The Republic of Korea’s Public Diplomacy Strategy: History and Current Status

By Kwang-jin Choi
The Republic of Korea's
Public Diplomacy Strategy:
History and Current Status

Kwang-jin Choi

January 2019
Figueroa Press
Los Angeles
About the USC Center on Public Diplomacy

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD) was established in 2003 as a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. It is a research, analysis and professional education organization dedicated to furthering the study and practice of global public engagement and cultural relations.

Since its inception, CPD has become a productive and recognized leader in the public diplomacy research and scholarship community. Having benefited from international support within academic, corporate, governmental and public policy circles, it is now the definitive go-to destination for practitioners and international leaders in public diplomacy, while pursuing an innovative research agenda.

USC received the 2008 Benjamin Franklin Award for Public Diplomacy from the U.S. State Department in recognition of the university’s teaching, training and research in public diplomacy.

CPD’s Mission

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy seeks to advance and enrich the study and practice of public diplomacy through research, professional education and public engagement.

CPD Perspectives

CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy is a periodic publication by the USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD), that highlights scholarship intended to stimulate critical thinking about the study and practice of public diplomacy.

Designed for both the practitioner and the scholar, this series illustrates the breadth of public diplomacy—its role as an essential component of international relations and the intellectual challenges it presents to those seeking to understand this increasingly significant factor in global society.

CPD Perspectives is available electronically in PDF form on CPD’s website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org) and in hard copy by request.

For general inquiries and to request additional copies of this paper, please contact:

USC Center on Public Diplomacy at the Annenberg School
University of Southern California
3502 Watt Way, Suites 232-234
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281
Tel: (213) 821-2078; Fax: (213) 821-0774
cpd@usc.edu
Table of Contents

I. History of Korean Public Diplomacy 5
   1. From 1948 to the 1960s 6
   2. From the 1970s to the 1990s 10
   3. From the 2000s until Today 13

II. The Public Diplomacy Act 14
    1. The Definition of Public Diplomacy 15
    2. The Public Diplomacy Committee 16
    3. PD Planning 16
    4. Support for Local Government and Private Sectors 17
       5. Designation of Official PD Institutions 17

III. Korean Public Diplomacy Strategy 18

IV. Conclusion 19

Appendix 1: Public Diplomacy Act 29
Appendix 2: Enforcement Decree of the Public Diplomacy Act 36
I. History of Korean Public Diplomacy

South Korea is a latecomer to public diplomacy (PD) compared to other developed countries that have longer histories of PD experiences. But if we trace the origins of Korean PD in history, just as Nicholas Cull, Raymond Cohen and Fangming Han did for the Western and Chinese origins of PD, respectively, we find that the first Korean case of what can be called PD was executed by Dr. In Wang. By the order of the King of the Baekje Kingdom, and upon the request of the Japanese King, Dr. Wang was dispatched in the fourth century to Japan, where he taught literature and moral philosophy to the Japanese people. Dr. Wang remains respected as a progenitor of Japanese literature. In fact, in 1937, the Japanese people established a monument at Ueno Park, Tokyo, in memory of his contributions, esteeming him as a Korean Confucius.

However, if we recall Sir Harold Nicolson’s assertion that the modern conception of diplomacy developed only after the establishment of the overseas diplomatic mission system, historically, Korea’s first case of PD can be traced back to the activities of the delegation headed by Mr. Jungyang Park, the first Ambassador to the United States, in January 1888. His accompanying secretary, Horace N. Allen, recorded in his travelogue that the Korean culture of Mr. Park’s dress and speech turned Washington topsy-turvy. In Korean traditional dress, Ambassador Park presented his credentials to President Cleveland at the White House. Allen
was impressed by Park’s noble personality and came to respect him as a father figure. In his diary, Allen wrote that anyone who is as noble as Park could become a gentleman, even if he wears a strange costume.\(^8\)

In 1884, four years before Park’s posting to the U.S., another Korean delegation, this one headed by Mr. Young-ik Min, received a similar response from Washington, D.C., but this was prior to the establishment of the modern diplomatic system in Korea. On top of that, at that time there were many different delegations designated by the King and sent to foreign countries. Regardless, Ambassador Park’s case can be said to be the first successful instance of PD in that he completed his diplomatic mission as an independent diplomat who impressed his foreign audiences effectively. In other words, Park experienced and predicted the possibility of the Korean Wave (or Hallyu), which refers to the current global popularity of Korean culture driven by K-pop and K-drama and, more recently, K-food and K-tech.

In the pages that follow, the history of Korean PD, which was first used as an official term in 2010, will be laid out in three phases, moving from the establishment of the modern Korean government to the present.

**1. From 1948 to the 1960s**

On August 15, 1945, Korea was liberated from Japanese colonialism. The U.S. and Soviet governments demarcated the 38th parallel for temporary military use in dealing with the Japanese surrender and disarmament. The U.S. forces controlled the area south of the 38\(^{th}\) parallel, and the Soviet Army took over the north. As time passed, this division between the northern and southern regions was solidified. On November 14, 1947, the UN General Assembly passed a resolution to establish the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea (UNTCOK). The UNTCOK was tasked
with observing the general election in Korea and the growth of a nascent unified Korean government. However, because the Soviet Union denied UNTCOK’s entry into the North, the general election was held only in the South. Subsequently, a Constitutional Assembly was established, and the newly elected Lee Seung-man became the first President of Korea. The successful establishment of the Korean government was proclaimed at home and abroad on August 15, 1948. After 35 years of Japanese colonialism and three years of U.S. military control, the Korean government regained its status as a member of international community.\textsuperscript{9}

The Government Organization Law of July 17, 1948 created the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), which was to undertake matters of diplomacy, treaties, international economy, overseas nationals and the research and conduct of international affairs generally.\textsuperscript{10} The Ministry’s top priority was to seek the international recognition of the new Korean government as the only legitimate one on the Korean Peninsula. It endeavored to achieve this goal by sending delegations to friendly countries and the UN General Assembly. The UN finally recognized this Korean government as the only legitimate one by a resolution issued on December 12, 1948.

The war with North Korea, which began in June 1950, pushed the South Korean government to the brink of collapse. However, with the help of the international community, it was eventually able to overcome this crisis. After the 1953 armistice, South Korea made an all-out effort to rise up as a nation from the ashes of war. Although the two Koreas maintained a hostile relationship during the 1950s on the basis of the Hallstein Doctrine,\textsuperscript{11} South Korea tried to set up substantial cooperative relationships with nonaligned nations.\textsuperscript{12}
To meet its foreign policy objectives, South Korean PD activities focused all assets and resources on recovering from war. In other words, because South Korea was first introduced to the modern world amidst the chaos of liberation, nation-founding, and political and social instability, it was essential to inform the international community about its history and potential as an independent state. This issue was especially pressing because North and South Korea continued to fight over historical legitimacy. Meanwhile, the U.S., South Korea’s strongest ally, supported Korean PD activities in order to help forward the American anti-communism agenda.\textsuperscript{13}

On August 4, 1948, the first Foreign Minister, Mr. Taeksang Jang, took over foreign administrative affairs from the Transition government established under the U.S. military regime after liberation. Initially, the Foreign Affairs Office focused primarily on consular affairs, and overseas diplomatic missions were limited to Liaison Offices in Japan (Tokyo, Osaka and Hukuoka), the Consulate General in Shanghai, and the Liaison Office in Tianjin whose main task was to repatriate South Koreans.\textsuperscript{14}

According to the \textit{Presidential Order on the Organization of the Foreign Ministry} proclaimed on November 4, 1948, the Foreign Ministry’s scope of work covered the following functions: (1) establishment and implementation of foreign policy; (2) trade and economic cooperation with foreign countries; (3) treaties and other international agreements; (4) protection and support for overseas nationals; (5) public relations; and (6) affairs related to immigration. The Foreign Ministry consisted of one Secretary’s office, five bureaus (Policy, Trade, Treaty, Research, Information), and 18 divisions. Under the Information Bureau in charge of public relations, there were 3 divisions: Propaganda,\textsuperscript{15} Press and Culture. The Korean government’s current PD structure originated with the Cultural Division, which handled international cooperation and exchange matters with regard
to culture and tourism.\textsuperscript{16} The Propaganda Division, charged with overseas publicity, information collection and public outreach on diplomatic issues, was abolished after only six months owing to the downscaling of the Foreign Ministry on May 5, 1949. Subsequently only two divisions remained: Culture and Press.\textsuperscript{17} Nevertheless, owing to the Cold War hostility and competition between the two Koreas, the term propaganda remained in use until 1974, when it was replaced with the term publicity.

Korea’s\textsuperscript{18} early PD infrastructure was weak owing in part to the small number of countries with which it maintained diplomatic ties. These countries, all of which had individually acknowledged the Korean government’s legitimacy, included the U.S., the Republic of China, the UK and France. By the end of 1959, the Korean government had only established nine embassies, eight consulate generals, three representatives, and two offices.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, the scope of PD activities was limited by frequent reorganization within the MFA. In 1955, the Culture and Press Divisions were moved from the Information Bureau to the Diplomatic Ties Bureau. In 1958, the two divisions were merged into a single Information and Culture Division. In 1961, this division was renamed as the Culture Division, the term information having been removed because the public affairs function had been transferred to the newly established Ministry of Public Affairs (MPA). The new MPA was tasked with acquiring international support and assistance for the newly inaugurated military junta’s political legitimacy and economic development policy.\textsuperscript{20}

In 1963, the Press Relations and Culture Division was returned to the MFA and placed once again within the Information and Culture Bureau. In 1970, the press relations function was transferred to the newly created Press Relations Division in the Office of Planning and Management within the MFA. Later that year, in acknowledgement of its importance to Korean’s foreign policy, it was put directly under the
auspices of the Foreign Minister’s office and, as of 1973, became the specific responsibility of the Press Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs. By 2005 this position had been renamed as Spokesperson for Public Relations.

During the 1940s, ’50s and ’60s, an increasingly broad range of PD activities was implemented to include the publication and distribution of periodicals focusing on Korean culture, cultural exhibitions, and student and sport exchange programs. Periodicals and government-issued publications included Korea Today, Korean Arts and Korean Survey, among others. The government also purchased media outlets such as the English-language newspaper Korea Times and the monthly English-language Pictorial Korea, distributing them to foreign agencies and individuals through Korean overseas diplomatic missions. Culture-focused exhibitions and exchanges included the donation of Korean traditional wedding costumes to the Smithsonian Museum as well as the broad distribution of photos, music, films, books, craftworks and traditional dress to Korean embassies overseas. Finally, beginning in 1947, when the first three Korean students arrived in the U.S. to study, the number and range of exchange programs slowly grew. For example, in 1956, the Korean government had sent 22 sports delegations abroad since the first dispatch of four athletes to the International Skating Championship in December 1948. In February 1958, 136 artists were dispatched to Southeast Asia as goodwill art envoys. Finally, in October 1968, the Korean government had not only hosted the Social Culture Center of the Asian and Pacific Council in Seoul but implemented a wide variety of cultural programs.

2. From the 1970s to the 1990s

In the 1970s, the international order began to change with the emergence of a period of “détente” between East and West, characterized by events such as President Nixon’s
visit to China in 1972, the U.S./USSR agreement on Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in May 1972, and the establishment of diplomatic ties between the U.S. and China in 1979. This relaxation of international tensions culminated in the Malta agreement in December 1989, which officially ended the Cold War. The Korean government supported the policy of détente by facilitating friendly relationships between democratic and communist states through full-dimensional diplomacy. Examples of Korea’s détente-focused diplomacy include the establishment of historic diplomatic ties with the USSR in 1990, North and South Koreas’ simultaneous entry into the UN in 1991, and the establishment of the Korea-China diplomatic relationship in 1992.23

In the 1970s and 1980s, the Korean government extended the scope and breadth of its domestic economic activities by bolstering bilateral and multilateral cooperation for economic development. This policy approach originated in the 1960s, when the Korean government endeavored to establish a foundation of economic independence through economic cooperation with developed countries.24 Initially, government PD activities focused on media promotion of Korea’s economic reputation and potential. However, by the late ‘70s25 cultural and exchange programs took on a major role in the effort to strengthen national security and prosperity by deepening friendly relationships with allies.26

The 1980s proved to be a decade of rapid economic and political change, including, most notably, the collapse of the Soviet Union. From Korea’s PD perspective, the 1980s was the decade of sports diplomacy: the 19th Asian Games (1986) and the 24th Seoul Olympic Games and Paralympics (1988). In response, by 1987 the MFA had expanded, once again, into two divisions—Culture and Publicity. Also in 1987, the Korean government established the Korean mission to UNESCO in order to expand its PD infrastructure. The Foreign Ministry created the Korea Foundation in 1991 in
order to do the following: (1) raise awareness of Korea in international society; (2) promote international friendship and cooperation; and (3) support Korea’s increasingly proactive diplomatic status in the international community as a result of its entry into the UN and OECD.27 The Foreign Ministry also created a new position, the Deputy Director General for Culture and Public Relations. Additionally, in order to lay a stronger foundation for more effective PD, the MFA expanded the Cultural Cooperation Bureau into three divisions: Cultural Cooperation Divisions 1 and 2, and a Public Relations Division.28 Finally, to take advantage of cultural globalization and to develop a value-added culture industry, the Korean government initiated a five-year Culture Growth Plan in 1993 and established the “Visit Korea” year in 1994.29

However, when President Kim Young-sam entered into office in 1994, the PD activities were institutionally affected by changes in domestic and international policies. Owing to government downsizing, the Cultural Cooperation Bureau was reduced to two divisions: the Cultural Cooperation Division and the Public Relations Division. In 1998, owing to the IMF crisis, the Deputy Director General for Culture and Public Relations position was repealed and the Korean mission to UNESCO was merged with the Korean Embassy in France. In this period, the scope of PD expanded to include the signing of cultural agreements and the holding of joint culture committees. By 1998, cultural agreements had been signed with 82 countries, and joint cultural committees were held with 21 countries. These facilitated Korea’s substantial external cooperation in a variety of fields such as culture, the arts, education, academia, youth, media and publishing.30

During this period, Korea’s cultural exchange programs broadened from an exclusive focus on developed countries such as the U.S. and European nations to take on a global approach. It supported the introduction of Korean culture to the world through overseas exhibits and festivals organized
by actors, artists and filmmakers. By the end of 1998, thirty museums around the world featured a Korean exhibition hall. With the establishment of the Korean Foundation in 1991, the number of Korean studies classes expanded exponentially. By 1998, 305 classes were underway in 50 countries, 33 universities in seven countries had established regular Korean Studies professorships, and 26 Korean Studies Centers opened in eight countries. Finally, the MFA sent its Ambassadors to support local government foreign outreach activities. By the end of 1998, 127 Korean municipalities had established ties to sister cities with 321 foreign local governments in 38 countries.\footnote{31}

3. From the 2000s until Today

With the growing nuclear threat from North Korea in the 2000s, the Korean government decided to focus its efforts on the need for peace and possible reunification on the Korean Peninsula. To that end, Korea tactically reinforced its alliance with the U.S. and at the same time improved its friendships with Japan, China and Russia. As a result of the diplomatic advantage afforded to Korea in the person of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Korean government actively took part in the activities of a wide range of international organizations. It also participated in international dialogues on issues such as arms reduction, non-proliferation and economic development, as well as terrorism and human rights.\footnote{32}

Government PD efforts in this period of increased multilateral activity mainly focused on two areas. The first was to improve Korea’s image in the international community. What became known as the Korean Wave originated in the late ‘90s with a famous Korean TV drama aired in China. The Korean Wave began to gain momentum in Japan, China and Southeast Asia in the 2000s. As a result, it came to be recognized as an important tool for PD. Following the
2002 FIFA World Cup, the Korean government, under the auspices of the Prime Minister, created the National Image Committee. Designed to develop a strategy to improve Korea’s global status, the committee later developed into the Presidential Council on National Branding in 2009.

Government PD efforts also focused on the development of a new era of PD activities by introducing the term "Public Diplomacy" legally for the first time. As mentioned before, this term was never used officially until the Korean government declared 2010 to be the first year of Korean PD, and appointed Young-sam Ma as the first Ambassador for PD (a position that is now reflected in the Presidential Order). Meanwhile, the Bureau of Cultural Cooperation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade became the Cultural Affairs Bureau (the Bureau of Cultural Diplomacy in Korean), thus formalizing the use of the term of "cultural diplomacy" in the Korean language. The Bureau of Cultural Diplomacy has since undergone several reorganizations. Today it is called the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau and consists of five divisions and one team: PD, UNESCO, Cultural Cooperation, Regional PD, PD and Policy, and the People Diplomacy team. To assure stable and successful PD program implementation, a legal infrastructure was created through legislation initiated by the National Assembly. Finally, Korea’s first Public Diplomacy Act was enacted in 2016.

II. The Public Diplomacy Act

As mentioned before, Korea’s current PD programs were pushed forward with full support of the legislative branch. The Korean National Assembly passed the Public Diplomacy Act, which went into effect in August 2016. As the first law in South Korea to address PD activities, the act stipulates general outlines and broader directions for strategy implementation. In effect, this law gives the Ministry of Foreign Affairs the legal authority to reinforce coordination and cooperation
with other Ministries, and to support local governments and the private sector if required. Ultimately, it can facilitate cooperation among the public, private and political sectors. In addition, the Korean National Assembly established the “Sub Committee for Public Diplomacy” under the Committee for Foreign Affairs and Unification in July 2016. This committee supports initiatives for the development of public diplomacy at the National Assembly level.

Henceforth, in this chapter, the contents of the Public Diplomacy Act and the Enforcement Decree of Public Diplomacy Act will be introduced in detail.34

1. The Definition of Public Diplomacy

The Public Diplomacy Act defines of PD as “diplomatic activities through which the State enhances foreign nationals’ understanding of and confidence in the Republic of Korea directly or in cooperation with local governments or the private sector through culture, knowledge and policies, etc.”35 This legal definition clearly articulates that the actors in Korean public diplomacy fall into three categories: the state, local governments and the private sector. Among them, the state is the main actor and local governments and private sectors are cooperative actors that directly or indirectly affect state decisions. The tools of public diplomacy, listed as culture, knowledge and policy, are to be used to enhance foreign audience understanding of and trust in South Korea. Target audiences include governments, individuals and the private sector. PD tools are also intended to promote “education and public relations with Korean nationals.”36 In other words, Korean public diplomacy also has a domestic mandate. Ultimately Korea’s PD activities seek to improve its national image and prestige in the international community.
2. The Public Diplomacy Committee

According to Article 8 of the Act, the Foreign Minister has the authority to establish a Public Diplomacy Committee to deliberate on and coordinate the principal matters for a comprehensive and systematic PD policy. This Committee consists of no more than 20 committee members from relevant ministries and other government institutions as well as civilian public diplomacy specialists. The Committee has the power to make decisions on matters related to the formulation, alteration and pursuit of a public diplomacy master plan, a comprehensive action plan, and cooperation and coordination among government ministries and public and private sector entities. In a nutshell, this committee serves as a control tower for public diplomacy. Additionally, there is the possibility of a working group to hold consultations and coordinate items on the Committee agenda.

3. PD Planning

According to the PD Act, there should be four different PD plans: a five-year master plan prepared by the Foreign Minister in consultation with other relevant ministries and local governments; an annual action plan prepared by relevant ministries and local governments; a comprehensive action plan that integrates the master and action plans; and, finally, overseas PD plans formulated by overseas diplomatic missions in conformity with the master plan.

As for the master plan, the Minister of Foreign Affairs must formulate a comprehensive strategy for public diplomacy every five years in consultation with the heads of relevant central administrative agencies and local governments. This plan should include a policy overview, implementation of policy objectives, policy coordination, fundraising, system improvements and evaluations, and a plan to support local governments and the private sector. The Public Diplomacy Committee will finalize this master plan.
4. Support for Local Government and Private Sectors

In Article 9 of the Act, the state is given the power to provide necessary support to a local government upon request. The state can fully or partially subsidize expenses within budgetary limits and/or provide administrative support to the private sector when deemed necessary. The nature of this assistance includes the following: the establishment of a cooperation platform with foreign governments, private institutions or international organizations; support to conduct cooperative activities with foreign diplomatic agencies or diplomatic missions stationed in the Republic of Korea; the provision of information and administrative support for the development of public diplomacy programs with foreign countries; and support for other activities as needed to revitalize public diplomacy.

5. Designation of Official PD Institutions

To carry out public diplomacy efficiently, the Foreign Minister has the power to designate an institution such as the Korea Foundation as an official conduit of Korean PD. When designated, this institution shall perform the following activities: support for the formulation of a comprehensive action plan; the establishment of a platform for cooperation with institutions and organizations related to the pursuit of public diplomacy at home and abroad; the establishment and operation of a comprehensive public diplomacy information system; the implementation of support projects such as education, consultations and public relations; the training of professional manpower; and the conduct of fact-finding surveys on the status of public diplomacy and compilation of resultant statistics.
III. Korean Public Diplomacy Strategy

The Korean PD Strategy is publicly declared to be, and is fully predicated on, the First Master Plan for Korean PD (2017-2021) as adopted by the PD Committee on August 10, 2017 pursuant to the PD Act. The Master Plan describes the current status of and challenges for Korean PD activities. Currently Korean PD actors include the national government, governmental agencies, local governments and private-sector participants. National government actors include primarily the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, and the Ministry of Education, etc. Governmental agencies comprise the Korea Foundation and the National Institute for International Education, among others. The Master Plan assesses Korean PD according to the premise that, with the development of globalization, information technology and democratization, the number of PD actors has increased significantly. However, problems have emerged as a consequence of the absence of mutual coordination and consultation among the various PD actors. Duplication of effort and information leakage result from separate and unsystematic PD operations. In other words, the absence of overall PD coordination at the government-wide level can cause damaging inefficiencies and inconsistencies.

Additionally, the Master Plan also points out that owing to the short history of PD in Korea, few citizens understand its nature and purpose, and most PD activities are undertaken and completed without due recognition of them as PD. In order to overcome these problems, the Korean government resolved to elevate public recognition of PD and bolster its implementation system. The government will also improve the recognition and proliferation of social consensus on PD. Finally, it will make an effort to construct a government-wide coordination system for the purpose of strengthening the PD Committee’s capacity to orchestrate the roles and functions of various PD actors.
Taking all of these factors into consideration, the Korean government has set up its vision for PD as “Communicating Korea’s attractiveness to the entire world.” In order to realize this vision, it has set four goals as follows: (1) to enhance national prestige and image by utilizing abundant cultural assets such as Hallyu, the 2018 PyeongChang Olympic Winter Games and tourism; (2) to proliferate current knowledge and understanding of Korea by rectifying factual errors in foreign textbooks and promoting Korean studies and Korean-language courses overseas; (3) to create a welcoming strategic environment for its policies by elevating the understanding of our policy to foreign opinion leaders and resident foreigners in Korea; and (4) to improve PD actors’ capabilities and thereby create a mutually cooperative system.

IV. Conclusion

The advent of globalization and the dramatic evolution of information technologies have altered the relationships between PD actors, targets and methods. From an actor’s perspective, states and governments no longer enjoy a relatively exclusive and monopolistic control of target audience perceptions and reactions. From the methodological point of view, countries no longer rely on accruing influence through political, security and economic instruments of power. Instead countries have become more conscientious in the pursuit of image development, seeking to win the hearts and minds of their target audiences by means of soft power tools. Against this backdrop, the role of PD in targeting foreign publics and engaging domestic audiences in foreign policy has become more influential and even decisive.

Although the Korean government has developed and accumulated its PD potential and know-how since 1948, it is still a relative newcomer to the field. Indeed, Korea’s PD is still
in its infancy, especially when compared to those of allies. According to the recent *Soft Power 30* report, for example, Korea’s soft power ranked 20th out of 30 countries.\(^{50}\)

Nevertheless, as this study indicates, Korea’s creative and systematically implemented PD strategies have produced some notable success. Take, for example, the PyeongChang Olympic Winter Games, viewed by over a quarter of the world’s population. In fact, the PyeongChang Olympic Games earned more digital views than any other Olympic Winter Games in history—124 percent more than Sochi (2014) and 870 percent more than Vancouver (2010). It also enjoyed the widest broadcast coverage in the history of the Olympic Winter Games.\(^{51}\) In effect, the PyeongChang Olympic Games showcased the best of Korea’s PD. First, it made the most of Korea’s soft and smart power tools. Then, it unified the country through the depiction of its strengths. It also enhanced Korea’s international image. Finally, it established the groundwork for peaceful dialogue between the two Koreas and the United States despite escalating nuclear tensions in the region and around the globe.

The public success of the Winter Games resulted in part from the Korean government’s well-orchestrated and implemented national PD strategy pursuant to the PD Act. The PD Committee effectively coordinated the event, bringing together everyone from the President to central and local government actors to individual citizens. The “Olympics of Peace” theme inaugurated by President Moon Jae-in in his Berlin Declaration on July 6, 2017 was systematically and effectively sustained by relevant ministries, local governments, businesses and 22,400 volunteers from all walks of life. Moreover, as a result of nationwide support and efficient PD efforts, the cost of the event was relatively low, coming in at $10 billion—five times less than the cost of the 2014 Sochi Olympics.\(^{52}\)
Now is the time to prepare for the post-PyeongChang era. As the embodiment of the accumulated achievements of past PD practices, the 2018 PyeongChang Olympics can also serve as the catalyst for a giant leap forward. By building on past achievements and reinforcing the existing legal, financial and organizational infrastructures the future of Korean PD is indeed bright.
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Appendix 1: PUBLIC DIPLOMACY ACT

Enacted by the Republic of Korea in 2016

ARTICLE 1 (Purpose)

The purpose of this Act is to contribute to improving the Republic of Korea’s image and prestige in the international community by establishing a foundation to strengthen public diplomacy and to enhance the efficiency thereof by providing for matters necessary for public diplomacy activities.

ARTICLE 2 (Definition)

“Public diplomacy” in this Act is defined as diplomacy activities through which the State enhances foreign nationals’ understanding of and confidence in the Republic of Korea directly or in cooperation with local governments or the private sector through culture, knowledge, policies, etc.

ARTICLE 3 (Basic Principles of Public Diplomacy)

(1) Public diplomacy shall be pursued by harmoniously reflecting the universal values of mankind and the intrinsic characteristics of the Republic of Korea.

(2) Public diplomacy policy shall focus on the promotion of sustainable and friendly cooperation for amicable relations with the international community.

(3) No public diplomacy activities shall be disproportionately concentrated in any specific region or country.

ARTICLE 4 (Responsibility of State)

(1) The State shall establish and pursue comprehensive and systematic strategies and policies to strengthen public diplomacy and enhance the efficiency thereof.
(2) The State shall formulate an administrative and financial support plan necessary for establishing and executing strategies and policies under paragraph (1).

(3) The State shall make necessary endeavors such as establishing a platform for cooperation with local governments and the private sector in order to efficiently conduct public diplomacy.

(4) The State shall make necessary endeavors such as in education and public relations in order to form social consensus on the importance of public diplomacy and to promote the people’s participation in public diplomacy.

ARTICLE 5 (Relationship to other Acts)

(1) Except as otherwise expressly provided in other Acts, public diplomacy shall be governed by this Act.

(2) Where any other Act is enacted or amended concerning public diplomacy, such Act shall comply with this Act.

ARTICLE 6 (Formulation of a Master Plan for Public Diplomacy)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall formulate a master plan for public diplomacy (hereinafter referred to as the “master plan”) every five years in consultation with the heads of related central administrative agencies, the Mayor of the Special Metropolitan City, Mayors of Metropolitan Cities, Mayors of Metropolitan Autonomous Cities, Governors of Provinces and the Governor of the Special Self-governing Province (hereinafter referred to as “Mayors/Provincial Governors”).

(2) Each master plan shall include the following:
1. Policy direction and implementation objectives for public diplomacy activities;

2. Matters concerning the establishment and coordination of major policies for public diplomacy;

3. Matters concerning raising and operating funds for public diplomacy;

4. Matters concerning the establishment of a foundation, system improvements and evaluations relating to public diplomacy;

5. A plan to support local governments in public diplomacy;

6. A plan to support the private sector in public diplomacy;

7. Other matters necessary for public diplomacy activities.

(3) The master plan shall be finalized following deliberation by the Public Diplomacy Committee under Article 8. In such cases, the Minister of Foreign Affairs shall notify the heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors of the finalized master plan.

ARTICLE 7 (Formulation of an Action Plan, etc. for Public Diplomacy)

(1) The heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors shall annually formulate and implement an action plan for public diplomacy activities (hereinafter referred to as the “action plan”) in conformity with the master plan, and submit such
action plan and the performance results of each agency and City/Province to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

(2) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall annually formulate and implement a comprehensive action plan (hereinafter referred to as the “comprehensive action plan”), which integrates the action plans under paragraph (1) and the action plan of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

(3) The heads of overseas diplomatic missions shall annually formulate and implement a plan for public diplomacy activities, including activities of the overseas diplomatic mission and public institutions under the Act on the Management of Public Institutions (hereinafter referred to as the “public institution”) within its jurisdiction, in conformity with the master plan.

(4) In the formulation and implementation of plans under paragraphs (1) through (3), similarities and duplications of activities shall be avoided. In particular, related institutions shall closely cooperate with one another so that the plans may be formulated and implemented in the light of the local characteristics of each region and each country.

(5) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall notify the heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors of the details and results of each comprehensive action plan and plan for activities within the area in which an overseas diplomatic mission has jurisdiction under paragraph (3).

(6) Other matters necessary for the formulation and implementation of action plans and comprehensive action plans shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.
ARTICLE 8 (Public Diplomacy Committee)

(1) The Public Diplomacy Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee”) shall be established under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Foreign Affairs in order to deliberate on and coordinate the principal matters for the comprehensive and systematic pursuit of public diplomacy policy.

(2) The Committee shall deliberate on and coordinate the following:

1. Matters concerning the formulation, alteration and pursuit of a master plan;

2. Matters concerning the formulation and evaluation of a comprehensive action plan;

3. Matters concerning cooperation and coordination in public diplomacy affairs among government ministries;

4. Matters concerning the people’s participation, public-private cooperation, etc. in relation to public diplomacy;

5. Other matters tabled at meetings by the chairperson of the Committee in relation to public diplomacy.

(3) The Committee shall be comprised of no more than 20 members including the chairperson; the Minister of Foreign Affairs shall serve as the chairperson, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs shall appoint or commission members from among the Vice Ministers or Vice Minister-level public officials of related central administrative agencies, and persons who have extensive professional knowledge of and experience in public diplomacy, as prescribed by Presidential Decree.
(4) Other matters necessary for the composition, operation, etc. of the Committee shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.

ARTICLE 9 (Support to Local Governments and the Private Sector)

(1) Where a local government requests the State to cooperate in public diplomacy activities, the State may provide necessary support.

(2) Where necessary to strengthen the private sector’s participation in public diplomacy, the State may fully or partially subsidize expenses within budgetary limits or provide administrative support necessary to conduct affairs.

(3) Matters necessary for support under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.

ARTICLE 10 (Fact-Finding Survey)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may conduct fact-finding surveys on the status of public diplomacy in order to formulate and implement public diplomacy policy.

(2) Necessary matters concerning subjects and methods, etc. of fact-finding surveys pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.

ARTICLE 11 (Establishment and Operation of a Comprehensive Public Diplomacy Information System)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may establish and operate a comprehensive public diplomacy information system in order to conduct public diplomacy in a systematic and efficient manner and provide useful information to related institutions, etc.
(2) Where necessary to establish and operate a comprehensive public diplomacy information system, the Minister of Foreign Affairs may request the heads of related central administrative agencies, Mayors/Provincial Governors, heads of public institutions, etc. to provide necessary data. In such cases, heads of related central administrative agencies, etc. requested to provide data shall comply with such request unless special circumstances necessitate otherwise.

ARTICLE 12 (Designation, etc. of an Institution that Conducts Public Diplomacy)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may designate an institution that conducts public diplomacy (hereinafter referred to as an “institution that conducts public diplomacy”) in order to efficiently carry out activities necessary to promote public diplomacy.

(2) An institution that conducts public diplomacy shall perform the following activities:

1. Support for the formulation of a comprehensive action plan and an action plan;

2. Establishment of a platform for cooperation with institutions, organizations, etc. related to the pursuit of public diplomacy at home and abroad;

3. Establishment and operation of a comprehensive public diplomacy information system;

4. Implementation of support projects such as education, consultations, public relations, etc. for public diplomacy activities;

5. Training of professional manpower for public diplomacy activities;
6. Fact-finding surveys on the status of public diplomacy and compilation of its statistics;

7. Other activities necessary to achieve the objectives for which the institutions that conduct public diplomacy are designated.

(3) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may support expenses incurred in the operation, etc. of an institution that conducts public diplomacy.

(4) Matters necessary for the designation, operation, etc. of an institution that conducts public diplomacy shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.

ARTICLE 13 (Report to the National Assembly)

The Government shall prepare a report on the current status, etc. of the implementation of the master plan and comprehensive action plan, and submit such report to the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea before its regular annual session.

ADDENDUM

This Act shall enter into force six months after the date of its promulgation.

Appendix 2: ENFORCEMENT DECREE OF THE PUBLIC DIPLOMACY ACT

ARTICLE 1 (Purpose)

The purpose of this Decree is to provide for matters delegated from the Public Diplomacy Act and matters necessary for the enforcement of the aforementioned matters.
ARTICLE 2 (Formulation, etc. of the Action plan of Public Diplomacy Activities)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall prepare guidelines for the formulation of action plans of public diplomacy activities (hereinafter referred to as the “action plan”) under Article 7 (1) of the Public Diplomacy Act (hereinafter referred to as the “Act”) and for submitting the results of the implementation thereof, and notify the heads of related central administrative agencies, the Mayor of the Special Metropolitan City, Mayors of Metropolitan Cities, Mayor of Metropolitan Autonomous Cities, Governors of Provinces, and the Governor of the Special Self-governing Province (hereinafter referred to as “Mayors/Provincial Governors”) of such guidelines by September 30 each year.

(2) The heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors shall formulate the following plans and results in accordance with guidelines pursuant to paragraph (1) and submit them to the Minister of Foreign Affairs by November 30 each year:

1. An action plan for the following year;

2. Results of the implementation for the current year’s action plan.

(3) An action plan shall include the following:

1. Outcome of the implementation of the current year’s action plan;

2. Direction for conducting public diplomacy for the following year;
3. A detailed plan to conduct public diplomacy in each region and each field for the following year;

4. Other matters the heads of related central administrative agencies or Mayors/Provincial Governors deem necessary for public diplomacy activities.

(4) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall formulate a comprehensive action plan (hereinafter referred to as the “comprehensive action plan”) which integrates the action plan under Article 7 (1) of the Act and the action plan formulated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by December 31 each year pursuant to paragraph (2) of the aforementioned Article.

(5) The comprehensive action plan shall include the following:

1. Outcome of the implementation of the current year’s comprehensive action plan;

2. Prospects and direction of the implementation of public diplomacy activities for the following year;

3. A detailed plan to conduct public diplomacy in each region and each field for the following year;

4. Other matters the Minister of Foreign Affairs deems necessary for public diplomacy activities.

(6) The heads of overseas diplomatic missions shall prepare the following plan and results in accordance with the comprehensive action plan and submit them to the Minister of Foreign Affairs by January 31 each year:

1. A plan of public diplomacy activities (hereinafter in this Article referred to as the “plan of public diplo-
macy activities”) under Article 7 (3) of the Act for the year;

2. Outcome of the implementation of public diplomacy activities based on the plan of public diplomacy activities from the previous year.

ARTICLE 3 (Request for Submission of Data for the Formulation of the Master Plan, etc.)

Where necessary to formulate a master plan for public diplomacy under Article 6 (1) of the Act and a comprehensive action plan, the Minister of Foreign Affairs may request the heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors to submit data. In such cases, the heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors in receipt of a request shall comply with such request unless special circumstances necessitate otherwise.

ARTICLE 4 (Composition of the Public Diplomacy Committee)

(1) The Public Diplomacy Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Committee”) under Article 8 (1) of the Act shall be comprised of the chairperson and the following members:

1. The Vice Minister of Strategy and Finance, the Vice Minister of Education, the Vice Minister of Science, ICT and Future Planning, the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Vice Minister of Unification, the Vice Minister of the Interior, the Vice Minister of Culture, Sports and Tourism, the Vice Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs and the Vice Minister of the Office for Government Policy Coordination. In case of agencies that have more than one Vice Minister,
the Vice Minister designated by the head of the relevant agency;

2. Five persons appointed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs based on the recommendation of the heads of the relevant central administrative agencies for each meeting of the Committee from among the Vice Ministers or Vice Minister-level public officials of related central administrative agencies (excluding agencies to which members under subparagraph 1 belong);

3. Five persons commissioned by the Minister of Foreign Affairs from among the following persons:

   (a) Persons who have at least ten years of work experience in a diplomacy-related field at a university, research institute, etc.;

   (b) Persons who have extensive knowledge of and experience in public diplomacy.

(2) Each member under paragraph (1) 3 shall hold office for a term of two years, and may be reappointed for only one consecutive term.

ARTICLE 5 (Dismissal of Members)

Where a member commissioned pursuant to Article 8 (3) of the Act falls under any of the following, the Minister of Foreign Affairs may dismiss the relevant member:

1. Where he/she becomes unable to perform his/her duties due to mental disabilities;

2. Where he/she engages in any misdeed related to his/her duties;
3. Where he/she is deemed unsuitable as a member due to neglect of his/her duties, injury to dignity or on other grounds;

4. Where he/she personally expresses difficulty to perform his/her duties.

ARTICLE 6 (Operation of Committee)

(1) The chairperson shall represent the Committee and preside over its affairs.

(2) Where the chairperson is unable to perform his/her duties for reasons beyond his/her control, a member of the Committee pre-appointed by him/her shall perform his/her duties on his/her behalf.

(3) Where the chairperson intends to convene a meeting, he/she shall notify members of the Committee in writing of the date, time, venue and items on the agenda of the meeting no later than seven days before he/she holds the meeting. Notwithstanding the foregoing, where he/she should hold the meeting in case of urgency or for reasons beyond his/her control, he/she may give notice until the day before he/she holds the meeting.

(4) The Committee shall open a meeting with the attendance of a majority of the incumbent members under Article 4 (1), and pass resolutions with the consent of a majority of the members present.

(5) Where the Committee deems it necessary to deliberate on items on the agenda and conduct other affairs related to the Committee, it may require interested persons or related experts to attend its meetings to hear their opinions, or request them to submit their opinions.
(6) The Committee may conduct teleconferences using a video link for members at different locations equipped with telecommunication systems that receive and transmit video and audio simultaneously. In such cases, the relevant members shall be deemed present in the same conference room.

ARTICLE 7 (Working Committee, etc.)

(1) A working committee may be established in the Committee to hold consultations and coordinate items on the agenda to be discussed at meetings of the Committee, and hold consultations regarding other matters the chairperson demands.

(2) One administrative secretary shall be assigned to the Committee to conduct its affairs, and he/she shall be appointed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs from among public officials under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

ARTICLE 8 (Detailed Rules for Operation)

In addition to matters provided in Articles 6 and 7, matters necessary for the operation of the Committee shall be prescribed by the chairperson following a resolution made by the Committee.

ARTICLE 9 (Support to Local Governments and the Private Sector)

The Minister of Foreign Affairs may provide the following support to local governments and the private sector pursuant to Article 9 (1) and (2) of the Act:

1. Support for the establishment of a cooperation platform with foreign governments, private institutions or international organizations;
2. Cooperation and support to conduct affairs with foreign diplomatic agencies or diplomatic missions stationed in the Republic of Korea;

3. Provision of information and administrative support for the development of public diplomacy programs with foreign countries;

4. Other matters the Minister of Foreign Affairs deems necessary to revitalize public diplomacy.

ARTICLE 10 (Subjects and Methods, etc. of Fact-Finding Surveys)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may conduct fact-finding surveys (hereinafter referred to as “fact-finding surveys” in this Article) concerning the status of the implementation of public diplomacy activities of institutions and organizations both at home and abroad that conduct public diplomacy activities pursuant to Article 10 (1) of the Act.

(2) Fact-finding survey shall be conducted according to the following methods:

1. Regular survey: A survey conducted every two years to regularly ascertain the status of public diplomacy activities;

2. Occasional survey: A survey conducted where the Minister of Foreign Affairs deems the survey necessary to ascertain the current status of public diplomacy activities to effectively formulate and implement public diplomacy policy.

(3) Where the Minister of Foreign Affairs conducts a fact-finding survey, he/she shall notify the person subject to the fact-finding survey of a plan therefore including the
date, time, objective, method, etc. thereof no later than 30 days before he/she intends to conduct the survey.

(4) Where the Minister of Foreign Affairs formulates a fact-finding survey plan under paragraph (3), he/she shall hold pre-consultations with related institutions and organizations.

(5) The Minister of Foreign Affairs shall notify the heads of related central administrative agencies and Mayors/Provincial Governors of the findings from a fact-finding survey so that they may utilize such findings for public diplomacy.

ARTICLE 11 (Designation of an Institution that Conducts Public Diplomacy)

(1) The Minister of Foreign Affairs may designate an institution to conduct public diplomacy (hereinafter referred to as an “institution that conducts public diplomacy”) under Article 12 (1) of the Act from among the following institutions or organizations:

1. The Korea Foundation under the Korea Foundation Act;

2. Institutions or organizations the Minister of Foreign Affairs deems to have professional manpower, organization, and facilities to efficiently perform activities under the subparagraphs of Article 12 (2) of the Act.

(2) An institution or organization that intends to obtain designation as an institution that conducts public diplomacy pursuant to Article 12 (1) of the Act shall submit an application for designation as an institution that conducts public diplomacy using the attached Form to the Minister of Foreign Affairs along with the following documents:
1. Articles of incorporation (only applicable to a corporation);

2. A business plan;

3. Current status of professional manpower, organizational structure and facilities necessary to perform activities under the subparagraphs of Article 12 (2) of the Act.

(3) Upon receipt of an application under paragraph (2), the Minister of Foreign Affairs shall verify the relevant certificate of matters of registration of a corporation (applicable only where the applicant is a corporation) through the common use of administrative information under Article 36 (1) of the Electronic Government Act.

(4) Where the Minister of Foreign Affairs designates an institution that conducts public diplomacy pursuant to Article 12 (1) of the Act, he/she shall officially make the announcement on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

(5) The head of an institution that conducts public diplomacy shall submit the following to the Minister of Foreign Affairs by December 31 each year:

1. An implementation plan of programs under the subparagraphs of Article 12 (2) of the Act for the following year;

2. A spending plan for expenditures provided pursuant to Article 12 (3) for the following year.

(6) In addition to the matters provided in paragraphs (1) through (5), the Minister of Foreign Affairs shall prescribe and announce matters necessary for the
designation and operation of institutions that conduct public diplomacy.

ADDENDUM

This Decree shall enter into force on the date of its promulgation.
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