

Crafting the Image of Nations in Foreign Audiences: How Developing Countries Use Public Diplomacy and Public Relations?

Ibrahima Ndoye
The University of Oklahoma
Email Address: indoye@ou.edu

Abstract

This paper seeks to explain the main differences in public diplomacy approaches between developed countries in the West and Third World nations. It focuses on the concept of publics through an overview of major institutional settings in the West and the use of practical cases in the Third World. In fact, the differences in strategic priorities have engendered a difference in target publics between the West and the Third World in their needs to reach out to hearts and minds of their respective foreign audiences. The paper concludes that Western countries, through well organized government structures, tend to reach out to foreign publics using public diplomacy as a wartime exigency, a vehicle for the promotion of democracy, a means to expand modes of engagement and as a mouthpiece versus policy instrument; whereas developing countries, in the pursuit of their economic survival, are more inclined to use international public relations to directly reach out to foreign government authorities, not the foreign countries citizens.

Introduction

The need for nations to convey a certain image to the rest of the world has always been a central element in governments' agendas. Many different reasons can lead a country to cultivate its image to a foreign public. Image cultivation mainly follows a crisis that requires repairing a country's image among the public of another country.

In the context of globalization, nations have entered a new world in which communication, knowledge and culture are key to the achievement of cohesion between the different peoples of the globe. The main concern among actors of international relations lies in the fact that "the powerful engine of the global economy will roll over cultural diversity, fragile social and political systems, and state sovereignty itself" (Potter, 2002, p. 2). Potter makes allusion to the growing concern among Western countries facing a pressing need to win the hearts and minds of other publics in different parts of the globe.

Developed countries, mainly in the West, have a different approach of public diplomacy in contrast to developing countries in the Third World. In the West, public diplomacy has entered a full scale of development in contrast to what is known as diplomacy, traditional diplomacy, and public diplomacy (Cull, 2007). For Allan Gotlieb, former Canadian ambassador to the US, "the new public diplomacy as, I called it, is, to a large extent, public diplomacy and requires different skills, techniques and attitudes than those found in traditional diplomacy" (Gotlieb, 1991, p. Vii). In this case, public diplomacy from developed country's perspective is directly geared to the public of another country using government medium or affiliates to service policy goals. Cole (2005), for instance, defined British public diplomacy as "work aiming to inform and engage individuals and organizations overseas in order to improve understanding of and strengthen

influence for the United Kingdom in a manner consistent with governmental medium and long term goals” (p. 8). The British government objective over the years has generally been based on the use of foreign governments to reach foreign publics. Yet, nowadays a more succinct definition links public policy to direct access to foreign publics. In fact, public diplomacy has now become “the process of achieving the UK's International Strategic Priorities through engagement with the public overseas.” Under this definition, strategic priorities are set forth in the process of reaching directly other publics.

In contrast, Third World countries are facing the need to craft a positive image to the West for many reasons, among which concerns for sustainable economic development are the most prominent (Kunczik, 2000). The acquirement of aid and funds for development projects from rich nations are based on criteria that Third World countries have to abide by to be eligible. This entails an approach to public diplomacy that is solely geared to rich countries’ governments, not directly to their publics. For Kunczik (2000), the flow of international capital within Third World countries depend on the images of nations to governments of Western countries. In fact, developing countries mainly rely on public relations professionals in the West to prevail in developing countries’ decisions.

The purpose of this paper is to probe the differences in public diplomacy approaches between developed countries and Third World nations with emphasis on the concept of publics. In fact, the difference in strategic priorities have engendered a difference in target public between the West and the Third world in their needs to reach out to hearts and minds of their respective audiences. Western countries, through public policy, tend to reach other publics whereas Third World countries are more inclined to use international public relations to directly reach out to foreign governments.

The study will explore public policy as applied by developed countries to set their agenda in foreign nations and how Third World countries, due to development constraints, rely more on international public relations to reach out to rich nations in the West. Yet, I will primarily survey the theoretical framework that set the basis for public diplomacy.

Public Diplomacy: An Overview

Defined as a “government’s process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas and ideals, its institutions and cultures, as well as its national goals and current policies” (Tuch, 1990, p. 3), public policy follows a process through different channels including media programs, cultural activities and exchanges between nations. Leonard (2002) defined public policy as the task of communicating with foreign publics. For Wang and Chang (2004) public policy can be assimilated to a form of international public relations. The argument is based on the fact that both public relations and public policy objectives are to reach out to a given public and at the same time share the same strategies and tactics. Dutta-Bergman (2006), in his attempt to relate public policy to public relations, states that:

Public diplomacy involves the communication of a government to the people of another nation with the goal of influencing their image of the sender nation. To the extent that public diplomacy attempts to influence the perceptions and opinions of the members of the target state with respect to the image of the source (nation), it embodies a form of public relations. (p. 104)

Public diplomacy then becomes a form of public relations' practice extended to a foreign public by another nation in its attempt to manipulate perception of its image through different strategies. It pertains to "issues of nations" image and reputations abroad and its management through public diplomatic actions" (Wang, 2006, p. 34). Kunczik (2003) considered public diplomacy public relations practiced by nations toward the public of other nations' with little difference with traditional public relations. For Wang (2006), the origins of public relations can be sought in the realm of public diplomacy in its early years. After reviewing the works of Kunczik (2003), Wang concludes that

an examination of the history of public relations demonstrates that the historical roots of the field of public relations are located in public diplomacy efforts such as the German and British public diplomacy initiatives, the public diplomacy conducted by the Committee on Public Information headed by George Creel, the work of Carl Byoir and Associates with foreign governments, and the role of Ivy Lee as a counselor to multiple foreign governments including the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. (p. 104)

In fact, public diplomacy and public relations share the same objectives and the same strategies geared to different publics. Their very existence is inherent to the need for governments and organizations to reach out to win the hearts and minds of their publics using strategic communication efforts. In the case of public diplomacy, there are two schools according to Deibel and Roberts (1976): The tough-minded school and the tender-minded school. The tough-minded school exerts influence on attitudes of a foreign audience through persuasion and propaganda by using fast media such as radio and TV. As for the tender-minded school, it uses the cultural functions of public diplomacy through slow media by incorporating academic and cultural exchanges. Within both schools, the images of nations through cultivation, play a prominent role in the strategies set forth for governments to achieve their agenda goals toward foreign publics. In fact, image cultivation stands as the backbone of public diplomacy.

For Kunczik (1996), image cultivation could be traced back to the beginning of the history of humanity. He pointed out that even the Bible contains examples of image manipulations. He also contended that attempts to influence the image of nations could be found in early history even though there are difficulties "to distinguish between attempts to influence one's own population and attempts to manipulate the image abroad" (p. 123). Yet, public policy relations through image cultivation peaked in Europe after the scientific breakthroughs in printing (Kunczik, 1996). In fact, Gutenberg's invention of printing consecrated the emergence of a new kind of international public relations, according to Kunczik. For instance, Emperor Maximilian I of Germany was the first to use newspapers as an efficient instrument for war. By using biased reports of war he managed to control the mood of his surrogates.

In a more recent era in the relationship between modern nations, public relations play a more compelling role in influencing the complex images of nations. For Fabian (1970),

they present one's own nation to the other as being as likable as possible. They exchange ambassadors and arrange state visits, they put on art shows and transport warm blankets to the locality of a disaster, they print brochures and invite students to a language course, they do all they can and they hope that at the next soccer international there is no brawling between the players of the two teams. (p. 29)

Von Studnitz, cited by Kunczik (1996), compares contemporary public relations between nations to the past in these words: “In the old days, one could win over an empire by marrying; today you can win over peoples by leading an article” (p. 299).

For a more contemporary understanding of public diplomacy practice, Signitzer and Coombs (1992) delineated three different reasons that entail the need for governments to reach out to foreign publics. First, the world we live in today has become more diverse, complex and intertwined. In fact, the flow of information is immediately shared around the globe with the ever-increasing development of information technology. Second, with new trends of cooperation in the world, globalization is playing a greater role in the peoples’ relationships. The third reason relates to the urgent need for nation-states as well as multinational corporations to communicate across international boundaries to attain certain objectives. Yet, Szondi (2008) suggested that for Western countries, “public diplomacy is rooted in conflicts and related to different levels of tensions between states and other actors; a peaceful political environment is not a necessary condition for engaging in public diplomacy” (p. 3). Thus, he identified three different stages in the evolution of US public diplomacy:

The first period stretches over four decades when American and Western values and norms were intensively spread throughout Eastern Europe and a whole range of methods were used to persuade people leaving behind the iron curtain. The collapse of the Berlin Wall marks the second phase of public diplomacy when significantly less efforts and resources were devoted to public diplomacy resulting in the decline of US public diplomacy worldwide. The tragic destruction and collapse of the World Trade Center on 11 September, 2001, marks the beginning of the third phase. (p. 2-3)

Yet Szondi (2008) argued that the conditions, goals, strategies, the directions of communication and message context have to change in a global context. According to Szondi, the 21st century public diplomacy should neither evolve through conflicts or tensions between states, nor should it be based on persuasion to manage publics, but it should even prosper in time of peace and geared to building and maintaining relationships by engaging with publics through two-way communication (dialogue) instead of one-way communication (monologue).

Public diplomacy is generally linked to communication in the sense that it uses global communication channels to reach out to foreign audiences (Fortner, 1993). According to Fortner, “public diplomacy aims to affect the policies of other nations by appeals to its citizens through means of public communication” (p. 278). Frederick went further and affirmed that the main objective of public diplomacy “is to influence a foreign government by influencing its citizens” through overseas radio broadcasts and cultural programs. Hachten and Scotton (2002) suggested that public diplomacy is about “a government’s overt efforts to influence other governments and their publics” (p. 102). For this reason, Hachten and Scotton (2002) used the term International Political Communication (IPC) to further define public diplomacy. The term helped “identify public diplomacy, overseas information programs, cultural exchanges, propaganda activities and political warfare” (Hachten & Scotton, p. 104). Furthermore they contended that the international media of all nation-states play a prominent role in IPC, and in more general terms, in public diplomacy.

Yet, all nation-states do not have the same financial possibilities to conduct public diplomacy. In fact, nation-states in the periphery, mainly developing countries in the Third World, “are mostly in the receiving end of public diplomacy because most lack the

communication capability to compete effectively on a global basis” (Hachton & Scotton, 2002, p. 104). For this reason, many Third World countries engage in international public relations leveled to foreign governments’ authorities.

In these countries, public diplomacy is linked to public relations at the government level, where the image of nations “is outsourced to branding or marketing agencies and consultants who advise governments about country branding, develop the core ideas and elements of the brand, design visuals, as well as produce a national ‘brand book’” (Szondi, 2008, p.12).

In the next section I will demonstrate that, through well organized government structures, Western nations tend to reach out to foreign publics using public diplomacy as a wartime exigency, a vehicle for the promotion of democracy, a means to expand modes of engagement and as a mouthpiece versus policy instrument; whereas developing countries, in the pursuit of their economic survival, are more inclined to use international public relations to directly reach out to foreign government authorities, not the foreign countries citizens.

First of all I will set the different elements of public diplomacy in the West by using examples of the U.S and Great Britain and later use practical examples of government diplomacy in the case of developing countries and their implications.

The purpose of Western Nations’ Public Diplomacy

The relationship between the West and the rest of the world has mainly been guided by the need for Western nations to build and maintain secure spaces of support for the flow of capital and establishment of peace, according to the realist point of view (Kiesling, 2007). The process requires strategic priorities that would set the basis for engagement in efficient public diplomacy. In fact, “the priorities for the management of the international environment – is a precondition for effective public diplomacy” (Cull, 2007, p. 11). According to Cull, engagement with a foreign public has the same objective as the management of the international environment (engagement between an actor and its own public is known as public affairs). Cull further sustained that “effective engagement requires listening and feeding back, hence the apparatus of public diplomacy and especially its listening elements should have a key role to play in defining and shaping the policies they will be called upon to deliver” (p. 12).

Western countries such as the United States and Great Britain have always faced challenges in managing their image and reputation within foreign publics. In their strategies to portray a flawless image to the rest of the world, these Western countries have developed strategies aimed at reaching out directly to foreign publics through government-operated structures.

In the United States, the practice of public diplomacy has a rich history since the early years of its development. Yet “as a formal, organized function of the government, such overseas information operation began in earnest during the First World War with the creation of the Committee on Public Information (CPI)” (Wang, 2007, p. 22). Other government vehicles for public diplomacy such as the Office of War Information (OWI) and the United States Information Agency followed respectively with the Second World War and the Cold War (Wang, 2007). Based on his historical review of the manifest mandate of U.S international communication agencies, Wang (2006) made four interesting observations on the purpose of U.S public diplomacy. First, public diplomacy is an exigency of wartime. He contended that “U.S public diplomacy has served primarily as an instrument of foreign policy to meet wartime exigencies” (p.26). In fact, the government established agencies as strategy to facilitate communications in World War I and II after recognizing the ultimate importance of international public opinion in the conduct of the conflict (Wang, 2006).

In times of conflict, the government of the U.S has always relied on agencies with strict wartime goals. For Wang, “the paramount mission of the agencies, whether through dissemination of information or building global understanding of America, was to help win the war” (p.26). After the end of any of the war government agencies tend to be obsolete without indicating that the United States international communication strategies stopped.

Second, public diplomacy plays an important role in the spread of democracy around the globe (Wang, 2007). The goal of US agencies is to promote American- style democracy all over the world. According to Dizard (2004), the Roosevelt administration primarily advocated the eradication of the Axis forces by promoting self-determination even though the mission of OWI was later geared to winning the war.

The third observation pertains to the expansion of modes of engagement. For Grunig (1993), public diplomacy “consists essentially of the application of public relations to strategic relationships of organizations with international publics” (p. 143). Wang (2007) further stated that “in strategic communication, the work of public diplomacy is not only to promote the policies and values of a particular nation but also to engineer consensus and facilitate understanding among overseas publics” (p. 27). To achieve this goal, it is crucial for any country “to understand the needs of foreign publics and to adjust one’s communication strategy and tactics accordingly” (p. 27).

The fourth observation is an attempt to probe the role of public diplomacy over whether it constitutes a mouthpiece or an actual policy instrument. According to Wang,

at issue is whether public diplomacy should be involved in policy making as well as policy communication. In this regard, it parallels the larger debate on the role and function of public relations in an organizational process, i.e., serving as a communication technician or a strategic management function (p. 27).

These four observations allow to understand how public diplomacy from the West follows a set of objectives with defined guidelines to reach out to the publics of foreign publics. In fact, public diplomacy from the West is contingent to the political environment of the period with the creation of agencies to achieve policy goals. Even in the post 9/11 era, the US found it important to reiterate its public policy mission to engage with foreign publics to curb anti-American sentiment; mainly in the Arab world.

After 9/11, the United States dialogue with the rest of the world is based on three strategic principles according to Karen Hughes, U.S Undersecretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs. For Hughes (2005), U.S public diplomacy is geared to (1) “offer a positive vision of hope and opportunity to people throughout the world, a vision rooted in our enduring commitment to freedom”, (2) “to isolate and marginalize violent extremists, and undermine their efforts to exploit religion to rationalize their acts of terror and (3) “to foster a sense of common interests and common values between Americans and people of different countries, cultures and faiths across our world”. This renewed appeal to dialogue also resonates with the British governments’ aim to embrace the publics of foreign nations.

Cole (2005), in his review of British diplomatic strategies, defined public diplomacy as “work aiming to inform and engage individuals and organizations overseas in order to improve understanding of and strengthen influence for the United Kingdom in a manner consistent with governmental medium and long term goals” (p. 8). This definition of public diplomacy tends to characterize public diplomacy as a means to achieve policy goals. And a more objective

definition from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office considered public diplomacy “the process of achieving the UK's International Strategic Priorities through engagement with the public overseas” (p. 12).

In the Western conception of public diplomacy, priorities are primarily set and defined to achieve objectives. Each government agency has a determined set of objectives to attain. There should be no expectations that each element within the British public diplomacy apparatus should take an equal role in realizing every priority (Cull, 2007). For Cull, “the British Council, for example, is more suited to serving an objective of engagement with the Islamic world as part of a counter terrorist policy than assisting in combating illegal migration” (p.9).

In fact, the debate in the British foreign sphere is concerned with determining the priorities that must govern its action toward foreign publics. For Cull, the Treasury, for instance, should question the reason why revenues should be spent on activities which cannot be linked to foreign policy objectives.

A new diplomatic environment took place after the invasion of Iraq, according to the British Foreign Center. This explains the dynamism of Western public diplomacy in the wake of a global crisis in comparison to Third World countries. In an article, a group of British scholars are calling for new orientation in policies for public diplomacy. Leonard, Small and Rose (2005) suggested that “the last year has shown that achieving political change now means developing new coalitions by using a wide range of policy and communications tools.” (p.7). In fact, governments are increasingly constrained by public opinion, which makes the legitimacy of policies increasingly important (Leonard, Small and Rose).

In the advent of this new public diplomacy environment, they identify key elements that entail a new approach to the exigency of the time. According to Leonard, Small and Rose (2005) “the revolution in information and communication technology means that information travels more quickly; is more diffuse and is increasingly responsive to individual markets” (Leonard, Small & Rose, p. 7). The development in communication technology has created “the new phenomenon of transnational public opinions operating and competing in a global space” (p. 8).

Globalization is playing a key role on revising traditional diplomacy. In fact, “globalization means that governments are increasingly reliant on attracting international trade, investment, tourism and talent to drive their economies” (p. 8). The gist of the argument is that there is no clear line between domestic politics and foreign politics. In fact, the political debates in Western countries can directly or indirectly affect the welfare of publics in developing countries.

Leonard, Small and Rose also contended that, “the spread of democracy and – perhaps to an even greater extent – the flexing of extra-democratic populist pressure mean that governments are increasingly constrained by public opinion, which makes the legitimacy of policies increasingly important” (p. 8). Because of the spread of democracy, Western countries tend to take foreign publics’ opinion into consideration in the implementation of policies. In addition, public policy helps solve the need for strong multilateralism; meaning that political action increasingly depends on mobilizing international coalitions and placing great importance on winning over public opinion in partner countries (Leonard, Small, & Rose, 2005).

A main difference in public diplomacy practice between Western countries and the Third world is the use of Non-Governmental Organizations to conduct diplomacy efforts according to the complexities of the missions geared to foreign publics. In fact, countries in the West use NGOs throughout the world, especially in the “developing countries”. NGOs play an important role in representing Western nations abroad by positively contributing to the image of their respective

country of origin (Wang, 2005). NGO's also constitute channels and networks for Western countries to efficiently reach out to foreign publics in developing countries (Leonard, 2002).

Matthews (1997) attributed the rise of NGOs as central entities of civil society to the power shift that characterized international relations. According to Jarvik (2007), NGOs have become prominent actors in international politics by acquiring enormous influence in developing countries.

The purpose of Western countries' public diplomacy is led by a strong objective for these nations to reach out to foreign publics to secure their interests. Not only are they more and more inclined to exchange with foreign publics using well structured government agencies and NGO's, but they are more prone to use dialogue following the recent developments in globalization and world politics. For less developed nations in the Third World, public diplomacy tends to be confined to the level of governments, not the public. In fact, Third World countries tend to focus on working directly with foreign governments as their publics. There are many reasons that underlie that approach, among which one can identify the need for economic survival in a world where their credibility in the eyes of foreign developed nations plays a prominent role in the flow of capital.

Third World Public Diplomacy: Image-making Toward Developed Countries' Governments

Third World countries' image-making efforts do not depend on their own government structured agencies for the purpose. Albritton and Manheim (1984), suggested that "one of the most interesting trends in political image-making in recent years has been the growing use of professional public relations consultants by national governments" (p. 641). In fact, the overwhelming majority of countries using public relations instead of a defined public diplomacy are Third World countries trying to polish their image to reach out directly to the United States government for economic privilege (Albritton & Manheim, 1984). Albritton and Manheim later contended that "This trend has been especially pronounced in the United States, where such assistance is readily available and where, the assumption seems to be, an improved national image can be translated into more concrete gains" (p. 641).

According to Kunczik (2003), "images of nations have a strong influence on the flow of international capital" (P. 3). For less developed countries the existence of certain criteria for eligibility to receive aid in form of loans from international monetary institutions has compelled them to craft an image that can be trusted to reach out to developed countries. The lack of human and financial resources could limit public diplomacy for developing countries (Szondi, 2008).

Third World nations use public relations' agencies to establish trust between them and more well-off governments in the West. Many countries make considerable efforts to cultivate their images abroad, especially in the United States and Europe (Kunczik, 2003). Developing countries image-making will mainly depend on international public relations as it adequately help them convey an good image to the governments of Western countries. For Kunczik (2003), the main objective of international public relations is to create or maintain an already existing positive image of one's own nation to appear trustworthy in the eyes of decisive actors in the world system.

Kunczik considered trust the main factor that could help less developed countries achieve their economic goals to enjoy the flow of capital from rich countries. He states that "trust is an important factor in mobilizing resources, e.g., in receiving political and/or material support from other nation" (p.6). In other words, if other actors in the world system place their trust in a

developing nation because of her reliability, trust becomes the equivalent of money (p.6). To put it simply: “trust is money and money is trust, the positive image of a country's currency reflects confidence in that country's future” (p.6).

In their need to establish trust, developing countries engage in international public relations through foreign firms. Public relations firms advise their international clients' embassy personnel on how to talk about important issues facing them (Albritton & Manheim, 1984). Albritton and Manheim summed up the role of international public relations agencies in these words: “they also schedule and conduct field trips for the press, organize visits with editors and lunches with business groups, conduct financial seminars dealing with opportunities offered by the countries, use their own contacts to help representatives of the client states” (p.77). These international public relations agencies help Third World countries develop personal relationships with officials of the United States government, and provide a variety of advice about specific policies or approaches to policy that a client government might adopt to improve its image. Perhaps one of the most important services such firms offer is to provide easier access to officials of the government in question (p. 77).

Reaching out to authorities in foreign countries is an ultimate goal for less developed countries. The task appears less burdensome with the use of international public relations agencies. In fact those countries lack the necessary resources to conduct a traditional public diplomacy that would allow them to influence Western governments through their publics. Moreover, the need for economic survival guides their international public relations objectives. According to Albritton and Manheim (1984), these objectives include:

visits of the head of state to the United States or the issuance of an invitation for the American president or vice-president to visit a given country, ending of political arrests followed by one or more releases or reductions in the sentences of either leading dissidents or masses of political prisoners, government-organized field trips for journalists to locations which call attention to the government's own agenda or point of view (p. 78).

The tendency to resolve bilateral issues at government have led some countries to hire international public relations firms to attain their objectives. The case of Surinam is a vivid example of international public relations.

The State of Surinam was plagued by a bloody dictatorship over the years. In that period, the United States did not desire to maintain good relationships with the Government of Lieut. Col. Desi Bouterse. Bouterse, following a military coup had taken over the country eight years earlier after ordering the killing of his chief political opponents, and then flirted with Libya and Cuba, which are enemies of the United States in that period (Binder, 1988).

The Reagan Administration's position was that Bouterse should not stay in power, according to Binder. The Surinamese government then hired The van Kloberg firm. The firm is one of numerous consulting firms in Washington that help improve the image and facilitate the access of foreign governments and companies (Binder, 1988). The firm's task was primarily to organize a five-day visit to Washington by a Surinamese delegation led by the Prime Minister of the country. It was a rocky beginning. According to Binder, the visitors wanted a high-level government interaction and later learned that the most senior Government official who would receive them was Elliott Abrams, the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The strategy later paid off after the prime minister's address to the United Nations through a

speech written and prepaid by the Kloberg firm. The relationship between the two countries became normal for the benefit of Surinam as development assistance followed quickly.

Yet, public diplomacy priorities can shift because of economic prosperity. For instance, China, mainly considered a developing country for a while, has witnessed a new direction in its public diplomacy after its rise as a major power in international politics (Wang, 2008). China's diplomacy was first meant to shape its image to rest of the world in an attempt to establish bilateral and multilateral cooperation at the government level (2006). This traditional conception of public diplomacy was inherent to the fact that "Since the main discourse of international relations is Westernized, so the argument runs, if the Chinese government expresses itself in the usual international language, it will lose its Chinese-ness and will be criticized by the Chinese people for being too Westernized" (Wang, 2008, p. 259). Traditional Chinese diplomacy mainly focuses on high level government interactions and neglects grass root politics. Public diplomacy was not directly geared to foreign publics such as the United States as "Chinese officials and citizens alike, for example, assume that if Sino-U.S. relations go well at the highest level, then all Americans will be sympathetic to China" (Wang, 2008, p. 260). According to Wang (Wang), this is the reason why Chinese government officials are puzzled when the White House sends good intention gestures to China while the U.S. Congress expresses some hostility.

Yet, the peaceful rise/peaceful development to a major political and economic power policy in Chinese strategy has sought to integrate a new realm of public diplomacy (Wang, 2008). Rawnsley (2007) noted that Chinese current leadership has deeply understood the value of public diplomacy and soft power in a way that their predecessors never could. He attributed this renaissance to China's embrace of economic approaches to globalization, its opening to world commerce, and its greater involvement in international regimes. In fact, China is no longer an isolated power and is now determined to play an increasing role in this more interdependent global environment (Rawnsley, 2007).

The rise of China as an economic power has prompted the country to think in terms of its soft power (Wang, 2008). In fact, the Chinese government has paid more and more attention to the development of its public diplomacy (Wang, 2008). Wang later argued that "with the academic Seminar on China's Public Diplomacy, inaugurated on March 19, 2004, a new Chinese public diplomacy strategy started being shaped" (Wang, 2008, p. 263). Wang identified two important roles China's public diplomacy aims to fulfill. First, public diplomacy must stand as a channel for wise strategic thinking and defensive reasons, and second as a task to facilitate China's rise to soft power (Wang, 2008). A renewed public diplomacy will help China as it seeks the road for peaceful economic development. Thus, "Chinese diplomacy has to go beyond the traditional model of diplomacy, which focuses on government-to-government engagement" (Wang, p.263). The Chinese government has to engage in foreign civil society to efficiently reach out to foreign public, according to Wang.

Less developed countries are more concerned about credibility and trust with foreign governments than reaching their public. In fact, the concept of publics in international public relations is mainly confined to foreign governments as publics for Third World countries. Public diplomacy from the Third World is carried out with compelling limitations as developing countries are not economically powerful (Ur Rashid, 2008). The objectives of Third World diplomacy depend on situations and circumstances, according to Rashid. Yet, there exist some underlying objectives that mainly require a government level interaction. The main objectives are about the preservation of sovereignty and territorial integrity of a nation and economic development (Ur Rashid, 2008). These goals are carried out through standard or traditional

diplomacy which he defines as a traditional art of negotiation, representation and analysis (Ur Rashid, 2008). According to Ur Rashid, traditional diplomacy relates to the ways diplomats interact with each other to solve bilateral issues.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to explain the differences in public diplomacy approaches between developed countries and Third World nations. In fact, the differences in strategic priorities have engendered a difference in target publics between the West and the Third world in their needs to reach out to hearts and minds of their respective audiences. Western countries, through public policy, tend to reach out directly to foreign publics; whereas Third World countries are more inclined favor higher levels of interaction with foreign administrations or use international public relations to directly reach out to foreign governments.

It appears that public diplomacy as carried out by Third World countries relates to traditional diplomacy and does not rely on their own governments' structured agency. At times, these countries tend to rely on public relations firms in the foreign countries to craft a positive image. In fact, the ultimate goal for these countries is dictated by a strong need for economic resources (Albritton & Manheim, 1984). The flow of capital is generally on the hands of developed countries and winning the trust of their government authorities appear to be efficient in gaining support for sustainable development. Yet, according to some scholars it appears that attempts to primarily win foreign publics are an efficient way to reach out to their governments (Wang, 2006).

Yet, in the case of Third world countries, government agencies that would solely be in charge of shaping their positive image cannot generally prosper for reasons that led them to bypass foreign publics and turn directly to government authorities (Ur Rasid, 2008). Among those reasons, one can cite the lack of economic and human resources and their inability to carry out such ambitious public diplomacy projects. Further research, with practical examples, can explore typical examples of Third World emerging giants such as India and Pakistan in their way to handle public diplomacy.

References

- Albritton, R., & Manheim, J. (1984). Changing national images: International public relations and media agenda setting. *The American Political Science Review*, 78 (3), 641-657.
- Binder, D. (1988). Diplomacy and public relations: Image maker aids new democracy. In *The New York Times*:
<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=940DEFDA113CF936A15752C0A96E948260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1> retrieved December 14, 2008
- Cull, N. J. (2007). Lessons from the history of US public diplomacy. University of Southern California Public Policy, Internet resources:
http://annenbergl.usc.edu/images/pdfs/pubd/cull_pd_report_for_fco_final_version.pdf
retrieved December 13, 2008
- Deibel, L., & Roberts, W. (1976). *Culture and Information: Two Foreign Policy Functions*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Dizard, W. P. (2004). Inventing public diplomacy: The story of the U.S. In *Information agency*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Dutta-Bergman, M. J. (2006). U.S. public diplomacy in the Middle-East: A critical cultural approach. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 30, 102-124.
- Fortner, R. (1993). *International communication*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Frederick, H. (1993). *Global communication and international relations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Gotlieb, A. (1991). *I will be with you in a minute, Mr. ambassador: The education of a Canadian ambassador in Washington*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hachten, A., & Scotton, F. (2002) *The World News Prism: Global Media in an Era of Terrorism*, 6th edn. Ames, IA: Iowa State Press.
- Jarvik, L. (2007). NGOs: A 'New Class' in international relations. In *Orbis*, 51 (2), March, 217-238.
- Kiesling, J. (2006). *Diplomacy lessons: Realism for an unloved superpower*. VA: Potomac Books.
- Kunczik, M. (1996), *Images of Nations and International Public Relations*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Kunczik, M. (1997). *Images of nations and international public relations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publishers.
- Kunczik, M. (2003). Transnational public relations by foreign governments. In K. Sriramesh & D. Vercic (Eds.), *Handbook of global public relations* (pp. 399-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Leonard, M. (2002 September/October). Diplomacy by other means. *Foreign Policy*, 48-56.
- Leonard, M., Small, A., & Rose, M. (2005). British public diplomacy in the age of "schisms". The Foreign Policy Center Internet resources: <http://fpc.org.uk/fsblob/407.pdf> retrieved on December 12, 2008
- Matthews, J. (1997). Power Shift. In *Foreign Affairs*, January/February, 50-66
- Potter, E. H. (2002). Canada and the new public diplomacy. *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*. Netherland Institute of International Relations, 9-19.
- Rawnsley, G. (2007). A survey of Chinese public diplomacy. University of Southern California Diplomacy Center. Internet resources: http://uscpublicdiplomacy.com/index.php/newsroom/pdblog_detail/070502_a_survey_of_chinas_public_diplomacy/ Retrieved on December 12, 2008
- Signitzer, B., & Coombs, T. (1992). Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual convergence. *Public Relations Review*, 18, 137-147.
- Szondi, G. (2008). Public diplomacy and nation branding: Conceptual similarities and differences. The Hague. Internet resource: http://www.clingendael.nl/publications/2008/20081022_pap_in_dip_nation_branding.pdf
- Tuch, H. N. (1990). *Communicating with the world: U.S. public diplomacy overseas*. New York: St.Martin's.
- Ur Rashid, B. (2007). Third world diplomacy. *The Daily Star* Internet Resources: http://www.thedailystar.net/pf_story.php?nid=49644 retrieved on December 12, 2008
- Wang, J., & Chang, T. K. (2004). Strategic public diplomacy and local press: How a high profile "head-of-state" visit was covered in America's heartland. *Public Relations Review*, 30, 11-24.
- Wang, J. (2005). Localizing public diplomacy: The role of sub-national actors in national branding. *Journal of Place Branding*, 2, 32-42.

- Wang, J.(2006). Telling the American story to the world: The purpose of U.S. public diplomacy in historical perspective. *Public Relations Review*, 33, 21-30.
- Wang, Y. (2008). Public diplomacy and the rise of Chinese soft power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 616, 257-273.