Nina GORENC*

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF US FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

Abstract. *The article analyses the role played by public diplomacy (PD) in the foreign and security policy of the United States of America. Relying on content analysis of publicly available official budget tables, national security documents and reports, we researched the relationship between PD and its funding, the challenges PD faces in the new digital environment, and its importance in the foreign and security policy setting. Content analysis helped detect the presence, meaning and relationships of words and concepts related to PD in the mentioned documents. We show a substantial difference exists between the declared importance of PD on one side, and its financing and ascribed role in foreign and security policies on the other.*
Keywords: *public diplomacy, national security, foreign and security policy, soft power, digital environment, content analysis*

Introduction

"Not through speeches and majority decisions will the great questions of the day be decided /.../ but by iron and blood." (Bismarck, 1862)

In his "Blood and iron speech", Bismarck clearly explains the concept of power politics. Still, the sources and manifestations of power are many, and 'hard power' is only one type of power. Power is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes you want (Nye, 2008: 94–109). We can achieve this in different ways: by (threats of) force, by inducements and payments, and by seducing others and making them believe that they want what we want. Soft power is the so-called attractive power that relies on the ability to shape the preferences of others. In international politics, such preferences are mostly seen in the values an organisation or country expresses in its culture, in the examples set by internal practices/policies, and the way it handles its relations with others (ibid.). Public diplomacy (PD) is one of the instruments of soft power. It is an instrument governments use to mobilise

_____
* *Nina Gorenc, PhD, Lector of English and Italian language, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.*

their resources to communicate with the publics of other countries, and not just their governments. To that end, PD relies on tools like broadcasting, cultural exports, exchange visits to attract foreign publics. In response to the need for a new concept, encompassing more than just information, public relations and propaganda, PD was relocated to a new framework for the purpose of distinguishing it from propaganda. According to Gullion (in Cull, 2016: 1):

> *Public Diplomacy... deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of foreign relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with those of another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications.*

PD has come to be seen over time as an instrument sovereign countries use to communicate with foreign publics, with the aim of providing/acquiring information, promoting national interests and foreign policy goals. It includes various activities, such as educational exchange programmes, language courses, cultural exchanges and events, media activities, broadcasting. PD is more than propaganda, cultural diplomacy, or public affairs. It may be regarded as an umbrella term covering all these concepts, as well as a critical element of the state's foreign and security policy, especially in today's changed international security environment that requires states to give fresh answers to the challenges brought by complex threats (Grizold, 2012: 57; Grizold, 2015: 15–17). The article first overviews the history of PD, moves on to the present Information Age and the challenges posed by the digital environment, presents empirical research entailing document analysis, a discussion and, finally, some conclusions.

PD in American Foreign and Security Policy: From Past to Present

PD was already important in American foreign and security policy during the Administration of Woodrow Wilson (1913–1921). As President of the USA, Wilson believed 'no single force' could withstand the President if he won the country's 'confidence', so strong was his faith in public opinion. Already in 1914, he established a publicity agency tasked with disseminating government information, coordinating press releases and redressing misinformation caused by biased or inadequate press reports. After the USA joined the First World War on 14 April 1917, Wilson set up the Committee

on Public Information that soon turned into a war-propaganda machine and a vehicle for controlling and shaping public opinion both at home and abroad. President Wilson introduced censorship covering all channels of communication between the USA and other countries (Turner, 1957: 509). The invention of radio in the 1920s triggered a wave of foreign language broadcasting, with governments in the 1930s competing by promoting positive images among foreign publics. In 1937, British Foreign Secretary Sir Anthony Eden (in Wagnleitner, 1994: 50) said:

It is perfectly true, of course, that good cultural propaganda cannot remedy the damage done by a bad foreign policy, but it is no exaggeration to say that even the best of diplomatic policies may fail if it neglects the task of interpretation and persuasion, which modern conditions impose.

By the late 1930s, the Roosevelt Administration considered PD essential for the security of the nation. In 1938, the State Department established a Division of Cultural Relations, 2 years later the Office of Inter-American Affairs, and in 1942 the Office of Wartime Information and the Office of Strategic Service. Even Hollywood was turned into an effective propaganda instrument. The resources of soft power created during the war were both governmental and private. The Voice of America (VOA) was modelled after the BBC and by 1943 was delivering the news in 27 languages (Nye, 2008: 98).

PD became a key foreign policy instrument of both the USA and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, with USIA (United States Information Agency) coordinating PD activities, ranging from radio broadcasting to cultural and educational exchanges. The end of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet Union altered the American perception of threats and dangers, inducing a sense of triumphalism at home. It was believed that history had come to an end, with no need for extensive PD because by then everyone understood the wisdom and virtues of American foreign policy. This led to substantial cuts in PD funding.

From 1963 to 1993, the federal budget grew 15-fold, whereas the USIA budget only 6.5-fold. The USIA had more than 12,000 employees at its peak in the mid-1960s, but only 9,000 in 1994 and 6,715 prior to being taken over by the State Department. Between 1989 and 1999, the USIA budget when adjusted for inflation shrank by 10%. While government-funded radio broadcasts made during the Cold War reached half the Soviet population every week and 70%–80% of Eastern Europe, only 2% of Arabs had heard the VOA by the start of the new century, and resources for the USIA mission in Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country, were cut in half. From 1995 to 2001, academic and cultural exchanges dropped from 45,000

913

to 29,000 annually, while many accessible downtown centres and libraries were closed (Nye, 2008: 93). In 1999, the USIA was abolished, seeing its exchange programmes and information activities transferred to the State Department's Bureau of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, and its broadcasting activities to the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG, today known as the US Agency for Global Media (Svet, 2008: 71)). By 9/11 of 2001, PD was mostly side-tracked and no longer considered necessary since it was largely associated with the Cold War.

The attacks on 9/11 brutally exposed the USA's vulnerability and destroyed the people's perception of safety. Following the attacks, the Bush Administration tried to recreate a positive image of the country. This became a central pillar of the American 'war on terror', hidden and justified by the presumed need to combat international terrorism (Van Ham, 2005: 49). The Administration started to engage in public opinion research and launched the 'war of ideas' where the lead role was reserved for PD. Negative attitudes to the USA were presented as a threat to national security, and PD was used to both counter them and mobilise foreign publics in support of American policies and interests (Van Ham, 2005: 75). However, for PD to be capable of producing soft power, cohesion must exist between words and deeds (Nye, 2008: 103), an area where the Bush Administration was not convincing. The term "axis of evil" President Bush used to refer to Iraq, Iran and North Korea in his State of the Union Address in 2002 (Bush, 2002) was not well received abroad, just like his "war on terrorism" (Bush, 2006). The lack of adequate funding proves that US governments have not recognised the importance and value of PD (Svet, 2008: 72).

The Information Age – a new environment for PD

The conditions for providing PD have changed in the Information Age. The competitive Cold War model is now less relevant and the role of public opinion is more important. Information is power; with the development of informational technologies a large part of the world has access to power. Too much information is available – the paradox of plenty (Simon, 1995) – and it has become difficult to focus on finding reliable sources. Credibility has become the most important source of soft power (Nye, 2019), while propaganda is counterproductive and can erode it. A case supporting this claim is the allegedly found weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, which served as a pretext for the 2002 attacks on Iraq. As exposed by a document from the Joint Chiefs of Staff "Iraq: Status of WMD", now fully declassified, the attacks were based on wrong assumptions and unchecked facts, as reflected in the document: "We don't know with any precision how much we don't know" (Memo WMD, 2002). The US invasion of Iraq reinforced

914

the image of American unilateralism and military superiority, in line with Machiavelli's advice that it is better for a prince to be feared than loved.

The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy only started seriously thinking about the digital environment, its challenges (e.g. artificial intelligence, bots, trolls, echo chambers and disinformation) and opportunities in 2017. Electronic communication has transformed the spread and impact of ideas, the sharing of information and disinformation, and the "weaponization of information" (Fukuyama, 2017).

States must understand this new environment and fully account for it if they wish to limit and control damage. Traditionally, bad information was countered by good information, with the hope of making true and right information rise to the top. Today, disinformation and lies travel faster than truth, as automated agents instantly respond as programmed to, regardless of the truth or our 'disclaimers'. Knowing how to react to this new environment remains one of the biggest challenges of tomorrow.

Research design

The article overviews the history of PD in American foreign and security policy; its role as declared in publicly available official documents and reports, confronted by its funding; and assesses its present state of affairs.

The sample consists of publicly available official budget tables, national security documents and reports prepared by the State or its PD agencies from 2001 to 2017.

Altogether, the corpus of analysed documents consists of 3,311 pages. The documents are as follows:
- Government's Accountability Office (GAO) reports on PD for 2003 (74 pp.), 2004 (21 pp.), 2005 (42 pp.), 2006 (62 pp.), 2007 (56 pp.), 2009 (43 pp.), 2010 (48 pp.)
- US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy (ACPD) reports for 2000 (19 pp.), 2002 (16 pp.), 2003 (81 pp.), 2004 (44 pp.), 2005 (29 pp.), 2008 (41 pp.), 2010 (151 pp.), 2014 (first comprehensive annual report – 258 pp.), 2015 (52+44 pp.), 2016 (410 pp.), 2017 (107 pp.) + (353 pp.)
- National Security Strategy prepared by the executive branch of the US Government for 2000 (84 pp.), 2002 (35 pp.), 2006 (54 pp.), 2010 (60 pp.), 2015 (35 pp.)
- Quadrennial Defense Review and National Defense Strategy prepared by the US Department of Defense for 2001 (79 pp.), 2005 (25 pp.), 2006 (113 pp.), 2008 (32 pp.), 2010 (128 pp.), 2014 (88 pp.)
- National Military Strategy prepared by Chairman of the Joined Chiefs of Staff for 2004 (38 pp.), 2011 (24 pp.), 2015 (24 pp.)
- Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review prepared by the US

915

Department of State for 2010 (242 pp.) and 2015 (90 pp.)
• Quadrennial Homeland Security Review prepared by the Department of Homeland Security for 2010 (108 pp.) and 2014 (104 pp.)
• International Affairs (IA) budget tables: International affairs budget request for 2001–2014, and Congressional Budget Justification; Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs for 2015 and 2016

The methods used for the document analysis are text and content analysis (Neuendorf, 2017; Anderson, 2007). We search among these documents for instances of PD and its instruments, studied in their politico-historical context. We hope to identify the policymakers' attitude to PD.

Our analysis builds on the following assumptions: during the time in question, PD was not actively included in foreign and security policy, it was not sufficiently researched and funded, and not adjusted to the new security challenges of the digital environment.

Document analysis: Results

The results are grouped by type of analysed document and open with the reports of the Government's Accountability Office (GAO) and Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy (ACPD), which are initially described in brief. What follows is analysis of the core national security documents, while we conclude with analysis of the budget tables.

Reports prepared by the Government Accountability Office

As stated on the GAO webpage, this is an independent, non-partisan agency that works for Congress and is often referred to as the "congressional watchdog". It investigates how the federal government spends the taxpayers' money. Its mission is to ensure the accountability of the federal government for the benefit of the American people. In 2003, the GAO initiated a comprehensive study of PD efforts aimed at improving America's image, which has decreased since 9/11, particularly in Arab and Muslim countries. The GAO has since issued six reports, the last in 2010.

The researched corpus unveiled many structural and operational problems of American PD from 9/11 on. Already in the *report for 2003*, the GAO exposed the lack of a comprehensive PD strategy for monitoring progress in achieving PD goals, and the lack of adequately trained and foreign language proficient PD officers. The poor image of the USA in countries with a Muslim majority had increased considerably. In Morocco, 77% of the population had been in support of the USA in 1999/2000, but only 27% in 2003. The drops in Indonesia (from 75% to 15%) and in Turkey (52% to 15%)

were similar. However, a 9% budgetary increase in real terms was reported for PD activities in 2002 and 2003, of which 63% was earmarked for South Asia and 58% for the Near East, two regions with a significant Muslim population (GAO-03-951). *The 2005 GAO report* examined and revealed the coordination difficulties of many PD entities, with funding almost exclusively reserved for the State Department and BBG. The report noted that anti-American sentiments, resulting from the country's unpopular foreign policy military interventions, were strongest but not only limited to Muslim states (GAO-05-323). *The 2006 report* showed increased funding for PD in countries with a significant Muslim population, and three major initiatives – a media campaign, a youth-oriented magazine, a group of youth-focused exchange programmes – directed at the Muslim world. However, most had been terminated or suspended for security reasons and insufficient funding. American PD facilities overseas started to close, and about 30% of PD posts abroad were occupied by people without adequate language proficiency. There was no guidance on how to implement the strategy for the marginalisation of Muslim extremism, and no or very limited research-based evaluation of meeting the set PD goals. Compared to 2005, funding for educational and cultural exchanges had risen by about 20% (GAO-06-707T). *The 2007 report* exposed that American national security and economic interests suffered from negative attitudes to the USA abroad. It stressed the importance of in-depth research of foreign audiences and cooperation between various agencies (DOD – Department of Defense, USAID – US Agency for International Development, BBG) and disciplines such as PD, public affairs, psychological operations and US international broadcasting (GAO-07-904). Despite the increased funding for PD efforts, *the 2009 report* underlined the persisting negative perception of the USA and exposed several areas needing attention; strategic and operational planning, definition of national communication strategy goals, coordination of communication efforts, human resources, outreach efforts, interagency cooperation, inclusion of social networks and technologies (GAO-09-679SP). *The 2010 report* focused on the USA's outreach platforms abroad and their cost. In order to maximise the outcome, resources should be allocated to those platforms with the biggest outreach and impact (GAO-10-767).

917

Reports prepared by the US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy (ACPD)

Since 1948, the ACPD has been assessing government activities regarding foreign publics for the purpose of understanding, informing and influencing them, as well as for increasing them. The ACPD studies and evaluates the PD activities engaged in by governmental agencies. Its most important

product is the Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting. The webpage of the State Department (SD) says that in order to make the most out of the limited resources allocated to PD – about 0.17% of the federal budget – compared to 12% allocated to the Department of Defense – must be strategically invested.

The 2000 ACPD report shows that PD was underfinanced and its role in achieving foreign policy goals and objectives undermined. *The 2002 report* states that only 4% of the IA budget was spent on SD information and exchange programmes and international broadcasting. It also highlighted the drop in PD funding since the end of the Cold War. From 1993 to 2001, overall funding for the SD educational and cultural exchange programme fell by more than 33%, while the number of exchange participants dropped from 45,000 to 29,000 between 1995 and 2002. Two ACPD reports were published in *2003*. One focused on the importance of IT technologies, security challenges, their cost effectiveness, the potential for PD and the reduction of American posts abroad. The other emphasised the problems faced by the USA in (mostly) Muslim countries due to political instability, economic deprivation and extremism, considered a serious obstacle to America's foreign policy and security goals. The American fight against terrorism should not be viewed as a clash of civilisations, but a clash *within* a civilisation, a battle for the future of the Muslim World, for the hearts of Arab and Muslim populations, and the pursuit of peace, which can only be achieved with the long-term, continuous and consistent application of PD measures in the context of foreign and security policy. *The 2004 report* underscored the progress made, e.g. PD's inclusion in the process of foreign policy formulation and in the context of security organisations. It also stressed that PD was neither funded adequately nor made a national security priority. *The 2005 report* exposed the inefficiency of public outreach, media dissemination, PD coordination and strategic planning. Despite the importance ascribed to broadcasting, its impact on foreign and security policy and the promotion of progress, freedom and democracy was not systematically evaluated. The *2008* ACPD *report* focused on human resources. It suggested the State Department modify and streamline its PD career track, its Foreign Service examination process, develop PD-related coursework, and re-evaluate its staffing structure. The *2010 report* stressed the strategic value of PD and an advanced model of PD evaluation developed by the University of Texas. The *2013 report* reflected on the development and current state of PD. It pointed out the post Cold War budget cuts, and the increased importance of military power following 9/11. It outlined that traditional diplomacy and PD had started to focus on non-traditional audiences, and that foreign policy had begun to include PD. In *2014, the first comprehensive annual report* on PD and international broadcasting was published, analysing major PD

activities funded by the US government, as well as reporting all of its out-side funding sources. It pointed to the decline in the IA budget from 2013 to 2012, with just 3.38% of it being allocated to PD and BBG activities. The report stated that research and evaluation at the SD and the BBG were sub-stantially underfunded. *The 2015 Comprehensive Annual Report* identified the greater relevance of PD for US foreign policy, also reflected in PD's inclusion in national security strategies. An increased share of 3.56% of the IA budget was spent on PD and BBG activities. The report described pro-gress made in 2015; advances in SD research and evaluation, strategic plan-ning, professionals' training, commitment to open-access US spaces abroad etc. Some of the report was dedicated to the role played by PD in coun-tering violent extremism. Two other reports were published in *2015*, one looking at human resources in PD, and the other at the protection of open access to American centres in conditions of increased security risks. *A com-prehensive annual report* was also issued in *2016*, stressing the importance of including people such as youth, journalists, civil society and religious leaders in the conduct of international relations, due to their stronger influ-ence. The report also stressed the need for sustainable PD budgeting and spending; the two main PD budgets [Educational and Cultural Exchange (ECE) budget and PD funds in the Diplomatic and Consular Programmes budget (D&CP)] should be considered together to make the allocation of resources to PD more efficient. *The 2017 reports* tackled the challenges of PD in the digital era, such as social bots, artificial intelligence, computational propaganda, and disinformation. They also analysed the spending on PD activities and programmes and exposed the 2.8% drop in overall PD spend-ing for the 2016 fiscal year compared to 2015, accounting for 3.7% of the IA budget, or 0.17% of federal discretionary spending. The report showed an important difference from the Cold War, when information was difficult to find. Today, we are living in the presence of the paradox of plenty and competing for people's attention, combating extremism and disinformation has become difficult. It requires cutting-edge expertise in content creation, audience and market analysis, technological systems, emerging and estab-lished social media platforms, local media industries, and deep knowledge of American policies and values.

Analysis of core security documents:

National Security Strategy (NSS)

The *2000 NSS* evaluated the USIA's 1999 integration into the State Department. The USIA was closed by Presidential Decision Directive 68, intended to improve the coordination of PD, public affairs, and other

919

national security related efforts, as well as provide for the better integration of PD into foreign and security policymaking. The *2002 NSS* was prepared after 9/11, and exposed the common fear of terrorist attacks and the need to combat terrorism with a war of ideas. This called for greater funding and a more comprehensive approach to PD. The *2006 NSS* opened by stating that America was at war, setting the tone for the entire strategy. One priority was to engage foreign publics and clearly advocate America's values, which required transformational (and public) diplomacy. The *2010 NSS* did not explicitly mention PD, but stressed the need to use educational exchanges, commerce etc. to engage not only governments, but also people, who have always been considered the best ambassadors. The *2015 NSS* also did not mention PD; however, it talked about new programmes of education exchange to promote contacts among young Americans and youth from other countries.

Quadrennial Defense Review and National Defense Strategy (QDR and NFS)

The *2001 QDR* had mostly been prepared before the 9/11 attacks, with no explicit reference to PD. It emphasises interoperability, the need for American cooperation and coalition efforts with other countries, and the need to overcome language and cultural barriers in order to pursue the country's American goals of promoting peace, sustaining freedom and encouraging prosperity. Military strength, effective diplomacy, strong economy, and a watchful and ready defence are seen as needed to achieve these goals. The *2005 NDS* presented America as a nation at war. Some parallels are drawn with the Cold War, but the importance of PD is neglected. The strategy exposes the need to counter ideological support for terrorism and to reinforce the message that the war on terrorism is not a war against Islam, but *within* Islam, between extremists and their opponents. The *2006 QDR* sees the 9/11 attacks as a trigger for the DOD reform. It suggests that the US National Security Policy planning include strategic communication and other (not only military) resources in order to achieve national security objectives. The *2008 NDS* stresses that better developed soft-power skills could shape the behaviour of states and international systems. They are needed to cope with the challenges lying outside conventional warfare, while force should be used only when needed. The strategy criticises the USA's public relations and the neglect of strategic communication, essential for a unified approach to national security. The *2010 QDR* is a wartime report, focusing on conflicts and their stakeholders. It recognises a broad range of security challenges and the need to prevent and deter conflicts through cooperation with partners and allies and by integrating other elements of national security, i.e. diplomacy, development, intelligence etc. It

920

stresses that PD is an essential part of effective strategic communication. The *2014 QDR* underlines that the military is just one of the tools available in the arsenal of state power. The USA must protect its national interests and, whenever possible, pursue them through diplomacy, economic development, cooperation, engagement, and the power of American ideas.

National Military Strategy (NMS)

The *2004 NMS* is focused on the war on terrorism, where interagency cooperation, strategic communication, PD and public affairs all play an important role. The *2011 NMS* underlined the need for America's foreign policy to employ an adaptive blend of diplomacy, development, and defence. The *2015 NMS* suggests that the military support diplomatic, informational and economic activities, which promote America's enduring national interests. Crucial importance is attributed to Stability and Counterinsurgency operations, encompassing cultural outreach programmes.

Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR)

The *2010 QDDR* reviews US diplomacy and development in the context of new actors and complex challenges, underlying the importance of civilian power. Some of the report is dedicated to diplomacy, particularly PD as its core mission. American interests should be presented and shared through expanded people-to-people relationships. The *2015 QDDR* focuses on strategic communication and people-to-people relationships, both essential in the fight to delegitimise extremist ideology. Based on the success of exchange programmes in building personal connections, different new exchange programmes have been created to embrace young future leaders from different countries, as seen in the report.

Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR)

The *QHSR* for *2010* is entirely focused on homeland security and the potential (or actual) dangers it faces (terrorism, immigration, natural disasters, cyberspace), while the *QHSR* prepared in *2014* only implicitly touches on the problem of PD neglect. However, it deals with immigration as a vital element of American national identity, and presents it as a positive force, bringing great economic and intellectual benefits to the States, as well as intercultural communication and connections with other countries, nations, cultures and religions. Positive immigration policy makes America appear like a cosmopolitan nation made up of many cultures and a champion of humanitarian causes around the world.

921

International Affairs (IA) budget tables

The IA budget, also referred to as Function 150, supports foreign aid, diplomacy and American engagement in the international community. About one-third of it is allocated to the salaries and expenses of US diplomatic corps; the construction, maintenance and security of American embassies around the world; educational and cultural exchanges, international broadcasting, and other aspects of PD; the costs of America's membership of the United Nations and other international organisations; and assessed contributions to UN peacekeeping operations (CRS Report for the Congress, 2006).

We analysed budget tables from the FY 2000 to FY 2016, with special attention to funding for the IA, Educational and Cultural Exchanges and Diplomatic and Consular budget. In FY 1999, when the most important institution responsible for PD, the USIA, was merged with the State Department, its resources became part of the SD expenses and the funding directly related to PD became less transparent (CRS report for Congress). However, by analysing the budget tables we could establish that the PD funding trend did not change much in the time covered by our research. In absolute numbers, funding nominally increased for almost the entire period of 2000–2006. The first substantial rise came in 2002, with the budget increasing from USD 22,835 billion to USD 27,163 billion, and to USD 31,214 billion in 2003, an expected consequence of the events of 9/11. Another rise was seen in 2005 when the funding went from USD 30,302 billion to USD 35,648 billion. After a short period of budgetary cuts, new rises were witnessed in 2008 (USD 42,914 billion), 2009 (USD 52,631 billion), 2012 (USD 54,491 billion) and 2016 (USD 55,301 billion). Despite the increase in dollars, the share of the PD budget remained constant, at around 4% of the International Affairs budget, which in a term accounts for less than 1% of the federal budget. In other terms, in 2016 the US government spent 36% less per foreign citizen on PD programmes than it did 30 years before (2017 Comprehensive ACPD report).

Discussion

The intention of this research was to show that PD has become one of the pillars of American foreign and security policy, that the lessons of the Cold War have been put to use since the 9/11 attacks, and that PD has been adjusted to the development of IT technologies and the new security challenges. Initially, another goal was to show that PD has been insufficiently funded. While some evidence in support of this claim was found, we also encountered several difficulties. Foreign policy spending of the

State Department supports several different government programmes and not only PD, preventing us from clearly identifying the entire budget allocated to PD. The programmes involved in PD activities have constantly varied, and a substantial share of the budget has been repeatedly allocated by way of unplanned emergency supplements. Another question was how to objectively measure the effects of PD and whether this has been attempted before. The documents that were analysed indicate there has never been much interest in this kind of research. In 2009, the US ACPD and the SD entrusted the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin with the task of evaluating the state of PD. The purpose was to review current PD measurement methods, assess gaps in the various methods, and develop a comprehensive measurement framework. The research ended in 2010 with a report and the Public Diplomacy Model for the Assessment of Performance (PD-MAP). Both the model and the report have since been seriously criticised by PD practitioners. The model was not implemented in practice, although in theory it was supposed to allow evaluators to quantify the results of PD programmes and assess their performance. In July 2010, the GAO published a document about the possible engagement of foreign audiences (GAO-10-767), stressing that the extent to which outreach platforms contribute to expanding engagement has neither been measured nor researched. The State Secretary was advised against closing down the overseas outreach platforms prior to conducting a department-wide assessment of their effectiveness in terms of expanded engagement with foreign audiences. The lack of such information continues to undermine the State's ability to adjust its plans or reallocate resources to those activities that offer a greater likelihood of success. Without such empirical data, PD cannot move towards an evidence-based approach. It is impossible to allocate resources to priorities if the priorities, or which programmes actually function and/or are efficient, are unknown (Rider, 2015). The need for an objective and quantitative measurement of PD performance was also stressed in the preface of the 2014 comprehensive ACPD report on public diplomacy, where Cull (2014: 12) wrote:

923

> *In a world of increasing competition for resources, in which the new tools of social media make new kinds of evaluation possible even as the communication environment requires an ever more nuanced approach for an ever more savvy audience, evaluation has an unprecedented significance. It must be part of the DNA of public diplomacy's future.*

The GAO and ACPD reports also expose the lack of adequately trained personnel, absence of a long-term vision, failure to include and utilise private-sector resources and skills, the deficiency of research-based

decision-making, as well as American behaviour around the world and the substance of American foreign policies. National security documents prepared in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks explicitly mention the need for increased funding and a more comprehensive approach to PD, while the defence-related documents largely ignore PD and other instruments of soft power. One exception is the 2010 Quadrennial defense review, where PD and strategic communication are explicitly mentioned and presented as important instruments while combating security challenges. National military strategies focus on military objectives and it is only when the importance of cultural outreach programmes (e.g. US Speaker programmes, hosting of artists, educational and cultural exchanges etc.), promoting multicultural awareness and building relationships that serve mutual security interests is mentioned that they implicitly touch on PD.

The two reports also included in the sample were the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review and the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review. They outline the role played by PD in the pursuit of America's national values and goals. The former stresses the importance of personal, people-to-people relationships, while the latter emphasises the positive side of immigration, which has always economically and culturally enriched the USA.

924

Conclusion

PD is an instrument of soft power. Through the use of broadcasting, exchange visits and other means, PD communicates the contents of three primary resources (culture, values and policies), hoping to attract the publics of other countries and to make them understand and support the policies, goals and values of America. If the contents of these resources are unattractive and not credible or a gap is perceived between the theory and the reality, PD cannot produce the power of attraction. In this respect, our research results are not very promising as the analysed reports show several structural and operational problems with PD. However, we also showed that PD does not depend on funding alone. Ultimately, it depends on people, their (and the State's) credibility, the contents of State policies, and their implementation. It depends first on what and how the State does, and only then on what it says.

This article started by assuming that PD was neglected in the USA for most of the time between the end of the Cold War and the attacks on 9/11, when it saw a sudden resurgence. We may confirm this assumption. After the Cold War ended, funding for PD was drastically reduced because it was generally believed the dangers and threats faced by America had disappeared. The Administrations failed to understand the challenges brought by

the new multipolar power constellation, also characterised by the development of modern technologies, including ICT.

The context in which PD occurs today has changed tremendously since the Cold War. Information is power, and access to this power has become more democratic and less restricted and, along with that, the importance of public opinion is stronger. Moreover, the concept of security has changed, as may be seen in the afterword of the White Paper on American Military Diplomacy (2015):

Gone are the days when a nation's security could be measured by bombers and battleships. Security in this new era requires harnessing all of America's strengths: the force of our diplomacy; the might of our military; the vigor and competitiveness of our economy; and the power of our ideals.

The importance of PD is well discussed in the media, in the works of prominent scholars (Cull, Nye, Riordan) but, as seen from our research, importantly less so in official strategic documents that establish the guidelines for America's foreign and security policy. Efficient PD requires more than just persuasive words; it needs long-term credibility and coherent political actions. If PD is to become the added value of foreign and security policy, then – to borrow the words of Ed Murrow, head of the USIA during the time of President Kennedy – it should be "in at the takeoffs and not only at the crash landings" (Murrow in: Cull, 2008: 32).

Given today's new security threats and challenges, PD should move beyond selling the national image, values and policies (Shaun, 2004: 10) and instead truly engage in a dialogue with foreign publics, NGOs and governments, all working towards common goals. According to the ACPD, the State Department and BBG are considered key contributors to the effectiveness of America's foreign policies, the protection of its national security, and prosperity of its economy, as well as being instrumental in the fight against increased foreign extremism and negative propaganda. Yet, they have been allocated a shrinking portion of the IA and the federal discretionary budgets. Artificial intelligence has partly already revolutionised global communication and will continue to do so. We agree with the notion found in the *2017 Comprehensive ACPD annual report* that the US government may give itself a competitive disadvantage if it continues to take PD lightly and refuses to invest in understanding and shaping these technologies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Anderson, Rosemarie (2007): Thematic Content Analysis TCA. Descriptive Presentation of Qualitative Data. Institute of Transpersonal Psychology.

925

Accessible at http://rosemarieanderson.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ThematicContentAnalysis.pdf, 15. 4. 2018.

Bismarck, von Otto (1862): "Blood and Iron Speech". Accessible at http://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=250, 15. 4. 2018.

Brown, Katherine and Chris Hensman (eds.) (2014): Data-Driven Public Diplomacy – Progress Towards Measuring the Impact of Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting Activities. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/231945.pdf/, 10. 7. 2019.

Cull, J. Nicholas (2008): Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories. In: Cowan, Geoffrey and J. Nicholas Cull (eds): Diplomacy in a Changing World, 31–54. The Annals of the American Academy 616, March.

Cull, J. Nicholas (2014): Evaluation and the History of Public Diplomacy. In: Brown, Katherine and Chris Hensman (eds): Data-Driven Public Diplomacy – Progress Towards Measuring the Impact of Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting Activities, 7–13. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/231945.pdf/, 10. 7. 2019.

Cull, J. Nicholas (2016): Public Diplomacy Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase. Accessible at https://www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/public-diplomacy-gullion-evolution-phrase, 20. 7. 2019.

Fukuyama, Francis (2017): Public Diplomacy in Post Truth Society. In: Powers, Shawn and Markos Kounalakis (eds): Can Public Diplomacy Survive the Internet? Bots, Echo Chambers and Disinformation, 1. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.

Grizold, Anton and Bernardka Prašnikar (2015): The Concept of the Responsibility to Protect and Solving the Crisis in Libya, 55–74. The Review of International Affairs. LXVI (1157), January–March 2015.

Grizold, Anton, Marina Mitrevska, Anthony Wanis-St. John, Vlado Buchkovski and Iza Tršar (2012): Conflict Prevention and Conflict Management in the New Security Context: The Case of the Former Republic of Macedonia. Faculty of Social Sciences. Založba FDV. Ljubljana, 2012.

Neuendorf, Kimberly A. (2017): The Content Analysis Guidebook, 2nd Edition, Cleveland State University, Sage Publications.

Nye, Joseph (2008): Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. In: Cowan, Geoffrey and Cull, J. Nicholas (eds.): Diplomacy in a Changing World, 94–109. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 616, March.

Nye, S. Joseph (2019): Soft Power and Public Diplomacy Revisited. The Hague Journal of Diplomacy 14 (1–2): Accessible at https://brill.com/view/journals/hjd/14/1-2/article-p7_2.xml, 20. 8. 2019.

Rider, Jamers (2015): Proving Public Diplomacy Programs Work: Speaking Out. The Foreign Service Journal, December 2015. Accessible at http://www.afsa.org/proving-public-diplomacy-programs-work, 24. 8. 2019.

Riordan, Shaun (2004): Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy. Discussion papers in diplomacy. Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael", ISSN 1569-2981.

Simon, Herbert A. (1998): Information 101: It's Not What You Know, It's How You Know It. Journal for Quality and Participation, Cincinnati 21 (4): 30–33.

926

Simon, A. Herbert (1995): Knowledge and the Time to Attend to It. Working paper presented at the Carnegie Bosch Institute's "International Conference on High-Performance Corporations", 21. 4. 1995, Bocca Ratan, Florida. Accessible at https://digitalcollections.library.cmu.edu/knowvation/app/consolidated Search/#search/v=thumbnails,c=1,q=identifier%3D%5BSimon%2Fbox00071% 2Ffld05439%2Fbdl0001%2Fdoc0001%5D%2CqueryType%3D%5B16%5D,sm =s,l=library1_lib%2Clibrary2_lib%2Clibrary3_lib%2Clibrary4_lib%2Clibrary5_ lib%2Cmultimedia_lib%2Clibrary7_lib%2Clibrary12_lib,a=t, 24. 9. 2019.

Svet, Oleg (2008): Public Diplomacy – War by Other Means. NIMEP insights: 71. Accessible at http://tiglarchives.org.s3.amazonaws.com/sites/default/files/ resources/nimep/v3/public_diplomacy.pdf, 7. 7. 2019.

Turner, A. Henry, Wilson Woodrow and Public Opinion (1957–1958): The Public Opinion Quarterly 21 (4): 505–520. American Association for Public Opinion Research.Oxford University Press.

Van Ham, Peter (2005): Power, Public Diplomacy and the Pax Americana. In: Melissen, Jan (ed.): The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations 49. Palgrave Macmillan. Accessible at http://culturaldiplomacy.org/ academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomacy.pdf, 20. 7. 2019.

Wagnleitner, Reinhold (1994): Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: The Cultural Mission of the United States in Austria After the Second World War. Chapel Hill and London. The University of North Carolina Press.

927

SOURCES

Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy reports, 2000–2016. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/pdcommission/reports/index.htm, 1. 9. 2019.

2001 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017. state.gov/s/d/ rm/rls/iab/2003/7807.htm, 22. 8. 2019.

2002 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/17226.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2003 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/28778.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2007 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/60297.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2008 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/122513.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2009 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/135888.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2012 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/207305.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

2016 budget for international affairs. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/doc-uments/organization/236395.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

Bush, W. George (2002): State of the Union Address. Accessible at https://georgew-bush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html, 1. 7. 2019.

Bush, W. George (2006): National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. Accessible at https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=466588, 20. 8. 2019.

2017 Comprehensive ACPD Annual Report on Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting. Accessible at https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/2017-ACPD.pdf, 24. 8. 2019.

CRS Report for Congress. Foreign Policy Budget Trends: A Thirty-Year Review, 2006. Accessible at https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20060620_RL33262_45b840cdc5d3ca19fbfdd8d42e7a4066d2fe768b.pdf, 24. 8. 2019.

GAO-03-951. U.S. General Accounting Office, Report to the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives. U.S. Public Diplomacy. State Department Expands Efforts but Faces Significant Challenges. U.S. Public Diplomacy, Sept. 2003. Accessible at https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d03951.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

GAO-05-323. United States Government Accountability Office Report on US Public Diplomacy – Interagency Coordination Efforts Hampered by the Lack of a National Communication Strategy, April 2005. Accessible at https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05323.pdf, 22. 8. 2019.

GAO-O6-707T. United States Government Accountability Office, US Public Diplomacy; State Department Efforts Lack Certain Communication Elements and Face Persistent Challenges, May 2006. Accessible at http://www.gao.gov/assets/120/113747.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

GAO-07-904. U.S. Public Diplomacy: Actions Needed to Improve Strategic Use and Coordination of Research, July 2007. Accessible at https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07904.pdf, 21. 8. 2019.

GAO-09-679SP. US Public Diplomacy: Key Issues for Congressional Oversight. May 27, 2009. Accessible at https://www.gao.gov/assets/300/290178.pdf, 21. 8. 2019.

GAO-10-767. Engaging Foreign Audiences: Assessment of Public Diplomacy Platforms Could Help Improve State Department Plans to Expand Engagement. July, 2010. Accessible at https://www.gao.gov/assets/310/307549.pdf, 21. 8. 2019.

J-2 Memo to SecDef: Status of Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Programs, 2002. Accessible at https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/2697361/Myers-J2-Memo.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

National Security Strategy for a Global Age (2000): The White House, December 2000. Accessible at https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=460717, 15. 7. 2019.

National Security Strategy (2010): The White House, May 2010. Accessible at http://nssarchive.us/NSSR/2010.pdf, 18. 8. 2019.

National Security Strategy (2015): The White House, February 2015. Accessible at http://nssarchive.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/2015.pdf, 18. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report, September 30, 2001. Accessible at https://archive.defense.gov/pubs/qdr2001.pdf, 15. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report, February 6, 2006. Accessible at https://archive.defense.gov/pubs/pdfs/QDR20060203.pdf, 15. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Defense Review Report, February 2010. Accessible at https://archive.defense.gov/qdr/QDR%20as%20of%2029JAN10%201600.pdf, 18. 8. 2019.

928

Quadrennial Defense Review, 2014. Accessible at https://archive.defense.gov/pubs/2014_Quadrennial_Defense_Review.pdf, 18. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (2015): Enduring Leadership in a Dynamic World. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/241429.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report, February 2010. A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland. Accessible at https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2010-qhsr-report.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, February 2014. Accessible at https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/2014-qhsr-final-508.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2002): The White House, September 2002. Accessible at http://nssarchive.us/NSSR/2002.pdf, 15. 7. 2019.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2006): The White House, March 2006. Accessible at http://nssarchive.us/NSSR/2006.pdf, 15. 7. 2019.

The National Military Strategy of the United States of America (2004): A Strategy for Today, a Vision for Tomorrow, 2004. Accessible at https://history.defense.gov/Portals/70/Documents/nms/nms2004.pdf?ver=2014-06-25-123447-627, 20. 8. 2019.

The National Military Strategy of the United States of America (2011): Redefining America's Military Leadership, 2011. Accessible at https://dod.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2011-National-Military-Strategy.pdf, 20. 8. 2019.

The National Military Strategy of the United States of America (2015): The United States Military's Contribution to National Security, June 2015. Accessible at http://nssarchive.us/NMS/2015.pdf, 15. 8. 2019.

The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America, March 2005. Accessible at https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/dod/nds-usa_mar2005.htm, 17. 8. 2019.

The National Defense Strategy, June 2008. Accessible at http://www.comw.org/qdr/fulltext/08nationaldefensestrategy.pdf, 19. 8. 2019.

The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (2010): Leading Through Civilian Power. Accessible at https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf, 18. 8. 2019.

Walcott, John (2016): What Donald Rumsfeld Knew We Didn't Know About Iraq. Politico Magazine, 24. 1. 2016. Accessible at https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/01/iraq-war-wmds-donald-rumsfeld-new-report-213530, 20. 8. 2019.

Wallin, Matthew (2015): Military Public Diplomacy: How the Military Influences Foreign Audiences. White Paper on Military Public Diplomacy, American Security Project, February 2015. Accessible at https://www.americansecurityproject.org//wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Ref-0185-Military-Public-Diplomacy.pdf, 24. 8. 2019.

929