

## **Cyber-Diplomacy : A New Strategy of Influence**

Paper presented to the Canadian Political Science Association General Meeting 2003  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
May 30, 2003

by

Pierre C. Pahlavi  
McGill University  
Political Science Department  
[pierre.pahlavi@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:pierre.pahlavi@mail.mcgill.ca)

© 2003

## **Cyber-Diplomacy : A New Strategy of Influence**

Diplomacy is the art of gaining friends abroad  
Otto von Bismarck

### **Introduction**

Governments are developing a new form of diplomacy that they consider a central strategic element in the conduct of contemporary international affairs. As societies evolve, new scenarios arise in the realm of international relations that demand new methods and new priorities. Diplomatic practice keeps time with the changing world, evolving, as it has throughout history, to meet new challenges and respond to new sets of national interests. A crucial change has been the re-equilibration of the relative importance of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ power. In other words, traditional coercive methods based on military or economic might are giving way to the more subtle diplomatic arts of persuasion and influence. This new balance is the product of a host of novel circumstances. Complex interdependence, cultural globalisation, the empowerment of public opinion, the mass media revolution and the increasingly international flow of culture, ideas and information are all factors that direct mounting pressure towards national governments, urging them to remould their foreign policy structures and to develop mass diplomacy as a new focal point for their diplomatic efforts. In the light of this new global environment, governments come to view the ability to inform and influence foreign audiences as a strategic aspect of their diplomacy and as an indispensable condition for the pursuit of their goals. The reasons for the rise of conditions leading to mass diplomacy have been discussed in preceding chapters. It is fitting now to ask a few questions and consider states’ potential uses for this new diplomacy. In what ways can mass diplomacy complete traditional state-to-state diplomacy? What is the utility of communicating directly with foreign audiences? Is it possible that mass diplomacy could create a more fruitful international environment, leading to better international footholds and greater facility in the attainment of national interests? Can mass diplomacy further specific security, economic and political goals?

It will be shown that a growing number of governments answer most of these questions affirmatively. In an attempt to explain this growing consensus, this chapter tries first to determine to what extent the task of informing and educating foreign populations can favourably influence the international context and secondly, to see how mass diplomacy can help advance specific goals.

## **1. Benefiting States in the International Arena**

The rationale of mass diplomacy is threefold: first, to engage foreign populations in relationship of trust and empathy; second, to create an enabling international conjuncture and third, to facilitate thereby the achievement of national interests.

### **a. Generating an Atmosphere of Trust**

It is interesting to consider both why states disseminate information and cultural values across international society, and why they believe that in so doing they advance their interests. A few decades ago, Karl Deutsch observed that “directly linked to the interests of each state [...] is the policy of diffusion of its own ideological propaganda in foreign countries, and the policy of support for cultural and scientific exchanges compatible with this goal”<sup>1</sup>. An implicit assumption among a growing number of leaders is that the promotion of a set norms and values viewed as preferable for one’s own society as well as for the world in general is an important national goal<sup>2</sup>. In the past few years, this foreign policy approach has become more resolutely inscribed in states’ international agendas. For Iranian, Japanese and Russian foreign policies it has become, respectively, an ‘indispensable line’, a ‘pivot’, or else, a ‘pillar’ on the same level as other more conventional fields<sup>3</sup>. French diplomacy has made it a priority to make France’s voice

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Deutsch, *The Analysis of International Relations*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Englewood Cliffs (NJ), Prentice Hall, 1988, 87.

<sup>2</sup> J. Spanier and D. Wendzel, *Game Nations Play*, CQPress, 1996, p. 89.

<sup>3</sup> Igor S. Ivanov, Russian Foreign Minister, *La Politique Étrangère de la Russie à l'Époque de la Mondialisation*, Moscou, Olma-Press, 2002 ; Hamidreza Assefi, Spokesman of the Iranian Foreign Ministry, “Foreign Ministry's Success Is in Changing World Public Opinion”, *Iran* (Morning Daily), May 23, 2001, No. 1810, p. 8; Japan Government, ‘Basic Strategies for Japan's

heard in the world by diffusing and sharing its preferred values, beliefs, norms and practices<sup>4</sup>. U.S. public diplomacy, consisting of disseminating American values and ideas internationally constitutes today one of the two main focuses of the Department of State's Strategic Plan<sup>5</sup>. For U.S. diplomats, this is a natural adaptation to the mass media revolution, the growing influence of culture and its greater relationship to politics and social change<sup>6</sup>.

In the eyes of German decision makers, as in those of most of their counterparts, cultural relations policy is not just a matter of “the good, the beautiful, the true”<sup>7</sup> or “some kind of frilly extra”<sup>8</sup> ; rather it is an integral part of foreign policy aimed at completing and sustaining it. There are a number of reasons for this.

The first reason why the mass media information and cultural propagation programs occupy a central place in modern foreign policy systems is that they are viewed as effective instruments for fostering trust and understanding in foreign countries. This is particularly true in the American case. Over the years, promoting mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the peoples of the world through international information and cultural exchanges has become a “distinct and vital goal” for the State Department<sup>9</sup>. The intention is to project a more favourable image and in doing so, to reverse entrenched misconceptions and deeply rooted antagonism. In the short term, this goal is advanced through the dissemination of information in support of U.S. policy and in the longer term, through a multitude of educational and cultural

---

Foreign Policy in the 21st Century New Era’, New Vision, New Diplomacy, Task Force on Foreign Relations for the Prime Minister, November 28, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Dominique de Villepin, ‘Dizième Conférence des ambassadeurs. Discours d’Ouverture du Ministre des Affaires Étrangères’. Foreign policy statement, Paris - 27.08.2002. [www.france.diplomatie.fr](http://www.france.diplomatie.fr) .

<sup>5</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State's Strategic Plan (2000)*, released by the Office of Management Policy and Planning U.S. Department of State, October 25, 2000, available @ [http://www.state.gov/www/global/general\\_foreign\\_policy/2000\\_dos\\_stratplan\\_index.html](http://www.state.gov/www/global/general_foreign_policy/2000_dos_stratplan_index.html).

<sup>6</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *Annual Report 2002*, ‘Media and Culture’, Wilson Editions, Washington, 2002, p. 24.

<sup>7</sup> Germany Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ‘Kulturpolitik-Grundsätze’, GFMOFA, available @ [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussenpolitik/kulturpolitik/grundsätze/index\\_html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussenpolitik/kulturpolitik/grundsätze/index_html).

<sup>8</sup> Joschka Fischer, Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Address at the opening of the Forum on the Future of Cultural Relations Policy, Berlin, 4 July 2000, released by the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs – GFMOFA.

initiatives. By combining information with education, mass diplomacy contributes to the familiarisation of foreign audiences with American norms and values allowing the construction of strong relationship based on confidence and trust. Cultural programs in particular are a top priority to the extent that they allow the modification of the value structure of targeted societies. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright made the following remark in this respect: “many of our other more officials ambassadors have told me of the value that cultural programs have in improving perceptions about America”<sup>10</sup>. This certitude is based on a certain number of program evaluations showing that foreign populations exposed to mass diplomacy develop more empathy for their host country<sup>11</sup>. U.S. mass diplomacy outreach capacity is of course greatly enhanced by strategic communications programs specifically designed for foreign audiences and conveyed by a vast array of technological facilities such as Internet, print publications, travelling and electronically transmitted speaker programs, and information resource services<sup>12</sup>.

The same logic holds true across the globe. In every corner of the world, countries rely increasingly on mass diplomacy and mass media to create an atmosphere of understanding and peaceful dialogue with foreign societies. Adopting Wilfrid Laurier’s idea that “the only way to defend one’s ideas and principles is to make them known”, Canadian policy makes a considerable investment in the dissemination of Canadian pluralist values throughout the world. This allows them to express and promote Canada’s unique identity to foreign populations and to build genuine relationships<sup>13</sup>. Creating understanding, goodwill and convergence are viewed as indispensable goals in the process of establishing a relationship with solid foundations with partner countries. In a

---

<sup>9</sup> U.S. State Department, U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000), *op. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, Remarks at Dinner for White House Conference on Diplomacy and Culture, U.S. Department of State, November 27, 2000.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *op. cit.*

<sup>12</sup> U.S. State Department, ‘About the Office of International Information Programs’, Office of International Information Programs, available @ <http://usinfo.state.gov/about/index.htm>.

<sup>13</sup> Canada - DFAIT, “Projecting Canadian Values and Norms”, *Le Canada dans le Monde - Le Cadre Stratégique de la Politique Étrangère du Canada / Canada in the World - Canadian Foreign Policy Review – 1995*, available @ [http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign\\_policy](http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy).

nutshell, those are the fundamental goals of mass diplomacy<sup>14</sup>. One of the central tenets of the German policy is to teach values and norms to ‘learning communities’ in order to get them to know and understand Germany better. In doing so German mass diplomats hope to create networks and dialogue across ideological and cultural fault lines<sup>15</sup>. For Joshka Fisher, the head of the German Foreign Service, to develop cultural relations with civil societies abroad is today one the “real hard issues that foreign policy is all about”<sup>16</sup>. Iranian foreign policy makers are convinced that chances for Iran’s success lie in a mass diplomacy capable of changing world public opinion and of bringing into agreement with Teheran. They believe in particular that a policy of détente, ‘answerable’ to people and based on the ‘dialogue of culture and civilisations’ holds the potential to improve the generally negative image of the Islamic Republic worldwide<sup>17</sup>. The Japanese consider that the new communication and information technologies make possible a strategy of cultural public relations aimed at attenuating ideological, cultural and ethnic differences, thus creating inter-societal rapprochement. Japan is actively promoting its culture abroad as a means of engendering trust among nations and building truly friendly relationships<sup>18</sup>. Like their Italian, Turkish or British counterparts, a growing number of foreign policy makers regard their diplomatic methods of information and cultural co-operation as a strategic lever of particular importance in affirming a favourable national image abroad and in maintaining a proper basis for establishing deep-rooted and solid relations with foreign societies.

---

<sup>14</sup> Evan H. Potter, Special Advisor (communications) to the Policy Planning Division of the DFAIT, ‘Canada and the New Public Diplomacy’, Discussion Paper in Diplomacy, Published by Spencer Mawby, University of Leicester, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 2002.

<sup>15</sup> Germany - GFMOFA, ‘Strategy for the immediate future’, GFMOFA, available @ [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussepolitik/kulturpolitik/grundsaeetze/index\\_html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/www/en/aussepolitik/kulturpolitik/grundsaeetze/index_html)

<sup>16</sup> Germany - Joshka Fischer, *op. cit.*

<sup>17</sup> Iran - Hamidreza Assefi, *op. cit.*

<sup>18</sup> Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic Blue Book 2000, ‘Chapter IV: International Exchange and Public Relations Activities’, JMOFA, available @ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2000/I-a.html>.

b. Engaging with Key Peoples and Creating a Facilitating Conjuncture

By targeting foreign populations, including both the general public and opinion leaders, mass diplomacy allows states to engage with key people and influence their government more or less directly. Far before the rise of the telecommunication tools that render mass diplomacy possible today, Hans Morgenthau had envisioned the potential of this subtle diplomacy that “aims not at the conquest of territory or at the control of economic life, but at the conquest and control of the minds of citizens”<sup>19</sup>. According to top British mass-diplomacy strategists, this approach can achieve a wide variety of results. A few of these include increasing people’s familiarity with one’s country, increasing their appreciation of one’s country (by creating positive perceptions and manipulating others into seeing issues from the same perspective) and finally by enabling them to engage with one’s country (by getting them to buy British products, understand and subscribe to British practices and policies)<sup>20</sup>.

In turn, bringing foreign masses to share a common vision of the world is viewed as an indirect means of applying pressure to their governments. In other terms, mass diplomacy allows a country to secure a partner’s consent or support by modifying the will of significant segments of its population. A Canadian specialist makes the point very clearly: “If there is initial resistance from the target government, it will be through public diplomacy that new alliances will be shaped with local groups to attempt to change policy”<sup>21</sup>. U.S. decision makers observe that in providing foreign audiences with a better understanding of the United States, cultural exchange are strategic activities that build a corps of informed opinion leaders in the national political, economic, cultural, and social infrastructures of their countries<sup>22</sup>. The impact of mass diplomacy is magnified, when, as

---

<sup>19</sup> Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., NY, Alfred A. Knopf, 1973, p. 74; see also K. J. Holsti, *International Politics* (Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice Hall, 1992, p. 116.

<sup>20</sup> Mark Leonard and Catherine Stead, *Public Diplomacy*, Foreign Policy Center, London, 2002, pp. 9-10.

<sup>21</sup> Evan H. Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>22</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

German specialists suggest, it targets in particular individuals exercising more influence within society<sup>23</sup>. Similarly, for Americans, what is central is mass diplomacy's capacity to engage emerging and current societal leaders on cultural and ideological issues. Information initiatives and strategic communications programs created strictly for key international audiences, such as the media, government officials and opinion leaders, are of course an additional condition for success<sup>24</sup>. This is why direct communication with foreign audiences is an increasingly essential responsibility of twenty-first century foreign policy<sup>25</sup>.

Another shared postulate is that by building relationships based on trust and sympathy, mass diplomacy facilitates diplomatic conjuncture and provides states with a stronger international position. By benefiting from emotional ties, a country will prosper more by gaining a position from which it is easier to draw international opinion in a direction to national advantage and to frame international issues to its own advantage. Public diplomacy cannot force partner governments to co-operate, "but what public diplomacy *can* do is change the environment in which the debate takes place, and this has a real effect on its outcome"<sup>26</sup>. With that in mind one can better understand why the Belgian anthropologist, Constantin von Barloewen, considers that "intercultural dialogue, (...) will become the existential problem of tomorrow's Realpolitik"<sup>27</sup>.

Foreign policy advisors from around the globe today admit that mass diplomacy is an excellent means of creating a favourable context for political action thereby providing countries with more control over the outcome of their diplomatic manoeuvring. American analysts, to begin with, believe that the task of fostering a consensus on American values

---

<sup>23</sup> Germany – GMOFA, 'Kulturpolitik Grundsätze', *op. cit.*

<sup>24</sup> Warren P. Strobel, "The Media: Influencing Foreign policy in the Information Age", U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda, March 2000; US State Department, 'About the Office of International Information Programs', Office of International Information Programs, available @ <http://usinfo.state.gov/about/index.htm>.

<sup>25</sup> U.S. State Department, U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000), *op. cit.*

<sup>26</sup> Liz Noble and Mark Leonard, "Being Public: How diplomacy will need to change to cope with the information society", *iMP Magazine*, July 23, 2001, available @ [http://www.cisp.org/imp/july\\_2001/07\\_01leonard.htm](http://www.cisp.org/imp/july_2001/07_01leonard.htm).

<sup>27</sup> Constantin Von Barloewen, "La Culture, Facteur de la Realpolitik", *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Novembre 2001, pages 22 et 23.



and norms, in other words, making the world a more congenial environment for American interests, is a crucial step in developing a facilitating context for the United States<sup>28</sup>. State Department strategists consider that creating empathy among foreign audiences builds a platform of international support from which it is easier to address issues of global importance<sup>29</sup>. For them, “such understanding provides a sensible context in which the United States can articulate its policy, intentions, and actions abroad”<sup>30</sup>. A U.S. congressman remarks that, “public diplomacy - which consists of systematic efforts to communicate not with foreign governments but with the people themselves - has a central role to play in the task of making the world safer for the United States”<sup>31</sup>. At the Canadian DFAIT, there is no doubt that a country’s success on the international scene depends in large part today on how it is perceived abroad and therefore on the ability of its diplomacy to project its values and culture globally<sup>32</sup>. For France, mass diplomacy conducted “in the public space” is one of the best guarantees for the expansion of national influence internationally, a ‘base’ for one’s presence abroad<sup>33</sup>. Mass diplomacy is a central tool of soft power diplomacy thanks to which Paris hopes to, once again, play a major role in international affairs<sup>34</sup>. Iranian foreign minister, Dr. Kamal Kharrazi, describes cultural diplomacy as the basis for Iran’s credibility in the international arena and for the creation of a durable atmosphere of understanding and peaceful cohabitation with other countries. He states that “the need to expand cultural relations with other

---

<sup>28</sup> Joseph S. Nye Jr, *The Paradox of American Power. Why the World’s Only Superpower can’t Go it Alone*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002 ; Julia Hanna, “Going Alone?”, *Kennedy School Bulletin*, Spring 2002.

<sup>29</sup> U.S. State Department, U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000), *op. cit.*

<sup>30</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *op. cit.*

<sup>31</sup> “Committee Expected to Report Legislation”, Reform of U.S. Public Diplomacy, *American Diplomacy*, March 15, 2002.

<sup>32</sup> Bill Graham, Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, *A Dialogue on Foreign Policy*, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, available on [www.foreign-policy-dialogue.ca](http://www.foreign-policy-dialogue.ca) – January 2003.

<sup>33</sup> Pierre-André Wiltzer, Minister-Delegate for cooperation and the French-speaking world, ‘Mondialisation – Environnement’, Plenary session of the french network for cooperation and foreign cultural initiatives, Closing speech, Paris, 18 juillet 2002, disponible sur [www.france.diplomatie.fr](http://www.france.diplomatie.fr) (octobre 2002); see also France – Foreign Affairs Ministry, ‘Une diplomatie Nouvelle’, MAE 2002, 20/03/2002 disponible sur [www.france.diplomatie.fr](http://www.france.diplomatie.fr).

<sup>34</sup> Jacques Charmelot, “Now is France’s opportunity to make ‘soft power’ relevant”, *The Daily Star* 24.08.2002

countries is as pressing as that of enhancing classic diplomatic ties”<sup>35</sup>. As suggested by the Japanese and Germans, for a country to play an enhanced part in the international community it is crucial to implement cultural public relations activities sustained by communication means. International media policy makes a valuable contribution to shaping a good image and building global networks that generate good will and voluntary co-operation<sup>36</sup>.

### c. A Soft Diplomacy for Hard Goals

By increasing dialogue with foreign audiences and creating an enabling international context, mass diplomacy represents a strategic means of advancing concrete national interests in international affairs. As Leonard and Stead explain, it is more than simply enchanting publics and engaging government for the sake of it – “it is about getting results”<sup>37</sup>. An increasingly widespread belief among today’s leaders is that this soft policy is essential to success in paving the way for a wide array of hard goals.

At the start of the twenty-first century, it has become evident to American leaders that mass diplomacy has a vital contribution to make to United States foreign policy. For the State Department, “public diplomacy has value as a strategic element of power in the information age”<sup>38</sup>. The belief is that it significantly promotes the national interest of the United States through educating, informing and influencing foreign audiences<sup>39</sup>. Working very much in co-ordination with and in parallel to traditional diplomatic efforts, the new diplomacy is officially presented as a ‘sine qua non’ or ‘indispensable’ instrument for

---

<sup>35</sup> Iran - Ministry of Foreign affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Dr. Kharrazi, released by the MFAIRI on Aug 20, 2002, available @ <http://www.mfa.gov.ir/News/Index.htm>.

<sup>36</sup> Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic Bluebook 2001, ‘Chapter II. Section 5. Domestic Public Opinion and Public Relations Activities, and Promoting Understanding of Japan in Other Countries’, JMOFA, available @ <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2001/chap2-5-b.html>; see also Germany - GFMOFA, *op. cit.*

<sup>37</sup> Mark Leonard and Catherine Stead, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>38</sup> U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, Building America’s Public Diplomacy Through a Reformed Structure and Additional Resources, Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, Washington 2002.

<sup>39</sup> Ramona Harper, “The Art of Public Diplomacy”, State Department Fellow in Ketchum’s Washington, *Ketchum*, February 2003.

addressing such critical objectives as increasing global economic growth, promoting democratic principles of government and securing a sustainable global environment<sup>40</sup>. As the State Department emphasises, “without mutual understanding and the trust it engenders, it would be virtually impossible for American diplomacy to pursue successfully [its] Strategic Goals”<sup>41</sup>. Secretary of State Colin Powell considers consequently that it is crucial that deepening contacts be developed at all levels to maintain United States leadership on the global stage and to compete effectively with its European partners in an area of strategic importance<sup>42</sup>. A valuable aspect of public diplomacy is that it is not concerned solely with the attainment of specific time-defined goals but holds the potential of maintaining an ongoing process benefiting all international affairs goals. It is stipulated in the funding document of the Bureau of Cultural Affairs that : “Essential to promoting the strategic goals outlined in the Department of State International Affairs Strategic Plan, cultural exchanges seek to establish trust, confidence, and international co-operation with other countries that sustain and advance the full range of American national interests”<sup>43</sup>. Again, major U.S. foreign policy goals are reinforced in critical ways by mass diplomacy information programs and America's comparative advantage in information and soft power resources<sup>44</sup>.

In the present context, other international actors are increasingly aware that mass diplomacy holds the potential to improve their standing in international society and to facilitate the attainment of their goals. Realising that they cannot match U.S. hard power at this point in time, second tier and middle powers increasingly rely on this soft power diplomacy to assume a key position.

---

<sup>40</sup> U.S. Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Official Website, <http://www.state.gov/>

<sup>41</sup> U.S. State Department, U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000), *op. cit.*

<sup>42</sup> Secretary of State C. Powell, “Cultural Action and National Interests”, in U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>43</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, “Exchanges in National Strategy”, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>44</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and William A. Owens, “America’s Information Edge: The Nature of Power”, *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 1996 also available in USIA Electronic Journals, Vol. 1, No. 12, September 1996.

- Like many other middle powers, Canada counts on its mass diplomacy to make a difference on the international scene despite relatively modest hard power assets<sup>45</sup>. It is believed that given the new realities of global affairs and the growing vulnerability of national borders, ethical diplomacy consisting of disseminating a set of preferred values and norms will advance Canada's economic and security interests<sup>46</sup>. The DFAIT stated it clearly when it announced that: "the projection of Canadian values and culture is important to our success in the world"<sup>47</sup>. This form of middle power international diplomacy is crucial in addressing a wide range of issues including straightening social cohesion and forging national identity domestically<sup>48</sup>.
- Major European countries also understand that they can promote their influence and interests by investing effort in mass diplomacy. British leaders believe that public diplomacy and the promulgation of the United Kingdom's image, values and policies overseas are effective ways to promote and protect Britain's national interests<sup>49</sup>. For the British diplomat Michael Butler, "the purpose of public diplomacy is to influence opinion in target countries to make it easier for the British Government, British companies or other British organisations to achieve their aims"<sup>50</sup>. As regards the question of knowing to what extent mass diplomacy can maximise national gains, Germany's answer is clear: cultural policy abroad is "part and parcel of foreign policy". By building trust, mass diplomacy "directly supports and serves general foreign policy goals and aspirations." Although it is difficult to quantify its results, it makes a valuable contribution in paving the way for international co-operation. "By winning partners and friends for our country", declare German leaders, "cultural relations policy directly serves vital national

---

<sup>45</sup> Laurence Baxter and Jo-Ann Bishop, *Uncharted Ground: Canada, Middle Power Leadership, and Public Diplomacy*, available @ [www.wws.princeton.edu/~jpia/5.html](http://www.wws.princeton.edu/~jpia/5.html)

<sup>46</sup> Andrew Latham, "Theorizing the Landmine Campaign: Ethics, Global Cultural Scripts, and the Laws of War", in Rosalind Irwin dir., *Ethics and Security in Canadian Foreign Policy*, Vancouver, UBC Press, 2001.

<sup>47</sup> Canada - DFAIT, *Canada in the World - Canadian Foreign Policy Review - 1995*, *op. cit.*

<sup>48</sup> Evan H. Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 4-5.

<sup>49</sup> UK British Council, 'Public Diplomacy Strategy', BC, 2001 available @ <http://www.ukinbangladesh.org/pds2001.doc>

<sup>50</sup> Michael Butler, former British permanent representative to the European Union, quoted in Mark Leonard and Catherine Stead, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

interests”<sup>51</sup>. There is little doubt on their part that this approach represents a powerful diplomatic channel: a pipeline serving simultaneously ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ political issues<sup>52</sup>.

- Many other governments consider mass diplomacy to be a medium through which they will be able to enhance their international standing and have greater impact than their present status suggests is possible. Notably, it is viewed by Chinese officials as ‘an all-dimensional opening up axe’ of its ‘grand strategy’ serving long-term national goals<sup>53</sup>. For Indians, winning international understanding and support plays a central role for the defence of national interests, priorities and aspirations<sup>54</sup>. Italians, Turks and Iranians agree that cultural policy helps champion national interests by contributing to the improvement of economic, trade and political relations with the rest of the world<sup>55</sup>.

## 2. A Tool for a More Secure, Prosperous, and Ideologically Friendly World

While mass diplomacy serves fashionable strategic, economic and political interests and although these interests are most of the time inextricably intertwined, it also has the ability to address them on an individual basis. A first and most important issue is that of security.

---

<sup>51</sup> Germany – GMOFA, *op cit.*

<sup>52</sup> German State Secretary Dr Pleuger, interviewed in *Deutschland*, April 2000.

<sup>53</sup> US State Department, Annual Report on Military Power of People's Republic of China – Report to Congress, released by the US State Department’s Bureau of International Information Program (IPP), available <http://usinfo.state.gov/regional/ea/uschina/dodrpt00.htm>, 2000.

<sup>54</sup> India Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *International Affairs Strategy of India*, MEADEV 2002, available @ <http://www.meadev.nic.in/>.

<sup>55</sup> Il Direttore Generale per la Promozione e Cooperazione Culturale Francesco Aloisi de Larderel: ‘La promozione della cultura e della lingua italiane all'estero è strettamente legata ai rapporti politici ed economici che l'Italia mantiene con tutte le aree del mondo’; Italia – Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Francesco Aloisi de Larderel, Il Direttore Generale per la Promozione e Cooperazione Culturale, Promozione e Cooperazione Culturale, Presentazione dell'attività della Direzione Generale per la Promozione e la Cooperazione Culturale, available @ <http://www.esteri.it/eng/foreignpol/index.htm>.; Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Functions of the Directorate General of Cultural Affairs and its Activities for the Years 1998-1999*, available @ <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupa/ao/01.htm>; see also P.C. Pahlavi, “La diplomatie culturelle à l’ère de l’interdépendance globale: la Turquie à la recherche des éléments fédérateurs de l’identité panturque”. *Revue Études Internationales*, volume XXXIII, n°2, juin 2002; Hamidreza Assefi, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

### a. Mass Diplomacy and Preventive Security

Mass diplomacy increasingly represents an essential element of a modern security policy. According to traditional perspectives, defence and even security are matters best dealt with through brute military might. But in an era of global interdependence, of closely interconnected societies and intertwined of communications, it becomes more difficult for states to increase their security by constraining rivals through force or military dissuasion. In this new context, security policy has been constantly broadened beyond the narrow classic definition to include non-military factors such as social, cultural and communication considerations. New factors, among which feature prominently the mass media revolution and the growing political weight of public opinion, have led to the diversification of functions and levels involved in the definition and delivery of security policy. Culture, information and communication are strategic assets in this domain. According to the former German president Roman Herzog, they become “imperatives of security policy”<sup>56</sup>. The new communication and information facilities become as important to national security as political, military, and economic power<sup>57</sup>.

Increasingly, a purely persuasion diplomacy based on culture, information and mass communication proves not only necessary but also feasible, cheap and easy. Mass diplomacy effectively prevents crises, resolves problems, establishes trust, builds alliances before aggression occurs and advances general national interests on the international scene. It functions as a first line of defence that promotes a better image among foreign publics, that instigates of a more favourable attitude from governments and creates a more stable and hospitable international environment. Mass diplomacy can also used as an offensive weapon designed to neutralise hostile groups or governments by depriving them of popular support. Alternatively, it can anticipate and react against the development of hostile sentiment by attacking on a grass-roots level through a patient and resolute strategy combining education and the dissemination of information. Though mass diplomacy is not a substitute for the use of brute force it is becoming its

---

<sup>56</sup> Constantin Von Barloeven, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 et 23.

<sup>57</sup> U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

unavoidable complement. This policy of pre-emptive dissuasion occupies a more and more important place within states' international security agenda. To date, in spite of the lip service paid to them, little concrete attention had been given to the importance of cultural diplomacy and information programs. In these new circumstances, issues of 'transparency', moral legitimacy and accountability to foreign populations are likely to be central to the success of states' defence and security policies, even though they have traditionally been absent from classic approaches in these areas.

According to Canadians, there is a clear and growing utility for security policy to "go beyond simple military preparedness" and to include new approaches based on cultural and information relations. They believe that the successful promotion of peaceful values, such as multiculturalism and democracy, can make an important contribution to national security and international stability<sup>58</sup>. It is a strongly held conviction that the dissemination of these values "will be critical to the struggle for international security in the face of new threats to stability"<sup>59</sup>. Italians do not doubt that this preventive diplomacy is a vehicle for peace and stability in the world<sup>60</sup>. French diplomacy is also founded on the assumption that such diplomacy, far from being futile, can reinforce security and facilitate the struggle against terrorism by allowing the patient development of exchange, legitimate relations and international solidarity<sup>61</sup>. Joshka Fisher too shares the certitude that that by promoting dialogue and exchange, cultural diplomacy can play a critical role in preventing conflict by socialising 'difficult' partner countries and by drawing them closer to the international community<sup>62</sup>. For the British, it is clear that "communication and building relationships do have a part to play if we are going to avoid slipping into a battle between the West and the rest"<sup>63</sup>. It is interesting to note that the quest for cultural and moral legitimacy among world populations is at the heart of the Common European

---

<sup>58</sup> Canada - DFAIT, *Canada in the World - Canadian Foreign Policy Review – 1995, op. cit.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> Domenico Calabria, "A Model of Preventive Diplomacy", *Italia Chiama Italia*, 2001-2002.

<sup>61</sup> Dominique de Villepin, *op. cit.*

<sup>62</sup> Joshka Fischer, Federal Foreign Minister, "We have to support the reformers in Tehran", Interview in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 13 July 2000.

<sup>63</sup> Mark Leonard and Catherine Stead, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

Security and Defence Policy project<sup>64</sup>. The head of the Iranian Foreign Service also believes that “Iran’s successful policy of détente and push for dialogue among civilisations to enhance relations has lowered significantly the cost of maintaining national security”<sup>65</sup>. This is a perspective shared by its Indian, Turkish and Japanese counterparts for whom mass diplomacy holds a central place within a comprehensive security policy. They believe that mass diplomacy is becoming an essential component of international peace by helping to resolve ideological distortion and fostering cultural rapprochement<sup>66</sup>.

By erecting a global psychological ‘firewall’, mass diplomacy has become America's first line of defence. While military strength and flexibility are vital to assure national security, the new international context has magnified the importance of communication with foreign audiences as a way to legitimize and strengthen U.S. leadership in the world. American leaders have come to realise that relatively small investments in mass diplomacy information and cultural propagation initiatives today can decrease the possibility of more costly conflicts later. Should mass diplomatic methods be ineffectually applied, military force might have to be employed prematurely but if it is undertaken in a timely and adequate manner it can help resolve emerging problems at low cost before they represent serious threats. Thanks to its comparative advantage in the domain of communications, U.S. diplomacy is in a position to deploy a ‘global cultural umbrella’ of great strategic importance for its security. As J. Nye and W. Owen explain, the information edge acts as a ‘multiplier’ of American cultural diplomacy; of its capacity to reinforce emotional links with foreign nations and to prompt alliances and ad hoc coalitions<sup>67</sup>. It is believed that, “[i]n the information age, diplomatic influence and

---

<sup>64</sup> Jolyon Howorth, ‘III. Norms, values and political legitimacy’ in *European Integration and Defence: the Ultimate Challenge?*, Institute for Security Studies of WEU, November 2000.

<sup>65</sup> Ministry of Foreign affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Dr. Kharrazi, released by the MFAIRI on Aug 20, 2002, available @ <http://www.mfa.gov.ir/News/Index.htm>.

<sup>66</sup> India Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *International Affairs Strategy of India*, *op. cit.*; Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Diplomatic Bluebook 2001, Chapter II. Section 4. Social Issues - Human Rights and Democracy, JMOFA 2001; Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ‘Turkey’s Security Perspectives and its Relations with NATO’, TMOFA, available @ <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupa/af/secure.htm>.

<sup>67</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and William A. Owens, *op. cit.*



military power go to those who can disseminate credible information in ways that support their interests and effectively put public pressure on the leaders of other countries”<sup>68</sup>. The State Department’s Strategic Plan insists on the importance of a sustained mass diplomacy promulgating American cultural values, norms and practices (ranging from democracy to mass consumption to pop music) for building a secure and friendly environment<sup>69</sup>. This policy is of critical significance in engaging populations, especially in fragmenting states and unstable regions, and in cultivating feelings of sympathy and trust instead of hostility and hatred<sup>70</sup>. Another security goal that mass diplomacy is designed to achieve is to “promote and strengthen international norms and principles that formalise and help verify non-proliferation commitments”<sup>71</sup>. Now it appears that in establishing an international consensus on such moral norms as the ‘*no-first-use* pledge’ and the ‘nuclear taboo’ it has greatly contributed to reducing the menace emanating from weapons of mass destruction (WMD)<sup>72</sup>.

One of the primary contributions mass diplomacy can make is in the struggle against terrorism. Although it may conflict with some aspects of short term military action, the pursuit of a long term policy of pacification through mass diplomacy can be of great utility in persuading opinion leaders and the general public in priority countries to the danger of support for and public apathy toward terrorists<sup>73</sup>.

The American example offers a good illustration. With 9-11, fostering mutual understanding, respect and long-term relationships with the peoples of other countries through information programs and cultural exchanges has assumed a sudden urgency<sup>74</sup>. Many specialists came to conclude that military force was not enough to eradicate the

---

<sup>68</sup> U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>69</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL), Human Rights, available @ <http://www.state.gov/g/drl>.

<sup>70</sup> Donna Oglesby, “Diplomacy in the Information Age”, Information Impacts Magazine (IMP), July 2001, available @ [http://www.cisp.org/imp/july\\_2001/07\\_01oglesby.htm](http://www.cisp.org/imp/july_2001/07_01oglesby.htm).

<sup>71</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State’s Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

<sup>72</sup> T.V. Paul, “Power, Influence and Nuclear Weapons: A Reassessment” in Paul ed., *The Absolute Weapon Revisited*, University of Michigan Press, 1998, pp. 30-31.

<sup>73</sup> One could read in the U.S. Department of State’s *Strategic Plan 2000* that: ‘terrorists based overseas can also instigate attacks within the United States’, U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

terrorist menace unless it was combined with a concerted mass diplomacy campaign attacking its roots<sup>75</sup>. A ranking member of the U.S. Foreign Policy Committee put it clearly: “Strong public diplomacy is critical to winning the war against terrorism. If we are to prevent future terrorist attacks, we must launch a concerted campaign to win over people across the globe who are subjected to anti-American misinformation and hate”<sup>76</sup>. By the same token, the U.S. Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy declared that “[i]t is extremely dangerous to ignore groups of people who are busy creating misperceptions about the United States so that it becomes part of a cause of fanatics”<sup>77</sup>. It is become strikingly evident among U.S. officials that mass diplomacy is now crucial to the goal of generating a global anti-terrorist coalition among allied nations, to win the hearts and minds of the people exposed to hostile influence, and to diminish the underlying conditions that allow terrorism to take root and flourish<sup>78</sup>. The struggle against terrorism through initiatives designed to inform and educate populations of young men and women in potentially dangerous countries is now the number-one mission of the U.S. public diplomacy. Its specific contribution to U.S. psychological warfare is fixed by White House’s *National Security Strategy* and State Department’s *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*<sup>79</sup>. These official documents stipulate that mass diplomacy has the task of serving ‘a war of ideas’ the goal of which, as explains U.S. Secretary of State Powell, is to eliminate the conditions in which terrorism is bred and lies dormant before erupting violently.

In waging this war of ideas, we will be equally resolute in maintaining our commitment to our ultimate objective. The defeat of terror is a worthy and necessary goal in its own right. But ridding the world of terrorism is essential to a broader purpose. We strive to build an

---

<sup>74</sup> U.S. State Department ‘Message from the ECA’, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA), <http://www.state.gov> – accessed september 2001.

<sup>75</sup> Joseph S. Nye Jr, (2002), *op. cit.*

<sup>76</sup> “Committee Expected to Report Legislation”, *op. cit.*

<sup>77</sup> John Leyne, US State Department correspondent, “US gets the cold shoulder”, BBCWorld Tuesday, 31 December, 2002, 15:07 GMT.

<sup>78</sup> Ambassador Francis X. Taylor, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, “The Global War Against Terrorism: The Way Ahead”, Address to the Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University Washington, DC, October 23, 2002, available @ <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/rm/14570.htm>.

<sup>79</sup> U.S. White House, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, Chapter IX. Transform America's National Security Institutions to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities of the Twenty-First Century available @ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>.

international order where more countries and peoples are integrated into a world consistent with the interests and values we share with our partners -values such as human dignity, rule of law, respect for individual liberties, open and free economies, and religious tolerance. We understand that a world in which these values are embraced as standards, not exceptions, will be the best antidote to the spread of terrorism. This is the world we must build today<sup>80</sup>.

As emphasised by Charlotte Beers, this is a war about a way of life, a vision of the world and the set of beliefs, values and norms that sustain it<sup>81</sup>. It is a war that America did not expect to ever have to fight again after the defeat of communist ideology but a war that has become essential for the preservation of its global interests.

However, one would be wrong to conclude that mass diplomacy is the monopoly of Western powers. As Noble and Leonard remind us, they are not alone in harnessing the power of public opinion and technology to promote their interests.

So will their adversaries. Terrorist and criminal organisations, extremists and rival powers are also increasingly becoming sophisticated in using technology to get their message across and recruit followers. This means in the future, conflict prevention will become a main driver of public diplomacy, since governments will have to play extremists at their own game and counter their messages using the same tools<sup>82</sup>.

It must be recalled that this competition for cultural leadership and global mind space need not take the form of a ‘clash of civilisations’. Mind space is open to all. Spheres of influence can be superimposed without automatically generating armed conflicts. Without reducing its strategic significance, this is what makes ideological and cultural action so very attractive to so many governments.

#### b. Spearheading Economic Interests

As observed by Italy’s former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lamberto Dini, the time when states could pursue their economic interests through economic means alone is now over:

---

<sup>80</sup> U.S. State Department, *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*, released by the U.S. Department of State's Office of International Information Programs (IIP), available @ [usinfo.state.gov](http://usinfo.state.gov) – accessed February 2003.

<sup>81</sup> U.S. Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Charlotte Beers, “Statement at Hearing: Public Diplomacy”, U.S. Department of State, House International Relations Committee, released by the Bureau of Public Affairs, Washington, DC, October 10, 2001.

“Culture and economics, sentiments and signs, practices and values can no longer be dissociated”<sup>83</sup>. In the age of interdependence and global communications, cultural values suddenly acquire a primordial importance for international trade and financial flows<sup>84</sup>. In this new environment, a growing number of states adhere to mass diplomacy to increase their influence and competitiveness in the world economy. The reason is it permits the alteration of domestic conditions within partner countries.

Firstly, states rely on mass diplomacy to shape favourable macroeconomic structures by influencing political and economic leaders into adopting norms and practices that they view as preferable for their own economy and for the world economy in general. The assumption is that information and cultural exchanges forge close cultural links with economic leaders on the private level which in turn foster economic co-operation between governments<sup>85</sup>. U.S. State Department’s strategists are convinced that public diplomacy can achieve a wide array of goals in this regards. Information programs targeting economic and political leaders help persuading governments to adopt or maintain market-oriented macroeconomic, trade, investment, exchange rate, legal, and regulatory policies designed to support economic growth. When combined with long-term cultural and educational programs, they favourably predispose future leaders to support global efforts to strengthen the international financial system and to adopt domestic policies, such as appropriate exchange rates and improved banking regulations, consistent with these improvements<sup>86</sup>. Another claim is that they encourage broad-based reforms, critical for clearing the path for effective economic partnerships, particularly with developing and transitional economies. They are designed to promote the transition from state protectionism to market-based economies, good governance, accountable leadership, fiscal responsibility, and financial market development<sup>87</sup>. Their role is to

---

<sup>82</sup> Liz Noble and Mark Leonard, *op. cit.*

<sup>83</sup> H.E.Lamberto Dini, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, Address to the Conference "Culture Counts: the Financing, Resources and the Economics of Culture in Sustainable development", Florence, 4 October 1999, released by the Italian Foreign Ministry, available @ [http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch\\_press/index.htm](http://www.esteri.it/eng/archives/arch_press/index.htm).

<sup>84</sup> Constantin Von Barloeven, *op. cit.*, pp. 22 et 23.

<sup>85</sup> Germany – GMOFA, *op. cit.*

<sup>86</sup> U.S. State Department, U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000), *op. cit.*

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

persuade foreign decision-makers to observe the rule of law (civil and economic codes) as well as a certain number of preferred norms and practices<sup>88</sup>. The purpose of cultural and education efforts is also to foster domestic growth and stability in stimulating transformation to more socially stable, free market-oriented regimes.

Secondly, mass diplomacy information and cultural programs are believed to serve a national economy on the world stage by stabilising world populations, by educating and informing them and by promoting a culture of mass consumption. Like many others, U.S. foreign policy clearly integrates humanitarian issues and world population regulation into a comprehensive economic strategy in which educational and cultural initiatives play a key role:

Achieving healthy and sustainable world population growth is vital to US interests. Economic and social progress in other countries can be undermined by rapid population growth, which overburdens the quality and availability of public services, limits employment opportunities, and contributes to environmental degradation. Not only will early stabilisation of the world's population at sustainable levels promote environmentally sound economic development in other countries, it will also benefit the US by improving trade opportunities and mitigating future global crises<sup>89</sup>.

Population stabilisation policies incorporate information, educational and cultural programs, such as family planning and other reproductive health programs, targeting women and adolescents in emerging countries. At the same time, cultural diplomacy complements efforts to prevent humanitarian crises (disease, starvation, and conflicts) by providing necessary education to remedy them or early warning to mitigate their consequences<sup>90</sup>. Mass diplomacy and more specifically human rights and democracy diplomacy have the capacity to stabilise partner countries and to turn them into “good investment environments”<sup>91</sup>. Finally, mass diplomacy can contribute to the emergence of vibrant mass consumption societies by enhancing communication with business sectors

---

<sup>88</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, “Economic Growth and Free market Reform”, *op. cit.*

<sup>89</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>91</sup> Lorne W. Craner, Assistant Secretary of State US State Department, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Human Rights Reports 2001, DHRL; see also Interview with German State Secretary Dr Pleuger in *Deutschland*, April 2000.

and foreign populations, by increasing social awareness, by providing access to new sources of information and education and by attenuating socio-economic disparities<sup>92</sup>.

Thirdly, mass diplomacy significantly contributes to foreign trade policy by opening foreign markets and stimulating exports. It occupies a central place in the U.S. trade liberalisation strategy by promoting core liberal standards, increasing trade and freeing the flow of U.S. goods, service and capital<sup>93</sup>. For American foreign policy makers there is little doubt that cultural and information efforts are central to building popular support for further trade liberalisation through domestic outreach efforts in the domains of information and culture. The State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) prides itself on fostering America's economic prosperity by expanding world trade and by enlarging the area of vibrant open-market economies<sup>94</sup>. Mass diplomacy supports trade policy by contributing to export promotion efforts. For example, Washington relies among other things on the capacity of its cultural and information diplomacy to reach and engage consumers overseas in order to expand U.S. exports from \$930 billion to \$1.2 trillion by early in the twenty-first century<sup>95</sup>. Canadians also believe that the projection of their values and culture combined with their expertise in the domain of mass media technologies is essential to their economic success. According to recent analysis, Canada's strategy in this domain rests on a niche diplomacy, which prioritises the 'economic pillars' of comparative advantage, efficiency, and maximum impact in the national interest rather than broader popular targets<sup>96</sup>. For Italians, "the promotion of culture abroad does not only mean mobilising Italy's ingenuity and credibility abroad but more specifically, preparing the ground for greater economic and commercial penetration of products and companies"<sup>97</sup>. For Germans too, informing and educating foreign audiences is an increasingly important element of their

---

<sup>92</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State's Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> U.S. State Department, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, "Economic Growth and Free market Reform", *op. cit.*

<sup>95</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State's Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

<sup>96</sup> Heather Smith, "Niche Diplomacy in Canadian Human Rights Policy: Ethics or Economics?", in Rosalind Irwin dir., *Ethics and Security in Canadian Foreign Policy*, Vancouver, UBC Press, 2001.

<sup>97</sup> "Culture must increasingly become Italy's ambassador", *Il Tempo*, 26 February 2002.

trade strategy<sup>98</sup>. For instance, Joshka Fisher admits that German schools abroad not only communicate German culture and language but also serve as “base camps for Germany's export industry” by engaging future leaders emotionally<sup>99</sup>.

### c. Strengthening Political Influence

Among the vital interests that mass-diplomacy can serve, one of the most important is the increase of ideological influence through the export of one's political culture and institutions. Athenians, the Fathers of the U.S. Constitutions, French Revolutionaries, Bolsheviks and Islamists have all considered the export of their political regime as a crucial foreign policy goal. The reasoning is quite simple: if populations share values and political culture they will be more likely to have friendly relationships based on trust. A perfect illustration is offered by the projection of the democratic regime by democracies. This example also illustrates the central role that mass diplomacy can play in spreading a political system internationally.

- The propagation of the democratic regime constitutes a leading political and strategic goal. Immanuel Kant was one of the first thinkers to envisage the spread of the republicanism as source of legitimacy, concord among nations, stability and international prosperity. More recently, the Democratic Peace School led by Michael Doyle has admirably systematised this line of thought: like-minded democracies develop quasi-fraternal relations and form an almost absolute sphere of peace. It is therefore the prime interest of democratic powers to co-opt other nations into the democratic club. Lucid in this regard, Kant had affirmed that ‘moral politics’ designed to spread republicanism is a matter of interest as much as authentic idealism and altruism. He had also specified that it requires politicians and governments to be ‘*innocent as a dove*’ but also ‘*wise as a serpent*’<sup>100</sup>.
- As democracy cannot be imposed through brute force, mass diplomacy combines cunning and innocence to further its spread. Michael Doyle stressed out that the success of a plan

---

<sup>98</sup> Germany - GMOFA, *op. cit.*

<sup>99</sup> Germany - Joschka Fischer, *op. cit.*

<sup>100</sup> Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, Translated, with Introduction by Ted Humphrey, Indianapolis, Hackett, 1983, p. 370-72.

designated to expand the democratic zone of peace rests on the capacity of democratic powers to shape a normative environment that impregnated non-democratic societies with their socio-political values and standards and fosters political reforms. Among the concrete measures designed to spread “democratic tastes across borders” and instigate democratic norms, Doyle prescribes an “active democratic right diplomacy”, incorporating information programs, educational exchanges, tourism and scientific meetings<sup>101</sup>. In many regards, mass diplomacy is therefore the instrument which, in the twenty-first century, should allow the reconciliation of idealism with traditional realpolitik.

A growing number of governments rely on public diplomacy to export their political system together with their specific values, norms and practices as a way of expanding their authority in the international arena.

- A crucial task given to the U.S. mass diplomacy is to integrate other nations and governments into a democratic network consistent with U.S. values and norms<sup>102</sup>. As stipulated by the State Department Strategic Plan, by supporting liberal democracy, public diplomacy “not only promotes fundamental American values,” but also helps create a more secure and prosperous world in which the United States can advance its national interests<sup>103</sup>. The chairman of the House International Relations puts it rather clearly: “in addition to genuine altruism, our promotion of freedom can have another purpose, namely as an element in the United States’ geopolitical strategy”<sup>104</sup>. The ECA Bureau confirms that a stable community of democratic nations respectful of U.S. values serves all of America’s strategic interests; from enhancing security to promoting economic prosperity.

---

<sup>101</sup> Michael W. Doyle, “A Liberal View: Preserving and Expanding the Liberal Pacific Union”, in John A. Hall and T.V. Paul, eds., *International Order and the Future of World Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 45-53.

<sup>102</sup> Richard N. Haass, Director of the US Office of the Policy Planning Staff. Remarks to Carnegie Endowment for International Peace/Center on International Cooperation Conference. Washington, DC. November 14, 2001

<sup>103</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State’s Strategic Plan (2000)*, op. cit.

<sup>104</sup> U.S. Rep. Henry J. Hyde (R- IL), chairman of the House International Relations Committee, “Speaking to Our Silent Allies, The Role of Public Diplomacy in U.S. Foreign Policy”, address delivered to the Council on Foreign Relations, 17 June 2002.



- The strategic targets of a campaign designed to further the spread of democracy are of course foreign populations. American officials estimate in this regard that their democratic crusade will be more likely to succeed by targeting the masses, those that Henry J. Hyde calls “America’s silent allies”<sup>105</sup>. U.S. ‘democratic rights diplomacy’ supports the transition process of non-liberal countries by communicating directly with populations and by impregnating them with American liberal ideology. The State Department takes advantage of a vast array of international forums, cultural exchanges and information programs to promote the emergence, from the bottom up, of robust civil societies. It also promotes the development, from the top down, of democratic political systems respecting human rights, the rule of law, liberal constitutionalism, freedom of opinion, the independence of media and the free flow of ideas<sup>106</sup>. U.S. mass diplomacy also takes advantage of the United States’ superior information assets and the increasing access of foreign audiences to global media to undermine illiberal propaganda but also to diffuse on a massive level its own ideological campaign<sup>107</sup>.
- Other democratic states count on such “democracy diplomacy” to expand their moral influence and serve their geopolitical goals. Japan, like many of its partners is convinced that the preservation of its interests lies in a policy aimed at expanding the community of democracies. The Italian Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi reminds us though that “[i]n the modern world, democracy cannot spread with the use of weapons, except under exceptional circumstances”<sup>108</sup>. There is little doubt that it can only move forward when driven by a complex initiative including economic means but also, to large extent, the use of culture, information and communication to educate populations in emerging democracies.

Although democracy is a universal idea and although democratic states generally join forces in this domain, each of them tends to promote a version of this idea that is

---

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>106</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State’s Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*; see also White House, *op. cit.*

<sup>107</sup> Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and William A. Owens, *op. cit.*

<sup>108</sup> Silvio Berlusconi, Italia’s Prime Minister and Acting Foreign Minister, Speech to the Chamber of Deputies, 25 September 2002, available @ <http://www.esteri.it/eng/foreignpol/index.htm>.

saturated by its own social values. Thus they not only stress their distinctiveness, but also serve their own interests. In other words, each of them attempts to champion democracy by giving to it a national cultural character. They do so by strategically linking the promotion of democracy with key cultural messages about themselves. U.S. leaders recognise that “democracy will continue to advance internationally, but democratic practices will vary among states and will be subject to countervailing influences and interests”<sup>109</sup>. In other words, democracy is both a universal concept and an ideological tool that states try to appropriate in order to spread their influence. Washington brands America’s image of liberal democracy as the universal model in an attempt to remain a major authority on the multilateral scene. Paris emphasises the distinction between the U.S. model and the French model of social democracy, in a bid to play a stronger role as a moral alternative in international society<sup>110</sup>. These differences are reflected in the design of mass diplomacy. Ottawa puts forth the multicultural and federal quality of the Canadian political system through a “liberal internationalist” public diplomacy<sup>111</sup>. Teheran and Ankara vie for the leadership of Central Asia by insisting on the distinct formulation of their democratic model. On the one hand, Turkey offers the appeal of a democracy inspired by the pro-western kemalist model, and on the other hand, Iran provides a democracy inclined towards Islam and theocracy<sup>112</sup>.

## **Conclusion**

Increasingly, political leaders and foreign policy-makers from around the globe have come to consider mass diplomacy as a necessary, pertinent, affordable and rewarding strategy for the twenty first century. It has become evident to them that culture, information and communication are essential tools for acquiring better international status and for maximising national interests.

---

<sup>109</sup> U.S. State Department, *U.S. Department of State’s Strategic Plan (2000)*, *op. cit.*

<sup>110</sup> France - Dominique de Villepin, *op. cit.*

<sup>111</sup> Evan H. Potter, *op. cit.*

<sup>112</sup> Iran - Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic republic of Iran, Statement by Foreign Affairs Minister at a conference on Eurasia, released by MOFAIRI September 16, 2002, available @ <http://www.mfa.gov.ir/News/Index.htm>.

- They view it first as a relevant approach fully equipped to deal with both the downside of global interdependence and the new opportunities it presents. They are aware that deep and lasting changes to the global landscape, such as new technologies and increasing democratisation, have made it not only feasible but also increasingly essential to the success of states in the international arena. It appears to them a relatively simple approach for a complex age. Mindful that the lines between economic, security and cultural policies are blurred, they are increasingly seduced by this new diplomacy that allows them to deal with different diplomatic goals simultaneously and, at the same time, to contribute to each of them distinctly and significantly.
- Mass diplomacy also suggests itself as a clever means to attain one's new international ambitions while involving a minimum of risk for national security. Mass diplomacy has the reputation of being able to combine daring and caution as it permits the exploitation of new opportunities and the promotion of national interests without irritating other countries. Indeed mass diplomacy often by generates friendly and harmonious relationships. In many regards, it is considered to be one of the less threatening ways to engage foreign audiences, build strong relationships and long-lasting alliances.
- Mass diplomacy also benefits from the fact that it is perceived as a cheap way to frame the international debate and to play a key role in world politics. In an age where the use of military force is increasingly costly (and inefficient), it constitutes an ideal palliative, exercising a growing appeal on governments. Relatively small investments in mass diplomacy hold the potential of creating the conditions for stability and economic growth while decreasing the possibility of future problems that might prove more costly to resolve later. This “diplomacy of the poor” has the potential to even out international interactions by allowing smaller players to compensate for their lack of hard power.

With each passing moment, mass diplomacy appears more indispensable to the conduct of foreign policy. By having the capacity of accomplishing significant goals in the medium and long terms, it tends to acquire a central position in the toolbox of diplomacy. Many decision makers see it as the tool *par excellence* for the conquest of hearts and souls on which more and more states depend for achieving their goals. In so doing, they increasingly swap the ‘spirit of conquest’ for the ‘conquest of the spirit’.