İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY PRESS

SİYASAL: Journal of Political Sciences, 27(2): 133–148

DOI: 10.26650/siyasal.2018.27.2.0006
http://jps.istanbul.edu.tr

SİYASAL: Journal of Political Sciences

Submitted: October, 1, 2018
Accepted: October, 25, 2018

RESEARCH ARTICLE/ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

Soft Power and Public Diplomacy: A Conceptual Assessment

Kıvanç Ulusoy[1]

'Really Powerful Republics and Princes do not purchase Alliances with Money, but obtain them by means of Virtue and the Reputation of their Forces' Niccolo Machiavelli (1970), *Discourses*, (London: Penguin), p. 372.

Abstract

This paper is a critical assessment of two novel concepts on international politics: soft power and public diplomacy. It claims that the rise of both concepts in the current international relations theory and practice could be contextualized in the radical changes taking place in world politics over the recent past decades mainly due to expanding communications technology and stronger quest for public participation in foreign policy-making. The article argues that the states are required to mobilized a variety of resources and instruments of power-soft power- different from the traditional military and economic capacity-hard power. They are also required, under the public pressure both within and beyond their boundaries, to engage in a deliberative exercise -public diplomacy- to defend their national interest and work to create a true perception of their foreign policies.

Keywords

Public diplomacy • Soft power • Media • Legitimacy • National interest

Yumuşak Güç ve Kamu Diplomasisi: Kavramsal bir Değerlendirme

Öz

Bu makale uluslararası siyasetin iki yeni kavramını -yumuşak güç ve kamu diplomasisi- eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla ele almaktadır. Bu iki kavramın uluslararası ilişkiler kuramı ve pratiklerinde yükselişini dünya siyasetinde geçtiğimiz yıllarda iletişim araçlarının yayılması, teknolojinin yaygın kullanımı ve dış politika alanında artan kamusal katılım talepleriyle gündeme gelen köklü değişimler bağlamına oturtmaktadır. Makale, devletlerin geleneksel askeri ve iktisadi kapasite çerçevesinde tanımlanan sert güçten farklı olarak çeşitli yumuşak güç kaynak ve araçlarını seferber etmek zorunda kaldıklarını iddia etmektedir. Devletler sınırlarının içinde ve ötesinde karşı karşıya kaldıkları kamuoyu baskısı sonucunda müzakereci egzersizle –kamu diplomasisiulusal çıkarlarını savunmaya ve dış politikalarının doğru algılanmasını sağlamaya çalışmaktadırlar.

1 **Corresponding author:** Kıvanç Ulusoy (Prof. PhD.) Istanbul University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: kivancu@istanbul.edu.tr

To cite this article: Ulusoy, K. (2018). Soft power and public diplomacy: A conceptual assessment. *SİYASAL: Journal of Political Sciences, 27*(2), 133-148. http://dx.doi.org/10.26650/siyasal.2018.27.2.0006

This paper argues that the states in current world politics have been overwhelmed by changes in communications technology and a stronger quest for public participation in foreign policy-making. They try to respond to these challenges through mobilizing a variety of resources and instruments of power, referred to as 'soft power'. The 'soft power' is different from the traditional varieties of 'hard power' defined by the military and economic capacity of the states in the sense that it is directed towards convincing the wider public within and beyond the national boundaries about the rationality and legitimacy of the national interest pursued. In other words, the states are required to develop a variety of capabilities to defend and explain their policies to the wider world which has become more and more integrated realm composed of not just the states, but a series of international entities from international organizations such as the United Nations (UN) to *sui generis* political structures such as the European Union (EU), and civil society actors with national and transnational character including charities. These capabilities include various forms of diplomatic techniques and instruments slightly different from the traditional diplomatic practices and propaganda techniques. They are generally referred to as 'public diplomacy', requiring diverse forms of engagement with the wider public both in domestic and international arenas. The post-war developments in technology and communications leave little room for governments to monopolize power but empowers international organizations, civil society actors and individuals to play roles in world politics. They bring also threats different from the previous ones in many respects. Conditioning actors and structures of politics technological advances starting from the early twentieth century, as the development of nuclear weapons demonstrates, have radically altered the relations among the states as the immediate question of survival is always at stake and this affects the struggle for power in international relations. The security challenges have come parallel to the social, economic and political opportunities that the technological developments bring about. They require governments to develop instruments going beyond the traditional state-centric forms of dealing with them. This paper does not aim to provide an exhaustive analysis of power with all its philosophical dimensions relating to human nature, domestic politics and the structure of international relations. Though it aims to analyze the roots and the development of different forms of diplomatic practice, it does not provide an exhaustive historical data. However, it establishes a framework for analyzing the two key concepts of current world politics: 'soft power' and 'public diplomacy'. First of all, this requires a clear distinction between 'propaganda' defined as a state-centric manipulation of information for a specific target audience from the 'public

diplomacy' briefly defined above as engagement with a broader public sphere. Secondly, this paper underlines the significance of massive changes in the international political landscape affecting not only the practices of diplomacy but also the projections of national power. The states are increasingly required to develop new foreign policy practices, broadly defined as 'public diplomacy' to confront with major changes in the immediate neighborhood. The questions of 'legitimacy', traditionally considered with respect to maximization of national interest, becomes an outcome of deliberative practices between a state and the public within and beyond its boundaries. Therefore, 'public diplomacy' is actually a deliberative exercise as the states are pushed and pulled to genuinely engage with an extended public via transnational media to defend their policies and create a true perception of their foreign policies.

A Framework for Analysis: Propaganda *versus* Public Diplomacy

This section provides a framework of analysis based on the elaboration of a distinction between 'propaganda' and 'public diplomacy'. In broader terms while 'propaganda' refers to a traditional instrument of politics to persuade people through manipulation of a situation or reality for political purposes, 'public diplomacy' as a relatively new concept of foreign policy puts forward a series of instruments to persuade domestic and international audience through a serious engagement and genuine deliberation. The states actually use both of them to maximize their national interests. Therefore, the similarities between the two concepts are related with the final purpose of their use. Probably, a distinction appears sharper when the different techniques and factors inherent in 'propaganda' and the traditional 'diplomacy' laid down. While in both cases the ultimate aim is to maximize the state power, the strategic choices of using any one of them affect advantages in the pursuit of power. Propagandists use simplification of issues which are also sensationalized to arouse emotions and heighten tensions. The content of propaganda is usually culture-specific and full of stereotypes and the propagandist is either the sole or the central source of information for the audience. In the context of international relations, for both 'propaganda' and 'diplomacy', there is no goal beyond power. However, diplomacy is also an institution of the inter-state system itself. It emerged in the fifteenth century Europe through a system of permanent relations among the state actors of the system. In this respect, diplomacy, beyond the purposes of state actors, has been an integral part of the state system. It provides an institutionalized form of communication. It is a permanent activity, basically serving for the representation of the state actors in political, military and

economic terms. Diplomacy includes military means in addition to the economic and political ones at a state's disposal in order to carry out its foreign policy.

Hans Morgenthau, one of the leading scholars of international relations, counts the 'quality of diplomacy' as an element of national power, along with geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness, population, national character and national morale. For him, it is also the most unstable one as the 'quality of diplomacy' highly depends on how the other sources of power- which are actually raw material out of which the power of nation is fashioned- are integrated as a whole, given direction and awaken the potentialities (Morgenthau, 1948, pp. 80-107). He claims "for a diplomacy that ends in war has failed in its primary objective: the promotion of the national interest by peaceful means" (Morgenthau, 1948, p. 419). Therefore, traditionally, the ultimate purpose of institutionalized diplomatic activities is to sustain peace and order in international relations, which serves in the end for the benefit of the public in its widest terms. In a similar vein, Kenneth Waltz, the leading figure of structuralism in international relations, underlines that securing peace requires to be innovative. He states that "even though one may find it hard to believe that there are ways to peace not yet tried by statesmen or advocated by publicists, the very complexity of the problem suggests the possibility of combining activities in different ways in the hope that some combination will lead us closer to the goal" (Waltz, 1954, p. 2).

In this context, 'public diplomacy', different from the traditional diplomatic practices in nature, content and the context of activity, is a form of innovation in international politics. As mentioned above, 'public diplomacy' actually is a novel phenomenon in close correspondence with the state of international affairs in the post-World War II era. The international politics in the aftermath of the World War II has gained a particular character largely shaped by a determining level of technology, overwhelming complexity of the issues, involvement of diverse type of actors, stronger global institutional structures supported by various issue agencies and a global media gradually creating an integrated audience (Ruggie, 1982; Held and McGrew, 1993). These new developments of the post-war period have been coupled with expanding democratization in the foreign policy-making and developments in normative spheres such as the permanent quest for deeper transparency in critical decision-making by the wider public. In particular, especially in the post-Second World War era, there has been an increasing level of pressure over the state actors by the wider public in regards to sharing information and greater involvement in the core decision-making processes. This has actually been a tremendous challenge against the classical

understanding of international politics, mainly regarded as 'high politics', a closed area for diplomats and the highest level statesmen. In the post-war era, the classical system of international relations based on the centrality of the states and their interactions seriously faces a global democratic challenge showing itself in various modes such as the development of new actors other than the state actors; expanding capitalism and deepening economic integration; ever porous borders and eroding territoriality; active citizens and overwhelming legalization (Slaughter, 2004, pp. 148-1963; Sassen, 2006, pp. 1-31).

The two world wars and their devastating effects brought a democratic challenge towards foreign policy-making and diplomatic practices hitherto shaped by "secrecy", 'balance of power' and 'strategic alliances'. The traditional diplomacy shaped by secret practices and power politics started to be regarded as the real causes the two world wars and many others in the previous centuries (Taylor, 1954). The developments in technology and the advent of democracy found significant echoes in international relations. Scholars regarded them as positive developments to make the field more transparent to prevent "secret diplomacy". Some thought that they would lead to the decline of diplomacy as to make ambassadors less significant in the crafting and the execution of policy (Butterfield, 1966, pp. 181-192). Therefore, in the post-war period, the transparency in diplomacy, the expansion of international institutions, the increasing observance of international law by the states and the multilateralism promoted by the democratic states of the Western world turned to be the main principles for the so called 'modern diplomacy'. In this context, one has to underline the globalization of diplomatic values and practices as well. In fact, those practices once considered as peculiar for the Western countries as they have developed in Europe throughout the past centuries, expanded to the rest of the world with the creation of a state centric post-war international political structure as a result of the independence of the colonies which is called the 'de-colonization' process (Wight, 1966, pp. 89-131). Despite the negative effects of the Cold War, both international politics in general and the diplomatic practices taking place between the states at bilateral and multilateral levels moved towards more transparency and democratization. Contrary to the claim that international organizations undermines democracy, the scholars of international relations such as Robert Keohane and others claim that multilateral institutions enhance the democracy not only in developing countries but also in established democracies through "restricting the power of special interest factions, protecting individual rights, and improving the quality of democratic deliberation, while also increasing capacities to achieve important public purposes" (Keohane, Macedo and Moravcsik, 2009, p. 1).

In its post-war reformulation, Morgethau accentuates that diplomacy has three means at its disposal: 'persuasion', 'compromise' and the 'threat of force'. In this perspective, diplomacy, aiming to avoid the absoluteness of victory and defeat and meeting the other side on the middle ground of negotiated compromise for the sake of long term peace, is a practice in a world of states, cool-headed diplomats and statesmen. Morgenthau (1948, p. 421) states "the art of diplomacy consists in putting the right emphasis at any particular moment on each of these three means at disposal". Therefore, the foreign policy-making is considered still in the domain of the particular principles of 'compromise', 'peace' and 'prudence', rather than an area open to popular excitements, provocations and emotions. Despite facing the growing pressures of democratization in many countries and the pressures of multilateralism enhancing democratization, Morgenthau still relies on a traditional, realist perspective prioritizing power and national interest in international relations. In his five prerequisites of compromise, he states "the government is the leader of public opinion". Morgenthau (1948, p. 443) continues "… the rational requirements of good foreign policy cannot from the outset count upon the support of a public opinion whose preferences are emotional rather than rational".

As underlined above, like diplomacy- both in traditional and modern practices-, the concept of 'public diplomacy' is also an instrument of foreign policy and a function of maximizing national power. The practices of 'public diplomacy' include cultural programs to international exchanges of students, scholars and artists to the traditional diplomatic domain. Many governments currently integrating various 'public diplomacy' practices to their political agendas consider the essential requirement of presenting their policies to a wider public both inside and outside to gain 'legitimacy' both in domestic politics and international relations. As mentioned above, similar to traditional diplomatic practices, the central motives of 'public diplomacy' actually include the wider goals of 'diplomacy' such as maintaining international peace and order which makes it different from 'propaganda' that does not necessarily carry the claims of truth and integrity. However, in addition to its target and practices, 'public diplomacy' differs from traditional 'diplomacy' in regards to how to realize the central goals of keeping peace and order in international relations. Public diplomacy contributes to international peace through developing better understanding of foreign policies among the nations. Public diplomacy serves for the states to transform the underlying context of foreign policy-making. It does this through making alternative information available, and communicating to the target countries' citizens and wider public the messages that legitimize their foreign policies.

There is a clear difference between 'diplomacy' and 'public diplomacy' in terms of target audience. While the former principally aims at foreign governments and the latter actually emerges from the necessity of reaching out directly to foreign (and domestic) publics. Therefore, 'public diplomacy' is designed to transmit ideas and communicate messages to the publics of the target countries and the worldwide public opinion. However, 'public diplomacy' and 'diplomacy' shares the objective of reaching the two central goals of international politics: peace and order but the former has a slightly different strategy based on fostering goodwill among peoples and states. This actually requires a rather sophisticated approach to foreign policy-making. Therefore, it ends up being different from the practices of 'propaganda' which is essentially based on 'simplicity', 'stereotypes' and 'sensationalism', as claimed above. The phenomena of 'propaganda' have been studied by the scholars of international relations since the emergence of the discipline as it relates to a specific form of state practice towards the wider public. In addition to military and economy, E.H. Carr, another eminent scholar of the field, already recognized the significance of a third form of power which is 'power over opinion'.

Carr states that "the organized use of power over opinion as a regular instrument of foreign policy is a modern development" (Carr, 2001, p. 135). In his well-known book on the international politics of the interwar years, *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939*, Carr claims that the advent of democracy after the World War I, the Great Depression of 1929, and the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany paved the way for the rise of a crucial phenomenon, namely 'propaganda'. For Carr, 'propaganda' is essentially a modern phenomenon, owing to the emergence of a mass society in the Western countries. He states that "contemporary politics are vitally dependent on the opinion of large masses of more or less politically conscious people, of whom the most vocal, the most influential and the most accessible to propaganda are those who live in great cities" (Carr, 2001, p. 133). In this context, Carr claims that the European countries during the interwar years and their leaders like Mussolini and Hitler aimed to influence the opinions of masses for political purposes but "the initiative in introducing propaganda as a regular instrument of international relations must be credited to the Soviet government" (Carr, 2001, p. 137). Carr considered 'propaganda' as an instrument of foreign policy for many countries during the interwar years. Even the victory of the democratic countries such as Great Britain and France in 1918 created an almost universal opinion that democracy was the best form of government. For Carr, crafting this universal opinion was also a form of 'propaganda' but he claims propaganda "as a weapon specifically appropriate to a period of hostilities" (Carr, 2001, p. 137). He underlines that 'propaganda' turned

out to be such a device that it is equal to 'military' and 'economic' ones to project national power. In the end, the real national power, for Carr, emerges as the art of linking these three forms of power Carr, 2001, pp.143-145.

Carr was probably one of the earliest scholars of international relations seeing the significance of public opinion in designing foreign policy to maximize national interest. Though it is a crucial early diagnosis, the power over opinion, the term he uses to describe a new conception of power, is limited to the level of technology, communication mechanism and the complexity of issues in his time. Propaganda was crucial for the fascists to come to power in Germany and Italy. It was crucial for earlier forms of the promotion of democracy which was soon regarded as a Great Power ideology and lost great prestige and credibility. The end of the World War II with the use of atomic bomb against Japan showed the devastating power of technology. The intensification of imperialism and nationalism which brought the two bloody world wars brought with it the collapse of traditional diplomacy and the power structure of the nineteenth century Europe. We can't expect from Carr to estimate the current level of technological developments, economic integration, legalization and complexity of issues affecting world politics such as the climate change, migration and poverty in the early twenty first century. He masterfully provided us with the principal signals and defined the major battle-lines of the next decades in international relations, if not the next century.

The Cold War and the balance of terror conditioned the post-war international politics through bipolarity and the fear of complete destruction of the planet (Gaddis, 1982; Gaddis, 1992). A detailed assessment of the Cold War international relations or a demystification of twentieth century issues surrounding that extends the scope of this paper, but, it concentrates on a specific conceptual device that mystifies the contemporary international studies. This paper argues the fault lines of the present day international politics have been deeply inherent in the transformation of the nature of power and how it is pursued in international arena (Lukes, 1974; Nye, 2011). It is beyond the focus of this paper to provide a full-scale analysis of the transformation of power or its operations in international relations, but, we limit ourselves to how it relates to the practices of 'diplomacy' through analyzing in detail the relations with the 'public diplomacy' and a novel form of power, defined as the 'soft power'.

Public Diplomacy and Soft Power: A Critical Assessment

The contemporary practices of 'public diplomacy' often decipher 'propaganda', designed from a center as 'personalized', 'dramatized',

'nationalistic and often 'immoderate' message. Particularly for this reason, 'public diplomacy' has been incorporated as an integral part of a country's foreign policy-making. 'Public diplomacy' is often configured against 'propaganda', as it is multi-level and multi-dimensional. The main reason for this is the increasingly integrated character of public opinion as a result of the developments in information technology and its world-wide expansion. An inevitable conclusion of this is the disappearance of distinction between 'reaching towards' or 'touching' foreign and domestic publics. In an international political context where sensational, emotionally arousing and disturbing messages are transmitted easily and fast, 'public diplomacy' actually turns out to be a critical 'counter propaganda' device in foreign policy. Therefore, the strategy and the practices of 'public diplomacy' employed by the states becomes increasingly comprehensive and integrated. In fact, 'public diplomacy' in its widest terms has always been an integral part of the traditional diplomatic practices and the projections of national power. One crucial example is the projections of French culture and language by of the French government during the liberal period of economic and cultural expansion in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. Britain also promoted the idea of free trade becoming a hegemonic idea of international economics, but the liberal economy ultimately served the British interests in those times.

'Public diplomacy' has been integrated into national strategies in a much more sophisticated way along with technological improvements in communications in the second-half of the twentieth century. In fact, as mentioned above, the developments in the media and technology have also highly contributed to the changes in the character of diplomacy. This novel concept emerged in the post-war context of the fast changes in technological infrastructure, radically transforming how we conduct politics and international relations. In the aftermath of the Second World War, the ideological struggle taking place between the two super powers, the USA and the USSR, provided a basis for the development of major propaganda devices. China was another superpower effectively using propaganda to save its communist regime during the Cold War. China portrayed a different regime from the 'totalitarian' and 'expansionist' Soviet type. However, public diplomacy practices along with the centrality of 'propaganda' developed throughout the decades of the Cold War. While the propaganda practices based on surveillance of communication mechanisms and defense of ideology were at the forefront as a result of the ideological struggle between two superpowers, public diplomacy practices, such as cultural exchanges and dialogue with the other camp was of secondary

significance. Each block, the Western Alliance and the Warsaw Pact countries in its propaganda, aimed to provoke the supposedly existing 'internal divisions' of the other block, and the potential 'self-destructive' character of political, economic and social system that each Block defends as best for the human nature and its development (Milburn et al, 1982; Cumings, 1992). During the Cold War, in order to defend this one-sided perspective, the huge propaganda machines were developed on each side and they operated with the priority given to government agencies and secret teams operating in the enemy camp (Cull, 2009; Wang, 2011).

Soft Power As A Novel Form of Power

The end of the Cold War brought an end to this aggressive and uncompromising struggle of ideologies. The triumph of liberal democracy as the most valid form of government initially created a rather optimistic atmosphere in terms of the existing and perceived threats in the West. As the American foreign policy makers perceived, the Soviet Union collapsed and the socialism as an alternative ideology to liberal democracy was defeated. The early expectation in the post-Cold War era was that the liberal democracy was adopted in the rest of the world and the ideological rivalries would definitively end. However, soon, the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers in Manhattan, U.S in September 11, 2001 made a shocking impact in the West in general and the United States in particular. Considering their continent immune from any serious attack because of its geographical location, the American foreign policy makers were puzzled with this threat that is difficult to identify and eliminate. Among the scholars of diplomacy and international relations, initially there was a great debate on how to respond to this unconventional danger. The traditional responses of using "hard power" such as a military intervention or an economic embargo would not be sufficient or even relevant. The idea of 'war on terrorism', employed by the American administration led by George Bush, actually appeared as an awkward term as there was no threat defined in conventional terms against the US.

The idea of 'public diplomacy' has been incorporated to the vocabulary of international relations in this post-September 11 context of unconventional security dilemma. It would not be completely wrong to state that it emerged as a result of the necessity of developing means to respond to this unconventional security threat through presenting and defending American interests and values in other countries in substantive terms. 'Public diplomacy' gradually became an integral part of the American national security strategy as an element of

"soft power" (Zaharna, 2010). Both, 'public diplomacy' and 'soft power', have been regarded by the critical observers as the functions of the US way of framing global politics after September 11 as a 'global war on terror'. In this context, public diplomacy has appeared to be the operational practice of a novel conception of power coined by an eminent scholar of international relations, namely Joseph Nye, as 'soft power'. Arguing that political leaders and philosophers have long understood the power that comes from setting the agenda and determining the framework of analysis, Nye (2000, p. 28) claims that "soft power can rest on such resources as the attraction of one's ideas or on the ability to set the political agenda in a way that shapes the preferences others express". Therefore, for Nye, 'soft power' refers to the ability of a country to establish preferences of the others through intangible power resources such as culture, ideology and institutions. Therefore, in the case of soft power, the ideas and perceptions of the agent is as much significant as the target thinks and perceives it. As Nye states "soft power is a dance that requires partners" (Nye, 2011, p. 84).

The 9/11 attacks brought a significant debate revolving around how to project national power in a world where the US appears as the only superpower. Written in the context of the post-9/11 interventionist policy of the Bush administration, Nye, in his two articles published in 2004 in academic journals on 'soft power', puts forward a profound critique of using solely military means to fight against terrorism and sustain the American supremacy around the world. As a quest for a multilateral foreign policy and a response to challenges of an interdependent world shaken by impressive developments in communication technology, Nye emphasized the necessity to develop a different conception of diplomacy supplementing, the 'soft power', which he considers as the most relevant way of success in contemporary world politics (Nye, 2004a; Nye 2004b). The 'public diplomacy', as a set of practices to maximize the American 'soft power', offers mediums to deal with the world politics that is challenged by technological developments, cultural changes and identity conflicts. The foreign policy experts saw that the cultural differences have been the potential cause of misunderstanding the American policies and tying the hands of even friendly governments to achieve policy goals such as trade pacts or defense alliances. Hostility caused by the misperceptions of the American policies provides an environment for hatred all around the world. They have been the actual route route causes of political violence civil wars and terrorism. Therefore, the American policy makers considered that the American values, culture and political system have to be promoted as

valuable assets of public diplomacy both to maximize American power and to foster peace and order in international relations (Seib, 2009).

Nye argues that there are three forms of soft power: cultural soft power; soft power derived from political values and soft power derived from foreign policies (Nye, 2000, 99). Culture could be a crucial source of state power deriving the attraction of others; political values, linked to the cultural ones, could condition the changes in policies and political structures of other countries along the lines of the agent country or a group of countries. Finally, foreign policies of a state or a group of states when regarded legitimate and having moral authority over others could effectively operate as a function of a soft power. However, Nye argues that different from the resources of hard power such as the army or a strong economy, soft-power resources often work through shaping the environment for foreign and domestic policies of other countries. The resources of soft power have always been slower, more diffuse, and more cumbersome to wield. For this reason, it often takes a long time to produce the desired outcomes. For Nye, the US is a latecomer of using information and culture for the purposes of diplomacy (Nye, 2000, pp. 100-104). The operations of soft power, for Nye, require a set of practices in order to reach the widest public in the world through utilizing the newest forms of communications technology and media. In this particular context, 'public diplomacy' differs from the traditional ways of promoting one's ideas and policies as it takes into account the plurality of views. This actually increases their credibility, legitimacy and moral authority over others. Furthermore, it is based on interactions and includes private views in addition to government ones.

'Public diplomacy' tools aim to mobilize primarily nongovernmental individuals and organizations as diplomatic agents besides the governmental agents. This would make the response by the American power to contemporary unconventional challenges as a more credible one. In this context, public diplomacy appears not only as a response to the terrorist challenges that the US faced in 9/11 but also to respond to the challenges of world governance that the US might face. Nye (2002, XIV) states "we are not only bound to lead, but bound to cooperate." As mentioned above, Nye considers public diplomacy programs, disseminating information through a variety of channels about various aspects of the American life, and values and policies that foreign publics regard as laudatory result in increasing America's power, reputation and prestige. For Nye, public diplomacy practices have three particular dimensions. First of all, they include daily communications, which require a continuous engagement with the public to explain the context of domestic and foreign policy decisions. Secondly, 'public diplomacy' involves strategic communications in which a set

of simple themes is developed. This appears much like what occurs in a political or advertising campaign. The third dimension of 'public diplomacy' relates to the development of lasting relationships with key individuals over many years. This includes mediums such as scholarships, exchanges, training, seminars, conferences, and access to media channels. In this conceptualization, 'public diplomacy', involving exchanges, listening and dialogue radically differs from the 'propaganda' that is generally controlled and broadcasted by the state.

Finally, for Nye, the foreign policy made and implemented by a country is a major aspect of its 'soft power'. Culture and values have been crucial aspects of 'soft power' in a world of communications and exchanges. But, foreign polices actually determine how a country is perceived by other countries and peoples as a friend or an enemy. Depending on whether policies are beneficial or detrimental, the perceptions of others change. As claimed above, 'public diplomacy' covers aspects of soft power largely beyond the control of the state to any significant degree. For this reason, 'propaganda' or policies arrogantly presented and narrowly self-serving may become counterproductive consuming the 'soft power' of a state through damaging its reputation and overall credibility. Therefore, 'public diplomacy' requires a fine-tuning with respect to the character of the target audience. As underlined by Nye, 'politics has become a contest of competitive credibility' in the sense that governments try to appear credible not only in the eyes of other governments but also other actors of globalizing world politics including media, corporations, NGOs, intergovernmental organizations and networks of scientific communities (Nye, 2011, p. 104). In addition to understanding the target audience, hearing the voice of others and serious engagement with their ideas and perspectives is crucial in order to maximize 'soft power'. Therefore, 'public diplomacy' as a two-way dialogue done by publics require the governments to relinquish good deal of their control in the creation of meaning and communication. The agents of 'public diplomacy', governmental civil society actors or individuals in operating in networked communications often run the risk of being not aligned with the objectives of their governments. However, this paradoxical side of 'public diplomacy', allowing the presence of dissent and even the self-criticism of policies, enhance the credibility of a state's foreign policy and contribute to the appearance of a country more attractive by others, which is the essence of 'soft power'.

Concluding Remarks

The information age and the developments of various ways of communications coupling with the global expansion of democracy makes the "power over

opinion" as a crucial aspect of contemporary international politics. 'Soft power' has become a key dimension of a national power projection along with the aspects of 'hard power' such as a strong army and a productive economy. Underlining the current challenges that foreign policy makers and practitioners face 'soft power' brings the crucial aspect of 'culture' widely neglected in international relations. Developed as a response to the unconventional security threats emerging with the attacks toward the twin towers in New York on 11 September 2001 through improving the American image around the world, this novel concept of 'soft power' incorporated an unconventional diplomatic practice, namely 'public diplomacy', to the study of international relations in a comprehensive way. The idea of 'public diplomacy', closely related to the traditional concept of 'power over opinion' has been studied by the scholars of international relations since the founding of the discipline in the early twentieth century. However, it never occupied a central place like today thanks to the 'soft power' analysis and 'public diplomacy' practices.

The clash of ideologies throughout the interwar years and the rise of bipolar world with the Cold War made 'propaganda' as a crucial instrument of legitimacy of foreign policy. However, 'public diplomacy', radically different from 'propaganda', based on broadcasting/talking by government agencies, aims to include private agents such as firms, associations and nongovernmental organizations to the presentation of a country's foreign policy along with its positive cultural values. With the growing privatization of the 'public diplomacy' actors, 'culture' rather than 'ideology' becomes a key component of the content of public diplomacy (Wendt, 1996). In this context, 'public diplomacy' prioritizes a relational approach or a more interactive perspective in projecting national power and foreign policy. However, a critical question remains to be answered. As the increasing use of internet and social media demonstrates, developments in technology mobilizes masses for political action and conditions public participation over foreign policy-making. This is understandable and inevitable in many respects. However, cat it change the centrality of the state as the organizing entity of the public life and the principal actor of international relations. The question in regards to technology becomes even more complicated as the negative effects of internet and social media in the erosion of democratic institutions and values becomes more and more apparent through massive promotion of false information, distorted images of reality and other damages brought to the privacy of individual.

References

Barnett, M. and Raymond D. (2005). 'Power in International Politics', *International Organization*, 59 (1), 39-75.

Butterfield, H. (1966). "The New Diplomacy and Historical Diplomacy", in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds) *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory and International Politics*, (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd), pp.181-192.

Carr, E. H. (2001). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939*, (New York: Perennial).

Cull, N. (2009). "How we got here" in Philip Seib (ed), *Toward a New Public Diplomacy: Redirecting US Foreign Policy*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 23-48.

Cummings, B. (1992). 'The Wicked Witch of the West is Dead. Long Live the Wicked Witch of the East', in Michael J. Hogan (eds). *The End of the Cold War: Its Meaning and Implications*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 87-101.

Dryzek, J. (2010). *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Democracy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ferguson, Y. & Richard M. (1996). 'The Past as Prelude to the Future? Identities and Loyalties in Global Politics', in Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil (eds) *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, (London: Lyne Rienner Publishers), pp. 21-44.

Gaddis, J. L. (1982). 'George Kennan and the Strategy of Containment', in Joh Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 25-53.

Gaddis, J. L (1992). 'The Cold War, the Long Peace and the Future', in Michael J. Hogan (eds). *The End of the Cold War: Its Meaning and Implications*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 21-38.

Held, D. & Antony M.G. (1993). 'Globalization and the Liberal Democratic State', *Government and Opposition*, 28 (2), 261-288.

Kissinger, H. (1957). *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy*, (New York: Council on Foreign Relations)

Kennedy, P. (1987). *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers*, (New York: Vintage Books).

Keohane, R., Stephen M. & Andrew M. (2009). 'Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism', *International Organization*, 63, 1-31.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*, (New York: Macmillan).

Milburn, T., Philip S. & Richard H. (1982). 'Perceiving the Other's Intentions', in Charles Kegley and Pat McGowan, *Foreign Policy: USA/USSR*, (London: Sage Publications).

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics Among the Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf), pp. 80-107.

Nye, J. (2000). *Understanding International Relations: An Introduction to Theory and History*, (New York: Longman).

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, (New York: Public Affairs).

Nye, J. (2004). 'Soft Power and American Foreign Policy', *Political Science Quarterly*, 119 (2), 255-270.

Nye, J. (2004). 'Decline of America's Soft Power: Why Washington Should Worry', *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 16-20.

Nye, J. (2002). *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 15.

Nye, Joseph (2011). *The Future of Power*, (New York: Public Affairs).

Ruggie, J. G. (1982). 'International Regimes, Transactions and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Post-War Economic Order', *International Organization*, *36*(2), 379-415.

Seib, P. (2009). *Toward a New Public Diplomacy: Redirecting US Foreign Policy*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Slaughter, A. M. (2004). *A New World Order*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Taylor, A.J.P. (1954). *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe 1848-1918*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).

Waltz, K. (1954). *Man, The State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*, (New York: Columbia University Press).

Wang, J. (2011). 'Introduction: China's Search for Soft Power', in Jian Wang (ed) *Soft Power in China: Public Diplomacy Through Communication*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 1-18.

Wendt, A. (1996). 'Identity and Structural Change in International Politics', in Yosef Lapid and Friedrich Kratochwil (eds) *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, (London: Lyne Rienner Publishers), pp. 47-64.

Wight, M. (1966). 'Western Values in International Relations' in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds), *Diplomatic Investigations*, (London: George Allen and Unwin), pp. 89-131.

Zaharna, R.S (2010). *Battles to Bridges: US Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy After 9/11*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).