

The Role of State Foreign Cultural Policy and Public Diplomacy in Realizing Foreign Policy Strategy

Darzhan Serikovna Kazbekova

Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan,
Astana, Kazakhstan

Abstract: In this article the author presents the main key position of public diplomacy in the globalized world. For clarity purposes, an overview of current trends in public diplomacy and an up to date definition of public diplomacy are included. The author offers an analysis of the leading Western experts in the field of cultural foreign policy and its relationship to public diplomacy. The main goal of this article is to understand the interconnection of foreign cultural policy and public diplomacy in the realization of the foreign policy strategy.

Key words: Public diplomacy • International relations • Foreign cultural policy

INTRODUCTION

Currently the role of public diplomacy is in a critical position in the realization of foreign policy. The processes of globalization - which have a direct impact on the major areas of human life - are in a state of flux as they impact the relations between the states and the methods of interacting between various society groups. Today we can say with the confidence that, to maintain global connection is essential not only through strategically thought-out management of internal state policy, but also through analysing forms and methods of public diplomacy, whilst maintaining close communication with the public.

The Main Section: First of all it is necessary to determine the definition of public diplomacy, which has no specific grading policies nor agreed upon implementation processes. According to J. Melissen, public diplomacy and public affairs are directly covered by the forces of globalization and the recent revolution in communications technology. In an age in which it has become important to influence world opinion, domestic and international public relations are becoming more complex issues that can pre-occupy some foreign offices [1].

However, whilst this is just one definition of the concept of public diplomacy, in most cases researchers define thematic areas according to the needs of their own research interests. This can lead to fragmented conceptual

definitions that reveal itself only as part of the spectrum. At present this translates itself into different possible trends and concepts of public diplomacy skills.

We include to the first group the following authors, such as W. Olins, J. Melissen, Edmund A. Gullion, R. Sheldon and J. Stauber, Jr. Crocker Snow, Alan K. Henrikson, M. Butler, who in the concept of public diplomacy are mainly focused on the process of influencing public attitudes, opinions, people and governments to build and mobilize international public and their decisions in their favor.

At the same time another group of scientists in the definition of public diplomacy is trying to emphasize its realization abroad as a form of communication. B. Hocking, H. Tuch, Jill A. Schuker, A. Michalski, A. Spiegel, Edmund A. Gullion, M. Lending, Jian Wang, Alan K. Henrikson define it as a process of communication with the foreign community in trying to explain to other nations their ideas and values, institutions and culture, national goals and policies, which fall under the slogan “winning the hearts and minds” of people [1].

The third group of researchers P. Sharp, B. Scaria Amoretti, J. Melissen, P. Sharp, A. Michalski, Ingrid d'Hooghe, Sh. Riordan, Kishan S. Rana, C. Lord are of the opinion that public diplomacy is about building relationships with civil society actors in foreign countries, as well as the process to facilitate the organization of relations between non-governmental organizations

within and outside the country. It should be emphasized that the above authors note the importance of the third group and the need for a process of public diplomacy in which direct relations are pursued first and foremost in the population of the country-to promote its interests and values outside the state. According to Sh. Riordan, effective public diplomacy within the country can be a significant precursor to successful public diplomacy abroad [1].

The fourth group of researchers B. Hocking, Sh. Riordan, Ingrid d'Hooghe, J. Melissen, John W. Wheeler-Bennett noted in the definition of public diplomacy that non-governmental organizations and other non-state actors are trying to put forward their ideas or message for the pursuit of its policy objectives. The correct establishment and management of these ideas or messages are a key source of the concept of public diplomacy strategy [2]. An important task is to shape the content of the messages, tools and actors towards public diplomacy strategy. For example, Sh. Riordan believes that the messages of public diplomacy need to be more sophisticated and subtle. Public diplomacy must engage in dialogues with a broad range of players in foreign civil societies. This requires a more open and perhaps humble, approach, which recognizes that no one has a monopoly of truth or virtue, that other ideas may be valid and that the outcome may be different from the initial message being promoted [3]. In addition, the authors note the importance of this attitude of public diplomacy messages towards a specific audience [3], thereby emphasizing the importance of not only the content of the specific ideas, but also that the audience accepts and carries its further implementation. Thus, on the basis of the foregoing analysis of a wide range of interpretations in determining public diplomacy, the author proposes the following definition which reflects its basic essence of the idea in the present state of international relations:

Public diplomacy is a set of measures aimed at a broad audience of foreign countries associated with the implementation of economic and political interests, with a view to attract the implementation of foreign policy in their home country. In addition, the important consideration is that policy should promote public diplomacy and in their own country, because of its initial aim to achieve success beyond its own natural borders.

It also needs to be noted that modern diplomats have to take into account not only the current global economic trends, which are important in the broad sense, but also their impact on national economic interests.

Current policy for today is 'soft power' [4] in the form of economic expansion policy of actively displacing hard power, which requires, in turn, the quality of the diplomatic security [5].

The influence of culture on the rise of identity from the inside and presenting themselves on the outside, has been studied by only nationalist researchers. 'Culture' operating at the time of formation of the nation, was an expression of national independence and evidence. That part of high culture, which was characterized by a special national value, served as the official explanation of the national culture and contributed to both internal and external understanding of the culture of the nation. This use of culture served as a tool for the early times, to the national development of the adoption of the necessary future communities. In this case, symbols, holidays, myths, literature and theater attached special importance [6].

Dissemination of national culture beyond the state is still one of the central elements of foreign policy. An indicative value can serve as a foreign cultural policy of the Federal Republic of Germany. Former Foreign Minister Willy Brandt defined the foreign cultural policy in 1967 as a mediator of German culture and the German language to the foreign representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Goethe Institute and the subsequent intermediaries in the form of the "Dritte Säule" [7] foreign policy, a simultaneous 'peace and trade' policy. For Hildegard Hamm Bücher, an independent political activist and candidate for the post of Federal President in 1994, while the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, the culture was the "Dritte Dimension" [8]. For Dieter Sattler-the architect of German cultural policy-the culture was "Dritte Bühne" [9]. Until now this idea continues to evolve and remains associated with foreign policy processes to promote their goals. Meanwhile apart from the classical art forms, linguistic mediation, foreign schools and foreign broadcasting, there are also new areas in the form of joint projects of public organizations, sharing in the work of youth, sports and also in the field of education and science, which form an advanced concept of foreign cultural policy. Foreign cultural policy does not operate in a vacuum and is being used to implement a comprehensive set of foreign policy goals.

The official aim of German foreign cultural policy, from the parliament of Germany point of view, is "the formation of new connections and collaborative partnership between the people of different regions and cultural circles" [10]. This goal is achieved by including a

thesis of “culture as a resource country's soft power”. Joseph S. Nye in this context also offered to strengthen cultural promotion abroad [11]. Zaharna in this regard speaks of culture as a “new frontier for defining identities and allegiances” [12] in a globalizing world. This form of foreign cultural policy could act as an early warning system for foreign policy and actively serve to prevent the crisis which he promptly “draws attention to the international, social, cultural, religious or ethnic, cultural distortion [7].”

Foreign cultural policy provides foreign policy the role of an independent mediator, with identity and values which affect and responds to recipients mainly on an emotional level while. In the German context this specifically means communication about the “Zweibahnstraße”. Henrikson said that with the end of the Cold War, a “major shift from ideological to culture engagement” took place [13]. The credibility of the external connection could succeed and culture would be applied in a lesser extent as support for ideological ideas and more as an opportunity for dialogue. Kurt Düwell [9] distinguishes five types of foreign cultural policy:

- Cultural broadcasting (Diffusion)
- Cultural self-interpretation (Radiation)
- Cultural expansion
- Cultural propaganda
- Cultural imperialism

During the imperial desire for power, types 3 and 5 were used. Today, one-dimensional manifestations of cultural policy is no longer in use. Instead, measures of foreign cultural policy are focusing as a continuous line between cultural diplomacy and cultural relations, akin to the second and third types. The first type is always present and is used in part to comply with their own national measures required by contemporary challenges [14].

Modern German foreign cultural policy includes a definition of a derivative culture, as has been clearly mentioned in the preliminary determination as an expanded definition of culture. This was introduced in 1960 in Germany by the Brandt / Scheel government. Since then, this has impacted the following topic areas: “Entwicklung, Krisenprävention, Konfliktbewältigung, Systemtransfer und Systemaufbau, der globale Arbeitsmarkt, die Internationalisierung und Qualifizierung des deutschen Ausbildungssystem und die Auswirkungen der Globalisierung.” [8].

This kind of broad understanding of the main parts of culture politically and socially shifted the cultural boundaries in the social space. It is problematic for the reason that, in this sense, all manifestations of culture fell into this context. The amended definition of culture is “the non-governmental role in transnational relations” as a whole and taking into the account the aggregate proportionate communication. This is mainly realized in the field of foreign cultural policy. Thus, the early distinction between foreign cultural policy and government relations with the public were maintained without too much difficulty and for the first time integrated into the processes of change in public diplomacy. This implies not only the lack of flexibility of both definitions, but also the ability to use culture to achieve foreign policy goals. Culture and foreign policy are under a strained relationship, caused by the principle of the autonomy of culture on the one hand and the principle of its foreign policy for regulatory policy interests on the other. While culture is perceived as a policy mindset, due to a close relationship, in this case some of this tension will be maintained at its expense. Foreign policy and foreign cultural policy in such cases can affect the overall goals-particularly the cost of education and overall relationship [14].

CONCLUSION

In summary it is worth noting that foreign cultural policy and its capacity for dialogue and cooperation-regardless of political interests-are part of public diplomacy as an important element of foreign policy. Public diplomacy is a tool for cultural resources for the implementation of “soft power” of the country.

Public diplomacy is becoming a media-owned tool consisting of adequate resources for the structures of “soft power”. It is an expression of the ‘self-mediatization’ of diplomacy and foreign policy, which is trying to win in the future with the government of her majesty at international events, as opposed to non-state actors through the media of adequate political communication. These changes are so thorough that we can talk about changing paradigms in diplomacy - yet public diplomacy is no complete substitute for the traditional diplomatic strategies. It is the main strategy, however, that is used to overcome the increasing complexity of transnational political relationships. The basis for determining public diplomacy and public image-building were founded in the very first definitions, more than 150 years ago. Despite the strong relationship between public diplomacy with the

cooperative, partly proportionate communication, its main purpose will always be associated with hard power, in other words, the strengthening of national interests in the geopolitical environment.

Public diplomacy acts as a link between identity and image. It is based as well on public relations and the media system as a whole to achieve a reality. The ratio of the objectives and implementation of the strategy of public diplomacy and public relations, is high. It is particularly noticeable that the overlap between the theories of public relations and public relations is credible and reflects constructivist approaches. Both theories have to be reintroduced in the study of public diplomacy, though without reference to the existing knowledge of public relations research. To summarize the definition of public diplomacy, one would necessarily quote from the practitioner of public diplomacy Hans Tuch, who was a long-term diplomat at the State Department: "Public diplomacy combines the skills of the traditional diplomat with those of the specialist in mass communication and the social researcher. The diplomat formulates the ideas that he would like to have communicated to a foreign public, the social researcher studies the intended audience and the communications specialist chooses the most appropriate media and composes the messages" [15].

Thus, it follows that the role of foreign cultural policy has a close relationship with the country's public diplomacy, as the two are eager to implement the primary major foreign policy goals of the state. Nevertheless, between the lines, researchers struggle with defining where foreign cultural policy stops and public diplomacy starts. The main essence is a two-way communication process, as foreign cultural policy and public diplomacy both require constant feedback to achieve the main goals of the foreign policy strategy.

REFERENCES

1. Melissen, J., 2005. The new public diplomacy. Soft power in international relations. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (Studies in diplomacy and international relations), pp: 221.
2. Hocking, B., 2005. Rethinking the "New" Public Diplomacy. The new public diplomacy. Soft power in international relations. Basingstoke, pp: 221.
3. Shaun, R., 2005. Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: a New Foreign Policy Paradigm? The new public diplomacy. Soft power in international relations. Basingstoke, pp: 221.
4. Nye, J., 1990. Soft Power. Foreign Policy, 80: 153-171.
5. Apzauri, D., 2013. "Energy Diplomacy in the Black Sea coast: challenges solutions". Lecture.
6. Hroch, M., 2005. Das Europa der Nationen, die modern Nationsbildung im europäischen Vergleich. Göttingen, pp: 171-178.
7. Hoffmann, H., 1996 "Dritte Säule" der Außenpolitik. Zur aktuellen Diskussion um die auswärtige Kulturpolitik, in: Internationale Politik, pp: 15-20.
8. Maaß, K., 2005. Ziele und Instrumente der Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik, in: Kurt-Jürgen Maaß (Hg.): Kultur und Außenpolitik, Baden-Baden, pp: 23.
9. Düwell, K., 2005. Zwischen Propaganda und Friedenspolitik-Geschichte der Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik im 20. Jahrhundert in: Kurt-Jürgen Maaß (Hg.): Kultur und Außenpolitik, Baden-Baden, pp: 73.
10. Schwan, A., 2011. Werbung statt Waffen Wie strategische Außenkommunikation die Außenpolitik verändert. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften/ Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH, pp: 137.
11. Nye, J., 1990. The Changing Nature of World Power. Political Science Quarterly, 2: 182.
12. Zaharna Rhonda, S., 2005. The Network Paradigm of Strategic Public Diplomacy. Foreign Policy in Focus, Policy Brief, 1(10): 2.
13. Henrikson, A., 2006. What Can Public Diplomacy Achieve?, Den Haag, pp: 26.
14. Fuchs, M., 2006. : Deutschlands Bild in der Welt. Politik und Kultur, Juli-August, pp: 10.
15. Tuch, H., 1990. Communicating with the World. US Public Diplomacy Overseas, New York, pp: 40.