

# The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science

<http://ann.sagepub.com>

---

## Public Diplomacy in a Changing World

*The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2008; 616; 291  
DOI: 10.1177/0002716208314503

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://ann.sagepub.com>

---

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[American Academy of Political and Social Science](#)

Additional services and information for *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* can be found at:

**Email Alerts:** <http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ann.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

# QUICK READ SYNOPSIS

---

## Public Diplomacy in a Changing World

*Special Editors:* GEOFFREY COWAN and NICHOLAS J. CULL  
University of Southern California

Volume 616, March 2008

Prepared by Herb Fayer, Jerry Lee Foundation

DOI: 10.1177/0002716208314503

---

## Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy

Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault,  
University of Southern California

### *Background*

This article argues that practitioners and academics should examine three layers of public diplomacy: monologue, dialogue, and collaboration.

- Collaborations are initiatives that feature cross-national participation in a joint venture or project with a clearly defined goal—collaboration, in certain instances, may be a more effective public diplomacy technique than either monologue or dialogue.
- By examining related social science research, this article seeks to start a systematic examination of the circumstances in which each of these three layers of public diplomacy is most appropriate.

NOTE: Each mode of public diplomacy has particular advantages for particular situations, and those concerned with the subject should think about the best times and places to use each, either by itself or in combination.

### *Monologue*

When a nation wants the people of the world to understand where it stands, there may be no better vehicle than a governmental address or a document.

- Monologue should not be considered in opposition to dialogue—there will always be times and places that necessitate one-way forms of communication. Greater consideration should be given to when and how to best formulate one-way or self-contained modes of communication.
- It is also essential for correcting and adapting to inadvertent or private one-way communication flows that, if left unanswered, could undermine transnational relationships and national reputations.

- Strategies that highlight diversity emphasize a nation's commitment to democratic debate and may help to insure that those who disapprove of a regime or its policies do not automatically hate the nation or its people.
- A caveat: one-way communications do not provide an opportunity to listen, or allow for feedback or critical responses from audiences.

*Dialogue*

A number of public diplomacy scholars and practitioners have called for increased cross-national dialogue, the creation of an "international public sphere," and a "conversation of cultures."

- Ideas and information can be exchanged in formal summits attended by elites; in academic or professional conferences; in call-in talk shows; on interactive Web sites; and through citizen participation in cross-cultural sports, cinema, and arts projects.
- Individuals are more likely to feel favorably toward those with opposing viewpoints and consider political outcomes as fair if they have the opportunity to engage in discussion and debate.

NOTE: The key is to listen, to make people feel that they are being heard and that they have a voice, without also suggesting that they have a vote.

*Collaboration*

Those concerned with articulating and formulating public diplomacy policies and theories have, to date, largely a critical and often more effective means of engaging foreign publics—cross-national collaboration.

- Collaborative projects include dialogue between participants and stakeholders, but they also include concrete and typically easily identifiable goals and outcomes that provide a useful basis and structure upon which to form more lasting relationships.
- Collaboration is at times *the* most important form of public diplomacy.
- There is growing agreement that projects and associations that
  - bridge racial, social, ethnic, gender, and national divides,
  - are essential for democracy building,
  - increase social and political trust, and
  - can help ameliorate social, political, and ethnic conflict.

NOTE: Many collaborations fail because a stakeholder feels disenfranchised, conflict derails the process, and/or parties either disagree or change their minds about the project goals. Cooperation generally necessitates compromise and joint projects are often hindered by disagreements about best practices.

*New Directions*

There are numerous examples of transnational collaborations that could be encouraged and expanded by those involved with public diplomacy.

- Citizen diplomacy programs are essential and should be expanded to include collaborative cross-national endeavors such as building schools, roads, or community centers.
- The Internet and other new communication technologies also offer unprecedented opportunities for promoting cross-national collaborations as well as dialogue and monologic communications.

- Today, Web 2.0 applications, the rise of virtual worlds, and the growth of online gaming sites have made it possible for those concerned with public diplomacy to move beyond online information portals to include much more broadly based forms of collaboration.

NOTE: While there is a large body of social science research that highlights the importance of monologue, dialogue, and collaboration in improving relationships across borders, future research is needed to identify the best practices and conditions for each of these three layers of public diplomacy.

## Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories

Nicholas J. Cull, University of Southern California

### *Background*

This article will establish a simple taxonomy of public diplomacy by dividing its practices into five elements: listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, and international broadcasting.

- Although public diplomacy has gained international currency only since the end of the cold war, it is essentially as old as statecraft.
- The article will consider in turn the nature, past success or failure, and possible future potential of each element.
- The author presents five examples of successes and failures.

### *Listening*

Through listening, an actor attempts to manage the international environment by collecting and collating data on the opinions of overseas publics and using that data to redirect policy or a wider public diplomacy approach accordingly.

- Information on foreign public opinion has also been gathered as part of the regular function of conventional diplomacy and intelligence.
- While systematic assessments of foreign opinion are a modern innovation, attempts to know the minds of a population have been a feature of intelligence reports as long as there have been spies.

### *Advocacy*

Advocacy in public diplomacy is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by undertaking an international communication activity to actively promote a particular policy, an idea, or an actor's general interests in the minds of a foreign public.

- Today this activity includes embassy press relations (frequently the hard end of policy promotion) and informational work (which can be somewhat softer and less angled to hard and fast policy goals).
- Advocacy is a dominant concept in American public diplomacy, where each element is scrutinized during Congressional oversight for its contribution to selling the idea of America.

- Cultural Diplomacy* Cultural diplomacy is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by making its cultural resources and achievements known overseas and/or facilitating cultural transmission abroad.
- Exchange Diplomacy* Exchange diplomacy is 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.
- While this activity can be conceptualized as a one-way process, the element of reciprocity has tended to make this area of public diplomacy a bastion of the concept of "mutuality": the vision of an international learning experience in which both parties benefit.
  - While the United States has invested heavily in exchange through the Fulbright scholarships, this work never displaced the centrality of advocacy in its public diplomacy.
- International News Broadcast* 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.
- International broadcasting work, as practiced by states, can overlap with all the other public diplomacy functions.
  - Historically, the most potent element of international broadcasting has been its use of news, especially when that news is objective.
- The Information Age* The information age has brought with it both a spirit that anything can be accomplished by public diplomacy and a certain defeatism among others who feel confounded by the proliferation of media of mass communication.
- The author presents the ways in which new technologies transcend public diplomacy lessons of the past or underline their enduring value.
  - Examples of the power of this new technology from the ability of a photograph from a cell phone to circle the globe and derail a carefully planned media event to the speed with which a short message service (SMS) text message can be passed from person to person and rally citizens to a protest.
  - The potential for interpersonal international communication has increased exponentially as a result of the Internet revolution but also because of an unprecedented mobility of populations.
- Conclusion* The cases presented in this article confirm the enduring significance of public diplomacy in international relations.
- The elements of public diplomacy have been separated into a basic taxonomy of equally significant functions, with the argument advanced that the historically neglected listening function does deserve special status as the starting point for public diplomacy.
  - The rise of the network society creates more opportunities than it closes for public diplomacy, especially if the public diplomat is mindful of the limitations of his or her craft and the necessity for thinking in terms of building relationships.

# Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy

Eytan Gilboa, Bar-Ilan University, Israel

Q  
R  
S

## *Background*

The new challenges and needs of public diplomacy in the post-cold war/post-September 11 era have been influenced by three interrelated revolutions in mass communication, politics, and international relations.

- The revolution in communication technologies created two major innovations: the Internet and global news networks.
- Many societies have transformed from autocracy to democracy, generating growing mass participation in political processes.
- Favorable world image, achieved through attraction and persuasion, is becoming more important than territory, access, and raw materials.

NOTE: This work critically examines attempts to advance theory and methodology in public diplomacy and suggests a new framework for analysis.

## *Models*

Gilboa (2000) developed three conceptual models of public diplomacy:

- In the first model, states used public diplomacy in antagonistic relationships to achieve long-term results in foreign societies.
- The nonstate transnational model is a theoretical concept designed to investigate public diplomacy activities of groups, NGOs, and individuals using public diplomacy across national boundaries.
- In the basic model, a government uses its own means of communication, such as radio stations, to conduct public diplomacy, but in the domestic PR model, it hires PR firms and even lobbyists in the target country to achieve its aims.

NOTE: Theory development in public diplomacy requires systematic application of conceptual models.

## *Soft Power*

Communication, education, and persuasion have become major techniques of foreign relations at the expense of military force.

- A grand strategy today requires integration and application of three fundamental components: force, diplomacy, and communication.
- When policies and positions of states or nonstate actors have moral authority, or are seen as legitimate, their soft power is increased.
  - Public diplomacy is presented as an official policy translating soft power resources into action.
- Due to considerable differences in the availability of information technology around the world, the new strategy is more effective in the West and concerns some issues more than others.
  - NGOs are seen as important, especially those from civil society.
- A new term, “smart power,” means learning better how to combine or balance hard and soft power (also called integrated power).

NOTE: Smart power and integrated power are still far from being clear and operational concepts, and they have not resolved the theoretical weaknesses in the linkage between soft power and public diplomacy.

*Public Relations* In recent years, more and more scholars and practitioners have conducted research on public diplomacy using public relations (PR) theories, models, and methodologies.

- Grunig (1993) argued that his classic PR models could be extended to public diplomacy:
  - Press agency describes PR programs designed to achieve favorable coverage in the media, often in a misleading way.
  - Public information refers to information written by in-house writers acting as if they were journalists and disseminated through controlled media such as newsletters and direct mail.
  - The two-way asymmetrical model is based on strategic communication—the scientific measurement of attitudes and formulation of messages used to persuade the public in the target state to behave in the interests of the state using PR.
- Grunig reconstructed the models into a four-dimensional normative framework, including *direction* and *purpose*, that appeared in the original framework, and two new dimensions: *channel* and *ethics*.

NOTE: Scholars have not sufficiently applied Grunig's models and other PR models to public diplomacy.

*Branding* While nation branding or rebranding is not new, it seems that it is gaining more attention in recent years.

- The “brand state” refers to what people around the world think and feel about a state.
- Ham (2002) argued that branding “implies a shift in political paradigms from the modern world of geopolitics and power to the postmodern world of images and influence.”

NOTE: Public diplomacy has to deal with complex and multifaceted issues, provide appropriate context to foreign policy decisions, and cope with social and political impetus not easily understood abroad—in short, public diplomacy cannot be reduced to slogans and images.

*Conclusion* Despite the growing significance of public diplomacy in contemporary international relations, scholars have not yet pursued or even sufficiently promoted systematic theoretical research in this field.

- Experts and practitioners in public diplomacy have often ignored relevant knowledge in communication and PR.
- Communication and PR scholars and practitioners have often ignored the relevant literature in international relations and studies.

NOTE: Progress in public diplomacy research is highly needed because of the central place it is now occupying in foreign policy and diplomacy. Public diplomacy research cannot be sufficiently accumulated without theory design and implantation, and the best way to promote theory is to initiate a new scientific program dedicated to this effort along the lines suggested in this study.

# The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance

Manuel Castells, University of Southern California

Q  
R  
S

## *Background*

The public sphere is an essential component of sociopolitical organization because it is the space where people come together as citizens and articulate their autonomous views to influence the political institutions of society.

- Civil society is the organized expression of these views; and the relationship between the state and civil society is the cornerstone of democracy.
- The decreased ability of nationally based political systems to manage their problems on a global scale has induced the rise of a global civil society.
- Globalization is the process that constitutes a social system with the capacity to work as a unit on a planetary scale in real or chosen time.
- Capacity is technological, institutional, and organizational capacity.
- New information and communication technologies, including rapid long-distance transportation and computer networks, allow global networks to selectively connect anyone and anything in the world.

## *Global Issues*

A number of issues faced by humankind are global in their manifestations and in their treatment—among these issues are:

- the management of the environment as a planetary issue characterized by the damage caused by unsustainable development and the need to counter this deterioration with a global, long-term conservation strategy;
- the globalization of human rights;
- the emergence of the issue of social justice for the planet at large;
- global security as a shared problem, including the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and global terrorism; and
- the practice of politics of fear under the pretext of fighting terrorism.

## *Four Issues of Governance*

The growing gap between the space where the issues arise (global) and the space where the issues are managed (nation-state) is at the source of four political crises that affect the institutions of governance.

- *Crisis of efficiency*—problems cannot be adequately managed.
- *Crisis of legitimacy*—political representation based on democracy becomes simply a vote of confidence on the ability of the nation-state to manage the interests of the nation in the global web of policy making.
- *Crisis of identity*—as people see their nation and their culture increasingly disjointed from the mechanisms of political decision making in a global, multinational network, their claim of autonomy takes the form of resistance identity and cultural identity politics as opposed to their political identity as citizens.

- *Crisis of equity*—the process of globalization led by market forces in the framework of deregulation often increases inequality between countries and between social groups within countries.

NOTE: As a result of these crises, and the decreased ability of governments to mitigate them, nongovernmental actors become the advocates of the needs, interests, and values of people, further undermining the role of governments in responses to challenges posed by globalization and structural transformation.

### *Global Civil Society*

The decreased ability of national political systems to manage the world's problems on a global scale has induced the rise of a global civil society.

- In every country, there are local civil society actors who defend local or sectorial interests, as well as specific values against or beyond the formal political process.
- A second trend is represented by the rise of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) with a global or international frame of reference in their action and goals.
- Social movements that aim to control the process of globalization constitute a third type of civil society actor.
- Another expression of global civil society is the movement of public opinion, made up of turbulences of information in a diversified media system; and the emergence of spontaneous, ad hoc mobilizations using horizontal, autonomous networks of communication.

### *New Networks*

The increasing inability of nation-states to confront and manage the processes of globalization of the issues that are the object of their governance leads to ad hoc forms of global governance and, ultimately, to forming new networks.

- Some of these networks are multipurpose and constitutionally defined, such as the EU; others focus on issues generally related to trade.
- Still others are spaces of coordination and debate.
- From a multipronged process emerges a new form of state, the network state, which is characterized by shared sovereignty and responsibility, flexibility of procedures of governance, and greater diversity in the relationship between governments and citizens.
- The network state faces a *coordination problem*, with three aspects: organizational, technical, and political.

NOTE: In the strongest networks, participating states explicitly share sovereignty. In weaker networks, states cooperate via implicit or de facto sovereignty sharing mechanisms.

### *Conclusion*

The implicit project behind the idea of public diplomacy is not to assert the power of a state or of a social actor in the form of “soft power.”

- It is, instead, to harness the dialogue between different social collectives and their cultures to share meaning and understanding.
- The aim of the practice of public diplomacy is not to convince but to communicate, not to declare but to listen.
- Public diplomacy seeks to build a public sphere in which diverse voices can be heard in spite of their various origins, distinct values, and, often, contradictory interests.

# Public Diplomacy and Soft Power

Joseph S. Nye Jr., Harvard University

Q  
R  
S

## *Background*

Soft power is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through enticement and attraction rather than coercion or payment.

- Soft power rests on a state's resources of culture, values, and policies.
- A smart power strategy combines hard and soft power resources.
- Public diplomacy has a long history as a means of promoting a country's soft power and was essential in winning the cold war.
- The current struggle against transnational terrorism is a struggle to win hearts and minds, but the current overreliance on hard power alone is not the path to success.
- The ability to establish preferences tends to be associated with an attractive personality, culture, political values and institutions, and policies that are seen as legitimate or having moral authority.
- The soft power of a country rests primarily on three resources: its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (when it lives up to them at home and abroad), and its foreign policies (when they are seen as legitimate and having moral authority).

NOTE: Public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of smart power, but smart public diplomacy requires an understanding of the roles of credibility, self-criticism, and civil society in generating soft power, which is getting others to want the outcomes you want.

## *The Information Age*

Promoting positive images of one's country is not new, but the conditions for projecting soft power have transformed dramatically in recent years.

- Diplomacy aimed at public opinion can be as important to outcomes as the traditional classified diplomatic communications among leaders.
- Technological advances have led to a dramatic reduction in the cost of processing and transmitting information leading to an explosion of information that has produced a "paradox of plenty," which then leads to a scarcity of attention.
- Among editors and cue-givers, credibility is the crucial resource, and an important source of soft power.

## *Dimensions of Public Diplomacy*

The mix of direct government information with long-term cultural relationships varies with three dimensions of public diplomacy, and all three are important.

- The first and most immediate is daily communications, which involves explaining the context of domestic and foreign policy decisions.
- The second dimension is strategic communication, which develops a set of simple themes much as a political or advertising campaign does.
- The third dimension of public diplomacy is the development of lasting relationships with key individuals over many years through scholarships, exchanges, training, seminars, conferences, and access to media channels.

- Listening/Talking* Effective public diplomacy is a two-way street that involves listening as well as talking.
- We need to understand better what is going on in the minds of others and what values we share—which is why exchanges are often more effective than mere broadcasting.
  - But all information goes through cultural filters, and declamatory statements are rarely heard as intended.
- NOTE: Broadcasting is important but needs to be supplemented by effective “narrowcasting” via the Internet.
- Private Actors* It often behooves governments to keep in the background and to work with private actors.
- Some NGOs enjoy more trust than governments do, and though they are difficult to control, they can be useful channels of communication.
  - American companies can also play an important role—their representatives and brands directly touch the lives of far more people than government representatives do.
  - Part of America’s soft power grows out of the openness of its society and polity and the fact that a free press, Congress, and courts can criticize and correct policies.
    - It has been suggested that the United States would do better if it turned Alhurra into an international C-SPAN that broadcast seminars, town meetings, and congressional debates.
- The Military* The military can sometimes play an important role in the generation of soft power with its broad range of officer exchanges, joint training, and assistance programs with other countries in peacetime.
- Cooperation* It is a mistake to see public diplomacy simply in adversarial terms—sometimes there is a competition of “my information versus your information,” but with cooperation there often can be gains for both sides.
- Conclusion* Public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of smart power, but smart public diplomacy requires an understanding of the role of credibility, self-criticism, and the role of civil society in generating soft power.

---

## Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power

Ernest J. Wilson III, University of Southern California

- Background* This article pushes beyond “hard power” and “soft power” to insist on “smart power,” defined as the capacity of an actor to combine elements of hard power and soft power in ways that are mutually reinforcing.
- It argues that advancing smart power has become a national security imperative, driven by long-term structural changes in international conditions, as well as short-term failures of the current administration.

- This article aims to provide a smart power framework for improving foreign policy performance.

*Smart Power  
Now*

The growing interest in smart power reflects two contemporary trends, one structural and long-term, the other short-term and critical, driven mainly by the policies of the current administration.

- The most obvious reason to reflect seriously on smart power is the widely perceived shortcomings of the policies of the U.S. administration over the past seven years.
- Also, the G-8 nations continued their transformation from industrial to postindustrial economies, where power increasingly rests on a nation's capacity to create and manipulate knowledge and information.
- The world of warfare has become more digital, networked, and flexible, and nonmilitary assets like communications have risen in the mix of instruments of state power.
- A final reason for the hunt for smart power today is that target populations themselves have become "smarter."

*Smart Power  
Issues*

To enhance the effectiveness of hard and soft power deployed individually, and combined into smart power, we must redress three issues:

- provide more precise and sophisticated definitions,
- carefully analyze the institutions of hard and soft power, and
- be more clear-eyed about the political dynamics required to support the integration of hard and soft power in the creation of smart power.

*Smart Power  
Framework*

A conceptually robust and policy-relevant framework for smart power should be built on a few additional core considerations:

- the *target* over which one seeks to exercise power—its internal nature, and its broader global context;
- *self-knowledge* and understanding of one's own goals and capacities;
- the broader *regional and global context* within which the action will be conducted; and
- the *tools* to be employed and how and when to combine them.

NOTE: A sophisticated smart power approach comes with the awareness that hard and soft power are separate and distinct institutions and institutional cultures that exert their own normative influences over their members, each with its own attitudes, incentives, and anticipated career paths.

*Foreign Policy*

A rational foreign policy based on smart power means recognizing and reforming a variety of institutional forms and relationships across a plethora of existing agencies, offices, bureaus, and departments, all of which have their own norms, values, and rigidities.

- Traditionally, all the foreign policy and security agencies possess internal cultures that make it difficult to cooperate and thereby decrease the chances of achieving smart power.
- Pursuing smart power cooperation means recognizing those cultural differences and incorporating some and dampening others where appropriate in any reformed interagency processes.

*Moving Forward*

Moving forward, smart power must begin with the assumption that hard power is essential and the national interest is best advanced by effectively combining hard power and soft.

- Smart power advocates must learn to articulate the advantages of soft power combined with hard power in a politically compelling language.
- Competence in combining hard and soft power in pursuit of a compelling national vision will be a key criterion for electing the next president of the United States.

*Conclusion*

Achieving smart power requires artfully combining conceptual, institutional, and political elements into a reform movement capable of sustaining foreign policy innovations into the future.

- The power of communications must be brought to bear on selling smart power just as it is mobilized so effectively for hard power.
- America's political leadership has to step up to meet these conceptual, institutional, and political challenges.
- Making this case convincingly will require both scholarly and technical writing as well as communicating through popular media to sway informed opinion in foreign affairs.

NOTE: Given the complexity of the problems—conceptual, institutional, political, and cultural—smart power will not be easy to achieve, especially in the short term. To launch this long march, smart power advocates need to become more sophisticated at soft power and communicate their message more convincingly.

## Place Branding: The State of the Art

Peter van Ham, the Netherlands Institute of  
International Relations “Clingendael”

*Background*

Place branding can be considered an effort to use strategies developed in the commercial sector to manage, if not necessarily wield, the soft power of a geographical location.

- This article argues that place branding, along with soft power and public diplomacy, is part of a wider spectrum of postmodern power.
- A country's brand is determined by culture, political ideals, and policies.
- States realize that their political and commercial images and reputations interact as in the so-called “country-of-origin effect” that plays an important role in consumers' purchase decisions.
- Few in government have the skills required to design major and long-term branding campaigns, which is why most place branding campaigns fade away—probably too quickly.

*Power*

Place branding stands in a long tradition of reputation management, “spin doctoring,” and propaganda.

- One could label all these different strategies and practices manifestations of social or postmodern power.
- The main characteristic of postmodern power is that it exercises power without using coercion and/or payments.
- In an information age, it is often the side which has the better story that wins—until recently, it was the *lack* of information that shaped people’s image of other places, rather than information overload.
- Political analysts remain wary about branding since they find it difficult to connect the intellectual dots between “the state” and the commercial practice of image making and reputation management.

*Branding and Diplomacy*

Public diplomacy can be compared with place branding since they both combine foreign policy goals with internal soft power strategies and objectives.

- The challenge of place branding and public diplomacy is to attract and satisfy these two, often radically different, objectives with one coherent set of images and messages.
- A key element is to build personal and institutional relationships and dialogue with foreign audiences by focusing on *values*, setting them apart from classical diplomacy which primarily deals with *issues*.

*Case Studies*

The article includes the EU and the United States in two case studies that examine the role of place branding within an international politics realm.

- The cases show that the brands of these two key players in international politics are shaped by history and images, as well as their foreign policy agendas and actions.
- They illustrate that these brands may change and should be managed.
- Whereas the EU remains reluctant to take its brand into its own hands, the United States seems more aware of the need for reputation management.

*Question*

The author’s concluding question is whether established schools of international relations theory have the theoretical tools and concepts to shed some light on a relatively new phenomenon like place branding.

- Place branding, as a part of soft power, centers around concepts like values, norms, and rules in international politics.
- Constructivism now comes to mind as a more fruitful avenue of thinking in which place branding may find its theoretical place.
  - The constructivist research agenda has questioned many established arguments and assumptions by seeking to explain interest and identity formation.
  - Its emphasis on norms, values, and identities as vital elements in international politics ensuring stability and predictability, is an important point of departure in the study of place branding.
- Constructivism is internally diverse (and at times even contradictory); it nevertheless comes closest as a possible theoretical home for place

branding, mainly since it offers brand states (as well as other place brands) the option to construct their own image, role, and identity.

- Constructivism offers insight into the power of structures and how state actors reproduce their own constraints through daily practice.

*Weaknesses*

Two main weaknesses remain that are relevant to our understanding of place branding as a concept that should be conceptually clarified within international relations theory.

- First, constructivism says very little about the mechanisms through which international norms reach the domestic arena.
- Second, constructivism fails to explain why the same place branding strategy will have a dramatic impact in one state and not another.

*New Research*

Further research could focus on the following areas and questions:

- How far is the emergence of the brand state fitting into a general trend from the “high” and “hard” politics to the new “soft” and “low” politics?
- How is the brand state affecting realpolitik in world affairs?
- Another field of research involves the processes of state building and nation formation that are involved in the internal process of branding.

NOTE: The bottom line remains that a new “Great Game” of politics is emerging, this time not about oil and trading routes but about image and reputation. Managers seem to be aware of this change, but the international relations research agenda has yet to take this new development on board.

## New Technologies and International Broadcasting: Reflections on Adaptations and Transformations

Monroe E. Price and Susan Haas, University of Pennsylvania;  
and Drew Margolin, University of Southern California

*Background*

Technological change is part of a new media landscape that has rendered older definitions and contexts of international broadcasting insufficient.

- This article uses U.S. international broadcasting as a model to tease out factors embedded in institutional purpose—among them organizational complexity, political influence, and control and contradictions.
- This article asks, What is there about the organization, management structure, and geopolitical context of each entity that leads to one pattern of technological adjustment or another?

*Defining  
Broadcasting*

The increased availability of new ways of reaching audiences makes it clear that it is no longer sufficient to define international broadcasting by distinct formats or technologies of distribution.

- There is the challenge of reaching audiences no longer theoretically or materially conceived of as “mass” or passive or susceptible to message by one-way injection.
- There is the problem of establishing credibility across the globe.
- Most important for international broadcasters is the rise of nongovernmental groups that rival states in the wielding of discursive or symbolic power via media and that deploy media locally and transnationally in pursuit of political goals.
- The entity’s vision, whether it sees itself as an objective news and information service or whether it fashions a persuasive tilt by intent, will affect the strategy of reaching particular elites or other targeted population groups.

*New  
Technology*

New technologies, particularly the Internet, but with a retroactive implication for all efforts, have radical implications for the style of delivery, and not only its physical mode.

- With cable and satellite have come the fierce engine of multichannel competition and the rise of niche audiences.
- With the Internet and broadband has come the culture of interaction and user-originated content.
- New technology compels a meaning of altered modes of thinking through the relationship between the content provider and the audience.

*Organizational  
Structure*

Theories of organizational structure provide guidance as to underlying forces that might help us understand the actions of U.S. international broadcasters as they seek to absorb new technologies.

- International broadcasting entities engage in technology adoption partly to perform better, but partly because of a set of expectations.
- Structural problems limit organizations to modest adaptations, and furthermore, no managerial crisis has sufficiently encouraged international broadcasters to veer substantially from existing patterns.
- Adjustments within international broadcasters are certainly the function of technological possibilities, internal budget priorities, and geopolitical change, but technological change brings with it transformed modes of thinking about the medium.
  - Different broadcasters may, using the adjustment to new technologies as a lever, have differing abilities to adjust.

*Alhurra*

America’s Alhurra was established to attract audiences through formats using new technologies but is traditional in terms of content.

- Alhurra is criticized as a faltering effort that has the trappings of innovation, though valid studies of impact have yet to be completed.

*BBG Case  
Study*

This study focuses on one example of a context for change—the U.S. Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) and its Voice of America.

- A starting point is a look at the goals and objectives of one of the inventions of the BBG, its 2002 to 2007 strategic planning document, “Marrying the Mission to the Market”:

- design a broadcasting architecture for the twenty-first century,
- employ modern communications techniques and technologies, and
- revitalize “Telling America’s Story” to the world.

NOTE: The problem—portrayed but not clarified in these goals—is what constitutes “the mission,” what constitutes “the market,” and how “marrying” the mission to the market will be accomplished.

*Coping with Change*

How effectively international broadcasters adjust or adopt to new technologies, how well they use existing ones, how flexible they are—all this will determine how well they cope with the situation presented to them by specific constraints on the flow of information in a target or receiving state.

- The plethora of satellites helped create an environment that encouraged the establishment of state-sponsored signals designed to persuade and to reach diasporas abroad.
- Now the Internet further indicates the relationship of access opportunities to demand.
- There are also the new worlds of MySpace, Second Life, and whatever is next on the unpredictable communications horizon.

NOTE: Transformation lies more in conceptions of mission and its fulfillment, rather than in the adaptation of the benefits of technological advance.

## Mapping the Undefinable: Some Thoughts on the Relevance of Exchange Programs within International Relations Theory

Giles Scott-Smith, Roosevelt Study Center and  
Roosevelt Academy, the Netherlands

*Background*

After World War II scientific and behavioral research in the 1950s and 1960s, mainly in the fields of communications and psychology, laid the basis for understanding the political implications of public diplomacy and exchanges.

- This article considers the continuing relevance of exchanges and then inserts exchanges within reflections on international relations fields such as regime theory, Gramscian-based critical theory, constructivism, epistemic communities, and transnational networks.
- Recent studies of diplomacy have shifted their focus to an appreciation of the intertwining functions and goals of diplomacy and public diplomacy.
- The article concludes with some observations on the relevance of exchanges as forms of cultural-political interchange and the use of case studies for confirming their importance as an object of study.

*Why Exchange Programs?*

Why exchange programs such as the International Visitor Leader Program (IVLP) and the Fulbright Program?

- Over the past sixty years, U.S. Foreign Service officers have consistently reported on the value of exchanges such as the IVLP and the Fulbright

*Purpose of Exchanges*

Program as well as technical assistance and training, and have viewed them as one of the most effective means to influence opinion abroad.

- At the same time, evaluation studies conducted intermittently during the past fifty years by the State Department and contract agencies have provided considerable anecdotal evidence indicating the favorable outcomes that these activities have generated.

The outlook of the State Department on the purpose of exchanges has been relatively consistent over the past fifty years.

- The aim is to nurture favorable public opinion abroad by securing the acquiescence of influential local individuals.
- Two basic justifications lie behind the practice of U.S. exchanges:
  - the importance of “mutual understanding,” referring to the idea that a greater appreciation of other points of view can only contribute to a reduction in sources of conflict; and
  - the more practically orientated political intentions of propaganda and psychological warfare.

*Role of Exchanges*

It is important to make clear that exchanges are primarily a potent weapon for sustaining the status quo rather than changing it.

- If a certain level of cultural affinity with the host country already exists, it can be successfully nurtured by exchanges.
- The IVLP has had an effect globally but has been most effective as an accessory for maintaining the U.S.-European transatlantic alliance.

*Exchange Potency*

Liberal institutionalism, regime theory, and Gramscian thought provide an initial opportunity for encapsulating the political potency of exchanges. Constructivism builds on some of these foundations.

- Increasing political and economic interdependence between states, and the concomitant need for states to establish international and intergovernmental institutions to manage global affairs, caused attention to be directed to how and why these developments were occurring.
- However, the early results of regime theory did not challenge the notion of states as unitary actors and stuck to the assumption that all states acted as rational units in the national interest, closing off the possibility of analyzing in greater detail how these networks of transnational consensus building are actually formed.
- The introduction of Gramscian concepts has provided another route for theoretical analysis. For Gramsci, the hegemony or “intellectual—moral leadership” of a particular social group relied on the role of “intellectuals,” defined as “the entire social stratum which exercises an organizational function in the wide sense—whether in the field of production, or in that of culture, or in that of political administration.” Since the 1980s, Gramscian models have been applied to international relations by many scholars looking to trace the workings of hegemony through international institutions and norms.
- Since the early 1990s a new field of international relations theory, constructivism, has opened up further opportunities for incorporating the analysis of exchanges within the linkages between social structure and power relations highlighted by the Gramscian School.

NOTE: The potential political reward is that individuals may reconsider their identity and their interests—of all the options to achieve this, exchanges offer the best chance for success. No single other experience may be so important in shaping basic attitudes of key future world leaders towards the United States as a U.S. exchange visit.

- Epistemic Communities* Related to constructivism is a subfield that achieves insight into the macro-micro linkage—the study of epistemic communities (transnational knowledge-based networks) and their political influence.
- This research focuses on the role of key interest and advisory groups related to the policy-making establishment.
  - These are networks of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain that represent “a concrete collection of individuals who share the same worldview.”
  - Exchanges may also be used as a catalyst towards establishing “informal networks of officials” by facilitating interchange.
- Future Research* Future research should consider the importance of context, the question of scale, and the resilience of the opinion leader model.
- Conclusion* If used well, exchanges can be a potent form of persuasion. But it must be stressed that whatever their political intent, they cannot alone cause specific political effects (there are too many other variables—material, political, psychological, etc.—that need to be taken into account).

## International Exchanges and the U.S. Image

Nancy Snow, University of Southern California

- Background* This article reviews four special issues of *The Annals* devoted to international exchange programs and the U.S. image.
- 1954: America through Foreign Eyes* The U.S. Information Agency (USIA) was established on August 1, 1953, less than a week after an armistice ended U.S. involvement in the Korean War.
- Intended as a propaganda vehicle of the U.S. government, the USIA was responsible for telling America’s story.
  - The idea was that the more foreigners understood the people of the United States, the more likely calmer waters would prevail in international relations.
  - While there was little prejudice against American democracy, there was also little indication of the deeply emotional faith in it as a model for other peoples which was typical in former times.

NOTE: Author Arvid Brodersen said there was universal agreement that the American people are psychologically a democratic people, natively endowed with a great ability for friendly and easy human relations among themselves, and hospitable toward the foreigner.

1961: *The Rising Demand for International Education*

As the postwar era progressed, the importance of exchange programs became increasingly recognized.

- Eisenhower stated that “it is vitally important that we detect and pursue the ways in which cultural and economic assistance will mean more to free world strength, stability, and solidarity than will pure military measures.”
- Under Kennedy there was even greater recognition of the important roles of the exchange of persons.
- International education was now conceived as integral to the foundation of global economic development.
- Through programs like the Fulbright exchange and the Peace Corps, Americans were also involved in other kinds of efforts to utilize private citizens and students to change America’s image.

1976: *International Exchange of Persons: A Reassessment*

In the 1970s, *The Annals* reassessed American support of the exchange of persons and concluded that levels of funding for such efforts had fallen abysmally.

- On the plus side, there were improvements in planning and evaluation of programs that could help secure more funding.
- The arts were now included in exchanges, as were formal exchanges with Communist China, which was virtually nonexistent in 1961.
- Foreign exchange scholars generally liked the American people as a whole, but there was considerable criticism of specific U.S. foreign policies and of discrimination, social welfare, level of cultural life, and so on.

1987: *The Fulbright Experience and Academic Exchanges*

After a review of the Fulbright Program and other exchanges, the major purposes of exchange were presented as

- skills training and exposure to the American system of education,
- exposure of foreigners to the United States for public diplomacy purposes,
- transnational sharing of technical expertise and knowledge in the natural and health sciences, and
- support for international and comparative research and training of academics in conducting such cross-national research.

*Lessons Learned* There are lessons to be learned from the above historical accounts.

- What *The Annals* volumes suggest is that policy rationales for exchanges are never the direct result of what any particular administration wishes, but rather a composite of individual motives, institutional linkages, and national objectives.
- Another obvious lesson of these historical accounts in light of post-9/11 realities is that the era for rationalizing exchanges exclusively in the name of peace and mutual understanding is retreating.

NOTE: Prior to 9/11, Americans in general tended to be more uniformly committed to the objectives of the cold war than they are today toward the foreign policy goals of the Bush administration, including the war in Iraq, thereby making the current administration’s support of critical exchanges a harder pill to swallow than was an anticommunist agenda.

- Conclusions* What conclusions can we draw from a reassessment of international exchange?
- Underscore our commitment to freedom and human rights.
  - Reach out to those who share our ideals.
  - Support those who struggle for freedom and democracy.
  - Counter those who espouse ideologies of hate and oppression.
  - In conclusion, the primacy of the individual in contact with another individual is still an important opportunity to change attitudes and in turn improve the image of the United States to at least a more realistic level than the current downturn.

## Buena Vista Solidarity and the Axis of Aid: Cuban and Venezuelan Public Diplomacy

Michael J. Bustamante and Julia E. Sweig, Council on Foreign Relations

- Background* Cuban and Venezuelan public diplomacy are examined in this article to show
- how Cuba and Venezuela mobilize international solidarity for their domestic and international political agendas,
  - how Cuba and Venezuela leverage their international aid programs to gain influence and legitimacy, and
  - how cultural products like film and music are deployed by each state in international settings.

NOTE: The article's examples show that successful public diplomacy is not just what governments do to promote themselves abroad but also how they react to, take advantage of, or benefit from external circumstances and actors.

- Cuban Outreach* The Cuban Revolution perhaps possessed a unique potential to forge lasting people-to-people ties with citizens across the globe, and officials in Havana designed several initiatives to help Cuba achieve these goals.
- One program was OSPAAAL, the Organization for Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—the group articulated Cuba's support for national liberation movements across the globe.
  - Cuban officials also spent (and continue to dedicate) much time and energy attempting to show off the benefits of their social and economic model to foreigners.
  - To complement these efforts, Cuba works hard to promote its message in the international media and on the Internet.

- The U.S. Embargo Effect* An indirect, but nonetheless important element of the Cuban government's public diplomacy strategy has been the U.S. embargo.
- Cuba has received great sympathy for the government's defiance in the face of all U.S. efforts to undermine its stability.
  - This also has given Castro worldwide respect.

*Solidarity*

By gradually cultivating deeply felt bonds of loyalty among many Latin Americans, the island's leadership has successfully secured a source of sympathy within foreign electorates and thereby inoculated itself from most attempts to pursue more hardline anti-Castro policies.

- For example, the notable cooling of Mexican-Cuban relations under Vicente Fox outraged members of the former ruling party, the PRI.
- Cuba's approach to public diplomacy has thus provided the island's centralized government with a layer of political and ideological protection simply not afforded to Hugo Chávez's Venezuela.

*Venezuela*

The meteoric rise to power of Hugo Chávez brought to power a leader inspired by Cuba's example of anti-U.S. defiance.

- The Chávez government has sought to duplicate some of Havana's public diplomacy successes.
- Chávez policies appeal to the long disenfranchised poor.
- His basic electoral credentials are a key selling point internationally, constantly burnished by Venezuelan officials to justify the concentration of authority in the executive branch.
- Venezuelan officials have sought to demonstrate to visitors and audiences abroad the advantages of their country's new social model.
- Through the Bolivarian News Agency, the government has attempted to lend its own perspective to the international media.
- Within the United States, the Venezuela Information Office, responsible for advertising the achievements of Venezuela's social programs, plays a crucial role in the Chávez government's public diplomacy efforts.
- More important and potentially influential on a larger scale was the creation of Telesur, a Latin American television network meant to compete with CNN and other dominant Western media outlets.
- On a more directly political level, Venezuela has attempted to mobilize citizens across the world to stand in solidarity with the Bolivarian Revolution as it faces what Chávez describes as external threats and provocations, primarily from the United States.
  - However, the fact that Venezuela depends on the U.S. to purchase more than 50 percent of its oil exports casts suspicion over the authenticity of Chávez's anti-American credentials.

*Cuban Medical Aid*

Cuba's long-standing commitment to providing medical services to the third world forms an integral part of the revolution's internationalism.

- The work of Cuban medical personnel is not only welcome but also taken as a demonstration of the Cuban government's generosity.
- In contrast to Cuba's grassroots efforts, U.S. aid programs often emphasize long-term goals that do not produce visible, easily marketable results.

*Chávez's Foreign Aid*

Overall, Venezuela's current international aid efforts have a much broader focus and reach than Cuba's because Chávez has more money to spend.

- The most obvious asset that Venezuela can give away is oil itself.
- Venezuela spends more on direct aid in Latin America than the United States.

- Outside of the energy sector, Chávez has extended his financial reach as well, most notably in Argentina, where the Venezuelan government purchased more than \$5 billion in Argentine bonds.

NOTE: The Venezuelan government frames these initiatives as part of a struggle to spur independent regional development and, in a spirit of solidarity, further the economic and social integration of the hemisphere. Yet the size and scope of Venezuela's charitable largesse ironically exposes the country's leadership to accusations of attempting to simply purchase influence.

### *Cultural Diplomacy*

Cuba has been engaged in cultural promotion activities that are not explicitly political in their orientation or purpose.

- The promotion abroad of Cuban art, music, and film has helped the island fulfill other equally important national interests: the attraction of tourists and hard currency, for example.
- One of the cultural movements to serve a public diplomacy purpose for the Cuban government was the rise of the Nueva Trova music style in the late 1960s, which highlighted the growing power of protest songs.
- Film is another area in which Cuba has obtained international success.
- Cuba has successfully managed these imperatives in ways that boost the government's reputation abroad and sustain sources of income.
- By comparison, Venezuela has made few inroads into the promotion of its culture abroad for public diplomacy purposes.
- Few Venezuelan films can be said to have directly served the public diplomacy interests of the Venezuelan government.

### *Conclusions*

If we define public diplomacy as the quest to build symbolic capital on the world stage, both Venezuela and Cuba have achieved noteworthy successes.

- In Cuba's case, diplomatic successes in recent years are almost wholly attributable to the island's soft power—the gradual but persistent branding and projection of a series of intertwined discourses generating sympathy for Cuba's culture, its social achievements, and its revolutionary mystique.
- However, Cuban public diplomacy, though less vulnerable than Venezuelan approaches in many ways, is far from uniformly successful. The 2003 incarceration of seventy-five dissidents elicited outrage internationally and motivated many long-time supporters of the regime to speak out in opposition to the government's repressive actions.
- Meanwhile, Venezuela's aid programs have been brought into question when they have been perceived to pursue specifically political ends. On several occasions, the Venezuelan government has been criticized for using international aid to influence electoral outcomes in neighboring countries.

### *U.S. Blunders*

In the end, it is the United States's own international blunders that act as Cuba's and Venezuela's most powerful public diplomacy tool.

- No amount of solidarity campaigns or international aid does as much for Venezuelan or Cuban public diplomacy as the Iraq war, Abu Ghraib, or accusations of mistreatment at Guantánamo Bay.
- While the links are not direct, broad failures in U.S. foreign policy create important rhetorical, thematic, and discursive spaces in which Cuban and Venezuelan critiques of U.S. leadership can thrive.

# Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power

Yiwei Wang, Fudan University, China

Q  
R  
S

## *Background*

In recent years, Chinese governments have demonstrated a limited understanding of public diplomacy, seeing it either as external propaganda or a form of internal public affairs, but this has not prevented China from becoming a skilled public diplomacy player.

- In comparison to the United States, China needs both an enduring and effective public diplomacy strategy and to make full use of the modern media.
- The peaceful rise/peaceful development policy in Chinese grand strategy has sought to integrate Chinese hard power and soft power to create a soft rise for China.
- China shows great interest in public diplomacy and has clearly set its sights on learning how to promote Chinese soft power and express itself positively to the world.
  - However, if the government expresses itself in the usual international language, it will lose its Chinese-ness and will be criticized by the Chinese people for being too Westernized.
  - Ironically, the world has now broadened its concern over the rise of China to focus on its mounting soft and hard power.

## *Public Diplomacy*

While the state propaganda system is very strong and influential in China, Chinese public diplomacy is relatively weak.

- The Chinese practice of public diplomacy took shape in 1983 as part of the “open and reform” period, beginning with the creation of a system of Chinese news spokesmen and intensified after September 11, 2001.
- China’s public diplomacy aims to fulfill two roles: as a function of wise strategic thinking and defensive reasons, and as an urgent task to facilitate China’s rise to soft power.
- China has advantages due to its rapid rise that has drawn world attention; a massive population; a strong government; and abundant political, economic, and cultural resources.
- Its disadvantages range from poor diplomats to a language gap.

## *Chinese Misconceptions*

The Chinese have many misconceptions about their international image.

- China assumes that if the nation is strong enough and big enough, then other nations will respect it.
- China has paid attention to its international position while neglecting its international image.
- China has focused on expanding its economy internationally while neglecting culture.
- The Chinese assume that China should be respected by the world for its long history and splendid civilization.

NOTE: Even if some misperceptions about China could be eliminated, Chinese culture poses a considerable obstacle to effective Chinese public diplomacy.

*Grand Strategy* To understand Chinese public diplomacy, one has to go beyond the diplomatic level and consider Chinese grand strategy.

- China must overcome the perception of the “China Threat,” which has been the main obstacle for improving China’s international image.
- China must change others’ perception of the logic that the strong are necessarily threatening.
- China pursues five main objectives:
  - more strongly publicizing the Chinese government’s statements and assertions to the outside world,
  - forming a desirable image of the state,
  - issuing rebuttals to distorted overseas reports about China,
  - improving the international environment surrounding China, and
  - exerting influence on the policy decisions of foreign countries.

NOTE: To properly carry out Chinese public diplomacy, China needs to learn from Chinese history, inquiring into ideas, environment, resources, and challenges for public diplomacy and put forward a systematic Chinese public diplomacy strategy with Chinese characteristics.

*Conclusion* The long-term challenge for successful Chinese public diplomacy is to keep a balance between Chinese and Americanized/Westernized trends.

- Compared to the United States, China needs an enduring and effective public diplomacy strategy and needs to improve its skills to make full use of the modern media and means to carry out its public diplomacy.
- Public diplomacy plays three roles in China’s rise:
  - Public diplomacy can shape a sympathetic and harmonious international environment and can be a catalyst for the process of China’s rise.
  - Public diplomacy can be the coagulant of China’s rise, solidifying the base for a Chinese national and international image.
  - Public diplomacy can be the lubricant for China’s rise by building Chinese soft power and changing China’s rise from a hard rise to a soft rise.
- China should learn to be a responsible stakeholder in the international system and achieve its sustainable soft rise in such a way as to satisfy or at least gain the acceptance of the international community.

## Public Diplomacy: Sunrise of an Academic Field

Bruce Gregory, George Washington University

*Background* This article examines scholarship with relevance, usually unintended, to the study of public diplomacy and a body of analytical and policy-related literature derived from the practice of public diplomacy.

- Ideas, wars, globalism, technologies, political pressures, and professional norms shaped the conduct of public diplomacy and the literature of scholars and practitioners during the twentieth century.

*Public  
Diplomacy  
Defined*

- In the twenty-first century, thick globalism, network structures, and new technologies are transforming scholarship, governance, and state-based public diplomacy.
  - Academics have been paying more attention to public diplomacy, and more practitioners are recognizing the value of scholarship.

Public diplomacy is a term that describes ways and means by which states, associations of states, and nonstate actors *understand* cultures, attitudes, and behavior; *build and manage* relationships; and *influence* opinions and actions to advance their interests and values.

- It is used by political actors to understand the consequences of policy choices; set public agendas; influence discourse; and build consent for strategies that require trade-offs among costs, risks, and benefits.
- Public diplomacy operates through actions, relationships, images, and words in three time frames: 24/7 news streams, medium-range campaigns on high-value policies, and long-term engagement.

*Twentieth  
Century*

The study and practice of modern public diplomacy began with World War I and the “big ideas” of the Bolshevik Revolution, the League of Nations, and National Socialism.

- Political leaders used radio and other industrial age technologies to influence not just governments but the opinions and actions of their citizens. The horrors of modern warfare drove widespread interest in educational and cultural exchanges.
- Fruitful scholarship for understanding this foundational era includes propaganda studies and John Dewey’s discourse-based challenge to Walter Lippmann’s “top-down” model of political communication.
- World War II and the cold war continued a pattern of linking U.S. cultural, information, and broadcasting agencies to war or the threat of war.
- Relevant scholarship included public opinion research, cultural anthropology, social psychology, media and political communication studies, and Jürgen Habermas’s theory of communicative action.
- Literature by practitioners falls generally into organizational studies of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) and alternative institutional models, and histories of contested relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in cultural diplomacy and international broadcasting.

*Twenty-First  
Century*

The transforming consequences for public diplomacy of new ideas, network societies, nonstate actors, digital technologies, and new forms of warfare are on a scale comparable to the changes that ushered in the state-based model a century earlier.

- Scholars are engaging in relevant research on identity theory and constructivism, media framing and political communication, governance and soft power, social network analysis, and a “new public diplomacy.”
- Practitioners tend to divide into those seeking reform in government agencies and those who contend public diplomacy requires new thinking, new tools, networked capabilities, and stronger, more imaginative relations with civil society.

*Conclusion* It is possible and desirable to treat public diplomacy as an emerging academic field based on three considerations:

- an achievable consensus on an analytical framework;
- a substantial body of relevant scholarship and practical literature; and
- benefits for learning, shared knowledge, and professional practice.

*The Future* Going forward, questions abound.

- Is it possible to create a field that is multidisciplinary and relevant to the public sphere while maintaining the academic standards of the separate disciplines on which it is based?
- Will mutually advantageous collaboration occur among departmental and university rivals competing for faculty and students?
- Will scholars engage in research, develop case studies, and build courses in ways that advance learning and address the needs of practitioners?
- Will practitioners provide data useful to scholars and take advantage of relevant scholarship?
- Will scholars and practitioners use their knowledge to enrich learning and public debate?

NOTE: If we achieve positive answers to these and other questions, the rewards can be significant for the academic study and practice of public diplomacy.