

Hasan Saliu\*

# Public Diplomacy and Related Concepts from the Perspective of Lasswell's Communication Model

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to explore the differences between public diplomacy and similar concepts that relate to the country's international image. Concepts such as public diplomacy, traditional diplomacy, foreign policy, international public relations, propaganda, national branding, etc., are often seen as synonymous. A mere observation of these concepts is provided in the literature review. These concepts are elaborated based on the communication actors' perspective, the inter-communicating parties, the message providers, the message recipients, and the mode of communication, whereas identifying the differences and distinctions between them is realized according to the Lasswell communication formula. The conclusions show that this communication approach provides more potential to identify the differences between these concepts as compared to the current approaches, which view them from an interdisciplinary perspective.

**Keywords:** public diplomacy, traditional diplomacy, propaganda, international public relations, Lasswell.

## 1. Introduction

Concepts such as public diplomacy, soft power, national branding, international public relations, etc. have found widespread support in recent decades. Common to these notions is that states aim to increase their international image in order to gain substantial benefits. Moreover, today in the age of media realities, networked societies, and widespread visibility, the need for conveying a positive image to the

---

\* *Correspondence Address:* Hasan Saliu, AAB University, Faculty of Mass Communication, Rr. Elez Berisha 56, Zona Industriale Fushë Kosovë, 10000 Pristina, Republic of Kosovo. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5864-3645>. E-mail: [saliu@aab-edu.net](mailto:saliu@aab-edu.net).

outside world is sought<sup>1</sup>. These benefits are primarily of an economic and political nature, however, areas in tourism, exports, investments, the consumption of cultural products, greater opportunities for alliances, political support, etc. may also benefit<sup>2</sup>. These notions are often used interchangeably not just by executives of image enhancement campaigns but also in current debates present among scholars<sup>3</sup>.

Confusion also occurs with traditional concepts, such as propaganda, or what is often put forth as the issue of whether public diplomacy is a synonym for international public relations<sup>4</sup>. In order to demonstrate transparency in foreign policy, traditional diplomacy often speaks of public diplomacy; there are small states that claim their branding without having to export and, there is confusion among scholars when it comes to the concept of public diplomacy and soft power. “Despite the growing body of scholarship on public diplomacy, there is still much confusion about what the term actually means and how it differs from international public relations.”<sup>5</sup>

Distortions often occur between the soft power concept and public diplomacy. Soft power presents ways on how to influence by interacting and communicating and sharing the values and preferences with the foreign public in order to be attractive to foreigners<sup>6</sup>. It is up to the public diplomacy of any entity to determine what specific activities should be undertaken to increase the country’s attractiveness. Public diplomacy is presented as an action or instrument, whereas soft power can be represented as value. More open debates remain for a country’s values, which should be distinguished to influence foreign public rather than the perplexity between public diplomacy and soft power.<sup>7</sup>

1 Castells, Manuel. (2009), *Communication Power*, New York; Oxford University Press.; Couldry, Nick and Hepp, Aandres. (2016), *The Mediated Construction of Reality*, Cambridge, UK; Polity; Wolton, Dominique. (2009), *Informateur n'est pas communiquer*, Paris; CNRS Editions.

2 Cull, Nicholas. (2008), *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*, Cambridge University Press.; Melissen, Jan eds., (2005), *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.; Tuch, Hans. (1990), *Communicating with the world: U.S. public diplomacy overseas*, Washington, D.C.; Georgetown University.

3 Gilboa, Eytan. (2008), Searching for a theory of public diplomacy, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 55–77. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207312142

4 Golan, Guy and Yang, Sungun. (2015), Introduction: The Integrated Public Diplomacy Perspective, in: Guy J. Golan, Sungun Yang, Dennis F. Kinsey eds., *International Public Relations and Public Diplomacy - Communication and Engagement*, New York: Peter Lang.

Kunczik, Michael. (1997), *Images of Nations and International Public Relations*, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates-Publishers Mahwah.

5 Golan, Guy and Yang, Sungun. (2015), 1.

6 Nye, Joseph. Jr. (2004), *Soft Power – The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York, Public Affairs.

7 This article will not address the relationship between public diplomacy and soft power, as it requires special attention.

The other intricacy is that public diplomacy is not often seen as part of communication, but as part of international relations, and sometimes as traditional diplomacy. This paper will focus on identifying differences rather than common features of these concepts, based on the Lasswell Communication Act<sup>8</sup>: Who → Says What → Through Which Channel → To Whom → With What Effect?

Scholars who study the “who,” the communicator, look into the factors that initiate and guide the act of communication. We call this subdivision of the field of research control analysis. Specialists who focus upon the “says what” engage in content analysis. Those who look primarily at the radio, press, film, and other channels of communication are doing media analysis. When the principal concern is with the persons reached by the media, we speak of audience analysis. If the question is the impact upon audiences, the problem is effect analysis.<sup>9</sup>

The Lasswell Communication Model has had a major impact on communication research. According to McQuail, as one of the most influential scholars in the field of communication research theories, Lasswell introduced “perhaps the most famous single phrase in communication research. This simple formula has been used in several ways, mostly to organize and to give structure to discussions about communication”.<sup>10</sup>

But first, let us look at the meaning of public diplomacy and the undertaken measures to enhance a country's image.

## 2. New definitions of public diplomacy

There are many definitions of public diplomacy, and these conceptual debates are discussed in this paper. I gave a definition of public diplomacy, explicating it as the communication means of state and non-state actors of a country with foreign publics with the purpose of informing and influencing them in order to reach expected benefits. Similar definitions are given by the most cited authors of public diplomacy, such as Melissen<sup>11</sup>, Gilboa<sup>12</sup>, Cull<sup>13</sup>, etc. Pamment points out that new public diplomacy has changed over time, and in recent years scholars have recognized a major paradigm shift in the field of international political communication from

---

8 Lasswell, Harold. (1948), *The Structure and Function of Communications in Society*, in: Bryson Lyman, *The Communication of Ideas*, New York; Harper and Brothers.

9 Ibid, 84-85.

10 McQuail, Denis and Windahl, Sven (1993), *Communication models for the study of mass communications* (2nd ed.), New York; Routledge, 13.

11 Melissen, J. (2005).

12 Gilboa, E. (2008).

13 Cull, Nicholas. (2012), *The Decline and Fall of the United States Information Agency: American Public Diplomacy, 1989-2001*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

the old public diplomacy of the 20th century as a state-centric activity, characterized by a one-way flow of information in which actors control the messages by making instrumentalist use of channels and allow only limited interactions between the sending and the receiving side, to the new, two-way diplomacy of the 21st century, which underscores greater exchange and collaboration as well as dialogue, cooperation and inclusiveness<sup>14</sup>.

Today, we understand public diplomacy as an instrument used by states, associations of states, and some sub-state and non-state actors to understand cultures, attitudes and behavior; build and manage relationships; influence thoughts and mobilize actions to advance their interests and values<sup>15</sup>. This metaphorical definition speaks of the democratization of public diplomacy nowadays; therefore, it is not only a technical foreign policy instrument<sup>16</sup>. Today, international communication is realized by representatives of foreign services, but also by representatives of other ministries, multinational corporations, civil society organizations, and even influential individuals who do not represent a particular state, organization, or corporation<sup>17</sup>. International communication is moving fast into cyber-space, while diplomatic messages have become public and interactive even through Twitter. Public diplomacy has already been digitized<sup>18</sup>, and at the same time, it has become even more complex. Extensive use of technology and social media leads towards the construction of a cyber-international society<sup>19</sup>. Listening has emerged as a core activity in many public diplomacy strategies, especially after introducing social media in public diplomacy<sup>20</sup>. The proliferation of communication actors and multiple platforms has added fake news and misinformation. It has become more difficult for governments to influence online untruths through information. “The rise of communication technology in

14 Pamment, Jammes. (2013), *New public diplomacy in the 21st century: A comparative study of policy and practice*, London-New York; Routledge, 3.

15 Gregory, Bruce (2011), American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 6. Issue 3-4, 353.

16 Melissen, Jan (2011), *Boynd the New Public Diplomacy*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael’.

17 Bjola, Corneliu and Kornprobst, Markus. (2018), *Understanding International Diplomacy - Theory, Practice and Ethics* (2 Ed.), New York; Routledge, 4.

18 Manor, Ilan (2019), The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy, Switzerland; Palgrave Macmillan.; Bjola, Corneliu; Cassidy, Jennifer and Manor, Ilan (2019) Public Diplomacy in the Digital Age, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 14 (83-101) doi:10.1163/1871191X-14011032

19 Barrinha, André and Renard, Thomas. (2017), Cyber-diplomacy: the making of an international society in the digital age, *Global Affairs*, 3:4-5, 353-364, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2017.1414924>

20 Luigi Di Martino (2019), Conceptualising public diplomacy listening on social media, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-019-00135-5>

public diplomacy is neither value neutral nor value positive to traditional public diplomacy.”<sup>21</sup>

However, before looking at the differences of the related concepts, it should be noted that public diplomacy focuses on three dimensions, activities, which it undertakes to enhance the country's image and reputation. Conversely, these dimensions ensure a broad consensus of the majority of public diplomacy researchers<sup>22</sup>:

1. Information management, which is an activity that covers hours and days, where the media is used as a communication channel to convey positive information about the country to foreign audiences;
2. Strategic communication, which means sending messages to foreigners focusing on weekly and monthly activities;
3. Establishing long-term relationships, which requires years of activities to achieve mutual understanding and cooperation, includes cultural diplomacy, exchanges, and scholarships, the impact of a diaspora of a country in the host country, etc.

### **3. The difference between Foreign Policy and Public Diplomacy**

Public diplomacy is often equalized with foreign policy, and when no distinction is drawn between public diplomacy and what is known as traditional diplomacy, then the actors of communication are confused even though the goals of the two might be the same. Many scholars and practitioners have entangled public diplomacy with propaganda, public relations, international public relations, and psychological warfare<sup>23</sup>. After September 11, 2001, many governments, public agencies, and organizations have published a number of reports, most rephrasing challenges, ideas, and principles. However, these reports have not contributed in any significant way to advance the theory and methods of public diplomacy<sup>24</sup>, and even less so when it comes to distinguishing foreign policy from public diplomacy. Melissen<sup>25</sup> advises that care should be taken not to create a very close relationship between foreign policy and public diplomacy, as this may harm a country's credibility when

---

21 Snow, Nancy. (2020), Rethinking Public Diplomacy in the 2020s, in: Snow, Nancy and Cull, Nicholas J. eds., *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, New York; Routledge, 2020, 8.

22 Leonard, Mark. (2002), *Public Diplomacy*, London; The Foreign Policy Centre.;

Nye, Joseph, Jr. (2008), Public Diplomacy and Soft Power, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*; 616; 94.; Melissen, J. (2005); Gilboa, E. (2008).

23 Gilboa, E. (2008), 56.

24 Ibid.

25 Melissen, J. (2005).

communicating with foreign audiences. In particular, if such a close relationship is forged, then there is a risk that public diplomacy will not be productive and successful because foreign policy is often interlinked with close interests that cannot always be shared with external opinions<sup>26</sup>. Nye<sup>27</sup>, for instance, explains the mistake of the Bush Administration and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, who did not rely strongly enough on the influence of public diplomacy, when he claimed that “after the war victory, peace be gained” at a faster pace in Iraq and Afghanistan<sup>28</sup>. Foreign policy may also use the hard power or the policy of coercion or payment installments, while public diplomacy intends to communicate with the foreign public by seeking values, ideals, and shared co-operation preferences.

Public diplomacy should not be developed independently from a country’s foreign policy and its public diplomacy by state actors; it should be tuned in with foreign policy in order to achieve long-term aims. For example, in situations where traditional diplomacy cannot gain results in certain societies where relationships become strained as a result of cultural divisions, public diplomacy may create spanning bridges between different cultures, bringing them closer together<sup>29</sup>. Such bridges can be created in either authoritarian or democratic countries when a nation’s population has little faith in their government representatives. Likewise, in cases where a country’s population has confidence in its government, a foreign country’s foreign diplomacy cannot be productive as long as relations are not regulated through traditional diplomacy<sup>30</sup>.

#### **4. Public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy**

Public and traditional diplomacy contain both similarities and differences. The similarities revolve around their common goals. Both require the realization of foreign policy and the protection of the political and economic interests of the state. Another similarity concerns the communication channel. Although traditional diplomacy mainly uses diplomatic channels, which are less public open compared to public diplomacy, both traditional and public diplomacy use the media to send messages to the foreign public. According to Melissen, some authors say that public

26 Ibid.

27 Nye, J. Jr. (2004).

28 Ibid., ix-x.

29 Melissen, J. (2005), 15.

30 Ibid., 15.

diplomacy is both - public and diplomatic - in their use of media; and that through media they both aim the art of influence on foreign opinions<sup>31</sup>.

However, public diplomacy differs from traditional diplomacy, first of all, by communicating parties - the players, the way of communication, the fields of their communication, and the effects of this communication. In regard to the *communicating parties*, traditional diplomacy represents the communication of one government with another government, but to a higher level, or “diplomacy is concerned with the management of relations between states and between states and other actors”<sup>32</sup>. “Diplomacy is an important means by which states pursue their foreign policies, and in many states, these are still shaped in significant degree in a ministry of foreign affairs”.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, in traditional diplomacy, communication takes place between high levels of states, between one government and another; communication between the President or the Prime Minister and his/her counterpart; communication between ambassadors and other state actors.

On the other hand, public diplomacy involves communication with citizens of another country. State and non-state actors of a country communicate with citizens of other polities, either directly or through media channels. Foreign messages are provided by state and non-state actors in a country. In other words, public diplomacy goes beyond the relationships between governments and their contacts, communicates with non-governmental factors, individuals, groups, organizations, associations, private institutions, etc. According to Melissen, the main difference is that traditional diplomacy deals with relations between state actors and other international actors, whereas public diplomacy addresses the general public of foreign communities as well as more specific informal groups, organizations, and individuals.

Another, second, difference between the *communicating parties* is that public diplomacy includes a wide array of people on both sides, wider groups of interests that go beyond the government’s daily interests<sup>34</sup>. Traditional diplomacy is limited to the relationships of high state officials of two or more countries. Differently, public diplomacy seeks the continuation of foreign policy by other means such as educational and cultural programs, but also through new mass communication technologies, including other foreign partners, such as non-governmental organizations, private enterprises, or foreign institutions, which cover a great number of a large number of inter-communicative actors.

---

31 Ibid., 5.

32 Barston, R.P. (2013), *Modern Diplomacy* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), London & New York; Routledge, 1.

33 Berridge, G. R. (2015), *Diplomacy Theory and Practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), New York; Palgrave Macmillan, 3.

34 Leonard, M. (2002), 8-9.

Thirdly, as regards to *communication issues*, in traditional diplomacy, embassies cover the relationship between two governments entirely while public diplomacy aims at the relations between the societies of the two states. Public diplomacy is not a new paradigm that opposes traditional diplomacy or replaces discreet or trustworthy relationships between the given representatives of different states. Rather, as this paper elucidates, public diplomacy has to do with the social and cultural interaction between societies of different countries, that is, with an intercultural communication that is not managed by the state.

Concerning the distinctions in the *ways of communication*, compared to traditional diplomacy, public diplomacy employs a much more open and encompassing communication policy: In this respect, mass communication, often with a global reach, is seen as an important tool in achieving the goals of public diplomacy. Traditional diplomacy, in contrast, aims to strengthen contacts between governments, often through secret diplomacy. In today's world of globalization and a networked society<sup>35</sup> characterized by communication technology and public diplomacy, the public diplomat occupies a greatly different function from the common or traditional diplomat. Namely, the public diplomat acts with a culture different from that of the traditional diplomat; he/she introduces politics to a broad heterogeneous audience by engaging in practice with colleges and/or rural areas; he/she participates in various literary activities, seminars, exchange programs, institutional visits, businesses, press, websites, etc.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, another recent distinction between public and traditional diplomacy concerns their respective impact. Traditional diplomacy has an immediate effect on communication with foreign states, societies, or actors, whereas public diplomacy acknowledges a degree of delay.

## 5. Differences between public diplomacy and international public relations

Some scholars do not distinguish clearly between public diplomacy and public relations<sup>37</sup>, nor between public relations and international public relations<sup>38</sup>. Examples are Signitzer and Wasmer, who see public diplomacy as a public governmental

35 Castells, M. (2009).

36 Canning, Mike. (2008), The Overseas Post: The Forgotten Element of Our Public Diplomacy, *The Public Diplomacy Council*, December 1, Retrieved from <http://media.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp0183e4.html> (accessed: 16 February 2020).

37 Golan, G. & Yang, S. (2015); Gilboa, E. (2008).

38 Kunczick, M. (1997).

relationship<sup>39</sup>. Public relations represent actions and means to negotiate and change relations between organizations and the public<sup>40</sup>. They represent *the art of influencing*, consisting of gradual designation, realization, and strengthening of one's personal agenda<sup>41</sup>. Kunczick makes a distinction between *public relations* and *international public relations* only because the former addresses the internal public and the latter, the external public<sup>42</sup>. Essentially, however, he regards them as the same matter. Public relations between the nations are the most difficult variety of their activities<sup>43</sup>. He conceives of *public relations and international public relations* within the same range of activities that differ only in terms of the recipient of the message: The former addresses the internal public whereas the latter addresses the external public, while simultaneously considering public relations and propaganda the same activities. This is particularly clear when he states that, "...I treat propaganda and public relations as synonyms"<sup>44</sup>. Yet, public relations are not designed to change people's perception of an issue, which is often the case with propaganda<sup>45</sup>.

Other authors say that the distinctions between public (internal) relations and international public relations are often not discernible because the internal message crosses geopolitical boundaries. Public relations can integrate a multicultural and global perspective in order to be effective. Consequently, it cannot be considered only as part of international public relations<sup>46</sup>. This way, scholars and practitioners increasingly argue for directing *international public relations* towards intercultural communication and cultural studies<sup>47</sup>. According to Nye, "nor is public diplomacy merely public relations"<sup>48</sup>.

Based on our approach, the distinction between public diplomacy and public or international relations is unambiguous. The differences include (1) actors of communication, (2) communication channels, (3) content, (4) the time effect, and

39 Signitzer, Benno and Wasmer, Carola. (2006), Public diplomacy: A specific government public relations function, in: Botan, Carsl, H. & Hazelton, Vinsent (Eds), *Public Relations Theory II*. Mahwah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006, 435–464.

40 Taylor, Maureen (2000), Toward a Public Relations Approach to Nation Building, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(2), doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1202\_3

41 Marconi, Joe. (2004), *Public Relations, The Complete Guide*. Mason, Ohio; South-Western/Thomson.

42 Kunczick, M. (1997).

43 Ibid., 2.

44 Ibid., 13.

45 Marconi, J. (2004).

46 Sriramesh, Krishnamurthy and Vercic, Dejan. (2009), *The Global Public Relations Handbook - Theory, Research, and Practice*, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 25.

47 Curtin, Patricia A. & Gaither, Kenn, T. (2007), *International Public Relations – Negotiating Culture, Identity and Power*, UK; Sage Publications, 2.

48 Nye, J. Jr. (2004), 107.

(5) the form of communication. First, with regard to the actors of communication, in public relations, communication specialists are those who reach the public through the delivery of a message; an actor/player and/or politician communicates to the audience as advised by communication specialists. Whereas, in public diplomacy, many actors not advised by communication experts communicate with foreigners, whether it be students, researchers, actors, visitors, tourists, or the diaspora.

Secondly, the difference concerning the communication channels is that public relations specialists employ the media to communicate with the public, or they alternately use direct contact with the public, which is realized by the person under the specialists' attentiveness. In public diplomacy, cinematography, film, book, theater, etc., are used as a communication channel, but they can rarely be used in public relations.

Thirdly, in terms of content, public relations are activities of communication specialists who convey an attractive message to the public, adjust the message, refine a message, or even have the means to negotiate and change the relationships between organizations and the public<sup>49</sup>. Public diplomacy goes beyond the word code or symbol and relates to the action, such as meetings, student exchanges, academic exchanges, sponsorships of various activities, funding of projects in host countries, etc.

Another difference is that of (4) the time effect. Public relations deal with the correction or daily management of the message and the presentation of an actor or activity, amongst others. Public diplomacy does not consist of only this dimension but includes a wider scope; and therefore rests on the commitment to establish long-term trust among different actors through scholarships, student exchanges, scholars, etc. Such a dimension requires engagement over the years and renders results over a relatively long time span. Public relations show mainly immediate and medium-term effects.

As our fifth and final point of difference, public relations direct one-way information to the public while public diplomacy uses dialogue and is therefore inherently a two-way direction. Public relations only provide the message and inform, while public diplomacy communicates and sets the message's turnaround. In other words, the message to the foreign public is often uncontrolled and not influenced by public relations specialists. A particularly relevant example in this respect can be taken from the area of tourism: When people from foreign countries visit a place, they carry with them the impressions and versions of how a particular country or culture

---

<sup>49</sup> Taylor, M. (2000).

is experienced, and in turn, communicate such experiences to their environment, playing thus part in shaping the foreign image of that territory from the bottom up.

## 6. The distinction of public diplomacy from the national brand

Similarities and differences between public diplomacy and national branding have also been addressed by some scholars<sup>50</sup>, and most notably in Szondi<sup>51</sup>. Anholt, who coined the term “nation branding” in 1996, explains that the term, however, has to do with market competition. “...The brand’ is a perfect metaphor for the way places compete with each other in the global marketplace for products, services, events, ideas, visitors, talent, investment, and influence...”<sup>52</sup>. Another researcher who contributed to this notion is Olins, who argues that today countries do not compete solely on the political level but also in the commercial domain<sup>53</sup>. He argues that the *national brand* implies the inclusion of three important sectors: exports, foreign direct investment, and tourism. Later, Anholt established the *national brand* notion by trying to give to the economic dimension a concept of a comprehensive understanding of the values of a country, not just economic values. He calls this *a competitive identity*, explaining that this identity has more to do with national identity, its economy, and politics, rather than *the brand* with which it is traditionally perceived<sup>54</sup>. According to him, *competitive identity* is “a term used to describe brand management synthesis with public diplomacy as well as trade, investment, tourism, and export promotion<sup>55</sup>. *Competitive identity* is a new pattern for increasing national competitiveness in the global world, which is already delivering results for a number of states, cities, regions, whether rich or poor<sup>56</sup>. With these definitions, Anholt claims to replace the notion of public diplomacy, considering it too narrow to summarize all the interests and attributes of a country in relation to the foreign public and competition with others<sup>57</sup>. Anholt openly admits that *national brand* relates directly to trade and marketing, even labeling this notion as pseudoscience and contending

50 e.g., Anholt, Simon. (2007), *Competitive Identity, The New Brand Management for Nations, Cities and Regions*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.; Gilboa, E. (2008); Saliu, Hasan. (2017), *The new nature of Cultural Diplomacy in the age of online communication*, Journal of Media Critiques, Vol. 3(10).

51 Szondi, Georgy. (2008), *Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations ‘Clingendael’.

52 Anholt, Simon. (2010), *Places, Identity, image and reputation*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1.

53 Olins, Wally. (2005), Making a National Brand, in: Melissen, Jan (2005), *New public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.

54 Anholt, S. (2007), xi.

55 Ibid., 8.

56 Ibid., 3.

57 Anholt, S.(2007; 2010).

that brand theory implies buying, selling, and promoting consumer goods. Often, this notion also relates to psychological and communicative phenomena, such as national identity, culture, social cohesion, etc.<sup>58</sup> In other words, according to Anholt, the proposition for enhancing a country's image to a foreign audience should be expanded to include economic value: Attributes, material goods and offers that are important or attractive for the market, and included in the competitive identities of countries, cities, and regions<sup>59</sup>.

However, the concept of *competitive identity* has not been able to avert the earlier concept of the *national brand* or be elaborated by researchers or field practitioners to emulate the broad use of the public diplomacy notion. In fact, Anholt himself repeatedly refers to the notion of the brand when he seeks to measure the image of a country in the world<sup>60</sup>. Yet, the competitive identity does not remain solely dedicated to commercial offers. It also includes a number of structural perceptions about a given place, and not just those that can be included in a national brand<sup>61</sup>:

- If you had a choice between two DVD players from unknown makers with identical features, would you expect to pay more for the Japanese brand or the Chinese brand?
- If you had two equally qualified candidates for a senior management role, would you be more likely to pick the Turk or the Swede?
- Does a holiday on the Albanian Riviera sound more or less luxurious than one on the French Riviera?

The concept of a *national brand* and *public diplomacy* differs in the fields they envision, it differs by the format and content of the message, and it differs by the communicating actors among other distinctions. It is also worth mentioning that the concept of the national brand is largely British, while the concept of public diplomacy is American. Anholt and Olins, two authorities and strong national brand advocates who contributed greatly to this concept's evolution and practice, are both British<sup>62</sup>. While British agencies are engaged in campaigns to create national brands of some European countries and especially post-socialist countries, such efforts are not present in America, where public diplomacy has started since the 1960s of the previous century. Countries in continuous search of their national brand identity are Estonia, Poland, Latvia, Croatia, Bulgaria, most of which rely on Simon Anholt's

58 Anholt, S. (2010), 2.

59 Ibid., 6-8.

60 Ibid., 80-88.

61 Anholt, S. (2007), 8-9.

62 Szondi, G. (2008).

agencies<sup>63</sup>. In relation to the field of interest, the national brand includes mainly the economic-trade profile, while public diplomacy includes education, culture, sport, and so on. “Put simply, for public diplomats the world is no market...”<sup>64</sup>. In Europe, mostly small countries with little economic resources primarily transitioning from the former socialist system have engaged in the process of establishing their own national brand, “even though it is important to emphasize that to the present day, no outside expert has succeeded in re-branding a single country”<sup>65</sup>.

Another feature is that of the number of messages. Public diplomacy delivers numerous messages to another country through media and by means of individuals, such as students, tourists, diaspora, etc., while the national brand sends a repeating message, which must be remembered. The distinction between public diplomacy and the national brand is that marketing in most of its functionality consists of preparations so that ideas become small concepts that repeatedly recur in a message form until that message becomes boring. Leonard pointedly explains that “when you are so bored with it that you feel like giving up, the listener may just have begun to register the message”<sup>66</sup>. This recurrence can only be made possible through message delivery by the media as marketing’s most important communication and replication channel whereas for public diplomacy, the media are not the only or most important channel of communication.

The other difference is that the *national brand* communicates only through a product designed or created by marketing experts and commissioned by the business or state sector. Public diplomacy can communicate even without a concrete product, such as students exchange, including the diaspora and their lifestyle in foreign countries; in these situations, there are no experts in the field who draft the message that addresses foreigners, but the message is compiled by individuals with different backgrounds, different professions, and many in number. As such, neither the *state* nor the *businesses* draft the message.

In mass marketing, the message is a one-way draw<sup>67</sup>. It merely provides information about a product, which means only one party speaks, there is no instant return of the message. In contrast, the other party should only act, buy the product, or use the service, whereas in public diplomacy, apart from information, there is also mutual communication and a dialogue between the parties.

---

63 Ibid., 1-2.

64 Melissen, J. (2005), 20.

65 Ibid.

66 Leonard, M. (2002), 16.

67 Kotler, Phillip (2002), *Marketing Management, Millennium Edition*, Boston; Pearson Custom Publishing, 320.

## 7. Public diplomacy and propaganda

Until recently, public diplomacy was considered to be a propaganda extension. Public diplomacy was confused with propaganda and with public relations by many scholars and practitioners (Gilboa, 2008: 56). Such confusion arises particularly given the purpose of both activities aimed at informing and influencing external audiences. There are also well-known authors who, although in principle, distinguish these two concepts, yet again, confound their differences in later stages. In the monograph *Empire of Ideas - The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy*, published by Oxford University Press, Hart writes:

The government's decision to develop programs in public diplomacy during the 1930 and 1940 is often portrayed as a weak and largely inept response to the formidable operations of Nazi Germany and, later, Soviet Russia, or as an inevitable, almost unconscious, reaction to the evolution of communications technology.<sup>68</sup>

So, it is about government programs of public diplomacy at the peak of the toughest Nazi propaganda programs. Cull says that when Edmund Gullion introduced *public diplomacy* in the 1970s, he thought more about propaganda, to which Dr. Goebbels had given a negative connotation<sup>69</sup>. Kunczick sees these notions as synonymous as well<sup>70</sup>. Likewise, Leonard says that the term *public diplomacy* is often a euphemism for propaganda<sup>71</sup>. The goal of public diplomacy and propaganda was to present the dividing line between the two notions as indistinctive. However, apart from the same goals, the differences in means are quite clear.

This confusion can be said to have occurred in the 60s and 70s of the last century when public diplomacy was led only by state actors and when it was really intended to create a separation from propaganda, which was connoted with a negative sense. Today, when non-state actors participate in public diplomacy activities that cannot be influenced or controlled by the states, the distinction highlighted is one that has to do with truthfulness: Propaganda often has significant deviations from the reality it describes, and this may lead to misinformation. While public diplomacy wants to hear what people have to say<sup>72</sup>, propaganda aims at manipulating foreigners. Lasswell considers propaganda as manipulation of symbols, an instrument of influence on

68 Hart, Justin. (2013), *Empire of Ideas – The origins of public diplomacy and the transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Oxford; Oxford University Press, 7.

69 Cull, Nicholas. (2010), Public diplomacy: Seven lessons for its future from its past, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. Volume 6, Issue 1, 10.

70 Kunczick, M. (1997), 13.

71 Leonard, Mark (2009), *Diplomacy by Other Means*, Foreign Policy, November 9. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/09/diplomacy-by-other-means/> (accessed: 23 March 2020).

72 Melissen, J. (2005), 18.

attitudes and complicated issues<sup>73</sup>, although he is more focused on dealing with the propaganda of the First World War. Ellul sees propaganda from a broader perspective as a sociological phenomenon that includes education and information technology as part of modern society<sup>74</sup>. According to him, propaganda tries to besiege the human being in all possible ways, in feelings and ideas, playing with his/her will for its own needs. First of all, propaganda is based on psychological and sociological research<sup>75</sup>. He explains that the purpose of propaganda is to derive effects rather than to say something. But, Ellul here speaks of internal propaganda.

Meanwhile, public diplomacy today is not just an information activity, but a dialogue, which has to do with the direction of the message, from the compiler - to the recipient, and involves both communicating parties in sending and receiving the message. Public diplomacy seeks to convince external opinions through dialogue and propaganda by providing information that often manipulates reality<sup>76</sup>. Public diplomacy is a two-way discourse and uses dialogue, while propaganda uses information, and as Wolton says, it is one-way communication<sup>77</sup>. Public diplomacy uses exchanges, dialogues, which is two-way communication, and therefore communication. Such is also argued in Wolton, as follows: “In a word, information is the message, while communication is the relationship...”<sup>78</sup>. We may even go further in stating that public diplomacy targets the relationship itself because its third dimension, i.e. the establishment of long-term relationships, is aimed through mutual understanding. Hence, although the researchers are mainly focused on the communication message and the relationship of this message with the truth, propaganda has largely operated with the spread of information (often fake information), while the scope of public diplomacy is much wider and not solely related to the field of communicating ideas. It is noteworthy to mention the actors of communication who are present in both situations. In propaganda, the author of the propaganda message may be the state, but also the media itself, which appears as communication actors or message dispensers. In turn, the recipient of the message is a foreign public, or simply the audience or reader, in other words, he/she is the customer of the media message. In public diplomacy, apart from the state, communication actors can be numerous non-state actors ranging from students, academics, people of culture, sports, ordinary individuals, tourists, etc. On the other hand, the recipient of the message is not only the audience or

---

73 Kunzick, M. (1997), 13.

74 Ellul, Jacques. (1973), *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, New York; Vintage Books Edition, Random House Inc.

75 Ibid., 4.

76 Melissen, J. (2005).

77 Wolton, D. (2009).

78 Ibid., 11.

readership receiving this message from the media but also individuals as direct communication actors with foreign individuals. An individual who has stayed for a period of time in a country and may have been part of any public diplomacy strategies may, after returning to his/her country, play an active role as a communication actor or local opinion leader when expressing positive attitudes towards the country in which he/she stayed. Communication actors also include artists, athletes, and people of culture who stay in a foreign country, or any other cultural product present in different ways in other countries. Regarding the communication channel, the exercise of propaganda to the public mainly uses the media. In contrast, in addition to the media as a communication channel, public diplomacy also uses interpersonal communication and communication with limited groups, such as theater members, various professionals in various exchange activities, etc.

However, it should be noted that propaganda has not disappeared with the development of public diplomacy. This is due to the fact that when a state wants to justify an illegal act in foreign policy, propaganda may arise. However, the spread of information in open societies, and nowadays in traditionally closed societies, as well, makes it difficult for government officials to control information<sup>79</sup>. This means that the increase of communication actors has led the state to lose its previous monopoly over communication with the world. The increase of the media, on the one hand, and in particular the internet with all its forms of communication, on the other hand, has led governments not to exert influence through controlled information and propaganda.

## 8. Conclusions

Current public diplomacy studies view the discipline as a link between international relations, diplomacy, political science, and sometimes, communications. The *Communication research* by analyzing the concepts discussed above according to the logic of Lasswell's communication scheme, Who → Says What → Through Which Channel → To Whom → With What Effect, gives a much clearer picture and deepened understanding of the differences that these concepts pose compared to many interdisciplinary studies that have been done thus far. Based on this logic, we can conclude that the first two dimensions of public diplomacy (information management and strategic communication) can be managed to some extent by the state. Earlier, the state played a much greater role on both scales and brought them in line with propaganda. Now, with real-time media, online communication, and social networks, it is almost impossible to manage these dimensions in the same way

<sup>79</sup> Leonard, M. (2009).

as decades ago when messages to external audiences/the foreign public were corrected and 'polished'. In other words, the increased diversity of communication opportunities in the era of networking has weakened states' possibility of exerting influence by means of propaganda on the foreign public because the state has lost the information monopoly. Even non-state actors in the Internet Age increasingly communicate with external audiences. This relates to the first question of the Lasswell's formula, *Who says*, in other words, who conveys the message to external audiences. Lasswell's second question *Says what* relates to the issues being communicated. Namely, the parties communicate with each other, i.e. non-state actors speak of universal values, preferences, and common interests aspired by inter-communicative parties. In the era of the internet and global networking, where multiple diverse individuals are in constant contact and interrelation with one another, it is difficult for any democratic government to control the information. However, in spite of this, at this level of the second question, *Says what*, even nowadays, propaganda survives through the communication or the messages of certain state actors. The means of communication through media where state and non-state actors transmit messages to the foreign public is implied in the third question posed by Lasswell, *In Which Channel*. Media is considered to be the communication channel here. However, we should also bear in mind direct, intrapersonal, and group communication, including public communication – with no media involved, or alternatively, mass communication with the intermediation of communication channels alongside information conveyed through the media.

Lasswell's question *To Whom* responds to the concepts, which have already been addressed in the paper because everyone in public diplomacy addresses the foreign public. The last question related to *the effect* demonstrates a substantial difference between the various concepts, especially between public and traditional diplomacy. All the measures taken by public diplomacy have a measured effect taking years and decades, while state actors - in traditional diplomacy, with their attitudes towards other publics, can have an immediate effect. The interplay between the actors is of essential importance to the international image of any polity: a negative public action by traditional diplomacy actors may affect several years of efforts conducted by public diplomacy activities, and vice versa.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Bibliography

- Anholt, Simon. (2010), *Places, Identity, image and reputation*, London; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barston, R.P. (2013), *Modern Diplomacy* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), London & New York; Routledge.
- Barrinha, André and Renard, Thomas. (2017), Cyber-diplomacy: the making of an international society in the digital age, *Global Affairs*, 3:4-5, 353-364, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2017.1414924>
- Berridge, G. R. (2015), *Diplomacy Theory and Practice* (5th ed), New York; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bjola, Corneliu and Kornprobst, Markus. (2018), *Understanding International Diplomacy - Theory, Practice and Ethics* (2th ed.), New York; Routledge.
- Bjola, Corneliu; Cassidy, Jennifer and Manor, Ilan. (2019), Public Diplomacy in the Digital Age, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 14 (83-101) doi:10.1163/1871191X-14011032
- Canning, Mike. (2008), The Overseas Post: The Forgotten Element of Our Public Diplomacy, *The Public Diplomacy Council*, December 1, Retrieved from <http://media.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp0183e4.html> (accessed: 16 February 2020).
- Castells, Manuel. (2009), *Communication Power*, New York; Oxford University Press.;
- Couldry, Nick and Hepp, Aandres. (2016), *The Mediated Construction of Reality*, Cambridge, UK; Polity.;
- Cull, Nicholas. (2008), *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945-1989*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press;
- Cull, Nicholas. (2010), Public diplomacy: Seven lessons for its future from its past, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Volume 6, Issue 1.
- Cull, Nicholas. (2012), *The Decline and Fall of the United States Information Agency: American Public Diplomacy, 1989-2001*, New York; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curtin, Patricia A. & Gaither, Kenn, T. (2007), *International Public Relations – Negotiating Culture, Identity and Power*, UK; Sage Publications.
- Di Martino, Luigi. (2019), Conceptualising public diplomacy listening on social media, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-019-00135-5>
- Ellul, Jacques. (1973), *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes*, New York; Vintage Books Edition, Random House Inc.
- Gilboa, Eytan. (2008), Searching for a theory of public diplomacy, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 55–77. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207312142
- Golan, Guy and Yang, Sungun. (2015), Introduction: The Integrated Public Diplomacy Perspective, in: Golan, Guy; Yang, Sungun and Kinsey Dennis F. eds., *International Public Relations and Public Diplomacy - Communication and Engagement*, New York; Peter Lang.
- Gregory, Bruce (2011), American Public Diplomacy: Enduring Characteristics, Elusive Transformation, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 6. Issue 3-4.
- Hart, Justin. (2013), *Empire of Ideas – The origins of public diplomacy and the transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kotler, Phillip. (2002), *Marketing Management, Millennium Edition*, Boston; Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Kunczik, Michael. (1997), *Images of Nations and International Public Relations*, New Jersey; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates-Publishers Mahwah.

- Lasswell, Harold. (1948), The Structure and Function of Communications in Society, in: Bryson, Lyman. (1948), *The Communication of Ideas*, New York; Harper and Brothers.
- Leonard, Mark. (2002), *Public Diplomacy*, London; The Foreign Policy Centre.
- Leonard, Mark. (2009), *Diplomacy by Other Means*, Foreign Policy, November 9. Retrieved from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/09/diplomacy-by-other-means/> (accessed: 23 March 2020).
- Manor, Ilan (2019), *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*, Switzerland; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marconi, Joe. (2004), *Public Relations, The Complete Guide*, Mason, Ohio; South-Western/Thomson.
- McQuail, Denis and Windahl, Sven. (1993), *Communication models for the study of mass communications* (2nd ed.), New York; Routledge.
- Melissen, Jan (2011), *Boynd the New Public Diplomacy*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael'.
- Melissen, Jan. (Eds) (2005), *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nancy Snow (2020), Rethinking Public Diplomacy in the 2020s, in: Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull (Eds), *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. New York; Routledge.
- Nye, Joseph, Jr. (2008), Public Diplomacy and Soft Power, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616; 94.
- Nye, Joseph. Jr. (2004), *Soft Power – The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York; Public Affair.
- Olins, Wally. (2005), Making a National Brand, in: J. Melissen. *New public diplomacy: soft power in international relations*, Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pamment, Jammes. (2013), *New public diplomacy in the 21st century: A comparative study of policy and practice*, London-New York; Routledge.
- Saliu, Hasan. (2017), The new nature of Cultural Diplomacy in the age of online communication, *Journal of Media Critiques*, Vol. 3(10).
- Signitzer, Benno and Wasmer, Carola. (2006), Public diplomacy: A specific government public relations function, in: Botan, Carsl, H. & Hazelton, Vinsent (Eds), *Public Relations Theory II*. Mahwah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006, 435–464.
- Simon, Anholt. (2007), *Competitive Identity, The New Brand Management for Nations, Cities and Regions*, London; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sriramesh, Krishnamurthy and Vercic, Dejan. (2009), *The Global Public Relations Handbook - Theory, Research, and Practice*, New Jersey; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Szondi, Georgy. (2008), *Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'.
- Taylor, Maureen (2000), Toward a Public Relations Approach to Nation Building, *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(2), doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1202\_3
- Tuch, Hans. (1990), *Communicating with the world: U.S. public diplomacy overseas*, Washington, D.C.; Georgetown University.
- Wolton, Dominique. (2009), *Informer n'est pas communiquer*, Paris; CNRS Editions.

# Javna diplomacija i srodni pojmovi iz perspektive Lasswellova komunikacijskog modela

## SAŽETAK

---

Svrha članka je istražiti razlike između javne diplomacije i sličnih pojmova koji se odnose na međunarodni imidž zemlje. Pojmovi poput javne diplomacije, tradicionalne diplomacije, vanjske politike, međunarodnih odnosa s javnošću, propagande, nacionalnog brendiranja itd. često se smatraju sinonimima. Pregled literature pruža puko promatranje ovih pojmova. Ti su pojmovi razrađeni na temelju perspektive komunikacijskih sudionika, strana koje međusobno komuniciraju, davatelja poruka, primatelja i načina komunikacije, dok se identificiranje razlika i odlika među njima ostvaruje prema Lasswellovoj komunikacijskoj formuli. Zaključci pokazuju da ovaj komunikacijski pristup pruža više potencijala za prepoznavanje razlika između ovih pojmova u usporedbi s trenutnim pristupima koji ih promatraju iz interdisciplinarnih perspektive.

**Cljučne riječi:** javna diplomacija, tradicionalna diplomacija, propaganda, međunarodni odnosi s javnošću, Lasswell.