

**Cross-cultural communication in international relations – U.S. on the world scene
Shikulya A. (Russian Federation)**

**Межкультурная коммуникация в международных отношениях – США на
мировой арене
Шикуля А. А. (Российская Федерация)**

*Шикуля Анна Александровна / Shikulya Anna – бакалавр,
кафедра межкультурной коммуникации и методики преподавания иностранных языков,
Институт филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации,
Южный федеральный университет, г. Ростов-на-Дону*

Abstract: *modern processes of cross-cultural communication, influence of globalization and their connections with international relations and politics are brought into focus. The United States is chosen as an example of these phenomena.*

Аннотация: *в центре внимания данной статьи – процессы межкультурной коммуникации, влияние глобализации и их связь с международными отношениями и политикой. Данные явления рассматриваются на примере Соединенных Штатов Америки.*

Keywords: *cross-cultural communication, international relations, politics, culture.*

Ключевые слова: *межкультурная коммуникация, международные отношения, политика, культура.*

Now it is the time of globalization – important and complicated period for all mankind. For the first time ever cooperation of civilizations and cultures is extremely massive and intense, expressing the main tendency of social progress. However, it is clear that intercourse between countries includes not only collaboration, but also various in itself conflicts. The necessity of international, interethnic, interreligious dialogue is becoming obvious under these conditions. It can take any form, but the actual objective is creating a new culture of interpersonal communication based on the standards of international law, moral principles of humanism and social justice. The problem of intercultural communication takes on independent significance in terms of international relations, which in their turn, on the one hand, represent a bright example of social development on different stages, but at the same time reflect numerous peculiarities of intercultural phenomenon. History of cross-cultural communication proves that it is directly connected with the development of political, commercial and cultural relations. It is history of international relations where we can trace the establishment of various approaches and forms of cross-cultural communication, which appeared under the influence of numerous factors. First of all, we should recall such a branch of cross-cultural communication as trading, which is considered to be a founder of diplomacy. Middle Ages was the time of mending of diplomatic and trading fences and history of Venice, Rome, Florence can be a spectacular example of it. Development of trading relations fostered dynamic, extensive exchange. People got acquainted with cultural achievements of other nations, which encouraged cross-cultural communication both on transnational and non-state levels.

Cultural ties played an important role in the development of political dialogue and later on often contributed to changes in political climate. Thus, for instance, fence mending between the USA and PRC started with «ping-pong diplomacy» and relations between the USSR and military regimes of Latin American countries were more or less stable mainly due to road tours of Soviet performers. Nevertheless, it is necessary to mention that despite all the economic and political interests, cultural ties have been never regarded independently from international relations until recently. During the long period of time they were complicated by peculiarities of ethnic, spiritual traditions and religion. Sometimes cultural differences became an obstacle on the way to successful diplomacy. It turned out to be difficult to overcome these contradictions because of deeply-rooted beliefs in superiority of one or another culture. The nineteenth century was a turning point in the development of international relations because in that time some traditions of diplomatic protocol were formed.

Cross-cultural communications in the field of international relations is also directly linked to the acute problems, which arise in terms of culture and international humanitarian relations. The problem of cultural expansion can be considered as one of them. We cannot but mention that American culture is the leading one nowadays: movie industry, music industry, products, cafes, devices, software and so on and so forth. American popular culture remains pre-eminent nowadays and it leads to commercialization of spiritual life. The immense influence of American culture disrupts morality and dissolves unique ethnic identities of other countries. Because of it other nations are forced to sideline their care about spiritual life of people in preference to solve economic, financial, scientific and technical and other problems triggered by globalization at first.

Another aspect of cross-cultural communication which is associated with international relations is issues of political communications and development of country's positive image. Such a phenomenon is brightly manifested in geopolitical strategy of the United States. To have a closer look at it, we should mention the theory of American political scientist - Joseph Nye. He offers two kinds of powers, which contribute to the supremacy

of any country, including the USA. The first one – «soft power» rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others. He supposes that it implies the capacity of striving others to have the same results, which are beneficial for us [5]. «Soft power» is a way to achieve something through voluntary participation of partners, without any kind of enforcement, relying on shared with another subject values. It is opposed to «hard power» which denotes a set of political pressure means for a definite mode of behavior on the world stage (including military, economic, diplomatic ones). This kind of power is based on threats, intimidation and inducement. Hard and soft powers are related because they are both aspects of the ability to achieve one's purpose by affecting the behavior of others [4]. By contrast with presidential administration of George Bush, the one of Barack Obama placed their stake on «soft power» instead of «hard» one. It is obvious that the United States has not desisted from the use of military force, but nowadays their focus is on creating a positive image abroad, strengthening and development of allied relations, creation of new alliances and mending of cultural ties. Thus, in National security strategy of the United States of 2010 it was mentioned what was necessary for forming of international order which corresponded to American interests. It included support for democratic institutions in new democracies, human rights protection, support of information dissemination, strengthening of food supply security in the world, assistance in health promotion of people, dealing with humanitarian crises. The whole chapter in this document is named «Strengthen the Power of Our Example» [3].

American academic Walter Russell Mead by reference to the conception of Joseph Nye introduces the notion of «sticky power», which implies those institutions and mechanisms (primarily, economic), which attract other countries to partnership with the USA and then involve in their sphere of influence [1]. This kind of power as well as «soft» one ensures the supremacy of the USA. And it is underlined in the best way possible in National security strategy of the United States of 2015, which has absolutely different character as the previous document. Obama's administration manages to convey a central theme: restraint in the use of American power, combined with the establishment and maintenance of American 'leadership' and a 'rules-based international order' with liberal characteristics. This continues themes discussed in the first NSS, released in 2010 [6]. But this time they care less about the importance of cultural dialogue, cross-cultural communications and mutual help which are of great importance in international relation. Here we can see quite definite problems which can be solved only by the superpower of the USA: «Escalating challenges to cybersecurity, aggression by Russia, the accelerating impacts of climate change, and the outbreak of infectious diseases all give rise to anxieties about global security. We must be clear-eyed about these and other challenges and recognize the United States has a unique capability to mobilize and lead the international community to meet them» [2]. What is more, America underlines the importance of European partnership in terms of Russian sanctions: «In lockstep with our European allies, we are enforcing tough sanctions on Russia to impose costs and deter future aggression» [2]. It is a bright example of «sticky power», because it was America that initiated anti-Russian sanction, and then involved all European Union to follow their example. But the point is that US is much more stronger than European countries weakened by immigrant crisis and they are losing a lot because of this policy. Speaking of which, when the surge of immigrant came to Europe, the reaction of the USA was utterly moderate. State Department was silent about European events for a long time. On the one hand, it is clear – America is not a part of European Union. But on the other hand, why then do John Kerry and Barack Obama make announcements almost every day concerning situation in Russia, Ukraine or Greece? The answer is simple – it is beneficial for them to set EU against Russia and to support poor Ukraine or Greece only to place NATO bases as close as possible to «dangerous» and «aggressive» Russia. As a result, such political games disrupt all effective cross-cultural communications and mutually beneficial relations because countries practically fight in great powers competition because of which all spheres of life suffer and, of course, people cannot but feel it.

To sum up, cross-cultural communication in international relations can be called an important condition of political, economical and humanitarian partnership. Without regarding of main features of communication process, it becomes quite difficult to build up relationship in modern society both on personal and international levels. Unfortunately, through the example of the USA we can make a conclusion that not all countries are ready to keep intercultural communication up to the mark: international relations have turned into proxy and informational wars, when every side is trying to meanly deceive another one, smiling and pretending to be partners at the same time.

References

1. *Mead W. R. Power, Terror, Peace and War: America's Grand Strategy in a World at Risk.* New York: Vintage Books, 2005.
2. National security strategy of the United States. February 2015. [Electronic resource]. Available at: Washington, DC, 2015.
3. [Electronic resource]. Access: URL:https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy.pdf (Date of access: 20.06.2016).

4. National security strategy of the United States. May 2010. [Electronic resource]. Access: Washington, DC, 2010.
5. [Electronic resource]. Access: URL:http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf (Date of access: 20.06.2016).
6. *Nye J.* Obama's Foreign Policies Must Combine Hard and Soft Power. [Electronic resource]. Access: The Huffington Post website. URL: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joseph-nye/obamas-foreign-policies-m_b_147108.html (Date of access: 23.06.2016).
7. Nye J. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs Group, 2004.
8. *Parakilas J.* Obama's 'Strategic Patience' Remains Ill-Defined. Access: The Royal Institute of International Affairs' website. URL:<https://www.chathamhouse.org/About/Contact#sthash.3PtmOsDY.dpuf> (Date of access: 23.06.2016).