



THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Ravshan Khalilov

Master's student

Tashkent University of Oriental Studies

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Public diplomacy, new public diplomacy, propaganda, international relations, “soft” power, “hard” power, Joseph Nye, smart power.

Received: 14.05.22

Accepted: 16.05.22

Published: 18.05.22

Abstract: Public diplomacy plays an important role in the foreign policy of states. This article reveals the significance of public diplomacy in international relations, and importance of public diplomacy related concepts to the countries' foreign policy.

XALQ DIPLOMATIYASINING XALQARO MUNOSABATLARDAGI AHAMIYATI

Ravshan Xalilov

Magistratura talabasi

Toshkent sharqshunoslik universiteti

Toshkent, O'zbekiston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so'zlar: Xalq diplomatiyasi, yangi xalq diplomatiyasi, tashviqot, xalqaro munosabatlar, “yumshoq” kuch, “qattiq” kuch, Jozef Nay, aqlli kuch.

Annotatsiya: Davlatlarning tashqi siyosatida xalq diplomatiyasi muhim o'rin tutadi. Ushbu maqolada xalq diplomatiyasining xalqaro munosabatlardagi ahamiyati, xalq diplomatiyasiga oid tushunchalarning mamlakatlar tashqi siyosatidagi ahamiyati ochib berilgan.

ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ПУБЛИЧНОЙ ДИПЛОМАТИИ В МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЯХ

Равшан Халилов

Магистрант

Ташкентский университет востоковедения

Ташкент, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: Публичная дипломатия, новая публичная дипломатия, играет важную роль во внешней политике

пропаганда, международные отношения, государств. В данной статье раскрывается «мягкая» сила, «жесткая» сила, Джозеф Най, умная сила. значение публичной дипломатии в международных отношениях, а также значение концепций, связанных с публичной дипломатией, во внешней политике стран.

INTRODUCTION

In current time, a number of political scientists acknowledge that both developing and developed countries are becoming more and more active in the process of international relations. Each of the countries has chosen their own strategies of how to collaborate with foreign actors and prioritize their interests in the international level. It is clear that although some countries possess advanced military technologies, the influence of these countries might be similar to those who can use public diplomacy in an efficient way. Besides that public diplomacy does not stop evolving in spite of cutting-edge military technologies. On the contrary, some independent states felt that they could solely acquire what they want to gain from other countries with the help of effectively implementing public diplomacy. If they utilize “hard power”, which is the power of weapons to influence on international process, they are likely to be sanctioned by United Nations or some countries might cease not only economical but political relations as well. As a result, this kind of countries will encounter a wide range of socio-economic problems. For this reason, in order not to undergo these sorts of problems, countries should develop cultural relations with foreign states whether they are developed or not.

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

In this article systematic, logical-comparative analysis and historical methods have been adequately used.

It can be argued that in the new century everything from way of communication to human's behavior significantly develop due to technological advances. In this case, public diplomacy also did not fail developing like other spheres. In the political science, new theory known as “new public diplomacy” has been introduced by scientists. Although public diplomacy is widely used by many countries, the scientific society of the US put much more emphasis on using this term rather than others. The debate about the new public diplomacy after 11 September 2001 has become dominated by US public diplomacy. (Melissen, *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* 2005. P-18)

In international political communication, Public Diplomacy is considered as the paradigm shift which is termed as 'transformational diplomacy' by the former USA secretary of state Condoleezza Rice in 2006. On the other hand, scholars preferred to use the term new Public Diplomacy because of following factors:

- New and more actors became the part of diplomatic mission.
- New and faster means of communication developed.
- Blurring of domestic and international issues.
- New terminologies for Public Diplomacy, like soft power and branding.
- New Public Diplomacy strategy is based on people to people contacts
- New Public Diplomacy is described as relation building.
- New thinking and new solutions are given chance to solve the problems.
- Increased role of NGOs, supranational and sub national actors. (Rehman. 2015)

It shows that the main differences between public diplomacy and new public diplomacy are actors, ways of implementation. The new public diplomacy is a chunk to the approach of actor- people starting to fall emphasis on people-people communication, international communication in which the actor has the role of facilitator. In this model, the former focusing on communication vertically from top to bottom, is eclipsed and the main task of public diplomacy is to create relationships. (Elena Gurgu 2016)

The new public diplomacy is thus much more than a technical instrument of foreign policy. It has in fact become part of the changing fabric of international relations. Both small and large countries, ranging in size from the United States to Belgium or even Liechtenstein, and with either democratic or authoritarian regimes, such as China and Singapore, and including the most affluent, such as Norway, and those that can be counted among the world's poorest nations, for example Ethiopia, have in recent years displayed a great interest in public diplomacy. (Melissen, The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations 2005. P-18)

It is clear that new public diplomacy can create an enormous opportunity for every country to establish a wide range of relations with any international subjects. Besides that technological advances also play an decisive role in the development of public diplomacy. In order to understand the new public diplomacy properly, it is neither helpful to hang on to past images of diplomacy (still prevailing in much diplomatic studies' literature), nor is it advisable to make a forward projection of historical practices into the present international environment (in the case of equalling public diplomacy to traditional propaganda). The new public diplomacy will be an increasingly standard component of overall diplomatic practice and is more than a form of propaganda conducted by diplomats. (Melissen, The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations 2005. P-18)

Moreover, almost every country relies on media to undertake its own public diplomacy. Media centralized approach to public diplomacy still has an important role to play in the new public diplomacy, because governments need to correct misrepresentation of their policies, but also to send a strategic message on long term. The main advantage of the approach is far-

reaching media exposure and ability to generate media impact in the public consciousness, but the disadvantage is the inability to influence how the message is perceived in different cultures. (Elena Gurgu 2016) It is clear that media has a great potential of being aware of international environment and it might help governments form sole public opinion of country. However powerful media is, diverse negative power attempt to media and other forms of information sources so as to spread their ideas. In this case, officials should put a special emphasis on the security of media.

The Oxford English Dictionary's definition traces the word's evolution: "the systematic dissemination of information, esp. in a biased or misleading way, in order to promote a political cause or point of view." Here propaganda emerges as being political and partisan in nature, in its attempt to coerce or persuade a mass audience to conform to a particular point of view. (Fitzmaurice 2018) According to Welch, for instance, propaganda is 'the deliberate attempt to influence the opinions of an audience through the transmission of ideas and values for the specific purpose, consciously designed to serve the interest of the propagandists and their political masters, either directly or indirectly'. (Melissen, *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* 2005. P-18) Propaganda is considered a powerful tool that can mould public opinion and affect behavioural change. Although, some scholars view propaganda as the intrinsic thought and practice in societal culture, others view it as "organised persuasion", and have characterised it as being unethical and harmful. (Mohit Malhan 2020.) Propaganda is also used by governments to encourage or coerce citizens to act and think in accordance with its philosophy and to uphold and support the contrived image of itself as well as the nation that it seeks to portray. (Fitzmaurice 2018) It is clear from definitions that propaganda also serves as a tool of creating public opinion by way of spreading information. In this case it is likely to be difficult to perceive the difference between public diplomacy and propaganda. A variety of propaganda methods were used by the British during the World War I, with emphasis on the need for credibility. Written forms of distributed propaganda included books, pamphlets, official publications, ministerial speeches or royal messages. They were targeted at influential individuals, such as journalists and politicians, rather than a mass audience. (Marsili October 2015.)

It can be seen that the main difference between propaganda and public diplomacy is that propaganda is directed towards mainly officials of country rather than ordinary people. In other words, public diplomacy is similar to propaganda in that it tries to persuade people what to think, but it is fundamentally different from it in the sense that public diplomacy also listens to what people have to say. (Melissen, *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* 2005. P-18) In brief, propaganda plays an important role in the foreign policy of countries in

order to strengthen their position in international environment and it helps states influence other countries. This is also considered as a separate way of implementing foreign policy.

A central aspect of the new public diplomacy is the concept of soft power. (Elena Gurgu 2016) The term of soft power was introduced by Joseph Nye at the end of Cold War. According to Nye "Soft power is the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. It arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies. (JOSEPH S. NYE 2004. P- X)

The soft power is identified as the capacity to attract and the attraction to shape the preferences of others. Nye argued that there are three key power resources, including the culture, political values, and foreign policy. In this sense, the soft power is considered as an attractive ability rather than coercion. The idea regarding to attracting others to align with another country is the core mission for conceptualizing soft power in the political science domain. (Jian-Li. 2018. P-3.)

It is true that nowadays, different types of influencing methods have been developed by political scientists. The main reason why countries are willing to use moderate ways of political power is that international law and Security Council of the UN do not permit countries openly invade less developed countries. For this reason, in order not to experience a wide range of sanctions and embargos on industrial goods, almost every country prefers soft power to hard one.

Soft power is not merely the same as influence, though it is one source of influence. After all, influence can also rest on the hard power of threats or payments. Nor is soft power just persuasion or the ability to move people by argument, though that is an important part of it. It is also the ability to entice and attract. Attraction often leads to acquiescence. In behavioral terms, soft power is attractive power. In terms of resources, soft power resources are the assets—tangible and intangible—that produce such attraction. (Nye 2008. P-31) It is true that soft power is widely used by individuals and governments as a source of impact on others' behavior or foreign policy in a polite way. For this reason, it becomes significantly difficult to perceive negative aspects of soft power. Soft power uses a different currency (not force, not money) to engender cooperation. It can rest on a sense of attraction, love, or duty in a relationship, and appeal to values about the justness of contributing to those shared values and purposes. (Nye 2008. P-31)

It can be seen that the main component of soft power is culture. Because culture is not usually accepted negatively by ordinary people. However, they do not become aware of any manipulations against themselves. For this reason, some independent states put a primary emphasis on cultural relations before signing economic or business agreements with foreign countries. In other words, soft power is potentially a dangerous idea not because it is unsound,

which it is not, but rather for the faulty inference that careless or unwary observers draw from it. Such inferences are a challenge to theorists because they are unable to control the ways in which their ideas will be interpreted and applied in practice by those unwary observers. (Gray. April 2011. P-29.)

Moreover, there is another explanation for soft power. Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is therefore central to soft power. If a people or a nation believes our objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead without using threats and bribes. Put another way, militaries are well suited to defeating states, but they are often poor instruments to fight ideas. According to Nye, today, “victory” depends on attracting foreign populations to our side and helping them to build capable, democratic states. Soft power is essential to gaining peace. To sum up, it is easier to attract people to democracy rather than to coerce them to be democratic. (Pallaver. October 2011. P-105-106)

In current time, political actions are becoming more and more active than previous centuries. Today even a citizen of any independent country might be the subject of international policy. However, there are a number of actors of soft power. The traditional actor of soft power is the state, which implements initiatives through various state agencies. However, the state is no longer the only actor able to build and mobilize soft power. The new global context requires governments to integrate other agents in its decision-making process. Many non-traditional actors such as NGOs, multinational corporations, civil society groups and individuals are becoming significant power players. (Aigerim Raimzhanova December 2015. P-14)

Moreover, there is another type of power known as smart power, which is distinct from both soft power and hard power. The origin of smart power can be traced to the thought of political scientist and former Assistant Secretary of Defense of the Clinton administration, Joseph Nye. In 2007 he co-wrote with Richard L. Armitage, also a former Deputy Secretary of State under George W. Bush, a report on smart power. (Maya KANDEL n.d.) Smart power is “the ability to combine hard and soft power into a winning strategy”. It involves the “strategic use of diplomacy persuasion, capacity building, and the projection of power and influence in ways that are cost-effective and have political and social legitimacy”. Smart power means developing an integrated strategy, resource base, and tool kit to achieve some key objectives, drawing on both hard and soft power. It is an approach that not only underlines the necessity for a strong military, force but also invests heavily in alliances, partnership, and institutions at all levels to spread influence and establish legitimacy. (Pallaver. October 2011. P-105-106) In other words, smart power is the capacity of an actor to combine elements of hard power and soft power in ways that the actor’s goals are advanced effectively and efficiently. Soft power alone

may not be sufficient, but its relative strategic importance compared to hard power will continue to increase. Smart power advocates need to articulate the advantages of hard power, such as strong military, in combination with investing in alliances, partnerships and institutions. If hard power is 'push' and soft power is 'pull', the combination allows leveraging maximum results in a legitimate way. (Aigerim Raimzhanova December 2015. P-14) It is true that smart power is considered as the center of both soft and hard power. In fact, in the current time countries will put themselves under great pressure if they officially state their own position, which is either soft power or hard power.

Besides that, Joseph Nye clearly defined the primary features of smart power.

First of all, Nye tells us what smart power is not and then tries to say what it is. To him smart power is different from hard power but it is different from soft power as well. It is different because smart power is not a third form of power, rather something closer to a method. Smart power is a recognition of the different forms of power and the instruments that power can employ. Secondly, Nye defines smart power as an "approach". He sees it as an approach to the way in which power is exercised. In any case the main point is that smart power goes well beyond soft and hard, not as a third power choice, but as a method, as an approach to the use of power which gives to decision-makers the chance to choose the best way to address a specific issue. Thirdly, according to Nye smart power is something closer to an agenda. Therefore - clarifies Nye - acting as a smart power means setting a structured political agenda in order to achieve desired goals. (Pallaver. October 2011. P-105-106)

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, countries are not capable of gaining what they want in international level unless they implement any sorts of power either soft or hard one. In the world, independent states always fight for their own interests. During this process, different countries protect their interests in a different way. Some, especially much more developed countries arm with the cutting-edge military weapons. Others, developing ones, utilize much more affordable way of power. The others can combine both military power and cultural relations in an attempt to influence international environment.

REFERENCES

1. Aigerim Raimzhanova, Ph.D Candidate. "POWER IN IR: HARD, SOFT, AND SMART". Institute for Cultural Diplomacy and the University of Bucharest, December 2015. P-10.
2. Elena Gurgu, Aristide Cociuban. «"New Public Diplomacy and its Effects on International Level".» Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People. Volume 5, Issue 3, , 2016.

3. Fitzmaurice, Katherine. «“Propaganda” .» Brock Education Journal, 27(2), , 2018.
4. Gray., Colin S. HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY. . April 2011. P-29.
5. Jian Li. Conceptualizing Soft Power of Higher Education Globalization and Universities in China and the World. 2018. P-3.
6. JOSEPH S. NYE, JR. SOFT POWER The Means to Success in World Politics. 2004. P-X.
7. Marsili, Marco Manuel. «Propaganda and International Relations: an Outlook in Wartime.» October 2015.
8. Maya KANDEL, Maud QUESSARD-SALVAING. AMERICAN SMART POWER STRATEGIES: redefining leadership in a post-American world. б.д.
9. Melissen, Jan. The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations. P-XX, 2005.
10. Mohit Malhan, Dr. Prem Prakash Dewani. «“PROPAGANDA AS COMMUNICATION STRATEGY: HISTORIC AND CONTEMPORARY PERSPECTIVE” .» Academy of Marketing Studies Journal Volume 24, Issue 4, , 2020.
11. Nye, Joseph S. The Powers to Lead. Oxford University Press, 2008. P-31.
12. Pallaver., Matteo. “Power and Its Forms: Hard, Soft, Smart”. London, October 2011. P-13.
13. Rehman., Dr. Saima Ashraf Kayani and Dr. Muhammad Saif ur. «“PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: A NEW FOREIGN POLICY PARADIGM” .» 2015: 48-49.
14. Madaminova, D. I., & Fayzullaev, S. A. (2021). The important aspects of uzbekistan's initiatives in central Asia. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR)*, 10(3), 324-328.
15. Sayfullaev, D. (2016). Parliamentary Diplomacy In Making Of Foreign Policy. *The Advance Science Journal of International Relations*, 1(1), 52-54.
16. Madaminova, D. I. (2021). Uzbekistan as a leading initiator in central Asia. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(3), 1045-1049.
17. Sayfullaev, D. B. (2020). CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF THE MODERN WEST AND EAST DIPLOMACY STUDY. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 23(2), 1-10.
18. САЙФУЛЛАЕВ, Д. Б. (2017). ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКИЕ И ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ ИНДИИ И УЗБЕКИСТАНА В ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ. *Восток. Афро-Азиатские общества: история и современность*, (1), 142-148.
19. Ravshanov, F. R., & Azimov, H. Y. (2021). Danger and Security: History and Present. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(4), 280-285.
20. Durdona M., Tokhirxodja B. FACTOR OF LANGUAGE INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS IN EU COUNTRIES ON THE EXAMPLE OF GERMANY //Uzbekistan Journal of Oriental Studies. – 2019. – Т. 1. – №. 2. – С. 102-108.