

UDC 327.82(045)

Kostyantyn BALABANOV,

*Rector of Mariupol State University,
Honorary Consul of the Republic of Cyprus to Mariupol,
corresponding member of the National Academy of
Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine,
Sc. D. (Political Science), Professor,
Head of the International Relations and
Foreign Policy Department of MSU;*

Mykola TROFYMENKO,

*Vice-Rector for Scientific and Pedagogical Affairs
(International Cooperation) of Mariupol State University,
PhD (Political Science), Associate Professor*

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AS A RESPONSE TO MODERN CHALLENGES

Due to intensified globalization and technologization, diplomacy is no longer an occupation for limited group of people. It has transformed developing a number of vectors such as culture, sports, energy, commerce, economy, publicity, society, etc. Each person becomes a diplomat in information and digital era. Modern diplomacy actively applies high technologies and acquires new possibilities due to electronic revolution. For instance, a Virtual Embassy of the United States was re-opened in Iran after having been closed for many years. Today, the mass media, that sometimes inform the public of certain events better than official diplomatic sources, experience unprecedented development. The growth of TNCs causes businesses to entice professionals from diplomatic agencies in order to strengthen their positions among the competitors and to influence the policies of certain states, etc.

Ardent liberals initiated discussion on whether the need in diplomats is justified, since businessmen can reach agreements on their own avoiding the otherwise inevitable bureaucratic red tape in the foreign policy agencies¹. The world of business tirelessly entices the most talented university graduates promising them high wages in-

comparable with state salaries. Having lost their monopolistic status in implementing policies modern foreign policy, agencies are forced to demonstrate extreme flexibility in finding new less expensive working forms and methods.

Diplomacy is being radically transformed right before our eyes. Its structure, methods and forms are being changed in response to the new challenges. Classical diplomatic model implying exclusively state-to-state interaction becomes one of the numerous aspects of the modern diplomatic activity.

Today all future professionals need basic knowledge in negotiations, protocol, and cooperation with representatives of different nationalities and require skills of collecting and analyzing information.

The most important challenge for modern diplomacy is high technology. Diplomats like to recall the story of an American ambassador to Spain who lived several centuries ago. Thomas Jefferson wrote: «We have not heard from our Ambassador to Spain for two years. If we do not hear from him this year, let us write him a letter». Several decades later the invention of the telegraph caused a real revolution. Upon receiving his first telegram the British Prime Minister Lord Henry Palmerston said: «By God, this is the end of diplomacy!»².

In 1969, the U.S. military developed the ARPANET network designed to ensure strategic command and data transmission in the event of Soviet nuclear attack. Today, more than forty years later, a direct descendant of that network – the Internet – has become a pillar of technological development and a powerful tool of globalization that transforms and changes the world and the society³.

The Internet is currently becoming the arterial channel of human communication, the key interaction axis which unites various formats and content, such as leisure communication, trade, gaming, conflicts, etc. And no crisis, apart from systematic development crises such as nuclear war or global depopulation, is likely to reverse this trend in the foreseeable future⁴.

Absolute accessibility of the Internet along with its impact on the social and political processes, social relationships, communication, and economy also entails the definitive incorporation of the Internet access into the international system of human rights. This trend has already been supported. In 2003–2009 the Finnish Ministry of Transport and Communications passed laws and regulations which de facto equated Internet to public communications services such as post and telephone. Moreover, each family was grant-

ed a guaranteed right to access the network (at a speed of at least 100 Mbit/s in 2015). Public Internet access has also been recorded as an inalienable right in the legislation of Costa Rica, Estonia, France, Greece, Spain and Switzerland. On June 3, 2011 the UN adopted a resolution based on the authoritative report by the UN Special Rapporteur Frank La Rue. The resolution implies that the states shall promote the right to freedom of thought and expression and the use of means necessary for its implementation, including the Internet. It also states that Internet access will gradually become one of the key aspects of the right to education. The OSCE report of 2011 also states that everyone has the right to participate in the life of information society; therefore, the states must guarantee Internet access to the citizens.

The aforementioned processes will be accompanied by rapid spread of the Internet around the world. According to forecasts, half of the world's population (3.5 billion people) will have Internet access by 2017. According to the authors of the mentioned OSCE report, this figure will increase up to 5 billion people by 2020. In another decade the level of Internet availability in developed countries will almost reach 100%. This means that the use of the global network will become a norm for all social and age groups including children, elderly people and low-income segment of population⁵.

Thus, the impact of the Internet on diplomacy will increase continuously.

The mass media also grow to become diplomacy's serious competitor. The former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau once proposed to replace the whole expensive ministry of foreign affairs with a *New York Times* subscription. He felt that newspaper reporters were better informed of the events than the authors of diplomatic cables⁶. Electronic media have become even a more serious contender of embassies, since they provide information from hot spots directly in real time. New social networks are not only able to report on events but also to influence them. As a result, senior diplomats and politicians are forced to sign up for social networks and defend their positions there.

During the Cold War states were the only formation that could afford international mass communication such as newspaper publishing, radio network development, financial support of NGOs. Development and depreciation of communications technologies, as well as increase in the number and combined impact of non-state ac-

tors of the world politics have completely changed this situation. A talented blogger today can compete with world famous newspaper; a satellite TV channel can challenge the leading news corporations⁷.

All of the mentioned facts and events contributed to the revival and transformation of the term of «public diplomacy».

One should pay particular attention while using Ukrainian equivalents of the English term «public diplomacy». «Public» can be translated into Ukrainian language as «громадська» (meaning «public»), «суспільна» (meaning «social»), «державна» (meaning «state»), «громадянська» (meaning «civic»), «публічна» (meaning «public»), etc. The most common of those are «публічна» and «громадська».

However, the most correct understanding of «public diplomacy» in Ukrainian would be the meaning of «public» («публічна»). There are many definitions of this term but all of them meet at the point of a system of dialogue and cooperation with foreign societies for political purposes. At the same time there is also another meaning: «diplomacy at the level of NGOs». In this case the Ukrainian equivalent of «social diplomacy» («громадська, або суспільна, дипломатія») is more appropriate.

The difference between traditional and public diplomacy was very accurately described by the United States Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy for Europe and Eurasia Colleen Graffy in her interview with Radio Liberty. She noted: «The title of my position is complicated but my functions are much simpler. I find ways for our government to communicate with people in other countries. Diplomats are traditionally thought to be communicating with other diplomats behind closed doors and outside the public access. They make decisions that affect nations, but they perform it at the elite level. Public diplomacy is how we as a government are trying to convey our views to people in other countries. We call it art of communicating the country's values, its culture and politics. It also explains who we are and why we adopt certain decisions»⁸.

Credibility is not earned easily by professional diplomats who are limited by regulations of their departments. Non-government actors of public diplomacy are in a better position. They are able to cover the entire spectrum of political life of their country, broadcasting both official and opposing views⁹.

Public policy is a new genre of policy implementation in the global information era. Public diplomacy is closely linked to this political

vector and represents a whole «universe» full of politicians, activists in the fields of culture, science, and education, mass media, NGOs, social networks users. And the most significant feature is that publicity today is an integral feature of professional diplomacy¹⁰.

Using a broader historical retrospective we may even dare say that the practice of cooperation of Foreign Affairs Ministries and Embassies with civil society and individuals abroad demonstrates the fact that the diplomatic representation of the countries has reached a new level¹¹.

Many practitioner-diplomats in various diplomatic services of the world may not have yet realized the importance of relations with foreign public. However, it is distinctly seen that in a number of countries this trend is increasingly attracting attention of foreign ministries' senior officials and political leaders.

Public diplomacy can be both of traditional (information propaganda via radio, television, cinema; training of specific socio-professional groups in order to create a loyal elite; dissemination of political culture through exhibitions, movies, etc.) and of digital character (broadcasting radio and television programs on the Internet, distributing literature in digital format, monitoring foreign blog discussions; creating webpages of government agencies, embassies and other organizations, as well as creating accounts of government members and ambassadors in social networks; sending information via cellphones, etc.).

Digital diplomacy, also called «Diplomacy Web 2.0» by the Silicon Valley experts, emerged relatively recently. A simplified definition of this phenomenon provides a comprehensive understanding: it is the use of web information and communication technologies (ICT) for implementing diplomatic tasks.

Digital diplomacy is mainly applied in its nature; it is particularly useful in dealing with foreign audiences while conveying official position and forming image of a state. It is important to understand that digital diplomacy is unlikely to ever replace diplomacy in its usual understanding. Closed-door negotiations will remain to be closed-door. However, digital diplomacy is able to explain why a certain decision was made, what it will result in, how it will influence the foreign policy — i.e. it is able to grant public access to the results of traditional diplomacy.

Nowadays a state that exists in the information space along with other sources of information is forced to be open. If you do

not fill this space in with unbiased information others will fill it in. Digital diplomacy is designed to efficiently provide adequate information, to refute incorrect information, and to confirm information from official sources.

One of the main problems and risks for existence and development of digital diplomacy in particular and public diplomacy in general is computer hacking. One of the most vivid examples of the latter opinion is a hacker attack on personal website of the Israeli Minister Yuli-Yoel Edelstein who controls the issues of public diplomacy and diaspora. Commenting on the occasion, the Minister said that nothing could prevent him from carrying out public diplomacy on behalf of the State of Israel. He intends to continue defending state interests on all fronts, including the Internet¹².

Returning to the words of the Israeli Minister, one could argue that in terms of intensity the Internet environment could be compared to the front line or to an important strategic frontier, while control over this frontier promises significant benefits to its holder. This advantage cannot be gained through nominal presence on the Internet in the form of several Twitter microblogs or a couple of Facebook accounts. One needs a strategy and tools for its implementation. However there is no need to reinvent the wheel. International experience shows that an impressive arsenal of techniques and methods of digital diplomacy that can be used to solve foreign policy objectives has already been accumulated.

The conditions of instant dissemination of both information and misinformation make the need in public attraction and support to be of particular importance. Public diplomacy has been enriched by communication in social networks. A new term of *twiplomacy* has been developed¹³. Twitter, Facebook and other social networks are used by foreign policy agencies. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine is not an exception¹⁴. Presidents, Prime Ministers, heads of foreign missions, ambassadors join social networks and become «twiplomats»¹⁵.

Together with other tools and methods of electronic diplomacy Twitter diplomacy can be a very effective tool.

Foreign office has created a special «Internet harbor» (hub) which provides 24/7 technical assistance to its twiplomats and develops digital strategies of foreign policy. Portal's title, «*Digital Diplomacy*», speaks for itself; it also contains a simple set out of mission, goals and objectives of e-Diplomacy of the British Foreign

Office. A manual guide on digital diplomacy tools is a valuable core of this resource. It provides brief and accessible instructions on how to use Twitter, Facebook and other social networks. Besides, the portal contains tips for working with the web site and for uploading and selecting information, video and audio online. Diplomats can get signed up for online trainings, receive experts' consultations or bring up questions to the experts. The developers of the resource have also created a separate «Case-studies» section which provides specific examples of successful projects in digital diplomacy¹⁶.

The electronic resource of the US Department of State on electronic diplomacy and the Department for Innovation CO.Nx is also worth mentioning¹⁷. The platform offers foreign audiences to listen to speeches of the leading American scientists, entrepreneurs, researchers and diplomats through Web conferencing and webinars.

Extensive information on digital diplomacy can be obtained by using a web application created by Agence France-Presse (AFP)¹⁸. The site has contains a large amount of statistics and data on various countries, personalities, and the most pressing issues in the form of infographics. The website also provides real-time monitoring of the online impact of those state actors who are involved in public diplomacy. The data includes the number officials' and experts' followers.

In spite of a very dynamic development and obtained influence, digital diplomacy, being a part of public diplomacy, will not replace classical diplomacy. However, skillful application of this tool can greatly enhance the work of the state in the field of international relations and foreign policy.

In today's information pluralism one can make his opinion heard, but he cannot achieve its uncontested dominance. The USA faced this problem soon after the tragedy of September 11, 2001. The first reaction to the attack, apart from military operations in Afghanistan, was activation of public diplomacy aimed at creating a positive image of the USA in the Arab world. Former US Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke raised the following rhetorical question in October 2001: «How can a man in a cave out-communicate the world's leading communications society?»¹⁹. However, creation of TV channels and radio stations, massive dissemination of messages on good relations with Muslims and other measures could not change the attitude towards the United States. It became clear that all the positive information about the USA would not

compensate the effect of American messages and actions in relation to the Muslim world coming from other channels²⁰.

This means that it is not enough for public diplomacy to ensure by various means communication of one country's government with the society of another. It should also consider the entire flow of statements made by various officials (presidents, ministers, and ambassadors) and of information and news going abroad through government channels. Public diplomacy will be efficient only in case if full range of factors is taken into account.

Official communication aiming at foreign audience is not a new phenomenon in international relations. Formation of image, promotion and activities that we now call public diplomacy are as old as diplomacy itself.

Confronting modern challenges, states are actively involved in implementing public diplomacy which is a synthesis of values, promotion and marketing technologies. With the help of public diplomacy governments hope to influence public opinion in foreign countries, create a favorable image, gain affection, and change the mood of international community²¹.

According to former US Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security, the famous political scientist and professor at Harvard University Joseph S. Nye, skeptics who perceive the term of «public diplomacy» as another euphemism used for propaganda purposes do not understand its nature. The usual propaganda is not as effective as public diplomacy. In its turn, public diplomacy is not just another advertising campaign. Public diplomacy involves, among other things, establishing long-term relationships that create favorable environment for state policy²².

The contribution of direct government information in long-term cultural relations depends on three dimensions, or stages of public diplomacy. All three dimensions are important. The first and the most required dimension is daily communication which includes explaining the decisions in domestic and foreign policy. This dimension also includes training to overcome crises. Should vacuum of information on any event appear, it would be quickly filled in by others.

The second dimension is strategic communication that develops a series of simple topics much like a political or an advertising campaign. While the first dimension is expressed in hours and days, the second one takes weeks, months and even years.

The third dimension of public diplomacy is the development of strong relationships with key personalities throughout the years and even decades by means of scholarships, exchange programs, trainings, workshops, conferences and access to media channels. These programs develop something that the American journalist Edward Murrow once called a crucial «last step», i.e. personal contact with high trust and confidence developed through close relationships²³.

In present information era power will more than ever imply the existence of a «soft» dimension of attractiveness and a «hard» dimension of enforcement and encouragement. Effective combination of these dimensions is called «smart power». For instance, current struggle against international terrorism is a struggle for hearts and thoughts, while excessive reliance on «hard power» will not be successful.

Public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of «smart power» but «smart» public diplomacy involves understanding of the need for trust, self-criticism and activity of civil society for creating «soft power». Degenerating into propaganda, public diplomacy becomes unconvincing and can destroy «soft power». Instead, it has to remain to be a two-way process, because «soft power» depends primarily on how we understand other people²⁴.

It is universally acknowledged that the term «public diplomacy» was coined in 1965 by Edmund Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and a distinguished retired US Foreign Service officer, when he established an Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy²⁵.

Gullion's concept determines that public diplomacy deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It includes international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the governments' cultivation of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communication.

Gullion was the first to use the phrase «public diplomacy» in its modern meaning, but this concept was not so much Gullion's invention in 1965 as a fresh use in a new meaning. Ironically, this new use of an old term was necessary because the even older term — propaganda — which Gullion preferred — had accumulated many negative connotations especially in English²⁶.

The earliest use of the phrase «public diplomacy» does not belong to Americans. It was used in a leader piece from the *London Times* in January 1856. It was used merely as a synonym for civility in a piece criticizing the posturing of President Franklin Pierce. «The statesmen of America must recollect», the *Times* opined, «that, if they have to make, as they conceive, a certain impression upon us, they have also to set an example for their own people, and there are few examples so catching as those of public diplomacy»²⁷.

The first use of the term «public diplomacy» quoted by the *New York Times* was in January 1871, in reporting a Congressional debate. Representative Samuel S. Cox (a Democrat from New York, and a former journalist) spoke in high dudgeon against secret intrigue to annex the Republic of Dominica, noting he believed in «open, public diplomacy». It was a use which anticipated the major understanding of this phrase thirty-five years later during World War II.

During World War II the phrase «public diplomacy» was widely used to describe a cluster of new diplomatic practices. These practices ranged from successive German statements around submarine warfare policy, through public declarations of terms for peace, to Woodrow Wilson's idealistic vision — as expressed in the opening point of his «fourteen points» speech of January 8, 1918 — of an entire international system founded on «open covenants of peace». The first point, in particular, stated: «Open peace treaties that are openly discussed will not allow different interpretations of those treaties to appear; diplomacy will always act openly and in the public eye». The principle of openness was a contemporary requirement because public opinion that acquired more influence on political life had a hostile attitude towards secrecy which traditionally shrouded diplomatic negotiations and contacts.

Many journalists and writers at the time preferred the phrase «open diplomacy» but «public diplomacy» had its adherents who increased its popularity by using its French equivalent — «diplomatie publique» in their articles²⁸.

The *New York Times* used the phrase on May 9, 1916 in its coverage of the so-called «Sussex Pledge»²⁹, a declaration issued on May 4 by the German government to restrict its submarine warfare. Reviewing US reactions to the pledge the *New York Times* quoted an editorial from the daily *Boston Herald*, which declared: «One of the evils of public diplomacy is the necessity of continued letter-writing, in which the responsible head of each nation must

save his face with his own people as well as communicate his purposes to the other side».

This opinion has its echo today all the domestic utterances of state leaders can be heard round the world. The third use of the phrase «public diplomacy» in the *New York Times* and first use in the *Washington Post* came on December 28, 1917 again quoting a foreign editorial from the *Berliner Tageblatt* commenting on the Russian-German peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk. The paper noted portentously: «Nothing can so shake the wall of arms as the new public diplomacy»³⁰.

On February 11, 1918 President Wilson himself used the phrase in his so-called «Four Principles» speech to Congress, in which he relayed the response of the German Chancellor, Georg von Hertling, to the «fourteen points», noting: «He accepts... the principle of public diplomacy».

Wilson's phrase was adapted from Hertling's original statement to the Reichstag on January 24, 1918 in which he endorsed what he called «publicity of diplomatic agreements». Reports of Wilson's speech caused the first use of the term «public diplomacy» in the *Christian Science Monitor*, and the only use of the phrase in the *Los Angeles Times* between 1899 and 1965³¹.

In July 1918 the US Senate considered the issue of «public diplomacy» in connection to a bold proposal by Senator William E. Borah (Idaho) that its debates over treaties henceforth be public. The proposal was defeated by fifty votes to twenty-three.

The phrase «public diplomacy» was transformed into its idealistic sense of Wilson's «open covenants» throughout the interwar years in the rhetoric of the internationalists like James Shotwell and Clarence Streit, and in similarly inclined editorials in the pages of the *Christian Science Monitor*³².

In 1928 a *Christian Science Monitor* reporter, Roscoe Drummond proclaimed an «era of public diplomacy» in an essay «The press and public diplomacy», which stressed the moral duty of the news media to report international affairs accurately and dispassionately so as to reduce tensions in the world.

Idealism of «public diplomacy» became increasingly remote from the realities of the deteriorating international scene. A correspondent of the *London Times* described the arrival of British troops in the Saarland³³ in December 1934 with marching bands and abundant

good humor towards the locals as «a striking demonstration of public diplomacy» in the face of defiant displays of Nazi banners.

In 1936 an *Associated Press* dispatch from Paris noted that Leftists were applauding the pledge of the new (and short-lived) French Prime Minister Albert Sarraut to use «public diplomacy» in foreign affairs. The term «public diplomacy» was seldom used during the Second World War. The post-war years saw both a reassessment and a reemergence of the Wilson's term «public diplomacy». In 1946 the French Prime Minister Henri Spaak spoke enthusiastically of «this age of public diplomacy» during the inaugural session of the UN General Assembly in October.

In Britain the *London Times* denounced «public diplomacy» as one of the «catch-phrases and slogans masquerading as principles of foreign policy» and endorsed a call from diplomat and politician Harold Nicolson for a return to «private diplomacy».

By the 1950s the usage of the term «public diplomacy» noticeably shifted towards the realm of international information and propaganda. It was not so much that the term was being used differently but rather that diplomacy was being practiced and understood differently and key diplomatic events were now recognized as explicit works of public performance. In 1953 Walter Lippmann observed in his column that some diplomats now «might argue that practice of public diplomacy and of propaganda and of psychological warfare had become such a plague» that key Soviet-American talks should be held in private³⁴.

In a more positive vein, in a speech in the summer of 1958, the UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld declared: «The value of public diplomacy in the United Nations will depend on a decisive extent on how far the responsible spokesmen find it possible to rise above a narrow tactical approach to the politics of international life, and to speak as men for aspirations and hopes which are those of all mankind»³⁵.

Observers of the diplomatic scene including Louis Halle, veteran British diplomat Lord Strang, or James Reston of the *New York Times* now used «public diplomacy» to evoke the element of showmanship in the diplomacy of Khrushchev, Kennedy and others. As the practice of public diplomacy had come to overlap with propaganda, Gullion needed only to carry the term «public diplomacy» a relatively short distance to relocate it entirely in its new meaning as an alternative for propaganda. For many years the term had lim-

ited usage, its old «open diplomacy» use also remained in circulation. The term did not figure in an academic book title until 1972.

The reason that the term «public diplomacy» took off in 1965 was that there was a real need for such a concept in Washington DC. For dozen years the United States Information Agency needed alternative to the terms «information» and «propaganda».

Gullion's term «public diplomacy» covered every aspect of USIA activity and a number of the cultural and exchange functions controlled by the Department of State. The phrase gave a respectable identity to the career officers of the USIA, working alongside the State Department as a legitimate organ of American foreign relations. If public diplomacy existed as a variety of diplomacy then the United States surely needed a dedicated agency to conduct this work, and USIA³⁶ was best structured to control all work in the field.

In 1978 USIA was reorganized according to the logic of the new terminology and at last acquired dominion over the entire range of American activity in the information field. The interdependence of the concept of public diplomacy and USIA is suggested by the fact that following the demise of the USIA in 1999 the Murrow Center at Tufts University became — and still remains — the Murrow Center for International Information and Communications.

The Reagan years saw both an increased expenditure on public diplomacy and a widening use of the term in congressional hearings, scholarship, journalism, and among practitioners. The Reagan White House provided an unhelpful challenge to the dominant definition when it created its own «Office of Public Diplomacy» to oversee the domestic selling of support to the Contra rebels in Nicaragua.

During the course of the 1990's the term «public diplomacy» finally entered common use in foreign policy circles overseas. In Britain, for example, the Blair government established a Public Diplomacy Strategy Board. In the years following the attacks of September 11, 2001 the term «public diplomacy» finally entered American public consciousness. In the wake of the Asian tsunami even President George W. Bush used this phrase, telling an ABC interviewer «Our public diplomacy efforts aren't ... aren't very robust and aren't very good compared to the public diplomacy efforts of those who would like to spread hatred and... vilify the United States», he went on to suggest that America's tsunami aid might make a difference to this³⁷.

The appointment of the new Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Karen Hughes, gave the final impetus to the term's currency within the United States, though elsewhere in the world the term could still produce blank looks.

Public diplomacy in the modern world is aimed at building up a positive image of a state. Reputation is formed by both rhetoric and action. If a diplomat takes political steps that would damage the country's image in the world, beautiful rhetoric is unlikely to improve the situation. Therefore, the purpose of public diplomacy is not only to provide positive information about the nation, but also to participate in the formation of foreign policy decisions with regard to the impact on the reputation of the country that they may cause³⁸.

Thus, public diplomacy is an integral part of the «soft power» policy. The objective of public diplomats is to attract the public of another country to their side.