

ORGANIZING PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: A LAYERED SYSTEM

By Barry A. Sanders

الدبلوماسية العامة

La Diplomatie Publique

Общественная дипломатия

Public Diplomacy

PUBLICZNA DYPLMACJA

הסברה

Publieksdiplomatie

Diplomacia Pública

公共外交

Δημόσια Διπλωματία

Публична дипломация

**Organizing Public Diplomacy:
A Layered System**

Barry A. Sanders

**March 2018
Figueroa Press
Los Angeles**

ORGANIZING PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: A LAYERED SYSTEM

by **Barry A. Sanders**

Guest Editor
Vivian S. Walker
Faculty Fellow, USC Center on Public Diplomacy

Published by
FIGUEROA PRESS
840 Childs Way, 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90089
Phone: (213) 743-4800
Fax: (213) 743-4804
www.figueroapress.com

Figueroa Press is a division of the USC Bookstores

Produced by Crestec, Los Angeles, Inc.
Printed in the United States of America

Notice of Rights

Copyright © 2018. All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without prior written permission from the author, care of Figueroa Press.

Notice of Liability

The information in this book is distributed on an "As is" basis, without warranty. While every precaution has been taken in the preparation of this book, neither the author nor Figueroa nor the USC University Bookstore shall have any liability to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused or alleged to be caused directly or indirectly by any text contained in this book.

Figueroa Press and the USC Bookstores are trademarks of the University of Southern California.

ISBN-13: 978-0-18-222930-7
ISBN-10: 0-18-222930-0

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

Organizing Public Diplomacy: A Layered System

Teaching and learning the discipline known as public diplomacy can be difficult and confusing. Its many parts do not seem to fit together. The definition of public diplomacy is easy enough: the art and science of communicating with foreign publics on behalf of your nation. But so many disparate activities fit that definition! How can we find the relationships between things as different as wartime propaganda and Fulbright scholarships or ISIS decapitation videos and Voice of America news broadcasts? They are all public diplomacy. I know of no existing theoretical system that pulls these threads together. What we need is a way to organize the discipline so that the pieces relate to each other coherently. I propose we do that by creating layers of inquiry and activity that, taken together, constitute the whole field and all its components.

1. The Minds of the Audience

Any study of public diplomacy ought to begin with an inquiry into how people form their ideas and how those ideas may change. These are fundamental questions in the art and science of persuasion and communication. Who is the audience? What do they think? How fixed are their ideas? Are new ideas carefully considered or quickly filtered through stereotypes? Any company selling a product or service starts with these questions. Public diplomats must do so, too. Governments are not oblivious to this and often engage in polling, focus groups and other audience research. Nevertheless, too often government agencies involved in public diplomacy issue messages reflecting national policy with little or no adjustment to account for the listeners' receptivity.

The study of the minds of the audience ultimately entails all that is or could be known about human nature. That is far too broad a set of questions for we public diplomacy specialists to tackle alone. However, we are not left to our own devices in answering these questions. Studies of the brain and how it operates abound. There is a veritable library of scientific material on the formation of memories, imagination and ideas. There is a similar fount of experiential writing by people who have spent lifetimes teaching and persuading. No trial lawyer could persuade a jury without a trained, experienced, or intuitive understanding of human nature. Successful politicians all have the knack. At a bridge between scholars and lay practitioners of the art of persuasion stand some excellent references for a general readership.¹ Writings such as these deal with central issues in public diplomacy: how do people generate ideas? How do they remember ideas? How do people hold conflicting ideas? Why are some ideas stronger or more permanent than others? What does it take to change minds? The entire field of social psychology is devoted to this inquiry. Before embarking on the study or practice of the tools of public diplomacy, we must try to understand what is going on in the minds of the audience and how we might affect it. It is fundamental.

To apply our knowledge of how the mind works, we must also consider the impediments to gaining access to the minds of the audience. Unlike the days of the Cold War, in which some foreign audiences living under censoring regimes were starved for news and information about the outside world, most of the globe's populations are now flooded with more information than they can absorb. Internet users everywhere filter and search for what they read, and they tend to self-censor information to match that with which they agree. The challenge is to get past the filter and grab the attention of the audience in order to have a chance to affect their views. Students of the field must study

the keys to reaching people's minds if they are to learn to craft messages that move listeners.²

Next, what makes someone believe what you tell them? The coin of this realm is credibility. Aristotle taught that credibility comes with "logos", "ethos" and "pathos"—good sense, good moral character and good will. Synonyms for those three terms form the advice on credibility by virtually every thinker on the subject who has come after Aristotle. These thinkers require our understanding.

2. Typology

The next layer of analysis considers the practice of public diplomacy in its various major categories: what are we trying to achieve in affecting people's thinking? Are we trying to have people understand the world differently; create new acquaintanceships and friendships; or change what they think of us? Do we expect an immediate result or a long-term shift? Do we want to proceed by compulsion or attraction? Public diplomacy activities can be filed generally into these different slots.

Often, scholars separate public diplomacy techniques into those that are "informational" and those that are "relational".³ The informational are communications to foreign publics that convey information the speaker would like the audience to understand and believe. For example, the American Declaration of Independence, a political manifesto primarily aimed at a domestic audience, also referred to a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" and laid out to the world the causes that impelled the colonists to separate from Britain. It sought to inform.

The "relational" are all the techniques that build friendships and interpersonal understanding such as exchange programs, tourism, collaborative efforts and cultural and

sports engagements. Relational activities interact with the informational in that relationships are intended to create trusting affinities that lay the groundwork for believing information that may later be conveyed. Moreover, personal relationships are a public diplomacy end in themselves to the extent that they humanize foreigners so that conflict with them is less likely.⁴

Strangely omitted from this standard approach is the third category of “reputational” communication. Public diplomacy intended to enhance the image of a nation is what most lay people think of when they think of public diplomacy. Reputational public diplomacy may make use of informational material and relationship programs, but its objective is the fashioning of a reputation that goes beyond any particular information or any group of relationships. This practice is broadly described as “nation branding”.⁵ The goals are to build general acceptance of and admiration for a nation; consequent receptivity to its messages; and, perhaps, a boost in tourism, trade or investment.

The three categories can be further subdivided into whether the communication is intended for short- or long-term impact. Normally, short-term effects are the province of informational public diplomacy. If you want someone to act in a certain way soon, you will have to tell them something of substance. Relational and reputational techniques (and some informational messages) are intended to create receptivity to believing what you will later say. They are long-term exercises. The contrast between short-term and long-term is comparable to the difference in the world of commercial communication between advertising and public relations. Advertising is a form of strategic communication, a call to action—“please buy this product”—while public relations sets the stage for later calls to action through enhancing familiarity and admiration for a company or its product. Long-term public diplomacy communications

analogously increase credibility and a willingness to listen to later messaging aimed at an immediate effect.

Each of the three categories can also be subdivided into whether the method used is attraction or compulsion or a combination of the two. Joseph Nye postulated the importance of “soft power” as a nation’s attractiveness to others and as distinct from its power to influence others through coercion.⁶ The concept of soft power is that people willingly accept the positions of nations which they admire. “Hard power”, in contrast, is persuasion by threat or by military, financial or commercial actions that seek to compel acceptance. In the years since Professor Nye wrote of soft power, many have expanded its definition to include anything short of kinetic military activity. The Obama Administration argued for the use of the term “smart power” as the deployment of all tools, soft and hard, in pursuit of the national interest.

Whether “hard”, “soft” or “smart”, communication in pursuit of the national interest is the definition of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is not always friendly or even honest. Within each of these categories of public diplomacy, the study then turns to the methods and content of messaging.

3. Techniques

How do we act to get to our informational, relational or reputational objectives? Using our knowledge of human nature and the categories of tools at our disposal, what do we do?

Listening to the audience before, during and following a communication is a crucial tactic. “Listening is an actor’s attempt to manage the international environment by collecting and collating data about publics and their

opinions overseas and using that data to redirect its policy or its wider public diplomacy approach accordingly.”⁷ Listening allows the diplomat to understand the audience’s needs and concerns. Moreover, listening has value in and of itself because people everywhere resent being ignored. This feeling is strongest among those on the weak side of a power imbalance. The act of listening overcomes resentment and educates diplomats. They learn how to tailor their messages, if not the nation’s underlying policies.

Some listening must be done scientifically. Professional audience research is necessary to create public diplomacy programs that understand the audience. Further evaluations are valuable during and following campaigns to assess their impact. Attitude surveys such as the Pew Global Attitudes Project and conventional focus groups help measure progress. As social media programs proceed, evaluation entails counting followers, hits, retweets and the like, as well as using analytics to target the message to intended recipients. Analyzing effects on an ongoing basis allows mid-course adjustments in the current campaign and improvements in future campaigns. Understanding the minds of the audience is a matter of constant assessment and re-assessment. Further, statistically supportable demonstrations of success are keys to future financial and political support for renewed activities. Thus, the discipline of public diplomacy entails studying statistical methods as well as the strengths and weaknesses of polling and other analytics.

In crafting the message, a technique that couples an appeal to emotion with data and reasoning is often most effective. Visceral reactions are strong and enduring. Love, hate, fear, joy and other feelings tend to prevail over any arguments based on logic. Better yet, combine the two. Communications that convey facts and reasoning can be paired with an effort to get an emotional response.

Story-telling is a powerful tactic in advocacy. Audiences become engaged with well-told narratives. People also place great credibility in things they have been shown, not just told. They place the most faith in ideas they think they have developed on their own so that the most persuasive arguments take the listener to almost the end of the story and allow the listener to draw the conclusion. Then it is theirs, and they are likely to cling to it.

Is a message best sent by words, deeds or both? United States' warships arriving on the scene of a tsunami as "first responders" is a powerful message of selflessness and caring. Food aid supplied to famine-plagued communities can build friendships. However, even the tactic of practicing good deeds needs to be deployed with care. Some nations refuse help for fear of appearing weak or incapable. Perhaps this was at work when Japan initially refused offers of help from the United States in its 2011 nuclear meltdown/tsunami disaster.⁸ Other nations decline humanitarian aid out of suspicion of the donors' motives. International efforts to provide polio vaccinations, AIDS assistance and other relief have encountered refusals on such grounds. For instance, in 2008 Myanmar accepted food and other material aid but warily refused to allow relief workers to enter the country to tend to victims of a cyclone and flood.⁹

Similar to narratives in which the listener participates, deeds are most effective when done as collaborative activities. As in the work of the Peace Corps, when people work alongside each other in a joint project, they build relationships that are stronger than those built on courtesy and conversation, and they yield a greater emotional attachment to the people involved and to the common objective.¹⁰

Silence is a tactic, too, and the audience can read a message in it. When Saudi Arabia apparently kidnapped

the prime minister of Lebanon and seemed to extract his resignation in November 2017, American silence spoke volumes. But silence is a risky public diplomacy tactic because it creates a vacuum that may be filled by other potentially hostile voices.

Ethical and moral standards limit the tactics that can be deployed. No one can doubt the efficacy of Josef Goebbels "big lie" techniques as propaganda for the Nazi regime in the 1930s. Further, his practices comported fully with the guiding philosophy of his government. But for most contemporary governments, there are more ethical and moral constraints on what can be done than there were on Hitler's government. For example, the United States government has a welter of laws and regulations that distinguish what it can say to domestic and foreign audiences. It is freer in speaking to foreigners, but even in such communications cultural norms, political considerations and fear of blow-back place limits. When aggressive public information initiatives by the Central Intelligence Agency in the Cold War came to light in Senate hearings in the 1970s, the embarrassment placed permanent handcuffs on what the United States permits itself in peacetime. Vladimir Putin's Russia, with its trolls and disinformation campaigns, has a freer hand. But there is no country that will foreswear the use of disinformation in wartime military deception operations. The study of what the ethical standards of public diplomacy should be, and where the line should be drawn between acceptable communication and coercive or "weaponized" messaging, is appropriately located within the study of public diplomacy techniques.

4. Channels

Whatever the techniques, there are choices as to the channels through which they are communicated. How do

the channels work? How is the message delivered? How is changing technology affecting them?

Marshall McLuhan's oft-quoted "the medium is the message" is unavoidably apropos.¹¹ The method of transmission of messages controls how many people are reached, where they are, who they are and whether they get to respond or participate. The medium also determines the cost of communication and therefore the quantity of communication. Currently, the United States government's relatively expensive broadcast operations consume about one-third of its entire public diplomacy budget.¹² Selection of one channel of communication over another can inform the listener of the nature of the speaker—official or unofficial, young or old, etc. Instagram and Tumblr get to a younger demographic than Facebook. Using Instagram makes the sender seem hip and cool and more credible to a certain target group.

Public diplomacy channels are not limited to electronic media or government initiatives. Public diplomacy messages are disseminated by every means possible. Eyewitnesses to events, from life-saving emergency responses and acts of kindness to lethal bombing attacks, absorb messages. Food shipments air-dropped to starving refugee camps say something to the recipients about the donor nation. Terrorist bombing is a message to those who are injured and those who see the damage. Other personal interactions, such as tourism, business dealings, conferences, exchange programs and speeches, create impressions on the minds of the participants and listeners. Public diplomacy programs drive personal interactions through Fulbright Scholarships, world's fair pavilions, international scientific conferences and travel programs. At the next remove, word-of-mouth from a friend, a relative, a teacher or a preacher can be as persuasive as being there. A leaflet airdropped in a war zone can be the most important message a person ever reads.

To reach a large audience, there are all the different methods of broadcast. Newspapers, magazines, books, posters, billboards, flyers and direct mail are some of the approaches of conventional written public diplomacy. By use of graphics and photographic imagery, the audience need not be limited to those who are literate. Radio and television took broadcasting to a higher level. From the BBC to Voice of America to RT, broadcast is a potent channel for sending messages on one-way trips to large audiences. Styles of writing and broadcast that magnify the impact of messages provide a deep well of study for the discipline of public diplomacy. Some broadcasters are all-message, all-the-time, while others bury their messages in an attractive mix with sports, music and entertainment. It varies with the target audience.

The internet changes and magnifies the impact of all kinds of communications. It lowers the costs to the sender and increases the range. It makes communication more vibrant and persuasive with its emphasis on still and video images, rather than words. Moreover, it naturally accommodates two-way communication. It offers dialogue, improving the audience-centered approach that is key to success in public diplomacy. Conducting meaningful dialogues with large numbers of people is a major effort, but it can be worth the trouble and expense. Conversation leads to relationships that are the core of some of the most successful public diplomacy programs. Even for informational and reputational public diplomacy programs, the feedback that is received from audience responses and by the analytic algorithms that track the audience allow message targeting and impact measurement.

The challenge presented by the potency of digital communication is its indifference to the licit or illicit intent of its users. On one hand, it multiplies typical soft power initiatives intended to raise a nation's attractiveness for

its policies, its trade, its investment climate, etc. On the other hand, it multiplies threats, misinformation,¹³ mal-information¹⁴ and disinformation.¹⁵ Twitter was a viral carrier for ISIS videos of gruesome decapitations. Facebook was a favorite medium for Russian interference in the 2016 United States presidential election. The web was an effective tool for ISIS recruitment through its social media relationship-building capacity. Cyber tools allowed the hacking of private files that polluted democratic elections through web-based leaks of classified documents on behalf of foreign nations. These unscrupulous attacks, and whatever countermeasures are developed, come under the rubrics of Psychological Operations, aka Military Information Operations, and Military Deception and fit within the definition of public diplomacy, too.

Countering the advantages of the web is the paradox that some of its virtues prove to be its failings. The ease of entry into the world of internet communication makes public diplomacy in conflict situations an area of asymmetric warfare. North Korea and other such nations cannot compete in the full panoply of national power, but they can contest the major powers in cyber warfare, just as they can in nuclear arms. Also, the internet has transformed the quantity of information that can reach most audiences. In the Cold War, Radio Free Europe brought news into an information desert. Listeners hung on its words. Now there is so much information available that it is harder to get the audience's attention. As mentioned above, the audience lives within its subdivided information niches. The paradox of the web is that being able to reach everyone with everything has made it more difficult to reach anyone who does not already agree. Finally, the use of the web for information of doubtful accuracy has raised the entire audience's skepticism toward anything it sees in that medium. The fundamental public diplomacy principle of credibility is at stake. So the choice of medium determines not only whom you can reach but

how you are perceived by the audience and whether your message is believable. After all, at least in part, “the medium is the message.”

5. Content

Now we get to the heart of the matter. What is the content of the message that will achieve the objective of the public diplomacy campaign? What do you say, and how do you say it? For many nations, including the United States, there are national policies and endeavors that they seek to advance in the minds of people abroad. For other nations, the effort is focused on trade, tourism and investment. What issues should be pursued? What to do or say to prepare the audience? How to gain their attention? What will be persuasive? How to close the sale?

When the objective of the campaign is relational, there are many arrows in the quiver of the diplomat that can be used to build friendships. Tourism, trade and inward investment campaigns rely on relationships. Some nations, such as Israel and Japan, offer subsidized travel for foreign opinion leaders with carefully curated tours or internships. Many international agencies and activities, such as the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, bring together people from all over into an informal fraternity of those engaged in business and investment. Longer stays are the work of exchange programs involving students and others. The Fulbright and Rhodes Scholars are examples of worldwide networks of alumni who fondly remember their experience abroad as students. These visitors often come with a predisposition to favor the place and leave as life-long aficionados and advocates.

For reputational messaging cultural exchanges and sports diplomacy are typical practices in nation branding. Musical exchanges can be effective if aimed at the right demographic,

whether classical music, jazz, rock and roll or hip-hop concerts. They combine techniques and content. Cultural encounters communicate a shared taste and sensibility that becomes both a good reputation and a warm relationship. A concert by country music star Toby Keith in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia in 2017 might seem a counterintuitive choice, but it was very well received by an all-male, thobe-clad, young Arab audience.¹⁶ Film festivals can affect a reputation with a careful choice of films.¹⁷ Trade fairs can make a difference, with Vice President Richard Nixon's kitchen debate with USSR Chairman Nikita Khrushchev at such a fair in Moscow in 1959 as a prominent example. International cultural institutions, taking advantage of a nation's diasporas such as the Goethe-Institut, the Alliance Francaise, the English-Speaking Union, the British Council, the Japan Foundation and Confucius Institutes, spread the influence of their sponsors' cultures and policies. The Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup are leading cases among many examples of sports diplomacy aimed at establishing reputations both for the participating nations, based on the performances of their athletes, and for the host nations, based on their success in welcoming the visitors. Kim Jong-un's decision to participate in the 2017 Winter Games in South Korea instantly put lipstick on the world's most reviled pariah state.

The "diplomacy of deeds" in which nations act in charitable ways in emergencies and in dealing with the chronic needs of other nations are time-tested methods of improving a nation's brand. The French organization Médecins Sans Frontières embellishes the reputation of France with its caring medical work abroad. Nations throughout the developed world offer foreign aid to assist the needy and to build friendships and enhance the donors' reputations.

Content that directly states a case can also build reputations. Advertising campaigns showcasing a nation's landscape and people can bring tourism and foreign

investment and generally enhance the nation's brand. "Incredible India" is an effective such web/video marketing program that has been improving India's image since 2002. Tourism and investment themselves bring visitors to a nation and tend to personalize and thus improve a nation's reputation.

The key to success in advocacy is to identify the challenge—the resistance to be overcome, the question to be answered, the doubts to be dispelled. After the World Trade Center attack of September 11, 2001 Americans asked, "Why do they hate us?"¹⁸ The United States State Department set out to change minds in the Middle East with a series of television spots called "Shared Values". They were intended to enhance the American reputation by focusing on the successful lives of Muslims living in the United States. They failed. The television spots were either ignored or mocked. The ads suffered from a muddled idea of what the problem was and what the challenge would be in overcoming it. The State Department was promoting the idea that the United States was a place of individual freedom, religious tolerance and financial success. None of those messages dealt with anti-American resentments within the region, where it was already accepted that the United States is rich and that life there is desirable. Rather, the messages triggered anger arising from the fact that viewers could not realistically hope to share in that life. The foreign public was already persuaded of America's advantages and was animated in its fury by its perception that the United States reserves those advantages for itself. For public diplomacy to succeed, you do not need to sell people what they have already bought; you need to correctly diagnose what is the objective and how best to get there.

While advocacy has an important place in reputational public diplomacy, it is at the center of informational public diplomacy. In turn, to be successful, direct advocacy relies on

reputational public diplomacy and relational public diplomacy for its credibility and reach. Strategic communication—messages to induce an audience to take certain actions—turns on the crafting of the message text. What do you say, and how do you say it? Successful messaging primes the audience to be receptive and uses well-composed words and images to maximize credibility. The use of celebrities and other attention-getting spokespersons and endorsers are well-known devices. Putting the message in the mouths of persons other than foreign government officials is frequently most effective. On the other hand, certain messages, particularly statements of national policy, may be best done as direct statements by the president or another national leader who speaks definitively for the nation and does so in the language of the audience. All of this is an art and science of its own.

6. Government Structure

The organizational architecture of a nation's public diplomacy administration is a core issue in the next layer of study. In studying farming we do not need to investigate the structure of the United States Department of Agriculture. However, at least in the United States, whenever concern is focused on the effectiveness of public diplomacy and improvements are sought, the changes urged are almost entirely involved with demands to reorganize the federal agencies charged with developing and implementing public diplomacy.¹⁹

The State Department is the primary institution charged with conventional public diplomacy, coordinated under the Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy. Through its embassies and the public diplomats located in most of them, the State Department speaks on behalf of the nation to foreign governments and publics. The State Department administers dozens of exchange programs, including

the Fulbright Scholarships and the International Visitors Leadership Program. Independent of the State Department, the Broadcasting Board of Governors is responsible for international broadcasts.²⁰ The Department of Homeland Security has authority over refugee and immigration programs, which have major impacts on foreign opinion. The Peace Corps runs programs that epitomize the “diplomacy of deeds”. Trade promotion and facilitation is the job of the Commerce Department and the Office of the Special Trade Representative, as well as local agencies. Tourism promotion remains largely a local and state government responsibility despite recent national efforts to empower public-private partnerships at the national level through “Brand USA”.²¹ In addition, members of Congress, numerous other local and federal officials and all sorts of business leaders and regular tourists are constantly travelling and making pronouncements seen and heard abroad.

Meanwhile, the evolution of international competition away from armies contesting for territory and toward the struggle for hearts and minds has moved informational advocacy public diplomacy from the periphery of national defense policy to its core. In the United States, integrating the “hearts and minds” efforts into contemporary public diplomacy has resulted in a shift of programs and funding for strategic communication initiatives from the State Department to the Defense Department.

While the State Department struggles, the Defense Department has ample funds to devote to operations intended to win friends in areas of military activity through its Military Information Operations, including Public Affairs and Military Information Support Operations. The limiting factor on such funding and effort is their focus on strategic informational public diplomacy with near-term goals in specific locations, rather than the broader, long-term activities involved in relational and reputational public

diplomacy. Also, when conventional military operations require the use of kinetic force in the same theater, such as a drone attack in Pakistan, it can undo all the good results of relational and reputational efforts by all agencies. This underscores how the relationship between organizational structure, function and funding and the practice of public diplomacy.

There is increasing attention on efforts to enlist the private sector in advancing public diplomacy, either on its own or in public-private partnerships. In part, this is a recognition that the private sector spends vast multiples of the government's budget on global advertising. Procter & Gamble alone spent \$8.3 billion on worldwide advertising in 2015.²² The total public diplomacy budget in FY 2016 for the State Department and its other related agencies (excluding the Defense Department) was \$2.03 billion.²³ The private sector is already reaching more foreign audiences and devoting more expertise and resources to it than the State Department. The private sector can respond more nimbly and promptly in social media than the State Department, for whom each statement, however minor, is an official pronouncement that must be vetted. Further, when the private sector speaks, it has the advantage of not being an official government spokesperson. People are more likely to believe it.

7. History

History matters and forms an overarching layer for the study of public diplomacy. Is there anything new in the art of addressing an audience effectively? Innovations have come and are yet to come in the channels and patterns of communication, but advocacy will still rely on the insights of the ancient rhetoricians. Demosthenes in 4th century B.C. Athens, Cicero in 1st century Rome, and St. Augustine in 5th century North Africa and their many followers not only spent

their lives in persuasion but thought and wrote about it as an art and a skill. The history of public diplomacy includes Homer and Virgil's accounts of the Greeks deceiving the people of Troy by abandoning to them an enormous wooden horse full of soldiers. Sun Tzu, the 5th century B.C. Chinese general and military strategist dictated principles in *The Art of War* that still apply to strategic communication and military deception: "Appear weak when you are strong, and strong when you are weak." "The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting."

In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt sent the "Great White Fleet" on an around-the-world tour to impress and notify foreign publics and governments of the United States' emergence as a naval power. Public diplomacy by attraction, so-called "soft power", has ample precedent in history, too. Edgar Allan Poe wrote in *To Helen* of the "glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." World's fairs, events established specifically for peaceful promotion of nations, began in 1851 in London with the Crystal Palace Exhibition (officially called the "Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations").

Some things advertise themselves by word of mouth. The United States is said to have developed the "greatest national image of all time"²⁴ long before it began its first official effort to advertise its virtues. The Committee on Public Information (the "Creel Committee") was established by President Woodrow Wilson in 1917 to build public support among Americans for World War I. While not strictly considered "public diplomacy" due to its lack of a focus on foreign publics, it represented the federal government's first foray into overt efforts to manage "hearts and minds".

With the Russian revolution and its new Soviet government and the fascist regimes in Italy and Germany, international conflict among sovereign states moved from

contests solely for power and wealth to conflicts about ideas. The Communists and Nazis refined the techniques of international messaging as instruments of soft and hard power. Also, early short-wave radio broadcasting, beginning with the BBC Empire Service in 1932, showed the ability of technology to convey public diplomacy. America followed suit as it moved toward involvement in World War II and empowered various agencies to engage in overt and covert messaging abroad on its behalf. Peacetime persuasion was codified in 1948,²⁵ and the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Department and the United State Information Agency played these roles since then.

This history, in the United States and elsewhere, provides perspective for the philosophical resistance to or embrace of governmental propagation of ideas and on the techniques used and their successes and failures. The stories of the Bay of Pigs Invasion of Cuba in 1961, the Church Committee hearings in 1975 that revealed the CIA's role in propaganda,²⁶ the elimination of the United States Information Agency in 1999 and many other events form a fascinating narrative. For a public diplomat the history is required background. It informs all that we do now. It is inherent in each of the six other layers that comprise the field.

At one level or another, this layered system of organization encompasses all the seemingly unrelated topics that inhabit public diplomacy. They are connected and need to be understood as a package. The workings of audience minds, the typology of what is communicated, the techniques, the channels of communication, the content, the governmental structure and the history form the whole discipline. The totality of issues raised within these layers is almost everything involved in human communication, psychology and epistemology. Public diplomacy properly

understood is an intellectual and operational arena for the most broad-gauged theoreticians and practitioners. It is a place where theory and practice come together coherently with real-world consequences.

Endnotes

1. E.g., Neuroscientist Antonio Damasio's *Self Comes to Mind: Constructing the Conscious Brain* (New York: Pantheon, 2010) on how emotion rules the brain; economist Daniel Kahneman's *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011); and his earlier book with Amos Tversky, *Judgment Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982) on the roles of preconceptions and stereotypes in forming decisions.
2. Social psychologist Robert Cialdini's *Pre-Suasion* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016) is a general reader's guide for persuading by getting the audience's attention and building a trusting relationship before the message is delivered. He focuses on reciprocation, personal affinity, social proof, authority, scarcity and consistency as the keys to preparing the environment for persuasion.
3. See R.S. Zaharna, "Mapping out a Spectrum of Public Diplomacy Initiatives: Information and Relational Communication Frameworks," in Nancy Snow and Philip M. Taylor, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy* (New York: Routledge, 2009): 86-100.
4. Less likely, but far from impossible. History is full of bloody internecine struggles among intimately acquainted groups.
5. See Melissa Aronczyk, *Branding the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013); Simon Anholt and Jeremy Hildreth, *Brand America: The Making, Unmaking and Remaking of the Greatest National Image of all Time* (London: Marshall Cavendish, 2010); and Dick Martin, *Brand America* (New York: Amacom, 2007).
6. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).
7. Nicholas J. Cull, "Lessons from the Past," *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy* (2009): 18.
8. Allison Carnegie and Lindsay Dolan, "The Effects of Aid on Recipients' Reputations: Evidence from Natural Disaster Responses" (April 3, 2015), docs.aiddata.org/ad4/files/carnegiedolan_2015_aid_legitimacy.pdf

9. Seth Mydans, "Myanmar Seizes U.N. Food for Cyclone Victims and Blocks Foreign Exports", *The New York Times* (May 10, 2008), nytimes.com/2008/05/10/world/asia/10myanmar.html
10. See Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault, "Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (2008): 10.
11. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: Mentor, 1964).
12. United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *2017 Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy & International Broadcasting*, state.gov/documents/organization/274950.pdf, p. 13.
13. False information shared with no intent to cause harm.
14. Accurate information shared with the intent to cause harm, often by publicly disclosing information intended to remain confidential.
15. False information knowingly shared with the intent to cause harm.
16. Spencer Kornhaber, "Toby Keith's Happy Hour," *The Atlantic* (November 2017): 20.
17. The 1940 Hollywood film version of John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* showed the world an America afflicted with Depression poverty, desperation and cruelty, so much so that the Motion Picture Export Association briefly withdrew it from export to France under State Department prodding. Ironically, Josef Stalin banned it in 1948 because it showed that even the poorest of America's proletariat could afford a car.
18. Fareed Zakaria, "The Politics of Rage: Why do they hate us?" *Newsweek* (October 14, 2001).
19. See *Report of the Defense Science Board, Task Force on Strategic Communication* (January 2008); *Voices of America: U.S. Public Diplomacy for the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: Brookings, November 2008); *Business Plan, Creating an Independent International Strategic Communication*

- Organization for America "SAGE"* (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, June 22, 2011); Reimagining Public Diplomacy's Organizational Structure at the U.S. Department of State, (Washington, DC: United States Advisory Commission of Public Diplomacy, May 12, 2016).
20. The networks under the Broadcasting Board of Governors are Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Office of Cuba Broadcasting, Radio Free Asia and Middle East Broadcasting Networks.
 21. See Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–145, sec. 9).
 22. Alexander Coolidge, "Once again, P&G is the world's top advertiser", *Cincinnati.com* (May 27, 2016), cincinnati.com/story/money/2016/05/27/once-again-pg-worlds-top-advertiser/84996916/.
 23. United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *2017 Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy & International Broadcasting*, state.gov/documents/organization/274950.pdf, p. 13.
 24. Simon Anholt and Jeremy Hildreth, *Brand America: The Making, Unmaking and Remaking of the Greatest National Image of all Time* (London: Marshall Cavendish, 2010).
 25. U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 80-402) ("Smith-Mundt Act").
 26. United States Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities.

Author Biography

Barry A. Sanders is an adjunct professor of Communication at UCLA teaching courses entitled "The Images of America around the World," "Public Diplomacy," and "Architecture as Non-Verbal Communication." He is also on the faculty of the UCLA law school. He is the author of two books: *American Avatar: The United States in the Global Imagination* (Potomac Books, 2011) and *The Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Games* (Arcadia Publishing, 2013). Sanders practiced international corporate law at the global law firm of Latham & Watkins from 1970 to 2007. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Pacific Council on International Policy, and the Board of the USC Center on Public Diplomacy. He served eight years as president of the Board of Commissioners of the Recreation and Parks Department of the City of Los Angeles and as a member of the Board of Commissioners of the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum. He is the Founder and chairman emeritus of the Los Angeles Parks Foundation. Sanders served as Chairman of the Southern California Committee for the Olympic Games from 2003 to 2017 and as a director of LA2028, the group that successfully bid to bring the Olympics to Los Angeles in 2028.

In September 2007 he received the Olympic Spirit Award from the United States Olympic Committee and the William May Garland Award from the Southern California Committee for the Olympic Games. He served on the board of Special Olympics of California and the board of the Special Olympics World Games 2015. He is a director of the Los Angeles Sports Council and of the Los Angeles Sports Council Foundation. He serves as an arbitrator at the International Court of Arbitration for Sport. Sanders' community service career spans many subjects. In early 1992, he served as executive editor and general counsel to the California Council on Competitiveness. From 1979 to 1984, he acted as primary outside counsel to the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. After the riots in Los Angeles in 1992, he was co-chair of Rebuild LA, the public-private organization established to deal with the problems of LA's inner city. While co-chair of RLA, he was chairman of the

board of the RLA Community Lending Corporation. In 2011 the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce awarded him its Civic Medal of Honor. He received the 1999 Medal of Honor for contributions to the arts from the Thornton School of Music of the University of Southern California. He has been chairman of the board and president of the Los Angeles Philharmonic and chairman of the Los Angeles Public Library Foundation.

He is presently on the executive committee of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Opera and led its city-wide Ring Festival LA in spring 2010. He also sits on the Board and the Executive Committee of the Ojai Music Festival. Sanders has served on the boards of directors of the League of American Orchestras, the Los Angeles Performing Arts Center (formerly "The Music Center"), the Music Center Foundation, The Walt Disney Concert Hall Corporation, the Joffrey Ballet, the Aman Dance Company, the Geffen Playhouse, the Otis Art Institute, and the Los Angeles Municipal Art Gallery, among others. Sanders was born in Philadelphia and earned degrees from the University of Pennsylvania and Yale Law School.

Other Papers in the CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy Series

All papers in the CPD Perspectives series are available for free on the Center's website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org). To purchase any of the publications below in hard copy, please contact: cpd@usc.edu.

- 2018/1 From Crawling to Walking:
Progress is Evaluating the Effectiveness of Public
Diplomacy: Lessons Learned from NATO
by Barbora Maronkova
- 2017/3 The Floating Tree: Crafting Resilient State Narratives in
Post-Truth Environments
by Vivian S. Walker
- 2017/2 Sino-Vatican Faith Diplomacy:
Mapping the Factors Affecting Bilateral Relations
by Juyan Zhang
- 2017/1 Why the Voice of America Remains a Vital Force in the
World
by Geoffrey Cowan
- 2016/5 The Reem Island Ghost: Framing State Narratives on
Terror
by Vivian Walker
- 2016/4 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers Part 2:
The Case of Indonesia
by Ellen Huijgh
- 2016/3 Canadian Public Diplomacy and Nation-Building:
Expo 67 and the World Festival of Arts and Entertainment
by Kailey Hansson
- 2016/2 Intersections between Public Diplomacy & International
Development: Case Studies in Converging Fields
by James Pamment

- 2016/1 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers, Part 1:
The Case of Turkey
by Ellen Huijgh and Jordan Warlick
- 2015/7 Public Diplomacy in Global Health: An Annotated
Bibliography
by Tara Ornstein
- 2015/6 Democratization through Public Diplomacy: An Analysis
of the European Parliament's Reaction to the Arab Spring
by Michael Reinprecht & Henrietta Levin
- 2015/5 Centers of Gravity in Public Diplomacy:
A Case Study of U.S. Efforts in South Africa
by Amelia Arsenault
- 2015/4 Public Diplomacy of Multilateral Organizations:
The Cases of NATO, EU, and ASEAN
by Zhikica Zach Pagovski
- 2015/3 Benghazi: Managing the Message
by Vivian Walker
- 2015/2 Soft Power and Public Diplomacy: The Case of the
European Union in Brazil
by María Luisa Azpiroz
- 2015/1 Distinguishing Cultural Relations from Cultural
Diplomacy: The British Council's Relationship with Her
Majesty's Government
by Tim Rivera
- 2014/3 Confucius Institutes and the Globalization of China's
Soft Power with contributions
by R.S. Zaharna, Jennifer Hubbert, and Falk Hartig
- 2014/2 De-Americanizing Soft Power Discourse?
by Daya Thussu
- 2014/1 Britain's International Broadcasting
by Rajesh Mirchandani and Abdullahi Tasiu Abubakar

- 2013/6 Public Diplomacy and the Media in the Middle East
by Philip Seib
- 2013/5 Public Diplomacy in Germany
by Claudia Auer and Alice Srugies
- 2013/4 The Syrian Crisis of 1957: A Lesson for the 21st Century
by Kevin Brown
- 2013/3 "Psychopower" of Cultural Diplomacy in the Information Age
by Natalia Grincheva
- 2013/2 Cases in Water Diplomacy
Edited by Naomi Leight
- 2013/1 Considering the "Illogical Patchwork": The Broadcasting Board of Governors and U.S. International Broadcasting
by Emily T. Metzgar
- 2012/10 Engaging India: Public Diplomacy and Indo American Relations to 1957
by Sarah Ellen Graham
- 2012/9 Silicon Valley's Foreign Policy
by Ernest J. Wilson III
- 2012/8 Buddhist Diplomacy: History and Status Quo
by Juyan Zhang
- 2012/7 Public Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution: Russia, Georgia and the EU in Abkhazia and South Ossetia
by Iskra Kirova
- 2012/6 Practicing Successful Twitter Public Diplomacy: A Model and Case Study of U.S. Efforts in Venezuela
by Erika A. Yepsen
- 2012/5 Media Diplomacy and U.S.-China Military-to-Military Cooperation
by Thomas A. Hollihan and Zhan Zhang

- 2012/4 The Cultural Awakening in Public Diplomacy
by R.S. Zaharna
- 2012/3 Promoting Japan: One JET at a Time
by Emily T. Metzgar
- 2012/2 Experiencing Nation Brands: A Comparative Analysis of
Eight National Pavilions at Expo Shanghai in 2010
by Jian Wang and Shaojing Sun
- 2012/1 Hizbullah's Image Management Strategy
by Lina Khatib
- 2011/11 Public Diplomacy from Below: The 2008 "Pro-China"
Demonstrations in Europe and North America
by Barry Sautman and Li Ying
- 2011/10 Campaigning for a Seat on the UN Security Council
by Caitlin Byrne
- 2011/9 A Resource Guide to Public Diplomacy Evaluation
by Robert Banks
- 2011/8 Essays on Faith Diplomacy
Edited by Naomi Leight
- 2011/7 A Strategic Approach to U.S. Diplomacy
by Barry A. Sanders
- 2011/6 U.S. Public Diplomacy in a Post-9/11 World:
From Messaging to Mutuality
by Kathy R. Fitzpatrick
- 2011/5 The Hard Truth About Soft Power
by Markos Kounalakis and Andras Simonyi
- 2011/4 Challenges for Switzerland's Public Diplomacy:
Referendum on Banning Minarets
by Johannes Matyassy and Seraina Flury

- 2011/3 Public Diplomacy of Kosovo: Status Quo, Challenges and Options
by Martin Wählisch and Behar Xharra
- 2011/2 Public Diplomacy, New Media, and Counterterrorism
by Philip Seib
- 2011/1 The Power of the European Union in Global Governance:
A Proposal for a New Public Diplomacy
El poder de la Unión Europea en el gobierno global:
Propuesta para una nueva diplomacia pública
by Teresa La Porte
- 2010/4 Spectacle in Copenhagen: Public Diplomacy on Parade
by Donna Marie Oglesby
- 2010/3 U.S. Public Diplomacy's Neglected Domestic Mandate
by Kathy R. Fitzpatrick
- 2010/2 Mapping the Great Beyond: Identifying Meaningful
Networks in Public Diplomacy
by Ali Fisher
- 2010/1 Moscow '59: The "Sokolniki Summit" Revisited
by Andrew Wulf
- 2009/3 The Kosovo Conflict: U.S. Diplomacy and Western Public
Opinion
by Mark Smith
- 2009/2 Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past
by Nicholas J. Cull
- 2009/1 America's New Approach to Africa:
AFRICOM and Public Diplomacy
by Philip Seib

CPD | USC Center on Public Diplomacy
at the Annenberg School

