understand the role of transformation in international politics, the theory of James N. Rosenau come in handy. Somewhat simplified, his big theoretical contribution comes from watching the modern world as a system in constant change, with premanent and conflicting elements. That world is ruled by complex and conflicted processes.[5] That change is not an anomaly, but according to Rosenau it deserves to be considered as essential part of reality. All of the changes that Rosenau talks about are important for this analysis: *bifurcation* of global society i *fragmegration* of the world. The first term means significant cleavage – between state and other subjects, institution, organization, group or even individuals that with their activities cross state borders.[6] Other here listed term means double process which works paradoxically, but which is achieved in its inner dynamics – on one hand, communication and other forms of approaching the teritories and persons cause general integration at the word level; on the other hand, local, national and regional collectivities protect characteristics and they ask for the status of political subjects, more or less institutionalized.[7] These processes give birth to the new structure of actors of international politics. Structure that no longer celebrates the state as the supreme international arbitrators, filters and mediators, but includes a variety of actors who have the

---

[4]  Watson, A., *Diplomacy. The Dialogue Between States*, London, 2005.
[5]  Rosenau, J.N., *Political science and political processes*, in: Rosenau, J.N., *The Study of World Politics*, Vol. 1, Routledge, New York, 2006, pp. 39.
[6]  *Ibid*.
[7]  Rosenau prefers the term *fragmegration* to expressions like "glocalisation" (R. Robertson) and "regcal" (regional+local, Tai et Wong) which also emphasize the double and contradictory processes; however, *fragmentation* and *integration* imply a larger meaning, sufficiently general to describe the phenomenon in its essence.

power, legitimicy and governance and who are intertwined. Those new centers of subjectivity of global politics by Rosenau are called *spheres of Authority.*[8]

In some different way, but with very similar views, diverse and decomposed structure in international politics stand out also the modern authors from realistic circle of science in international relations. More precisely, from version of that circle which is called *neoclassical realism.*[9] According to that view, the main attention in studying the international politics needs to be focused on processes of deciding inside the state.[10] Although, the greates importance in those processes belongs to the state, orientation to decision making and persons that are involved in that indicates to diversity of actors. Because, in order to reach a decision, especially in conditions of pluralism, tho whole web of actors inside and around institutions to which official authority belongs is started.

In practise, that kind of structure is visible every time when some transnational company, some nongovernment organization, political or paramilitary group exercises power despite dissatisfaction of government. In the last time, influence of big audit firms on international politics and economy, precisely illustrate the idea of *spheres of influence.* Although, those organizations don't have the inherent jurisdiction of the states, they are capable to influence on politics in international frames. That also shows the role of media, marketing agencies, interest groups and many non-state actors.

We will later return on the question how that kind of structure can influence the diplomacy and, also the relations between states, even between cultures. For now it is enough to notice that there is bigger divercity than before in terms of subjects and content, and this does not apply to diplomacy (Watson) equaly as the international politics (Rosenau).

## Cultural diplomacy - the specialization of international communication

The term cultural diplomacy is not strictly connected with structural changes that we just saw, either chronologically or implied, but its contribution to international politics is undoubtedly strengthened by the rise of different actors in political scene. It is correct that traditional term of diplomacy, even the one

---

[8] Rosenau, J.N., *Building blocks of a new paradigm for studying world politics*, dans Rosenau, J.N., op.cit. pp. 17.
[9] R. Schweller, F. Zakaria, J. Snyder, pour n'en citer que quelques auteurs.
[10] Kegli, Č.V., Vitkof, J.R., *World Politics*, Prometej, CEES, FPN Belgrade, 2006, pp. 95.

that can be called cultural, falls under the authority of the state.[11] However, the question is to what extent the concept of diplomacy may extend to non-state actors.

General changes in diplomacy we have already introduced, and now it is necessary to elaborate that display, and also to explain the terms *cultural diplomacy* and *public diplomacy.*

First of them is, on the one hand, imagined, as a 'diplomacy with the help of culture', state activity which goal is promotion, even the propaganda abroad. As shown by Jessica Gienow-Hecht, this view could be satisfied by the explanation of the term in some cases, as, for example, in representation of USA to world in the Cold War.[12] Understood like that, cultural diplomacy represents 'the projection of soft power', in the terms of J. Nye.[13] On the other hand, there is also a concurrent definition, more refined in a theological, if not an idealistic sense. According to that other understanding, which is articulated by M. Cummings, cultural diplomacy is 'the use of creative expression and the exchange of ideas, information and persons which goal is the improvement of mutual understanding' over the state borders.[14]

As far as the second terminological clarification is cinsidered, we will leave aside the meaning of the term *public diplomacy which* refers to open and visible communication between states, as opposed to hidden, secret contacts (like the negotiations which American president and scientist W. Wilson blamed for deceitfulness in the First World War).[15] On the contrary, we adopt a different meaning of the term, suggested by A. Watson: public diplomacy as an acitivity 'that influences the public opinion in foreign countries, as a means of influence on other governments'.[16] On that influence worked more Nancy Snow- she classifies diplomatic work into three categories, depending on actors, participants in diplomatic communication. Those three types are designated as: a) 'government

---

[11] Modern diplomacy is born in the bourgeois and national revolutions in Europe at the end of the 18th century, as it was first defined by Edmund Burke, pioneer of the discipline and the author of the term; diplomacy has since then been an interstate practice; for an elaborate presentation of the creation of diplomacy as a practice and a scientific discipline, see the chapter "The Nature of Diplomacy" in Watson, A., *Diplomacy. The Dialog Between States.* pp. 1-8.

[12] Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., *What are we searching for? Culture, Diplomacy, Agents and the State*, in Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., Donfried, M. (eds.), *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, Berghahn Books, 2010, pp. 3.

[13] Nye, J.S., op. cit., pp. 90/92.

[14] Cummings, M.C. Jr., *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: a Survey*, Center for Arts And Culture, 2003, p.1, cited in : Schneider, C.P., *Cultural Diplomacy: Why It Matters, What It Can – and Cannot – Do?*, Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, August 2006.

[15] Watson, A., *op. cit.*

[16] *ibid.*

to government' (traditional way); b) 'government to public' (institutionalized flow of information to abroad, in the way that Watson sees public diplomacy); and c) 'public to public' (which corresponds to the meaning of cultural diplomacy as suggested by Cummings).[17]

In practice of the American State Departmant, cultural diplomacy lies in the core of public diplomacy. This is evidenced by the report of the Advisory Committee about cultural diplomacy[18] from 2005: "Cultural diplomacy is the linchpin of public diplomacy; for it is in cultural activities that a nation's idea of itself is best represented. And cultural diplomacy can enhance our national security in subtle, wide-ranging, and sustainable ways. Indeed history may record that America's cultural riches played no less a role than military action in shaping our international leadership, including the war on terror. For the values embedded in our artistic and intellectual traditions form a bulwark against the forces of darkness." [19]

This affective discourse is followed by recommendations that invite us to increase financing of cultural diplomacy, to engage in the diplomatic staff, to replicate programs of cultural exchange. Generally, the goal was to give the new force to cultural presence of USA in the world, two years after the beginning of the war in Iraq. Cultural diplomacy is thus mobilized, at least on a declarative level, as means of protection of national security.

If we understand the key terms like this, what is their content and, especially what are their cultural elements? Considering the fact that diplomacy crosses over national borders, its communicational angle is always more or less inter-cultural. Diplomatic relations are always established with those 'others', with associates or opponents from the other side of borders. It would be unduly to declare the diplomacy of every communication that crosses over the national borders, but that kind of communication is an essential starting element of every diplomatic activity. It is not only about the communication as a means of maintenance international jobs, but it is the way that actors of world politics represent, legitimize themselves and make others accept them as such. This is even more important in cases when state needs to recognize some non-state actor as subject with who it establishes the relation (whatever its nature is, from cooperation to conflict). Without democratic legitimacy, authorization for using the force (within the law) and important status in front of international law, non-state actors of international politics are that much more because they ma-

---

[17] Snow, N., *Rethinking Public Diplomacy*, in: Snow, N., Taylor, P. M., *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, New York, Routledge, 2009, pp. 6.

[18] Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy – the very existence of such an institution testifies about the importance attributed by the US to the cultural diplomacy.

[19] *Cultural Diplomacy. The Linchpin of Public Diplomacy*, Report of the Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy, U.S. Department of State, September 2005, p. 1.

nage to be *communicators*. That *visibility* of new actors is not limited on public presentation, publicity, media presence, not even the broadcasting or *online*.[20] As explained by J. Gerstlé in case of political communication, limitation of this type leads to a final simplification of the term of politics and communication, because only " [...] represents technical conception of the prior, and manipulative conception of the latter."[21] If we take this as a starter point and expend that logic on the question of international communication of political actors, their media presence becomes far more than international advertising: it is one of the forces that creates relationships, relations and leave consequences on public and politics. Really, one video-message of a terrorist group which takes over a responsibility for attack and threatens, or advertising of some trans-national corporation presented all over the world, are also the political facts, and not just idea of the fact. Because, the terrorist message is *the way that terrorists act*, and not only the promotion, such as the advertising is an integral part of the company.

In an international plan, that role of communicating is transported to intercultural relations. The context of intercultural communication corresponds to the state in modern international relations, in the spirit of two-way processes that are here already introduced. The return to local, traditional, along with globalization of culture and identity, marks the cultural angle of social and political changes at the beginning of 21[st]century. Even before almost two decades Michael Featherstone has noticed these double processes: globalization can lead to even bigger sensitivity for cultural differences.[22] This is not only about sensitivity, but about very practical advantage – possibilities to use new channels in order to show some new cultural characteristic, even to develop. However, total processes are more complicated than that , indicated by Cvetan Todorov: 'Big technological inovations had concequences on the way of life, but have not immediately finished off the earlier world [...] They have actually sequenced contrasts one to the other, so it borders with ultra modern.That at the same time existence feels both within countries and between countries.'[23]

This point of view is consistent with the perception of fragmented world, to use the term of J.Rosenau. It would be utopian to believe that communication can remove differences of power in world politics, despite the apparent increase of possibilities for 'small' to come to terms and even enter into a relationship with other actors on international scene. The difference remains large, according to J. Nye, because of at least four reasons. Fisrt, economical power determine

[20] Riutort, P., *Sociologie de la communication politique*, La Découverte, Paris, 2007, pp. 96/98.

[21] Gerstlé, J., *La communication politique*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2004, pp. 10

[22] Đordano, K., *Eseji o interkulturnoj komunikaciji*, Biblioteka XX vek, Beograd, 2001, p. 205.

[23] Todorov, T., *La Peur des barbares. Au-delà du choc des* civilisations, Robert Laffont, Paris, 2008, p. 14.

the level of patricipation in communicational and cultural exchanges. This is equaly true both for intelligence services and the industry of fun, for militaries and music production houses. Second, competition causes the fight for new information, which are rare and therefore expensive, in every aspect.[24] The third reason is the advantage of some actors in the use of informational technology: circles which are at the source of some inovation mainly stay more skilled to use it. Finally, hard power, military (material), has still significant impact on international relations, at the expance of actors that have it little or none.[25]

Flows in the modern world thus strengthen the role of traditional actors of international relations, and at the same time favor the strengthening of new participants. These last are more important for this analysis, because their contribution to international politics is of crucial importance for cultural diplomacy.

## The cultural domain of the European Union and cultural diplomacy as *European political life*

In those tendencies, where is the place of the European Union, a unique political form which nature is still a subject of inexhaustible teoretical and prectical debates?

The European political project from its beginnings creates new forms of managing, institutional and practical inovations. When it comes to communication i cultural exchange of state borders in EU, relations between states and their citizens rely on the nature of European construction. So, if we use realistic, interstate view of European integrations, analysis needs to be focused on diplomacy in traditional meaning of the word. In contrast, the idea that EU represents (or it can become) supranational political colectivity, requires to focus the attention on *European culture*, or *European identity* as frames of analysis.

According to the realistic approach, European project is created based on the interest of national states, as the main subject of EU.[26] Following that logic, the conclusion that relations between the national authorities rule the communicational exchange important for European integration is imposed. On the other hand, the idea to build the special community, transcending the nation-state framework, is based on the assumption that there is enough level of identification among 'European citizens', who share the common history, similar cul-

---

[24] Nye, J., *Kako razumevati međunarodne odnose. Uvod u teoriju i istoriju*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd, 2006, p. 303.

[25] *Ibid*, p. 304

[26] Moravcsik, A., *What Can We Learn from the Collapse of the European Constitutional Project?*, *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 47, No. 2, 2006, pp. 219/241.

70

ture, lived experience, knowledge – that, therefore enable rapprochement of the European nations.[27] Markus Jachtenfuchs shows that the constructivist idea encounters the wall of empiric reality which does not support the creation of European community based on the ideas, values, the feeling of belonging.[28]

It would be wrong to assume that the idea of Europe as a unique cultural space, is only inherent to the constructivism. Also, that idea does not imply the existence of an integral European culture, supranational and apart from its components, local, regional and national, ethnical, religious and linguistic. Europe as a community is the thought that circles and occurs all over again, only in new contexts. As for diplomacy, 'cultural Europe' is its cradle, since the diplomacy is one of the political, but not cultural products of Europe.[29] Diplomacy and cultural exchange in Europe come from the same practise of cooperation, even if it only serves only to conceal the real intentions of domination, influence and propaganda. Whatever the real nature of international contact in European history is, they have certainly created the individual political space. The Westphalian system created the network of international communicating countries, that were conected material and symbolical exchange. Edmund Burke, creator of the expression *diplomacy*, calls this network 'federal society, or in other words, diplomatic republic', while Walter considers this system to be a "large republic divided into many countries".[30] The French revolution, Napoleonic wars, civic and national movements despite restoration, have led to constant changes. However, even in the full rise of the nation-state, during the 21st century, ideas in several countries call for economic and political integration of what, according to them, had already been a European society – notably, thinkers such as Viktor Hugo, Giuseppe Mazzini, Richard Cobden, Benjamin Constant, etc.[31] However, this view 'does not stand to the test'[32], having in mind the decisive role of the state and the pragmatism in European affairs, including the integration project itself.

It would be reasonable to observe that the integration in West Europe lies on the national. Furthermore, while the question of culture and identity remains open and among the greatest challenges of today's Europe, the supranational tendecies are starting mutual diplomatic and cultural action of European community. At the same time, states and societes in Europe continue to create relations through communication, but also through diplomacy, formal and traditional, as well as cultural, indirect, public one. Any cultural centralism at the

---

[27] Jachtenfuchs, M., *Deepening and widening integration theory*, *Journal of European Public Policy* 9:4, August 2002, pp. 652/653

[28] *Ibid*.

[29] Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 85.

[30] *Ibid*.

[31] Magnette, P., *Le régime politique de l'Union européenne*, Presses de Sciences Po, Paris, 2006, pp. 33.

[32] *Ibid*.

same time could cause reactions to which points Chris Shore: 'The idea of eureopan culture could in that way bring the celebration of central power, before the paradigm of tolerance around the perimeter. Concentration of power brings danger [...] to cause the disturbance and vulnerability on the periphery, which is after that transformed in local chauvinism and xenophobia.'[33]

Cultural integration is in fact one of the main challenges of Europe in the 21st century. Even if it is not rational to strive for a supranational European culture, it is certainly possible to consider Europe as a cultural and political frame that includes different elements. In his eight theses about the future A. Giddens recommends  creating the European identity and culture based on regional and national elements, modeled on USA, That culture should, according to Giddens, be based on the feeling of belonging to Europe, that would go beyond the economic, even the political construction of European Union.[34]

## Expansion of the EU- the opportunity for cultural diplomacy

Let us return to the issue of cultural diplomacy and its part in European integrations. In politicial Europe, formed from different communities and states, the idea of incitement political relations through the cultural content diserves consideration and theorization. In order to round and direct the analysis of this complex phenomenon, this question can be limited to the case of enlargement of EU to the Western Balkans.

The enlargement clearly shows the meaning of the cultural dimension for EU. Before we mention the best known example for that, the case of Turkey, we can recall that the candidacy of Morocco in 1987 was rejected because the country 'is not European', although not even one contract expressly set the boundaries of the continent as a framework for expansion of the EU.[35] And certainly, the Turkish case: weak progress in the negotiations of the official status of candidate, in 1999, is often explained by political and cultural differences between this country and the rest of the Europe.

How, having in mind all of this, cultural diplomacy affects the expansion to the Western Balkans? First, this region of Europe is not officially excluded from the European cultural circle, as far as the EU policy. That qualifies it for European cultural exchange, in the way that is presented above. Moreover, cultural dimension is completely fit in political consideration of access of this region to

---

[33] Shore, C., *Inventing the 'People's Europe': Critical Approaches to European Community 'Cultural Policy'*, Man (New Series) 28, no. 4. (Dec., 1993), pp. 779/800.

[34] Gidens, E., *Evropa u globalnom dobu*, Clio, Beograd, 2009, pp. 267/269.

[35] *Ibid*, p. 270.

EU. This is supported by the report of European comity about Western Balkans[36] from 2008. Setting the directions of future access, Commission points out, among the others, the following goal: 'Assistance of the Commission for developing the civil society and for dialogue with it will be expanded. For this purpose, the new financial mechanism is established.'[37] The Commission adds to that the need to enlarge the number of scholarships for students in Western Balkans, for studying in EU. These two plans are good examples of cultural diplomacy. Acting directly towards public, and moreover, motivating cross-border cooperation, belongs indeed to what we set as cultural diplomacy. Education, public activites like civic initiatives, represent the starting of civic elements jumping over traditional logics of hierarchical inter-state communication.

European Commission is far from being the only actor of cultural (and also diplomatic) strategies of the EU states. National cultural centers clearly show the structure of public act in the region. Schools of languages, scholarships, programs of cultural exchange, shows, travels and visits organized for citzens of Western Balkans, are just a few examples of cultural diplomacy that acts in the region. To make it public, closer to the citizens, the participation of young actors should be ensured, the influence of the offiicial authorities should be mitigated and the personal contact should be encouraged. We come again to the model 'public to public' about which talks N. Snow, with the ucertainty regarding the results and open questions whether the integration and coming closer are final outcome. Because, not even the presence of the american (sub)culture in Balkan did not produce the supporters of american politics. That is shown by the example of the Serbs during the bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999: Serbs 'wear jeans, eat at McDonalds', but still support their forces in Kosovo and even 'use the (American) movie Wag The Dog for mocking the USA.'[38] N. Snow refers to the case of Arabs and their attitude in style 'we hate you, but send us more *Baywatch*!'[39] Certainly, final consequences of cultural diplomacy require wider, deaper and longer lasting analysis.

On the other hand, what are the possibilities for lands of Western Balkans to reach the European public by using the cultural diplomacy? This practice could help diversify the international action, including different actors. If joining the EU affects all social aspects, it is logical that different representatives are called

---

[36] This document defines the region as a list of countries as follows : "Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Kosovo, as determined by the Resolution 1244/99 of the UN Security Council".

[37] Commission des communautés européennes, *Balkans occidentaux : renforcer la perspective européenne*, Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen et au Conseil, Bruxelles, le 5.3.2008, COM(2008) 127 Final, pp. 25.

[38] Nye, J.S., *Ibid.,* pp. 92.

[39] Snow, N., *Ibid.*, pp. 4.

to participate in the exchange of messages concerning the approximation to EU. The role of non-state subjects is especially important. This concerns collectivities, communities and other groups and organizations. Although their actions are limited by capacities, their participation is achievable and it can be part of the tools of cultural diplomacy.

There are numerous possibilities for those actors. First of all, the presence in public involves them in social and political *games* in Europe. To pariticipat in events, represent themselves in media all over Europe, to advertise, to send representatives in European countries [...] all of these actions contribute to visibility. This applies equally to, for instance, Republic of Srpska as well as associations and companies. In addition to visibility, these actors create relations that certainly have and political dimension. Cultural contacts can cause political action, at least by the entry of certain topics on the agenda of politics and public in other countries. The example of Turkish television shows in the Western Balkans witnesses it on a daily basis. Despite the political deflection and bad historical connotation of Turkey among the Serbs and Croats, Turkish shows are reaching unprecedented popularity in the Balkans, resulting in a 'normalization' of the Turkish presence in Serbian and Croatian society.[40] However, it is early to conclude whether these series will have the same destiny as the American ones – according to the example that we presented above – leaving the strong cultural influence, but without much promotional effect in the filed of politics.

In any case, it should be noted that daily recognition and possible evaluation of some content is not far from the political effects. In case of expanding of the EU, even if the dominant aspects are the economic, legislative and political processes, considering cultural relations (that become diplomatic) can mean adding the missing parts to the European political mosaic.

## Conclusions

Instead of presenting ready-made solutions, it will be more convenient to underline here the stated elements, important for political life in Europe and for expanding the EU. They come from reproduction of actors and from new possibilites that offers the international in intercultural communcation.

---

[40] Tomić, Đ., *The 1001 Episodes: A Diplomatic Perspective to Turkish TV Series in the Western Balkans*, paper presented at the international conference "The EU as a global actor", Berlin, July 2011: http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/culturaldiplomacynews/participant-papers/eu/Djordje-Tomic-The-1001 Episodes-A-Diplomatic-Perspective-to-Turkish-TV-Series-in-the-Western-Balkans.pdf

First, there is a tendency of possible politicization of intercultural contacts. Every communication can create political acts, and in the case of international communication, that effect can be placed under the wing of cultural diplomacy.

Furthermore, it is important to differentiate the cultural diplomacy of the state, driven as a means of projecting the soft power, from 'cultural diplomacies', more or less planned, that are undertaken by the non-state political acotrs, including the territorial collectivities inside the states. Considering the large choice of possible 'diplomacies', each of which corresponds to the organization to which it belongs, we can imagine the large range of choices of actions to be made in order to represent, promote or gain consent. This is by no means far from political influence, especially since the state communication is recognized as a propaganda, while the one from non-state actors is seen as a part of communication 'public to public'.

The question of influence of the latter remains open. *Sensibilization* of public across the state borders could, in theory, bring the desired results for communicators, but it is still on the basis of individual cases that we will be able to determine under what conditions such outcomes are possible.

## Literature

1. Commission des communautés européennes, *Balkans occidentaux: renforcer la perspective européenne*, Communication de la Commission au Parlement européen et au Conseil, Bruxelles, le 5.3.2008, COM(2008) 127 Final.
2. *Cultural Diplomacy. The Linchpin of Public Diplomacy*, Report of the Advisory Committee on Cultural Diplomacy, U.S. Department of State, September 2005.
3. Đordano, K., *Eseji o interkulturnoj komunikaciji*, Clio, Beograd, 2001,
4. Gerstlé, J., *La communication politique*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2004.
5. Gidens, E., *Evropa u globalnom dobu*, Clio, Beograd, 2009.
6. Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., Donfried, M. (eds.), *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, Berghahn Books, 2010.
7. Jachtenfuchs, M., *Deepening and widening integration theory*, Journal of European Public Policy 9:4, August 2002.
8. Kegli, Č.V., Vitkof J.R., *Svetska politika*, Prometej, CEES, FPN Belgrade, 2006.
9. Magnette, P., *Le régime politique de l'Union européenne*, Presses de Sciences Po, Paris, 2006.

10. Moravcsik, A., *What Can We Learn from the Collapse of the European Constitutional Project?*, Politische Vierteljahresschrift 47, No. 2, 2006.

11. Nye, J., *Kako razumevati međunarodne odnose. Uvod u teoriju i istoriju*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd, 2006.

12. Nye, J.S., *Power in the Global Information Age*, Routledge, New York, 2004.

13. Riutort, P., *Sociologie de la communication politique*, La Découverte, Paris, 2007.

14. Rosenau, J.N., *The Study of World Politics*, Vol. 1, Routledge, New York, 2006.

15. Schneider, C.P., *Cultural Diplomacy: Why It Matters, What It Can – and Cannot – Do?*, Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, August 2006.

16. Shore, C., *Inventing the 'People's Europe': Critical Approaches to European Community 'Cultural Policy'*, Man (New Series) 28, no. 4., 1993.

17. Snow, N., Taylor, P.M., *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

18. Todorov, T., *La Peur des barbares. Au-delà du choc des* civilisations, Robert Laffont, Paris, 2008.

19. Tomić, Đ., *The 1001 Episodes: A Diplomatic Perspective to Turkish TV Series in the Western Balkans*, paper presented at the international conference *The EU as a global actor*, Berlin, July 2011: http://www.culturaldiplomacy. org/culturaldiplomacynews/participant-papers/eu/Djordje-Tomic-The-1001-Episodes-A-Diplomatic-Perspective-to-Turkish-TV-Series-in-the-Western-Balkans.pdf

20. Watson, A., *Diplomacy. The Dialogue Between States*, London, 2005.

21. Zakarija, F., *Postamerički svet*, Heliks, Smederevo, 2009.