

# POLITICKÉ VEDY / POLITICAL SCIENCES

Časopis pre politológiu, najnovšie dejiny, medzinárodné vzťahy, bezpečnostné štúdiá / Journal for Political Sciences, Modern History, International Relations, security studies

URL časopisu / URL of the journal: <http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk>

**Autor(i) / Author(s):** Jana Peterková  
**Článok / Article:** The Impact of the EU Accession on the Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy – The Czech Case  
**Vydavateľ / Publisher:** Fakulta politických vied a medzinárodných vzťahov – UMB Banská Bystrica / Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations – UMB Banská Bystrica

**Odporúčaná forma citácie článku / Recommended form for quotation of the article:**

PETERKOVÁ, J. 2017. The Impact of the EU Accession on the Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy – The Czech Case. In *Politické vedy*. [online]. Roč. 20, č. 2, 2017. ISSN 1335 – 2741, s. 8-26. Dostupné na internete: <http://www.politickevedy.fpvmv.umb.sk/archiv-vydani/2017/2-2017/jana-peterkova.html>.

Poskytnutím svojho príspevku autor(i) súhlasil(i) so zverejnením článku na internetovej stránke časopisu Politické vedy. Vydavateľ získal súhlas autora / autorov s publikovaním a distribúciou príspevku v tlačenej i online verzii. V prípade záujmu publikovať článok alebo jeho časť v online i tlačenej podobe, kontaktujte redakčnú radu časopisu: [politicke.vedy@umb.sk](mailto:politicke.vedy@umb.sk).

By submitting their contribution the author(s) agreed with the publication of the article on the online page of the journal. The publisher was given the author's / authors' permission to publish and distribute the contribution both in printed and online form. Regarding the interest to publish the article or its part in online or printed form, please contact the editorial board of the journal: [politicke.vedy@umb.sk](mailto:politicke.vedy@umb.sk).

## THE IMPACT OF THE EU ACCESSION ON THE DOMESTIC DIMENSION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY – THE CZECH CASE

Jana Peterková\*

### ABSTRACT

The European Union currently faces many problems, including its image among the public in member states. This article goes back in time to the Grand Accession from 2004 to remember a rather positive approach of candidate countries to the EU. The aim is to investigate whether and how the whole movement has influenced public diplomacy activities as it represented a significant political impulse in many candidate countries. This study examines the pre-accession strategy and later activities at the strategic documents level. Using the documentary analysis, text focuses on the occurrence of some terms associated with good image and presentation in documents as well as changes in conceptual apparatus that was used. The results show that there is a difference in influence of the pre-accession strategy on the information and communication strategy on European affairs and public diplomacy or general presentation abroad. Differences arise primarily in the terminology used, the frequency of documents adopted and the extent to which they are being met. Each area is also managed by another government body. Principles of the campaign and communication on European affairs with domestic public became an integral part of domestic information policy and the occurrence of its documents has intensified over time. On the other hand, general presentation and good image of a country, even if presented in concepts of foreign policy and government statements, until recently has had almost no practical impact on the activities of state authorities. It is nevertheless considered an impulse for the authorities to give a broader reflection on the good name of the country abroad.

**Key words:** public diplomacy, domestic dimension, actors, European Union, EU accession, communication strategy

### Introduction

The European Union's diplomacy and its influence on the member states are quite often discussed in the literature (Hug, 2013; Avery, Faber, Schmidt, 2009; Archick, 2017). However, the topic of domestic dimension of public diplomacy is

---

\* Ing. Jana Peterková, PhD. is an Assistant Professor at the Jan Masaryk Centre for International Relations, Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Prague, W. Churchill Sq. 4, 130 67 Prague 3, Czechia, e-mail: peter@vse.cz.

not the same case. The European Union is perceived as a normative power entity, based on formulated and shared principles, ideas, and values (Michalski in Melissen, 2005, p. 124-144; see also Manners, 2002). The process of enlarging the European Union is considered to be one of examples of spreading such ideas and values to a broader area on the European continent. This process represents, among others, an interesting aspect of public diplomacy. On the level of the EU, the domestic dimension is devoted to domestic communication between European institutions and member states' public, and the foreign dimension is represented by the EU communication toward the candidate countries and third parties outside the EU. On the level of candidate countries, we speak about the communication between the candidate countries and the foreign public in its foreign dimension and among governments and their public at the domestic level. An interesting view can be reached by looking at the domestic public diplomacy of candidate countries following EU internal communication standards in the existing member states when domestic and external dimensions are mixed.

This article looks at the process of the fifth enlargement from the public diplomacy perspective and analyses the domestic dimension of this process from the point of view of the candidate country. Its aim is to show whether, in what dimensions, and how deeply the entry into the EU influenced the further development of public diplomacy in the candidate country. The Czech Republic was chosen as a young state, as a candidate country with almost no experience with state presentation or public diplomacy before the accession to the EU.

The first part discusses the nature of public diplomacy and its domestic dimension. The second part brings a perspective on the area of the internal dimension of public diplomacy in the European Union's policy and practice, and focuses it primarily on the expression of strategic documents in the period preceding the 5<sup>th</sup> wave of enlargement in 2004. The third part describes some important documents and actors that affected Czech access to the process of European integration. General observations are replenished by the example of the strategy before entry into the EU, along with its goals and dimensions. The last part of this text deals with the influence that the attitude of the EU had on the further development of public diplomacy in the Czech Republic.

The article uses a method of documentary analysis based on the approach to strategic documents as a part of the model of strategy – actors – tools that can be used to analyse the system of public diplomacy (Peterková, 2008). Text focuses on the occurrence of some terms associated with presentation in documents as well as changes in conceptual apparatus that was used.

## 1 Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy

According to **Leonard**, “public diplomacy is about building relationships: understanding the needs of other countries, cultures and peoples; communicating our points of view; correcting misperceptions; looking for areas where we can find common cause.” (Leonard, 2002, p. 8) He also speaks about the image and reputation of a country as public goods that can create a positive or negative environment for individual activities. Public diplomacy activities should help to increase people’s familiarity with one’s country, increase people’s appreciation of one’s country, and, later engage with this entity and influence people to act in accordance with its values and principles (Leonard, 2002, pp. 9-10).

The domestic dimension can be introduced in the broad social context, connected to the modification of national environment and the international scene as well, e.g. the democratisation of foreign policy or the accumulation of the importance of public opinion (Huijgh, 2011). This has been mentioned as a discipline of *public affairs*. It means giving information to the domestic public about the diplomatic activities of their government and higher control of the domestic public over these activities. Its connection to public diplomacy is more about the internal communication of the government (as mentioned later). The aim of such communication is to inform the public and then to stimulate support of the public for the external activities of the government (Planning Group for Integration of USIA into the Dept. of State, 1997).

**Ken Heller** and **Liza Persson** see a difference between public affairs and public diplomacy in their core mission, which involves informing in the case of public affairs (PA) and influencing in the case of public diplomacy (PD) (Heller, Persson in Snow, Taylor, 2009). They also claim that PD “is strategic in itself,” while PA is not “in the classical sense of the word” (Heller, Persson in Snow, Taylor, 2009, p. 228).

The domestic aspect of public diplomacy can be seen through several facets. The first one concerns the very system of public diplomacy, i.e. what type of organisational structure has been chosen and how many interested actors have been involved. The second level relates to the exposure to the domestic public, to the effort to inform the public about foreign policy priorities and the reasons for it. The approval of the domestic public is now more important than ever in connecting to the role of public opinion. The next level goes even further to the involvement of local public in performing of support to

the foreign policy priorities and their connection to shared ideas and values of the public, of the country itself.

Also worth mentioning is the movement to domestic outreach, which is connected with deep societal changes and moves the meaning of the domestic dimension of public diplomacy from *public affairs*, e.g. giving information to create networks, to support civil society initiatives, and to create genuine dialog and long-term relationships (Huijgh, 2011, p. 66). Such a shift is also connected with the changes in the international environment mentioned above.

From the perspective of domestic actors, the system of public diplomacy can be divided into several basic levels. The first one is the level of government, followed by central and local government, NGOs, private sector, and the public. As the state administration is still the key actor in the area of public diplomacy, the following division is seen from its perspective. However, this division is not conceived of as strictly hierarchical, but it serves mainly to clarify the stakeholders.

An effective system of management at the state level is a precondition for efficient operation of the whole system. Only then it is possible to extend the “national network” of public diplomacy activities to self-government and to non-state actors such as private firms or non-governmental organisations. How deep the interestedness and collaboration of different public diplomacy actors is differs on a case-by-case basis and also depends, for example, on the actual development of state administration. An internal system of collaboration between the state administration and the private sector or non-governmental organisations has to be defined very precisely, as does the extent of coordination.

Non-state domestic actors and their positive influence on public diplomacy campaigns are also often mentioned in connection to politically sensitive issues where state activities, especially by great powers, are often suspected of deceitful reasons for their campaigns. Non-state actors (La Porte, 2012) bring a taste of fair-mindedness in their work. **Jozef Bátora** presented the idea that to succeed, public diplomacy needs to attract participants at the domestic level as well as among the foreign public (Bátora, 2005). With respect to public diplomacy at the governmental level, especially abroad, the positive impact of the non-state actors involved is very often mentioned with regard to the operation and the perceived objectivity of the disseminated information. This question refers foremost to the system of creation and the implementation of procedures through which foreign policy is performed. The question is whether

the system is centralised, involving only the state, or if there are also other entities, non-state participants (private entities or non-governmental organisations), and the degree to which they have been involved.

The idea of non-governmental actor activity in the field of public diplomacy is mainly positive, due to their longer power distance (Gonesh, Melissen, 2005). However, their impact on a country's public diplomacy goals does not need to be positive in all cases. An important circumstance can be the harmony of political priorities between the state on one hand and, e.g., civil society organisations on the other. The issue is whether such harmony exists or not. If not, the revelation of such disharmony, e.g. on social networks such as Facebook or Twitter, can have a very devastating effect on a state's public diplomacy goals.

The other level is associated with exposure to the domestic public to become informed about the performance of foreign policy and about the state's activities abroad. For a long time, foreign policy and public diplomacy were not at the centre of attention of the domestic public. Now, thanks to all changes mentioned above, the situation is changing. The rising power of public opinion and the strong ability of the media to strengthen or damage intended diplomatic activity force the need to attract the domestic public regarding foreign policy issues. The government wants to or has to inform its public, institutions, and media about its foreign policy priorities and about what the government, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or other involved institutions want to do.<sup>1</sup>

The involvement of the local public and its contribution to the presentation of the country abroad might contribute greatly toward the final success. Active demonstration of the values presented is very important (The New Public Diplomacy, 2012). The public should show that such values are shared and are part of its identity. The creation and presentation of the country's desired image must be much more than an effort by state authorities. Other participants such as non-governmental organisations, academia and universities, political parties, cultural operators, private companies, and many others can contribute. They all participate in creating the image of the country. It is not possible to ignore the role of the public in creating and promoting the image and different topics on the

---

<sup>1</sup> In the U.S. practice, such actions at home are referred to as "public affairs", whereas in the Czech Republic such activity was known as a "communication strategy". Now, from the ministerial point of view, it has become a part of domestic dimension of public diplomacy. It also means that the domestic public should, on a regular basis, be informed about foreign policy or about foreign activities of its officials in general.

international scene. Engaging the domestic public in the active demonstration of the presented values has significance for the evaluation and the success of public diplomacy activities.

## **2 Information and Communication Strategy of the EU**

The internal dimension of public diplomacy in the EU has a relatively long history, coupled with the efforts of European institutions to inform the public of the member states concerning European issues and their own activities. The aim is also to increase support for EU values and their enforcement, bring the Union closer to its citizens, and create a sense of shared values and a common identity. Roots of this process go to the beginning of the nineties and the adoption of Maastricht Treaty in 1992, which was not as easy as expected with France approving only by a small margin and Denmark accepting on a later date (Euractiv, 2009). One of the results of this unexpected situation was the adoption of the Interinstitutional Declaration of October 1993 intended to encourage the respect of the Commission, the European Parliament, and the Council to more democratic principles and transparency in their work. They agreed on more openness and public nature in their work. These three key institutions, because of their legislative power, are also the main actors of public diplomacy during the 5<sup>th</sup> wave of EU enlargement.

Because the communication and information aspect of the European integration was formerly evaluated as unsatisfactory, the European Commission decided not to underestimate public opinion during the Eastern enlargement and, in 2000, adopted the Communications Strategy for Enlargement. The main target was to keep the public in candidate countries and member states informed to ensure their participation and their support of the enlargement. This document settled main principles and key objectives of communication in the forthcoming pre-accession campaign. (European Commission, 2000).

It is important, in this regard, to mention the terminology used during the pre-accession period. The Commission has consistently used the terms “communication” and “information policy.” According to the Communication Strategy for Enlargement, information means “the flow of facts and figures” and communication “the presentation of objective information in the form of key messages adapted to particular audiences” (European Commission, 2000, p. 4).

This strategy was composed as a framework document that presented a set of main communication goals for the Union during the pre-accession period.

The Commission put an emphasis on a decentralised approach at the levels of actors and target groups. As the key actor and coordinator, the Commission was responsible for generally applicable information and core messages. An important role was given to representatives in member states and delegations in candidate countries. The local political actors and non-state actors (business and industry, civil society) should also be involved in tailor-made information that is responsive to individual needs of particular settings.

The importance of such a strategic approach and of the role of different actors and their mutual cooperation has several aspects. On the one hand, a certain level of centralisation was needed to create unity of the European Union, defining the shared principles and values that characterize the European identity. These were expressed through some core messages and the key role of the European Commission. The motto of the EU, “United in diversity”, has symbolic value. Such a motto acknowledges the common background and shared values and at the same time different individualities of member states and their public and of course their different needs. Different perspectives are connected with different actors involved in the whole process from European institutions, individual representatives and delegations, and also local actors (state or non-state) with their specific target groups.

The public, as a target group in general, was first divided into two groups – member states and candidate countries – where each of them had specific needs. According to their different development in history, the candidate countries were divided into the Central and Eastern European countries and Malta, Cyprus, and Turkey as a special group (European Commission, 2000).

The contribution of this strategy and its close connection to public diplomacy and its domestic outreach lies exactly in this decentralised approach and in close cooperation between the Commission and national actors at the state and non-state level, and among these actors at the national, regional, or local level. All these connections together, created at different levels, established varied horizontal networks (Zaharna, 2007). Such decentralisation can be seen in close connection to essential societal changes and the growing importance of public opinion. The exposure to domestic public, to inform them about main principles and general values of European integration was not enough. The involvement was needed because of the active participation of the public in the whole process of the European enlargement.

In 2001, the Commission delivered a White Paper on European Governance, where communication of European institutions and the need for

increasing openness in their work was also mentioned. Open and credible communication was identified and emphasized as a precondition for more effective European governance (Commission, 2001). Communication was also detected as a third track of the enlargement process after the pre-accession strategies in candidate countries and the accession negotiations (European Commission, 2004).

One year later, the Commission introduced an evaluation of the Communications Strategy called "Explaining Enlargement" (DG Enlargement Information Unit, 2002), which included detailed information about existing projects, instruments, and public opinion results. In the member states, a relatively low level of knowledge was identified. In CEE countries, a reduction of general post-1989 enthusiasm was identified along with a clearer calculation of interests concerning EU membership (DG Enlargement Information Unit, 2002). To meet all the needs mentioned in this evaluation, the Commission and its counterparts made some changes for the next period beginning in 2002, when a general information campaign was transformed to a more specific approach according to the different needs of different groups among the actors and target groups as well. Responsibility was given to national governments to inform their citizens and to explain the process of enlargement and its consequences (DG Enlargement Information Unit, 2002).

Cooperation was needed with civil society and with the media to ensure that all necessary information for the public in both member states and candidate countries was provided before the accession referenda. After the first evaluation (mentioned above), an updated version was issued each month until December 2003 regarding the progress in communication about the enlargement in every candidate country (European Commission, 2004). Different elements were mentioned, including public opinion, media coverage, networking events, and instruments used to fulfil the strategy's aims, such as press conferences, and information activities such as seminars or workshops, etc. The Commission observed the development very carefully at every step because of the role of the public in accession referenda and the importance of successful enlargement for further development of the European idea (DG Enlargement Information Unit, 2002).

### **3 Communication to the Domestic Public – Czech Inspiration by the EU**

The preparation for accession to the EU became a very important moment for the Czech state administration. There was a broad political agreement among different political parties in the Czech Republic that accession to the EU was the only possibility way to restore the place of the Czech Republic in the international community. The referendum had symbolic significance. The positive result could be interpreted as a final point of the transition period and confirmation of the new and democratic orientation of the Czech Republic.

During the time of negotiations, many candidate countries' governments also realised that it was inevitable for them to present the EU, the process of integration, and its positive consequences to the domestic public. In the Czech Republic, such a need had been experienced since the mid-1990s (MFA CR, 2007). The main domestic political reason was the plebiscite to decide on the entry to the EU. A need was also discovered to present the state as a prospective new member state (democratic, safety, etc.) that had a lot to offer and to show its positive (reshaped) image to the foreign public in EU member states. A low level of knowledge about the candidate countries and about the process of enlargement and its real consequences for concrete issues was identified.

The accession to the EU was declared as one of the most important foreign political priorities with consequences for the society as a whole. From this point of view, preparation of the strategy on how to communicate the possible membership to the public was a general political task with strong foreign policy dimension and the communication strategy was developed to fulfil this aim. The main political actor was the Government and its bodies, including the Government Committee for European Integration. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was chosen as the coordinator a key managing subject for the communication. Later, in 2001, the Interdepartmental Coordination Commission for Fulfillment, which handled the communication strategy of the Czech Republic before joining the European Union, was established as a coordination body for the whole campaign.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was chosen as the coordinator of this strategy because of the foreign affairs dimension of the whole process. The strategy was in preparation since 1997 and was also divided on its foreign and domestic part according to its target groups to foreign and domestic public.

As a timeline, the strategy was divided into several phases. The first one was the preparation phase, which took place from 1998-1999, which was then followed by a phase that employed a broader information campaign aimed at the general public (from 2000 until approximately six months prior to the plebiscite) primarily prepared and realised by the Communication Strategy Department at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). However, at the same time, special projects targeting specific target groups were realised. It was one of the basic principles of the strategy to combine the national and targeted impact of its activities. The last phase was supposed to start after the accession and to be devoted to regular information about European issues (Chatardová, 2001).

The whole strategy was later implemented, on the basis of the Government Resolution No. 974, from 26. 9. 2001 (VLÁDA ČR, 2001), with the aim to perform the two main tasks mentioned above, i.e. to inform the domestic constituency about the EU and to present the Czech Republic to the EU. At this point, the strategy can be seen (in its domestic dimension) as a typical public affairs project, as the principal aim was to inform the domestic public about the EU accession in an objective way. The goal was to present the European idea to domestic citizens so that it was attractive to them and to let them to decide according to their own opinions.

The main task in foreign promotion was to present the country as a very well-prepared, modern, and democratic state with high potential for becoming a rightful member of the community. Considerable effort was made in organising seminars, debates, round tables, press trips for foreign journalists in the Czech Republic, and many other social events that presented the Czech Republic as a candidate country for the EU. However, in contradiction to the understanding of the two-dimensional character of public diplomacy and the role of domestic non-state actors in this field (See Bátorá, 2005 or Huijgh, 2011), the external dimension of the communication strategy was seen mostly as the exclusive sphere of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its counterparts (Zahraniční politika České republiky v roce 2000, 2000) (diplomatic missions, EC Representations, other Czech governmental actors). There is no evidence (MFA CR, 2009) regarding the participation of civil society in conducting the external dimension of the communication strategy. The MFA should have cooperated mostly with the Commission Representations in individual member states and to coordinate its effort with them. Thus, this dimension can be mentioned in parallel to the traditional understanding of public diplomacy as a tool of achieving foreign policy goals performed mainly by diplomats (MFA CR, 2002). The external

strategy also used the MFA's Web page ([www.mzv.cz](http://www.mzv.cz)) and the official information source regarding Czech membership in the EU ([www.euroskop.cz](http://www.euroskop.cz); MFA CR, 2003a).

As **Adamcová** pointed out, emphasis was placed on communication to the domestic public. The reason, though not officially presented, was probably the referendum, which was to be held for the first time. Some sources (Europeum, 2002) also recommended a more influential than merely an informative campaign. The campaign was, in subsequent years, regularly monitored and evaluated (MFA, 2009). The strategy was proposed as a broad concept including different groups of citizens and networks of official and non-official institutions. It was labelled as a society-wide project, as a state or national strategy, not merely a governmental or a ministerial one. The multiplicity of actors and stakeholders was one of its fundamental conditions to reach different levels and groups in society (Chatardová, 2001). For example, at the EU summit in Göteborg (15.-16.6.2001), the candidate countries' communication activities were mentioned. Regarding the Czech case, the report stated the intention to engage civil society and Parliament as well in the debate (MFA CR, 2002).

The communication strategy took into account the experience gained from previous activities, recommendations made by PR agencies, the results of public opinion surveys, and the experience gained from other European countries' strategies. The Czech strategy was inspired also by the Finnish, Swedish, and Austrian experiences.

The main goal of the strategy was to give to everyone enough information about the European Union (Kubernát, 2000). The aim of the information campaign was to make people aware that such information was available and let citizens know where they could get it. The tone of the campaign was strictly neutral to give citizens the ability to decide whether they wanted to join the EU or not. It is interesting that, contrary to such a statement, the aim of the whole campaign was not merely to inform (as in public affairs) but also to influence the public to vote for the EU accession (Parlament ČR, Poslanecká sněmovna, 2002). In subsequent years, after 2001, the MFA implemented and regularly monitored the campaign (MFA CR, 2009). As the responsible authority, the MFA also stressed direct contact and dialog with the public, responding to diverse questions concerning the EU and future membership and its consequences. The MFA co-organised 20 regional and many local information centres, educational courses for teachers, 17 kinds of leaflets, and 14 different

brochures (MFA CR, 2004). Other ministries also had their own strategies concerning their related topic. The Czech Chamber of Commerce also participated, among other non-state actors, but their involvement was concerned mainly with the Czech public. (MFA CR, 2004) The Government Council for Non-Governmental Non-Profit Organizations also had a role in the complex structure and system of coordination (Government of the CR, 2009).

#### **4 The Impact of the Pre-accession Strategy on Further Development of Public Diplomacy in the Czech Republic**

The question is whether and how the process of accession to the EU and the communication policy applied by the EU and by candidate countries influenced the further development of public diplomacy and the relationship of the state to this area. At the level of the strategy and related documents, it is natural to use some strategic documents at the national level. Good examples of strategy papers represent at the national level a government statement or a foreign policy conception. Both of these documents express principles, tools and targets regarding the foreign policy and list the accession to the EU as one of its priorities.

In connection with the accession to the EU, the Czech government has also taken on a number of elements mentioned by the European Commission in its Communication Strategy for Enlargement (European Commission, 2000). The special strategy on how to communicate European affairs with its own public is one of them.<sup>2</sup> The following table brings the timeline of communication strategy and the aforementioned documents, where the concept of public diplomacy or expressions, such as presentation, promotion, or good name appear.

It is evident that the occurrence of these concepts has intensified over time. By simple comparison, it can be ascertained that the given words and, together with them, the themes in Czech strategy documents after the accession to the EU appear in every government program statement and in both foreign policy concepts (MFA CR 2011, 2015). Accession to the EU has fundamentally changed the concept of European information, where an ad hoc campaign has become a long-term strategy with regular updates. In 2005, the government also adopted a separate concept of a unified presentation of the Czech Republic.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Concept of Unified Presentation of the Czech Republic is mentioned as the only document devoted to presentation or to presenting a good image of the country abroad.

**Table 1. The Timeline of the Czech Strategy documents**

Czech Strategy documents				
	The Government Statement	The Concept of Foreign Policy	Communication Strategy Before/after the Accession of the Czech Republic to the EU. <sup>3</sup>	Concept of Unified Presentation of the Czech Republic
1997			x	
1998		x		
2002	x			
2003		x		
2004			x	
2005			x	x
2006	x		x	
2007	x		x	
2009	x		x	
2010	x		x	
2011		x	x	
2015		x	x	
2016			x	
2017			x	

Source: author

We can see also a great terminological difference between the Communication Strategy and other documents. The Strategy and its sequels after 2005 use terms like communication and information, but there is no evidence of public diplomacy or presentation of a good image. Terminology in government statements and foreign policy concepts also has been fine-tuned over time. Mostly this is evident in the formulations used in the foreign policy concepts.

<sup>3</sup> In 2005 it was the Communication strategy for informing the public about the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. Since 2005 the document is called Concept of information on European Affairs in the Czech Republic.

**Table 2. Expressions used in The Concept of Foreign Policy of the ČR (1998 – 2015)**

Year	Used Terms
1998	Public/non-state diplomacy. A positive image of the state abroad. Communication strategy. Promotion of the Czech Republic abroad.
2003	Targeted presentation of the Czech Republic abroad.
2011	Public diplomacy/targeted presentation/ to strengthen the positive image and perception of the Czech Republic abroad.
2015	Good reputation abroad/branding.

Source: author, using concepts of foreign policy of the CR (MFA CR, 1998; 2003b, 2011, 2015)

The former head of the communication strategy department at the MFA, Ms. **Adamcová**, stated that for the state administration, it was an exceptional experience and opportunity to try to coordinate presentation activity at the domestic and international levels as never before. The reach and demands of the EU campaign revealed existing imperfections and gaps in the internal and external communication of the state administration. It was discovered that there was an absolute lack of readiness of the state administration for such a duty, no coordination across the administration, and no systematic work at this level (Adamcová).

The first, and perhaps most important discovery, was that a state really needs a strategy on a long-term basis, and some concept of how to deal with its image, how to present its crucial aims, and how to ensure the support of its citizens to achieve its goals in domestic and foreign policy. We can see that in the timeline of the Communication Strategy (1997), then in the mention of presentation later in The Government Statement (2002) and collaterally in The Concept of Foreign Policy (1998, 2003).

We can see also a major division between the foreign presentation and its expression in the Concept (2005) and domestic information policy, concerning European affairs. Where the Concept of presentation has remained the only document, and the coordination of these activities is not without errors today, information on European affairs has become a matter of the utmost importance for the Office of the Government with an annual update. It is here that the influence of the EU's communication policy is most visible.

## **Conclusion**

The EU accession and communication strategies prepared before the accession by the EU and by the candidate countries represent excellent examples of the influence of the EU information policy on the domestic communication concerning European affairs. A long-term and continuous access was adopted by the Czech Government. Well-established communication strategy tools have become an integral part of a long-term concept. The influence of EU standards and initiatives on the communication strategies of candidate countries is evident. The only problem concerning the public diplomacy and presentation issue is that the information about European affairs became a strictly domestic issue with almost no relationship to and no impact on the area of public diplomacy. Czech authorities stated that the impact was in recognising the need for a long-term strategy and also using public opinion polls to determine the perception of the country abroad. The concept of unified presentation of the Czech Republic was used as an example. Even if the ambitions of this document have not been fulfilled in the future, its processing is, according to the authorities (Adamcová), also attributable to the influence of the communication strategy and the campaign before joining the EU.

Looking at key documents, it is possible to say that the approach of the European institutions has influenced the position of the Czech authorities in the area of information on European affairs. However, in relation to public diplomacy and country presentation, it is necessary to state that information on European affairs did not become a part of the domestic dimension of public diplomacy, but rather a matter of internal affairs of the domestic scene of the Czech state. It is likely that the communication strategy before the accession to the EU was indeed an impulse for the Czech authorities to give a broader reflection on the good name of the country abroad and its importance for the fulfilment of Czech interests. Unfortunately, the same dynamics of development as in the previous area have not been achieved in this area. In the development of the domestic dimension of public diplomacy and in the attitude of the state to the promotion of foreign countries, much remains to be done.

## **References:**

ADAMCOVÁ, J. *Vznik, základní úkoly a postupná realizace jednotné prezentace České republiky.* (manuscript).

- ARCHICK, K. 2017. *The European Union: Questions and Answers*. Congressional Research Service. RS21372. [online] Available at: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS21372.pdf>
- AVERY, G. – FABER, A. – SCHMIDT, A. (eds.) 2009. *Enlarging the European Union: Effects on the new member states and the EU*. Brussels: TransEuropean Policy Studies Association, 2009.
- BÁTORA, J. 2005. *Public diplomacy in small and medium-sized states: Norway and Canada*. Discussion Papers in Diplomacy. [online] The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael", 2005. Available at: [http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050300\\_cli\\_paper\\_dip\\_issue97.pdf](http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20050300_cli_paper_dip_issue97.pdf).
- CHATARDOVÁ, M. 2001. Komunikační strategie České republiky před vstupem do Evropské unie. (The communication strategy of the Czech Republic before the accession to the European Union.). In *Veřejná správa*. No. 25. [online] June 2001. Available at: <http://aplikace.mvcr.cz/archiv2008/casopisy/s/2001/0025/25konz1.html>
- COMMISSION. 2001. *European Governance – A White Paper*. COM. 428 final (2001/C 287/01).
- DG ENLARGEMENT INFORMATION UNIT. 2002. *Explaining enlargement*. A progress report on the communication strategy for enlargement. [online] March 2002. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/enlargement\\_process/past\\_enlargements/communication\\_strategy/explaining\\_enlargement\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/enlargement_process/past_enlargements/communication_strategy/explaining_enlargement_en.pdf)
- EURACTIV 2009. *EU communication policy*. [online] Available at: <http://www.euractiv.com/section/public-affairs/linksdossier/eu-communication-policy/>
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2000. *The communications strategy for enlargement*. [online] Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/enlargement\\_process/past\\_enlargements/communication\\_strategy/sec\\_737\\_2000\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/enlargement_process/past_enlargements/communication_strategy/sec_737_2000_en.pdf)
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2004. *The communication strategy for the fifth enlargement*. [online] Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/enlargement\\_process/past\\_enlargements/communication\\_strategy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/enlargement_process/past_enlargements/communication_strategy/index_en.htm)
- EUROPEUM. 2002. *Referendum o členství České republiky v Evropské unii* (Referendum on Membership of the Czech Republic in the European Union.) [online] April 2002. Available at: [http://old.europeum.org/doc/arch\\_eur/EPF\\_referendum.pdf](http://old.europeum.org/doc/arch_eur/EPF_referendum.pdf)

- GONESH, A. – MELISSEN, J. 2005. *Public diplomacy: Improving practice*. [online] The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael", December 2005. Available at: [http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20051000\\_cdsp\\_paper\\_diplomacy\\_5\\_gonesh\\_melissen.pdf](http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2005/20051000_cdsp_paper_diplomacy_5_gonesh_melissen.pdf).
- GOVERNMENT OF THE CR. 2009. *Non-Governmental Organizations*. [online] Available at: <http://www.vlada.cz/en/ppov/rnno/basic-information-45510/>
- HELLER, K. S. – PERSSON, L. M. 2009. The distinction between public affairs and public diplomacy. In SNOW, N. – TAYLOR, P. M. (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. New York: Routledge, 2009. ISBN 978-0-415-95302-3. pp. 225-232.
- HUG, A. (ed.) 2013. *Europe in the world: Can EU foreign policy make an impact?* London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2013. 58 p. ISBN 13:978-1-905833-25-2.
- HUIJGH, E. 2011. Changing tunes for public diplomacy: Exploring the domestic dimension. In *Exchange*. Fall 2011, pp. 62-73. [online] Available at: [http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2011/20111100\\_huijgh\\_exchange.pdf](http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2011/20111100_huijgh_exchange.pdf)
- KUBERNÁT, P. 2000. Komunikační strategie o evropských záležitostech před vstupem České republiky do Evropské unie. In *Inforum 2000*. 6. ročník konference o profesionálních informačních zdrojích. VŠE v Praze. May 23-25, 2000. [online] Available at: <http://www.inforum.cz/archiv/inforum2000/prednasky/komunikacnistr.htm>
- LA PORTE, T. 2012. *The legitimacy and effectiveness of non-state actors and the public diplomacy*. Concept. Paper presented at ISA Annual Convention, San Diego, April 1-4, 2012. [online] Available at: <http://files.isanet.org/ConferenceArchive/58816b94a39845d9a5b618ae52e7c80c.pdf>
- LEONARD, M. 2002. *Public diplomacy*. London: The Foreign Policy Centre, 2002. 183 p. ISBN 978-1903558133.
- MANNERS, I. 2002. Normative power Europe: A contradiction in terms? In *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Vol. 40, no. 2/2002, ISSN 1468-5965, pp. 235-58. Available at: <http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/mannersnormativepower.pdf>
- MFA CR. 2002. *Report on the foreign policy of the Czech Republic between January 2001 and December 2001*. Prague: MFA CR, 2002. 292 p. ISBN 80-86506-14-2.
- MFA CR. 2003a. *Report on the foreign policy of the Czech Republic between January 2002 and December 2002*. Prague: MFA CR, 2003. 317 p. ISBN 80-86506-29-0.

- MFA CR. 2003b. *Conceptual basis of the foreign policy of the Czech Republic for the 2003 - 2006 period*. [online] Available at: [www.mzv.cz/file/14172/ForeignPolicyII.doc](http://www.mzv.cz/file/14172/ForeignPolicyII.doc)
- MFA CR. 2004. *Report on the foreign policy of the Czech Republic between January 2003 and December 2003*. Prague: MFA CR, 2004. 314 p. ISBN 80-86506-46-0.
- MFA CR. 2007. Interview at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. November 2007.
- MFA CR. 2009. Reports and documents. 29.1.2009. [online] Available at: [http://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign\\_relations/reports\\_and\\_documents/index.html](http://www.mzv.cz/jnp/en/foreign_relations/reports_and_documents/index.html)
- MFA CR. 2011. *Conceptual basis of the foreign policy of the Czech Republic*. [online] Available at: [http://www.mzv.cz/file/681350/koncepce\\_zahranicni\\_politiky\\_2011\\_en.pdf](http://www.mzv.cz/file/681350/koncepce_zahranicni_politiky_2011_en.pdf)
- MFA CR. 2015. *Concept of the Czech Republic's foreign policy*. [online] Available at: [http://www.mzv.cz/file/1574645/Concept\\_of\\_the\\_Czech\\_Republic\\_s\\_Foreign\\_Policy.pdf](http://www.mzv.cz/file/1574645/Concept_of_the_Czech_Republic_s_Foreign_Policy.pdf)
- MICHALSKI, A. 2005. The EU as a soft power: The force of persuasion. In MELISSEN, J. (ed.) *New public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. ISBN 978-0230535541. pp. 124-144.
- PARLAMENT ČR. POSLANECKÁ SNĚMOVNA. 2002. 4. volební období. Zápis z 3. schůze Výboru pro evropskou integraci konané dne 26. září 2002 (Parliament of the Czech Republic Chambre of Deputies the 4th election term. Minute No. 3 Meeting of the Committee for European Integration held on 26 September 2002). [online] Available at: <https://www.psp.cz/sqw/text/text2.sqw?idd=2499>
- PETERKOVÁ, J. 2008. *Veřejná diplomacie*. Plzeň, Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, 2008. 202 p. ISBN 9788073801250.
- PLANNING GROUP FOR THE INTEGRATION OF USIA INTO THE DEPT: OF STATE. 1997. June 20. [online] Available at: <http://publicdiplomacy.org/pages/index.php?page=about-public-diplomacy>.
- The new public diplomacy: A greater role for domestic civil society?* 2012. [online] Available at: <http://publicandculturaldiplomacy6.wordpress.com/2012/04/23/the-new-public-diplomacy-a-greater-role-for-domestic-civil-society-6>.

- VLÁDA ČR, 2001. The government resolution No. 974, from 26. 9. 2001 to the Report on the progress and needs of the communication strategy of the Czech Republic before joining the European Union. [online] Available at: [https://kormoran.odok.cz/usneseni/usneseni\\_webtest.nsf/0/3779B843485BE289C12571B60070BBAE](https://kormoran.odok.cz/usneseni/usneseni_webtest.nsf/0/3779B843485BE289C12571B60070BBAE)
- ZAHARNA, R.S. 2007. The soft power differential: Network communication and mass communication in public diplomacy. In *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*. Vol. 2, no. 3, October 2007, ISSN 1871-1901, pp. 213-228.
- Zahraníční politika České republiky v roce 2000*. 2000. ČRo 6/RSE. 20. prosince 2000. [online] Available at: [http://zpravy.rozhlas.cz/cro6/stop/\\_zprava/zahranicni-politika-ceske-republiky-v-roce-2000--3472?print=1](http://zpravy.rozhlas.cz/cro6/stop/_zprava/zahranicni-politika-ceske-republiky-v-roce-2000--3472?print=1)