

The linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy

Salantiu Tudor, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Abstract: *The linguistic approach of concept construction describes a clear direction in communication theories which reflect both an object of analysis and a methodological approach to information. Distinct from political and institutional accounts of cultural diplomacy, the linguistic approach to concepts can emphasize the influence lines from social exchange as an intercultural sharing process. Due to that, the utility of the linguistic framework in the analysis of cultural diplomacy has the potential to improve the meanings of concepts used in socio-cultural processes rather than seeing communication only as a function of interaction. Under this framework, the paper discusses how linguistic aspects appear as a condition of concept-imagination to obtain a complex meaning of information in cultural diplomacy. Particularly, how the linguistic framework is articulated in cultural models which are used by societies, groups and agents to identify and express themselves.*

Keywords: *Culture, communication, information capture, linguistic framework, cultural diplomacy, sharing of concepts.*

Sommario: *L'approccio linguistico alla costruzione dei concetti descrive una chiara direzione nelle teorie della comunicazione che riflettono sia un oggetto di analisi che un approccio metodologico all'informazione. Distinto dai valori politici e istituzionali della diplomazia culturale, l'approccio linguistico ai concetti può enfatizzare le linee di influenza dello scambio sociale come processo di condivisione interculturale. Per questo motivo, l'utilità del quadro linguistico nell'analisi della diplomazia culturale ha il potenziale di migliorare i significati dei concetti utilizzati nei processi socio-culturali piuttosto che vedere la comunicazione solo come una funzione dell'interazione. In questo quadro, l'articolo discute come gli aspetti linguistici appaiano come una condizione di immaginazione concettuale per ottenere un significato complesso di informazione nella diplomazia culturale. In particolare, come il quadro linguistico è articolato in modelli culturali che vengono utilizzati da società, gruppi e agenti per identificarsi ed esprimersi.*

Parole chiave: *Cultura, comunicazione, cattura di informazione, quadro linguistico, diplomazia culturale, condivisione dei concetti*

Introduction

In a hyper-connected world, cultural diplomacy occupies an essential position for the articulation of meanings from international interaction. This situation is due to the existence of two main factors which are correlated with globalization. First, it was social and economic changes added to the continuous geopolitical transformations following the Cold War that led to a new relevance for international cultural policies (Zamorano 2016). The second factor is the impulses generated by innovation and knowledge production in the transformation of cultures. For world dynamics, the latter factor appears as a primary source of competitiveness rather than resource control competition in terms of the realism paradigm (Hotz-Hart 2000; Rycroft 2003; Peters et al. 2013). However, in cultural production and consumption, both factors are responsible for the serious implications entailed by the so-called digital transformation (Berry 2011). For cultural diplomacy, this change discloses new ways in which culture is expressed (Ang et al. 2015).

In this context of change, the pre-existing national models have started to become specialized and replicated through the designation of cultural instruments (Wyszomirski et al. 2003). Through this action, governments outline their purposes in an attempt to obtain a renewed dynamism in foreign affairs in line with the new spectrum of challenges. What makes these challenges special is the fact that results are obtained from precise values (Mellisen 2005: 11-12). In this light, cultural diplomacy appears on a global level as a modern instrument of interrelations that can be used to improve or generate networking and networks.

However, all of that happens in a multi-dimensional international environment, where not always everyone speaks the same “*language*”¹. First, because

1 In simple terms, this is related to the fact that interaction and communication in foreign affairs are no longer subject to the ideology or doctrinal paradigm of national institutions. Hence, the existence of a set of communicators distinct from political and military ones that derive their communications from different parts of vocabulary or use another one complicates the situation. That is added to the fact that the population has become an active

cultural diversity has begun to generate a wide range of reinterpretations of classical notions. Thus, communication has started to carry a significant cosmopolitan cultural normative freight and connotations. Secondly, the emergence of global cultures increases the complexity of the vocabulary used in IR. This means that an expression or description offered in an interaction contains a complex schema of meanings concerning different concepts. Therefore, the requirement for a common basis for relational information appears as a necessary backdrop to access the meanings of information.

In a world where Keohane and Nye (2011) highlight that themes from the international agenda do not have a hierarchy, values and their significance have become a sensitive issue. Because of that, to assure the communication of information between actors a language distinct from power and coercion is a logical necessity. For the feasibility of this requirement, it is necessary to have a function that can code and decode the meanings of values in a relatively symmetric mode. Yet, the role of “*language*” is increasingly important in international relations (IR) due to the numerous systems of rules which specify the relationship between values and meanings. It follows from this that language needs to represent a framework able to form statements in which concepts are recognized correctly in such a way as to simplify information. This view puts forward productivity and the interpretation of complexity expressed in some of its logical aspects.

Based on the linguistic approach of cultural diplomacy, the article seeks to explain the conceptual framework of interrelations between communications and practice. Through that, I intend to examine the characteristics and limits of vocabulary which is usually used in IR to communicate information. The paper is divided into four parts: 1) in which the assumptions are briefly outlined. In the second part of this section, I am concerned with the organization of the concepts from cultural diplomacy in communication. 2) analyzes the possible implications of the perceptual processes and the limits under which the knowledge encapsulated in a concept can be grasped in intercultural interaction. 3) examines the aspects of a communication structure which is sketched

communicator at a global level, and unlike elites, , in many cases they use distinct types of communication and vocabulary. For example, Instagram, manga cartoons, and the fetish of technology are useful examples.

in the first section. In the course of this investigation of tone patterns and their design, certain rules from the organization of concepts in cultural diplomacy are approached. 4) investigates how the linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy is exploited based on the dynamics of perception in globalization. The end of the paper presents an informal account of the main conclusions.

The new design of system structuring

In the Cold War era, the language used in IR was easy to learn by the actors due to the relatively poor vocabulary that was configured around three concepts — ideology, risks and military capabilities. In general, the rules and the “sounds” of this language were established commonly, that is to say by how the superpowers reported and set the structural organization of concepts. These rules were focused on the security dimension and a zero-sum game through an ideological and doctrinal competition. Yet, for other actors, it was not very complicated to learn or to make slight “*inflections*” based on the “*phonetics*” chosen by the superpowers. After the end of the Cold War, culture began to be a very sensitive filter for a broad spectrum of communication variations due to the new freedom of interaction. This was mainly because the diversity of actors led to the development of communications and a proliferation in the modes of interaction and languages used. In part, this combination between the fall of barriers and social implications created a complex global background, where different systems of value started to collide through new types of actors and societies².

In this context, there arose a clash between the global culture and national cultures. The source of that was the former type of culture that starts to penetrate static social systems in an act of “*cultural imperialism*” (Berger and Huntington 2002: 6). Nevertheless, according to Friedman (2008), traditional culture continues to sustain the natural state offered by national traditions and their values. Thus, the issue of domination regarding the aspects of social space appears to become a sensitive matter of relations between values and practices. In this

2 For how space redefinition under different circumstances can produce consequences due to hybridity in the same socio-political environment see: Gupta and Ferguson (1992); Kearney (1995); Welsch (1999); Jensen et al. (2011).

situation, cultural diplomacy seems to be a symbiotic factor with a commodity form in the transnational sphere, where regulating cultural exchange is no longer feasible. At present, this characteristic is one of the most important developments for the developed worldwide in key areas, especially for communication.

In these circumstances, cultural diplomacy has become a mechanism of construction for intercultural exchanges and interaction. Thus, what started as a focus on diversity and interdependence is today directed at global convergence and innovation through multiple-interconnected themes (Bertrand 2017). Under this view, we consider the language used in cultural diplomacy as a set of structures that express an independent statement regarding the connection between themes. However, to be a usable construction, the structure of the “*language*” needs to be a system of cultural meanings that specify the context and tone of the theme’s communication. Hence, each theme requests a structural organization of concepts that are associated with a semantic interpretation based on the “tone” expressed through a certain context.

At present, the system of “*language*” contains two meanings that often complement each other. The first meaning refers to the skills of the actors to determine and recognize tones through the cultural meanings of each cluster of themes used in the sharing process. In these terms, the competence of actors represents their capacity to establish preferences through the assimilation of associations from behavioral terms (Cull 2008; Nye 2008). The second refers to an explicit framework which does not include institutions and proposes a description of social exchange in an ever-globalizing world (Lee and Ayhan 2015). For Castells (2008), the second meaning appears as an argument that supports the existence of a public process which seeks to create a communication space over classical borders as a public sphere of sharing. This aspect emphasizes the fact that actors appreciate the possibility of global communication in an act that puts pressure on national constraints regarding sharing, global themes and interests and comes to reinforce the continuous development of new language structures³. Yet, in the digital era, this aspect tends to be more individual rather than collective.

3 When the communication structure used in cultural diplomacy follows knowledge propagation, cultural interaction and social exchange as an act of socialization, communication comes to explain reality and to offer openness. On the other hand, when language follows doctrinal requirements, communication is a rigid function linked extensively to the sovereign-

This visible feature of the transformation of rules is enabled to produce interpretations of reality following world change. Also, an important fact is that everyday exchange and communication create new meanings with no awareness of culture⁴. Although they appear normal, these utterances are not similar and do not have anything in common with those previously produced. It is thus necessary to emphasize that there is no general framework in which new utterances may express a global experience. Rather, they are an expression of the regional resistance of cultures to globalization. Thus, it is hard to characterize the assimilation capacity of actors which represent the system of organization of communication in terms of any important concept in IR.

Under globalization, language appears as a social-cultural resource that highlights a model which facilitates new modes to express identity. At present, this model describes the connection between the exchange process and the social structures that are worldwide. In social-culture interaction, these types of links determine a class of potential relations and concepts that are used to settle a common language. Although a characteristic of the language adopted in cultural diplomacy is its “universal aspect”, it unfortunately cannot take account of the huge range of lexical items that incorporate great experiences. For example, in the Cold War era and immediately afterwards, the universal aspect of the language of IR was characterized by the ideological relationship between democracy and communism. The former attempted to emphasize its achievements and opportunities, while the latter pursued the propagation of a set of values in decline (Westad, 2000). In the following period, this relationship was replaced with how democracy needs to be introduced on the global level, and how it can be correlated with diversity. In both periods, this context generated a common aspect regarding actors’ capability to interfere

ty of the actors. In this case, the language used will seek to avoid an externalist approach to themes and to invoke static standards. Through that, the aim of communication is addressed to a sensitive reality in a search for stability points rather than offering different prospects through interaction. This understanding is relevant because it emphasizes the capacity of society to increase its political strength in the world. See Taylor and Hartnett (2000); Shome and Radha (2002); Uhm (2005); Fraser (2007); Sorells (2016).

4 For example, vlogging as a factor of social influence, and attitudes regarding expectations for certain technologies, especially in communication areas are very strong examples. In that regard see Wang and Lin (2011); Wang et al. (2014).

from different points of view (Forsythe 1992). This is a shift of a standard with a complex system of representations, which for a short time worked under the presumption of a new order. However, the significant variation from the system of organization and acceleration of cosmopolitanism generated the representation of reality as a collective ambiguity.

These variations from the system of organization of concepts describes alternatives to correction through specific representations. This does not mean that the basis of communication is completely gone. Rather, it draws a model that determines a structure of representation based on concepts which are limited or were not taken into account. The effect of the global recognition of the importance and implications of some concepts in world organization made them reference points also in social-cultural expressions (Bochner, 1994; Phills et al. 2008; Zhou, 2008). However, in comparison with other systems used in IR fields such as security policy, those attached to cultural diplomacy are focused on the meaning of changes that are taking place in practice. Based on the remarks highlighted in this part, in the next section we proceed to analyze the perceptual processes in cultural diplomacy and how they influence intercultural interaction.

Understanding the meanings of concept clusters

One of the most complex features of the practice of cultural diplomacy is its intricate system of power contours, both within policies and within the processes which construct influence (Lukes 2007; Nye 2009). In the Fourth Industrial Revolution there is an assumption that sensitivity encountered in cultural diplomacy has been strengthened at least in three perceptual levels (Wang 2006). Thus, the large range of implications must be recorded in an improved transcription of cultural representation in policy. Also in IR studies, it is well known that today there are no foreign interactions that do not contain different aspects of cultural exchange. First, because cultural products and services have become an essential part of global competitiveness. Second, because in a transnational environment every social or political interaction becomes a carrier for cultural elements. This has led to the development of a particular type of situation which describes the role of culture along broad

lines through opening access to multiple sources of knowledge and information (Feigenbaum 2001; Wiarda 2016).

For most actors, the implications produced by intercultural interaction on cultural diplomacy are limited to the issue of forms of preferences and the production of attraction. Therefore, what remains a central theme is the development of influence by an actor through his capability for cultural dissemination. Yet this element raises a question of how it is possible to increase the influence of a soft or aggressive rise of culture which cannot be perceived as an assertive rise. So nowadays discussion centres on the extrapolation of concept representation from a brand to a dynamic culture. Thus, because we can assume that the position of sensitivity is a correlated feature, the rules of intercultural interaction that determine the potential fluctuation of sensitivity may well result from the idiosyncrasies that are present in this process.

The rules in the system of concept organization operate functionally. We may believe in these rules as a function that organizes the relationships from the assimilation-interaction standpoint. The basis of this mechanism is the pursuit of a scheme that contains an abstract pattern of links between national cultures and social-political paradigms. Nevertheless, the ambiguities which appear are harder to eliminate rather than correct since users tend to relate concept representation to a social perspective. The second case is when the mechanism is relaxed due to openness and the new logic of exchange or interaction. In this situation, ambiguities might generate a miscellaneous reaction regarding the meanings of representations and the consequences of assimilation to a foreign culture. However, in the absence of systematization, the nature of reactions appears to be confused in the cultural context, which leads to the low capacity of a society to combine the global with the traditional. This results from the fact that in the absence of a collective systematization, the input of information may become confusing in terms of what the data represents. The effects of this type of behavior can be the appearance of a certain reticence regarding the acceptance of a high degree of intercultural exchange. On the other hand, the softening or disappearance of borders leads to the tendency of cosmopolitanism, where these ambiguities tend to become the sources of some subcultures. Another factor is the self-identity related to the wish of an individual or group to expand or to maintain its identity as an uprising connected to the link between local and global (Delanty 2006).

This framework brings into the discussion an image that can be constructed in the communication of cultural diplomacy in terms of knowledge appreciation. That divides the rules of the organization of concepts into two groups. One that follows the global context of change, and a second group that is limited to traditions. To understand the cultural exchange which is formulated in interactions, it must be admitted that the concepts related to the Fourth Industrial Revolution, for example, have noncyclical transformational rules. Distinct from the classical concepts which are static — such as the narrative of an initial subjectivity — these new types of rules are applied in the context determined as successive stages of social expectations. These sets of outlooks, which exist in a fuzzy transformation, initiate for current generations new symbols of identity, and creative sites of understanding or questioning traditions, in an act that characterizes global culture. Related to the linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy, this assumes that on a global level there exists a complex principle of concept orders which is not necessarily a hierarchical sequence.

In several ways this is an act against outmoded practices which undermines the traditional meaning of containment to the advantage of intellectual links and social exchange (Nye and Owens, 1996). In light of this fact, the puzzle of knowledge and attraction of intercultural exchange can be reformulated in a question about the role of perception and the limits of culture in the assimilation process. The globalized culture induces a sophisticated process through which reality is constructed. In this action, exchanges between societies that are outside the institutional framework become a context that assures their inter-subjective meanings and their transformations. This is appreciated as an investigation of language through a vocabulary where social, political, security and economic effects produce pictures for a reality that combines culture with agents' identity⁵. In cultural diplomacy, these patterns describe the social processes through which actors convey how to report the concepts in cultural descriptions to each other.

The perceptual processes of concepts are mediated through how the communication between agents is made. For that, the “*language tones*” used by the communicator for knowledge-sharing based on a system of signs become es-

5 For this interpretation of reality construction see Onuf, 1989; and Adler, 2013.

sential. The important part of this, however, is that it enables actors to transmit their world perception through their particular culture into intercultural interaction⁶. On a social stage, this situation can produce a debate that transforms the knowledge and information attached to a concept into the picture of world understanding. In this way, the culture/world is more than a picture, it is a sociocultural journey of languages. This means that the perception of knowledge to be expressed through concepts operates through multi-codes in complex cultural universes.

To pin down the weight of concept constructions in cultural exchange, however, it is difficult to say that all knowledge uttered in communication leads towards the perception of reality. Rather, for any particular concept expressed, there exist many possibilities of contradictory interpretations regarding its significance in social constructions. For instance, it is conceivable that this case depends on the empirical effects in each stage of interconnectivity. This type of perception system is not at all arbitrary, a feature of knowledge communication must be specifically linked from the ordering of culture to global transformation. According to Goodall et al. (2006), a relatively new principle suggests that in the practice of strategic engagement, control of meaning should not be sought in a culture that is not fully understood. At present, it appears reasonable to suppose that the structures selected in communication need to follow the reduction of perception limits. That aspect describes a cumulation of factors required to determine the complexity of concept assimilation through a cultural schema.

6 In what this means for the markets, the relationship between tourist markets and hosts expresses a clear example. In particular, the cultural-orientated relationship between Asian actors and Australia, which represents tourist behavior under the influence of cultural differences, can provide a line in how international interaction can affect social experience based on perceptions of expectation. Nevertheless, this means a new situation which in part brings huge novelty to traditional models described through exchange between the West and the Middle East where sociocultural forces characterize the communication framework. See Feghali 1997; Reisinger and Turner 2002; Litvin et al. 2004.

The structure of concept communication

Cultural diplomacy represents one of the main instruments of communication in the IR field due to its association with “*states branding*”. For these types of countries or regional organizations, international recognition through their cultural heritage provides them with the opportunity to support foreign activities abroad, thus helping to follow their aims from an influence perspective, and perceptions created around their domestic image. As an instrument, the model of cultural diplomacy which is promoted needs to be able to attract public opinion, fostering positive attitudes towards the agents and actors that facilitate achievements. Because of that, communication appears to be an essential function. First, because it is responsible for the sharing of concepts and links to the nominal and historical aspects which must create expectancy. Second, it assures the framework for broadcasting and connecting the participants in an interactive process that follows the sharing of information and meanings. The aim here is to communicate balanced information about the concepts in such a way as to make the whole rational and understandable.

When China formulated “*peripheral diplomacy*” under Xi Jinping, the debate brought forward three new ideas: *China Dreams*, *Asia Dreams* and *World Dream*. The introduction as a reference to the Chinese strategy of referring to national and regional heritage was a smart idea because it introduced a set of lines that were relatively easy to understand, especially in the region. At the same time, the promotion of the concepts created a friendly framework where the national strategy could be understood through a historical backdrop and pragmatic logic. This concept construction thus appeals to different aspects of culture and historical philosophy as a pro-active action that continues to consolidate the Chinese diplomatic strategy in the current state of the region and the world (Callahan 2016). The features of this strategy were set up through the Work Forum on “*peripheral diplomacy*” in 2013 as a modern approach to Beijing’s challenges in foreign relations. Additionally, the forum was a framework that shared lines of thinking as a part of a new model in which China understands how to relate to foreign states (Swaine 2014). According to Xi (2014), interaction based on the ideas mentioned in the new model of diplomacy was meant to create a model of regional cooperation, which would be

able to be expanded as a sharing system beyond material standards. Through this step, Xi Jinping is seeking to make China more sociable in the region to obtain an acceptance of China's view regarding its main interests and sovereignty in territorial disputes (Heath 2013).

This type of communication, based on the sharing of common beliefs as an enlarged expectation, allows the introduction of attention as a logical argument. In the case of "*peripheral diplomacy*", the Chinese leadership attempts to introduce the idea of a Sino-centric system as a fact that needs to be recognized through cultural diplomacy (Ferdinand 2016). From a political perspective, however, the model used by China is an attempt at negotiation between regional identity and national interests through ascribing a global importance to particular cultural concepts. For the Chinese party, the possibility to communicate political interests through concepts that make reference to culture creates the opportunity to mould certain aspects, thus making them long-ing and open-ended (Ferdinand, 2016; Summers 2016). Thus, in the global context, the communication initiated by China offered a new narrative of regional history that attempts to supplement the old lines and to encourage global interaction using their vision.

Because this strategy appears as a main element in most models of cultural diplomacy, communication has the role of offering an answer to the question "*why?*" and a concept to the question "*how?*" In both cases, interests and values are pursuits to describe a common goal. Hence, communication appears as an instrument of dissemination that emphasizes priorities and interests. Communication logic in any endeavor involves the assurance of specific semiotic rules by which to provide an understanding of the signs and symbols. Since communication in cultural diplomacy means engaging different cultures in a struggle about ideas, research, and mutual understanding, the aim requires assumptions about interests, values, significance, and understanding of the information and concepts transmitted. For the Chinese leadership, the global context urges a new direction for foreign policy as an act of resistance through cultural diplomacy. In this particular case, communication continued to extend the meaning of some regional concepts to the largest understanding of common opportunities. Thus, strategic communication has become an instrument of conversation which uses particular concepts to draw a political vision and to offer explanations about some perceptions.

In the final part, I will argue that communication in cultural diplomacy needs to be understood as the construction of a series of operations that require different capabilities. Through the example of China, I emphasize that communication functions when the factors are enhanced simultaneously in a coordinated function. This example shows that actors need to be capable of generating a context of shared understanding regardless of their objectives, the concepts used and convergence of meanings (Miranda and Saunders, 2003).

The tonalities of the language

The 2000s introduce with the innovation boom a different complexity for interculturalism and social interaction. In the last two decades, however, there have been three events that emphasize the new drivelines of language used in cultural diplomacy. The first was the 9/11 attacks which represent the shift of the “*New World order*” to multilateralist engagement. This event brought forward the socio-cultural reality which was developed through idiosyncratic discrepancies under globalization, and which received a security significance – the War on Terror (Agathangelou and Ling 2004; Krebs and Lobasz 2007). The subjection of this event to the security and political paradigm generated a cross-border awareness of cultural differences through the question of insecurity and the need for communal action. Thus, cultural geographic demarcations became the main lines that sustained the realist notions of security and trust. This was happening in a world where the neoliberal perspective began to converge the ties between identities and the historical construction of nations on a global scale based on culture.

The second event was the development of models based on the appreciation of technological devices, which generated a significant distribution of Asian culture (Otmazgin 2008; Steers et al. 2008; Lee et al. 2013). In general terms, this event was about the ability of societies to integrate cultural differences through new technologies. Traditionally, the link between these two dimensions can be explained through social anthropology as the norm which positioned technology in developmental trends from the perspective of reservations, and elements of permissivity. This means that there exists a consideration upon an initial state which brings potential improvements into doubt.

Thus, in realist, feminist or constructivist notions this perspective continued to argue the potential achievements by altering a state from the perspective of a culture which gives a meaning to evolution. This situation, however, started to change once technology began to offer a perspective over performance as distinct from the arguments given by the culture. The characteristics of the new generation made it more interested in avatarization and performance rather than control and action. The new lines of development, as a creative endeavor, require both new cultures and perspectives on values. It hinges on the capacity to consider innovation roles separately from traditional understanding. Thus, the new cultural models that are adopted due to technological factors can be described as an extrareal product of an unconventional “*expression site*” of social masses.

The last event was the beginning of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4FIR) which led to the “*fusion of knowledge*” (Gleason 2018: 2). In this process of world transformation, cultural diplomacy received a role in shaping societal transition. Nevertheless, the main challenges were configured by the major global issues which emphasized the limits of the old models of exchange. Yet this situation did not restrict the international agreement that cultural diplomacy is in the 4FIR a fundamental communication instrument to carry social activity away from states. In a hyper-connected world, this role of the concept encourages the development of social and cultural models around sophisticated images of interaction possibilities. This made from the new models a context that incorporates the connection between communicative aspects in foreign affairs and plausible impacts on interrelations. However, this does not mean that models contain an explanation function or a clear logic for understanding.

The concept of “*soft power*” as Nye (1990) coined it, was to emphasize the growing importance of non-coercive pursuit of interest through culture. Nevertheless, the three above events filled the void left by the traditional testing of power through a systematical introduction of a strange set of references regarding attitudes about changes and foreign interaction. Hence, the capacity of the public to disseminate strong meanings and opinions becomes a powerful method to formulate positions over foreign affairs. Due to hyper-connectivity and the lack of space, however, finding a balance by which to assure the reduction of disparities between concepts in intercultural interaction

represents a serious problem. The existence of new cultures and perspectives does not mean that for societies everything is rebooted. On the contrary, it means that for the old knowledge and information the limits disappear, making space for their expansion in a strange way. Thus, the new culture models bring forward the possibility for a collective development that is to be shared and accepted, rather than an individual validation of norms expressed.

An explanation for these drivelines may be found in the social patterns which exert a formative effect on the setting of the cultural consciousness. The way in which social interactions are configured tends to produce cultural and behavioral consequences for those involved (Enfield 2006). Hence, the current state of language description from transnational interactions struggles to offer a perspective on links between specific forms and modalities and model formulations. This new aspect, which was introduced through 4FIR, is a series of sophisticated phenomena composed of interrelated cultural dimensions. Through that it highlights what the language can or cannot express from cultural models in an extensive framework. Although a number of operational forms exist, the broad range of ascertained forms emphasizes concepts and a convergence of social expectations. Briefly, the new tones of “*cultural language*” describe criteria that can serve to change the features of the feedback on a particular topic. Therefore, attractiveness is one of the pathways for *soft power* and formulates co-option using culture and domestic values for foreign affairs. The question now is what represents the new models of culture for *soft power*, whether they tend to be transnational rather than belonging totally to a nation. And more important, of whom the new cultures create expectations.

Conclusions

Communication through cultural diplomacy does not refer commonly to exchange or to the propagation of an image. Certainly, the linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy has become relevant at present due not least to the impact of institutions. The linguistic framework concerns the processes of communication in which old and new concepts take meaning. That is adding spaces of discourse and interaction that are open, leading to a transformation in how societies communicate information and perceive it. Yet, from the perspective

of a critical theory of international relations, a linguistic “desktop” tries to analyze and explain changes in the relationship between sharing and meanings, interactive relations between culture and modernity, dialogue and influence.

For these reasons, a critical approach to the communication process proceeds on the premise that the linguistic desktop of cultural diplomacy can exert influence through the meaning of concepts. This paper focuses on the formulation of large images through concepts as one of the main functions of cultural diplomacy. This assertion expresses an advanced backdrop that appears in intercultural interactions due to the transformation of modernity which occurs in the socio-cultural dimension. The linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy can be a means to give a sense of vocabulary transformation, which entails an unavoidable degree of evaluation of concepts that feature new cultural aspects. To this end, the linguistic framework of cultural diplomacy is a strand between socio-cultural features and communication structuring in the international environment. It has a significant role to play in the opening-up of concept formulation and sharing in a discursive space of global connection and is thus of a transformative nature.

Bibliography

Adler Emanuel, *Constructivism in international relations: sources, contributions, and debates*, in Carlsnaes Walter, Risse Thomas and Simmons Beth A. (eds.), *Handbook of international relations*, Los Angeles: SAGE:112-145, 2012.

Agathangelou Anna M. and Lily HM Ling, “Power, borders, security, wealth: Lessons of violence and desire from September 11”, *International Studies Quarterly*, no. 48.3: 517-538, 2004.

Ang Ien, Yudhishtir Raj Isa and Phillip Mar, “Cultural diplomacy: beyond the national interest?”, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, no. 21.4: 365-381, 2015.

Berger Peter L. and Huntington Samuel P., *Many globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Berry, David, “The computational turn: Thinking about the digital humanities”, *Culture machine*, n. 12: 1-22, 2011.

Badie Bertrand, *Transnationalizing diplomacy and global governance*, in Kerr Pauline and Wiseman Geoffrey, *Diplomacy in a globalizing world*, New York: Oxford University Press, 85-103, 2017.

Bochner Stephen, “Cross-cultural differences in the self concept: A test of Hofstede’s individualism/collectivism distinction”, *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, no. 25.2: 273-283, 1994.

Callahan William A., “China’s “Asia Dream” the belt road initiative and the new regional order.”, *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, n. 1.3: 226-243, 2016.

Cull Nicholas J., “Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories”, *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, n. 616: 31-54, 2008.

Delanty Gerard, “The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory”, *The British journal of sociology*, no. 57.1: 25-47, 2006.

Enfield Nicholas J., *Social consequences of common ground*, in Enfield Nicholas J. and Levinson Stephen C. (eds.), *Roots of human sociality: Culture, cognition, and interaction*, Oxford: Berg Publishers, 399- 430, 2006.

Feghali Ellen, “Arab cultural communication patterns”, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, no. 21.3: 345-378, 1997.

Feigenbaum Harvey B., *Globalization and cultural diplomacy*. Center for Arts and Culture, 2001.

Ferdinand Peter, "Westward ho-the China dream and 'one belt, one road': Chinese foreign policy under Xi Jinping", *International Affairs*, no. 92.4: 941-957, 2016.

Forsythe David P., "Democracy, war, and covert action", *Journal of Peace Research*, no. 29.4: 385-395, 1992.

Fraser Nancy, "Transnational public sphere: Transnationalizing the public sphere: On the legitimacy and efficacy of public opinion in a post-Westphalian world", *Theory, culture & society*, no. 24.4: 7-30, 2007.

Friedman Thomas L., *Lexus și măslinul*, Iasj; Polirom, 2008.

Gleason Nancy W. (ed.), *Higher education in the era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution*, Singapore: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018.

Goodall Bud, Angela Trethewey and Kelly McDonald, "Strategic ambiguity, communication, and public diplomacy in an uncertain world: Principles and practices", *Consortium for Strategic Communication*, Arizona State University: 1-14, 2006.

Gupta Akhil and Ferguson James, "Beyond 'culture': space, identity, and the politics of difference", *Cultural anthropology*, n. 7.1: 6-23, 1992.

Heath Timothy, "Diplomacy work forum: Xi steps up efforts to shape a China-centered regional order", *China Brief*, n. 13.22: 6-10, 2013.

Hotz-Hart Beat, "Innovation networks, regions, and globalization", *The Oxford handbook of economic geography*, 432-450, 2000.

Jensen Lene Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen Arnett and Jessica McKenzie, *Globalization and cultural identity*, in Schwartz Seth J., Luyckx Koen, and Vignoles Vivian L. (eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research*, Vol. 1. New York: Springer, n:285-301, 2011.

Kearney Michael, "The local and the global: The anthropology of globalization and transnationalism", *Annual review of anthropology*, no. 24.1: 547-565, 1995.

Keohane Robert O., and Nye Joseph S. J., *Power and interdependence*, Boston: Longman, 2011.

Krebs Ronald R. and Jennifer K. Lobasz, "Fixing the meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, coercion, and the road to war in Iraq", *Security Studies*, no. 16.3: 409-451, 2007.

Lee Geun and Kadir Ayhan, "Why do we need non-state actors in public diplomacy? theoretical discussion of relational, networked and collaborative public diplomacy", *Journal of International and Area Studies*, no. 22. 1: 57-77, 2015.

Lee Sang-Gun, Silvana Trimi, and Changsoo Kim, "The impact of cultural differences on technology adoption", *Journal of world business*, no. 48.1: 20-29, 2013.

Litvin Stephen W., John C. Crofts and Frank L. Hefner, "Cross-cultural tourist behaviour: a replication and extension involving Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance dimension", *International Journal of Tourism Research*, no. 6.1: 29-37, 2004.

Lukes Steven, *Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds*, in Berenskoetter Felix and Williams M. J. (eds.), *Power in world politics*, New York: Routledge, 2007.

Melissen Jan (ed.), *The new public diplomacy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Miranda Shaila M. and Carol S. Saunders, "The social construction of meaning: An alternative perspective on information sharing", *Information systems research*, no. 14.1: 87-106, 2003.

Nye, Joseph S., "Soft power", *Foreign policy*, no. 80: 153-171, 1990.

Nye Joseph S. Jr., "Public diplomacy and soft power", *The annals of the American academy of political and social science*, no. 616.1: 94-109, 2008.

Nye Joseph, *Puterea blândă: calea către success în politica mondială*, Iasj: Institutul European, 2009.

Onuf Greenwood Nicholas, *World of our making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations*, New York: Routledge, 1989.

Otmazgin Nissim Kadosh, "Contesting soft power: Japanese popular culture in East and Southeast Asia", *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, no. 8.1: 73-101, 2008.

Peters Linda D. et al., "Constructivism and critical realism as alternative approaches to the study of business networks: Convergences and divergences

in theory and in research practice”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, no. 42.3: 336-346, 2013.

Phills James A., Kriss Deiglmeier and Dale T. Miller, “Rediscovering social innovation”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, no. 6.4: 34-43, 2008.

Reisinger Yvette and Lindsay W. Turner, “Cultural differences between Asian tourist markets and Australian hosts, Part. 1”, *Journal of Travel Research*, no. 40.3: 295-315, 2002.

Rycroft Robert W., “Technology-based globalization indicators: The centrality of innovation network data”, *Technology in Society*, n. 25.3: 299-317, 2003.

Shome Raka and Radha Hegde, “Culture, communication, and the challenge of globalization”, *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, no. 19.2: 172-189, 2002.

Sorells Kathryn, *Intercultural communication: Globalization and social justice*, Los Angeles: SAGE Publishing, 2016.

Steers Richard M., Alan D. Meyer and Carlos J. Sanchez-Runde, “National culture and the adoption of new technologies”, *Journal of World Business*, no. 43.3: 255-260, 2008.

Summers Tim, “China’s ‘New Silk Roads’: sub-national regions and networks of global political economy”, *Third World Quarterly*, no. 37.9: 1628-1643, 2016.

Swaine Michael D., “Chinese views and commentary on periphery diplomacy”, *China Leadership Monitor*, no. 44.1, 2014.

Taylor Bryan C. and Stephen J. Hartnett, “National security, and all that it implies...”: Communication and (post-) Cold War culture”, *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, no. 86.4: 465-487, 2000.

Uhm Kiyul, “The Cold War communication crisis: The right to know movement”, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, no. 82.1: 131-147, 2005.

Wang Dan, Zheng Xiang and Daniel R. Fesenmaier, “Smartphone use in everyday life and travel”, *Journal of travel research*, no. 55.1: 52-63, 2016.

Wang Jian, “Managing national reputation and international relations in the global era: Public diplomacy revisited”, *Public relations review*, no. 32: 91-96, 2006.

Wang Shu-ming and Judy Chuan-Chuan Lin, “The effect of social influence on bloggers’ usage intention”, *Online Information Review*, no. 35.1: 50-65, 2011.

Welsch Wolfgang, *Transculturality: The puzzling form of cultures today*, in Featherstone Mike and Lash Scott (eds.), *Spaces of Culture: City, nation, world*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.: 194-213, 1999.

Westad Odd Arne, “The new international history of the Cold War: three (possible) paradigms”, *Diplomatic History*, no. 24.4: 551-565, 2000.

Wiarda Howard J., *Culture and foreign policy. The neglected factor in international relations*, New York: Routledge, 2016.

Wyszomirski Margaret J., Christopher Burgess and Catherine Peila, “International cultural relations: A multi-country comparison”, (2003).

Xi Jinping, *The Governance of China*, Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 2014.

Zamorano Mariano Martín, “Reframing cultural diplomacy: the instrumentalization of culture under the soft power theory”, *Culture Unbound: Journal of Current Cultural Research*, no. 8.2: 165-186, 2016.

Zhou Youefang, Jindal-Snape D., Topping K. and Todman J., “Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education”, *Studies in higher education*, no. 33.1: 63-75, 2008.