

## **SOME THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**

**Ravshan Khalilov\***

\*Master's Student,  
Faculty of International Relations and World Politics,  
Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies,  
UZBEKISTAN

**DOI: 10.5958/2249-7315.2021.00180.5**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*Public diplomacy plays an important role in the foreign policy of states. States may use public diplomacy to establish or develop bilateral or multilateral relations. This article reveals the theoretical foundations of public diplomacy, and political scientists' approaches to public diplomacy. At present, almost every country attempts to improve both economic and cultural as well as political relations with international subjects. To reach prospective purposes, states usually utilize a wide range of diplomatic and cultural techniques. Public diplomacy is one of the techniques that are commonly used by many states.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Public Diplomacy, Bilateral Relations, International Relations, "Soft" Power, "Hard" Power, Cultural Diplomacy, Joseph Nye, Official Diplomacy.*

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

At present, almost every country attempts to improve economic and cultural as well as political relations with international subjects. To reach prospective purposes, states usually utilize a wide range of diplomatic and cultural techniques. Public diplomacy is one of the techniques that are commonly used by many states. Moreover, in the information age, everyone or every country can publicly demonstrate their position or attitudes towards any political circumstances through mobile phones, social media, and social networks. In this case, globalization also plays a pivotal role in international relations. Because even minor issues or little information can entirely modify the whole public opinion in any country. As a result, various conflicts are emerging in the diverse edges of the world. Thanks to public diplomacy, most of the states show their desire to improve bilateral relations with countries and international organizations in a diplomatic way. This is also considered a peculiar feature of twenty-first-century international relations. Public diplomacy is still evolving gradually and being comprehensively studied by political scientists.

### **METHODS**

In this article systematic, logical-comparative analysis and historical methods have been adequately used.

### **RESULTS**

Public diplomacy is not a new theory. Although its origin is almost equal to the early statehood of human beings, public diplomacy was widely studied by political scientists around the mid-1960s. In the scientific sphere, we are likely to encounter a great number of definitions of the term of Public diplomacy. Edmund A. Gullion who was former Dean of the Fletcher School coined the term of Public diplomacy in 1965. He defined that "Public diplomacy" deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with those of another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those

whose job is communication, as between diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the processes of intercultural communications. "Central to Public Diplomacy (PD) is the transnational flow of information and ideas". (Rehman, 2015) [8] From this definition, we can understand that the primary features of public diplomacy are closely tied to international relations and foreign affairs. Moreover, it shows that public diplomacy is usually used by the government as a tool for impacting other countries.

On top of that diplomacy and its related theories are different from each other. Initially, after precisely defining each of the terms, it will be straightforward to comprehend public diplomacy. Political scientist, Nicholas J. Cull from the University of Southern California, provides a broad explanation of diplomacy and public diplomacy. He defines diplomacy as the mechanisms short of war deployed by an international actor to manage the international environment. Today, this actor may be a state, multi-national corporation, non-governmental organization, international organization, terrorist organization/stateless paramilitary organization, or other players on the world stage; traditional diplomacy is an international actor's attempt to manage the international environment through engagement with another international actor; public diplomacy is an international actor's attempt to manage the international environment through engagement with a foreign public. (Cull, 2009) [2]

From these explicit definitions, it can be seen that the primary aspect of diplomacy is to attempt to manage the international environment. However, as the public interferes in this process, we are likely to witness public diplomacy.

In addition, we can learn various definitions of public diplomacy from a wide range of references. For instance, "Public diplomacy is integral, in fact, to achieving both "soft" and "hard" power objectives, providing both the essential underpinning for actions and anticipating and explaining the consequences of actions. Effective public diplomacy provides the groundwork necessary between state and society for the acceptance and legitimacy of a country's policy actions and outreach. Effective public diplomacy can make the crucial difference in the attraction, rejection, and perception of how a country, its people, and its policies can influence and alter others' attitudes and decisions." (Schuker, 2008) [9]

In this theory, it is clear that public diplomacy is considered as a means of influencing the other country through utilizing far softer power. However, softer it is, the main aim of Public diplomacy is to achieve the final goal by way of not showing negative aspects of policy.

What's more, we can learn different definitions of Public Diplomacy from much more generally written books. One of them is Encyclopedia Britannica. In this resource, public diplomacy is given a clear definition: "Public diplomacy, also called people's diplomacy, is any of various government-sponsored efforts aimed at communicating directly with foreign publics. Public diplomacy includes all official efforts to convince targeted sectors of foreign opinion to support or tolerate the government's strategic objectives. Methods include statements by decision-makers, purposeful campaigns conducted by government organizations dedicated to public diplomacy, and efforts to persuade international media to portray official policies favorably to foreign audiences". (Britannica., n.d.) From this definition, it is clear that public diplomacy is conducted between a couple of countries' populations, governments, or other government-supported organizations that play a crucial role in impact on another foreign state through public diplomacy. Another definition is given by Alan K. Henrikson Professor of diplomatic history: "Public Diplomacy may be defined, simply, as the conduct of international relations by governments through public communications media and dealings with a wide range of nongovernmental entities (political parties, corporations, trade associations, labor unions, educational institutions, religious organizations, ethnic groups, and so on including influential individuals) to influence the politics and actions of other governments". (Rehman, 2015) [8] It provides a brief explanation of public

diplomacy that also gives us a sense of influence on other subjects.

As we glance at types of public diplomacy, it will be a little easier to understand its significant inner features. According to Encyclopedia Britannica, There are two basic kinds of public diplomacy. The first is branding, or cultural communication, in which the government tries to improve its image without seeking support for an immediate policy objective. States use branding strategies to foster a better image of themselves in the world. Ideally, branding creates general goodwill and facilitates cooperation across a variety of issues. It also helps to maintain long-term alliance relationships and undermine enemy propaganda. The second type of public diplomacy includes various strategies designed to facilitate more rapid results—a category sometimes called political advocacy. Whereas branding is meant to affect long-term perceptions, political advocacy campaigns use public diplomacy to build foreign support for immediate policy objectives. Foreign publics may be encouraged to support or oppose the leaders of other states. Sometimes states need to quickly convince foreign audiences to support costly military alliance strategies. Foreign leaders may want to cooperate with alliance plans but fear domestic reprisal for agreeing to unpopular actions. Under these conditions, public diplomacy may help those leaders cooperate by reducing the threat of backlash at home. (Britannica., n.d.) Without a doubt, each of the types of Public diplomacy indeed has its strong aspects.

Moreover, political scientist Hans Tuch defines public diplomacy as a communication process of the government of a country with foreign audiences, trying to explain his ideas and ideals of the respective nation, its institutions, and its culture as well as national interests and policies. (Elena GURGU, 2016) [3].

Besides that, another political scientist Joseph S. Nye also explained the practical aspect of public diplomacy: “Public diplomacy is an instrument that governments use to mobilize these resources to communicate with and attract the publics of other countries, rather than merely their governments. Public diplomacy tries to attract by drawing attention to these potential resources through broadcasting, subsidizing cultural exports, arranging exchanges, and so forth. But if the content of a country’s culture, values, and policies are not attractive, public diplomacy that “broadcasts” them cannot produce soft power. It may produce just the opposite”. (NYE, 2008, p. 95) [5] It is clear from that definition that Public diplomacy is a much more powerful tool to affect another political subject. Unless it is wisely utilized, it will bring about more serious outcomes like wars between two countries and disruption of relations.

On the other hand, cultural diplomacy is also widely considered as the main part of international relations. However, it is highly important to find out the primary discrepancy between public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy. In this circumstance, we should clarify the meaning of cultural diplomacy. A definition from an earlier era describes cultural diplomacy as: “the act of successfully communicating to others complete comprehension of the life and culture of a people”. (Lenczowski, 2011, p. 160) [4] In the other definition, cultural diplomacy is defined as "the use of various elements of culture to influence foreign publics, opinion makers, and even foreign leaders. These elements comprehend the entire range of characteristics within a culture: including the arts, education, ideas, history, science, medicine, technology, religion, customs, manners, commerce, philanthropy, sports, language, professional vocations, hobbies, etc., and the various media by which these elements may be communicated.” (Lenczowski, 2011, p. 163) [4] It is clear that the primary aim of both cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy is to influence other countries' policies indirectly and form a positive opinion on the state which is using these types of diplomacy. Apart from similarities between public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy, political scientists namely Kevin Mulcahy and Harv Feigenbaum provided information on the difference. According to them, the difference between public and cultural diplomacy is that public diplomacy is moving towards disseminating information and promoting policies in the short term, and the cultural diplomacy is establishing long-term relationships. (Elena GURGU, 2016) Although there

is a difference between public and cultural diplomacy, states usually use them to enhance their position in the international arena. For this reason, if both public and cultural diplomacy are openly politicized by international actors, the cultural values of some states are likely to remain on the brink of extinction.

As Mark Leonard highlights, the implementation of public diplomacy can result in the following impacts: first, the increase of people's familiarity with the "sender" country (the citizens start thinking more positively about it, tackling any negative view); second, the increase of respect for the country (creates positive perceptions); third, the understanding of the values and the open invitation for a productive dialogue (for example, by encouraging foreign citizens to see the country as the most attractive destination for tourism, studies, or even for education by distance learning) (Petropoulos, 2011, p. 17) Although the implementation of public diplomacy creates a positive impression on the other state, its outcome might negatively influence on the economy, social life, and culture. For this reason, any country should be much more attentive to establishing strong relations with foreign subjects that offer interest-free agreements or various grants for students in order not to experience different repercussions in the future.

Public diplomacy is a highly broad range of science. Therefore, each of the components of public diplomacy should be investigated by political scientists. In this case, the goals of public diplomacy play an important part in forming a general understanding of it. Different scholars mentioned different goals; nevertheless, the underlined theme remains the same.

- introducing or familiarizing the country to a foreign targeted audience.
- To exhibit a positive image of the country.
- To engage and influence the foreign public.
- To influence people.
- To respond to any kind of propaganda
- To correct the misunderstandings and misinterpretations. (Rehman, 2015, p. 52)

According to Mark Leonard "Public diplomacy is not simply delivering a message to an audience—it is about getting a result" (Pamment, 2016, p. 60). This definition clarifies the exact purpose of public diplomacy. Because some countries do not start negotiations with other countries before accurately assessing the benefits and damages of building relationships.

In addition to the definitions shown above, there are others that help to clarify the meaning of public diplomacy. "Public diplomacy can be defined as the entire array of diplomatic instruments – cultural, educational, political, ideological, information, and intelligence – designed to have relations with, and influence over, foreign societies, foreign publics, and foreign opinion leaders, with the ultimate effect of influencing foreign opinion. Cultural diplomacy, or the use of various elements of culture to influence foreign publics, opinion makers, and even foreign leaders, is arguably the most visible, potentially influential, and therefore the significant aspect of public diplomacy" (Lenczowski, 2011, p. 19). [4] From this definition, we can summarize that public diplomacy is primarily performed by governments to influence other states' strategic plans or decisions. On the one hand, this kind of attitude towards public diplomacy by countries politicizes even educational relations. On the other hand, the country which wisely uses public diplomacy might have an opportunity to improve its economy and spread its culture to foreign states as well.

Moreover, Joseph Nye mentioned three dimensions of Public Diplomacy, and all are important:

- Daily Communications: At this stage, the government tries to explain the daily domestic and foreign policy decisions. It occurs within hours or days. It can be a press conference or policy brief by the government. It's a short-term arrangement.

- Strategic Communication: It aims to develop a theme; it is for weeks, months, or even years.
- Lasting Relationships: It develops over a decade and involved long-term planning. It involves scholarships, exchange programs, or media campaigns. It's long-term planning. (Rehman, 2015, p. 52) [8]

Each of the dimensions is indeed being seen in our daily life. The final dimension is popularly being utilized by governments through a wide range of grants.

At the same time, different approaches to public diplomacy play an important role in studying theory. Nicholas J Gull has identified, listening, advocacy, cultural

Diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, international broadcasting, and psychological warfare as the core approaches to public diplomacy. Bruce Gregory has mentioned understanding, planning, engagement, and advocacy as the core approaches and concepts of public diplomacy (Rehman, 2015, p. 54) [8]. More accurately, advocacy represents the high priority that public diplomacy sets on ensuring that the foreign public has an accurate image of the country rather than an image based on inaccurate facts. Cultural diplomacy and cultural exchange visits are important tools of public diplomacy. Because a government can be promoted abroad and influence public opinion through cultural traditions and events. Regarding cultural exchanges among students, the students can be an excellent ambassadors for the hosting country, refuting any existing negative stereotypes (Petropoulos, 2011, p. 19) [7]. Listening is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by collecting and collating data about the public and their opinions overseas and using that data to redirect its policy or its wider public diplomacy approach accordingly. This has traditionally been an element of each constituent practice of public diplomacy, with advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange, and broadcasting agencies each attending to their audience and opinion research. Exchange diplomacy in public diplomacy may be defined as an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by sending its citizens overseas and reciprocally accepting citizens from overseas for a period of study and/or acculturation. International broadcasting is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by using the technologies of radio, television, and the Internet to engage with foreign publics. Commercial international broadcasting may still be regarded as public diplomacy, but it is public diplomacy for the corporate parent, which can warp its output or insist on rigid objectivity according to its desired ends. In an international information context, psychological warfare can be defined as an actor's use of communication to achieve an objective in wartime, usually through communication with the enemy's public. Typical objectives include the breaking of the enemy's will to resist or facilitate surrender or dissent within enemy ranks. (Cull, 2009, pp. 19-21) [2]

International relations is the discipline that has been developing since initial foreign relations formed between independent states. However, the actors of world policy are also enlarging since globalization is accelerating different relations between states and international organizations. Besides that the actors of public diplomacy play a crucial role in international relations. Traditionally, diplomacy and foreign policy are considered as a state domain. Public Diplomacy was also under the jurisdiction of the state. With globalization, non-state actors sprout with global agendas and interests. As defined by The National Intelligence Office of the United States: "Non-sovereign entities that exercise significant economic, political, or social power and influence at a national and international level (National Intelligence Office, 2007)". As a result, non-state actors of international relations start playing a significant role in world policy. Because they are usually supported by the public, different environmental actions. The major strategy of non-state actors is to rely on soft power. Not only has this, the non-state actors like NGOs, multinational co-operations, think tanks, religious groups, but transnational diaspora communities do also have the clear objectives, resources, means of communication, networking abilities, and human expertise to effectively carry out Public Diplomacy activities and strategies. All the major capitals in this

world have the head offices of NGOs and INGOs. Talking about the role of non-state actors in Public Diplomacy Nye said that: "These flexible nongovernmental organizations and networks are particularly effective in penetrating states without regard to borders. Because they often involve citizens who are well placed in the domestic politics of several countries, such networks can focus the attention of the media and governments on their issues" (Rehman, 2015, p. 53). [8]

Although some countries broadly use public diplomacy to impact other states efficiently, there are a few structural problems with it. Political scientists have identified and clearly explained what these problems are. Three principal structural problems lie at the root of the inadequacy of strategic attention devoted to public diplomacy: The first is the absence of institutional loci with sufficient cultural commitment to public diplomacy and with concomitantly sufficient influence within the overall foreign policy apparatus of the government. The absence of any centralized strategic planning and coordination of public diplomacy functions at the senior levels of the various foreign affairs and defense agencies in general and among their various public diplomacy offices, in particular, is second. The third is the absence of systematic strategic integration of public diplomacy with other arts of statecraft (Lenczowski, 2011, p. 59). [4]

## **DISCUSSION**

To sum up, public diplomacy is seen as one of the main tools of current international relations. Because, unlike traditional world policy, nowadays countries are not capable of using "hard power" to influence on another nation. For this reason by taking into account the current political environment, political actors primarily would prefer emphasizing on public diplomacy as a tool of policy. Thus, the importance of public diplomacy and "soft power" is gradually growing around the world in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Besides that several factors support the significance of public diplomacy in international relations:

First of all, it is difficult to perceive the positive and negative impacts of public diplomacy on countries where political science did not develop enough. Because countries implement their policy towards developing states without any obstacles. As a consequence, it is likely to occur various political instabilities around the world. Moreover, public diplomacy creates an opportunity for states to improve both bilateral and multilateral relations in the international arena. Lastly, public diplomacy also positively serves countries to develop economic integrity.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Britannica, Encyclopedia Public Diplomacy. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/public-diplomacy>
2. Cull NJ. Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past. University of Southern California 2009. P.12.
3. Elena Gurgu A D. The Role of Public Diplomacy in International Relations in Full Process of Globalization. 2016;2.
4. Lenczowski J. Full Spectrum Diplomacy and Grand Strategy Reforming the Structure and Culture of U.S. Foreign Policy. 2011.
5. Nye JS. Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. Annals, Aapss, 2008.
6. Pamment J. British Public Diplomacy and Soft Power Diplomatic Influence and the Digital Revolution. Palgrave Macmillan. 2016.
7. Petropoulos S. Public Diplomacy Is Alternative Diplomacy In Foreign Affairs Issues. Greek Public Diplomacy: Capabilities and Perspectives. Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School. 2011.

8. Rehman DS. Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm. Margalla Papers, 2015. P.47.
9. Schuker JA. The Challenge of Public Diplomacy and the Role of Government. 2008. <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/challenge-public-diplomacy-and-role-government>