

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AS A THEORETICAL PROBLEM: SEARCHING FOR A DEFINITION

Erik Pajtinka

*Matej Bel University in Banska Bystrica,
Faculty of Political Science and International Relations,
Department of International Relations and Diplomacy,
Kuzmanyho 1, 974 01 Banska Bystrica, Slovakia
erik.pajtinka@umb.sk*

Abstract

The article analyzes the meanings of the term “public diplomacy” in contemporary diplomatic theory and practice and tries to find its suitable definition. It is concluded, that public diplomacy should be defined as a complex of activities carried out or supported by a state which focuses on influencing public opinion abroad with the aim of reaching or promoting a certain foreignpolicy goal. In this context, public diplomacy should not be confused with government public relations and foreign propaganda. It is argued that while the former is, unlike public diplomacy, targeted on domestic public primarily and its aim is to inform rather than to influence the citizens, the latter uses the means of communication based on one-way messaging rather than dialogue.

Key words: *public diplomacy, government public relations, foreign propaganda*

INTRODUCTION

The term “public diplomacy” is used very frequently in today’s diplomatic practice. Ministries of foreign affairs of many states have strategies and programmes of “public diplomacy”, the organisational structures of diplomatic bodies frequently comprise “public diplomacy” units or departments and mentions of the importance of “public diplomacy” are often found in official foreign policy documents or in public speeches and statements of politicians and representatives of diplomatic services. However, the opinions regarding what, in fact, the term “public diplomacy” constitutes or what activities it encompasses, often differ from one another and/or are only very vague, not only between the diplomatic services of individual states, but in many cases even among diplomats themselves. In addition, diplomats, and especially politicians, like to use the term “public diplomacy” without properly getting to know its etymology or

the context of its previous usage¹. In this manner, various purposeful “definitions” of public diplomacy, which only take into account the institutional needs of a specific ministry of foreign affairs and/or the subjective political needs of a particular statesman during a specific time and situation, and which usually lack theoretical precision, are brought into the diplomatic terminology. The result of all this is that today, “public diplomacy” is used in a very inconsistent way in diplomatic practice, with more or less different meanings. However, a similar semantic variety of use of the term “public diplomacy” is typical also for contemporary academic literature in which we can encounter several diverse – and in some cases even partly contradictory – interpretations of this notion. Such variety in meaning, or non-unified interpretation of the concept of public diplomacy, ultimately complicates expert discussion on the topic, that being on an academic as well as practical level – within foreign affairs ministries. It is therefore certainly reasonable to devote oneself to the issue of the definition of “public diplomacy”.

In academic literature, it is possible to find quite a large number of works which deal with public diplomacy, whether it be in the mostly generally-theoretical plane [e.g. Leonard 2002; Melissen 2007; Snow 2009], the mostly practical plane – in relation to individual states [e.g. Simons 2014; Kruckeberg and Vujnovic 2005; d’Hooghe 2015], or possibly in both of the abovementioned aspects of this issue more or less equally [e.g. Ostrowski 2010]. Hence there are a sufficient number of possible sources to draw on for the needs of this paper.

The aim of this study is to attempt to find a definition of “public diplomacy” that is not merely theoretically precise, but also has the widest range of application both for diplomatic practice as well as for the needs of international relations theory. At the same time, this paper aspires to differentiate the term “public diplomacy” from other similar or related processes and activities, which we may encounter in the states’ current international political practice and which are often incorrectly identified with or mistaken for public diplomacy.

The first section of this study outlines individual definitions in which the term “public diplomacy” is employed most often in current academic literature. Subsequently, on the basis of critical analysis, selected interpretations of the notion of public diplomacy have been chosen from among them which appear to be the most universally practical for the theory and practice of diplomacy. Drawing on interpretations of the term “public diplomacy”, its defining features are outlined in the next part of this study. Based on this, it is possible to identify public diplomacy in practice and separate it from other similar or related phenomena. In the final two parts of the study, a comparison is made between public diplomacy with regard to government public relations and foreign propaganda.

1. MEANINGS OF THE TERM PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

In contemporary academic sources, the term “public diplomacy” carries at least four different meanings.

In its original and currently less pervasive meaning, public diplomacy is used as the opposite to secret diplomacy. That is, as a term synonymous with open diplomacy

¹ The current popularity of the term “public diplomacy” among politicians and diplomats probably derives from the fact that it carries a rather strong positive connotation, (perhaps also as a result of the frequent use of this idea as a contrasting term to “propaganda”, which, on the contrary, comes with a markedly negative connotation).

[e.g. Berridge and Lloyd 2012; Peterková 2008]. In this understanding, public diplomacy is viewed as negotiation carried out “before the eyes”, under the surveillance or control of the public. We can encounter this understanding of public diplomacy most often in a historical context, namely in connection with the ban on secret agreements between states and greater public control of diplomacy, which was postulated by the American president Woodrow Wilson after World War I in his famous, “Fourteen Points” speech.

In another meaning, the expression “public diplomacy” is sometimes understood to denote the combination of all activities and expressions of various actors which contribute to the creation of a state’s image abroad –regardless of whether they influence in a positive or negative way. In this meaning, public diplomacy is defined by the American author Cynthia Schneider [2004: 1], who understands it as “all a nation does to explain itself to the world”.

In a similar but narrower meaning, “public diplomacy” is used as an umbrella term for all of the various activities of governmental and non-governmental actors which contribute to the creation of a positive image of a certain state. In this understanding, public diplomacy is defined by the Slovak academic Jozef Batora [2005: 4], who describes it as “all activities by state and non-state actors that contribute to the maintenance and promotion of a country’s soft power”.

Lastly, in its fourth meaning, public diplomacy is associated with the complex of state and possibly state-supported activities which focus on influencing public opinion abroad and whose purpose is the realisation of foreign-policy interests of a particular state. Public diplomacy in this sense is understood as a kind of supplement or counterpart to “traditional” government-to-government diplomacy, whose essence is on the contrary, the advancement of foreign-policy interests of the state through negotiations with foreign governments and/or their diplomatic representatives. In other words, public diplomacy represents in this sense a specific dimension or form of diplomacy that aims to fulfil the goals of foreign policy by influencing public opinion abroad and not through direct diplomatic negotiations with official representatives of foreign countries, as it is in the case of the “traditional” government-to-government diplomacy. The first to define public diplomacy in this understanding was the American Edmund Gullion in the 1960s, as “influencing the way groups and peoples in other countries think about foreign affairs, react to our policies, and affect the policies of their respective governments” [quoted in Delaney and Gibson 1967: 31]. From contemporary scholars, we can perceive a similar understanding by another respected American expert on the issue of public diplomacy, Hans Tuch [1990: 3]. For Tuch, public diplomacy is “a government’s process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas and ideals...as well as its national goals and current policies”. In an analogous meaning, public diplomacy is viewed by American author Anthony Pratkanis [2009: 112], who defines it as “promotion of the national interest by informing and influencing the citizens of other nations”. Some state institutions also understand it similarly. For example, The Planning Group for Integration of United States Information Agency (USIA) in the Department of State has characterised public diplomacy as “the promotion of national interests...through understanding, informing and the influencing of foreign audiences” [quoted in Heller and Persson 2009: 226]. From other similar definitions of public diplomacy formulated by scholars, is worth mentioning one offered by the Canadian expert Evan H. Potter. For Potter, public diplomacy is “the effort by the government of one nation to influence public...opinion

of another nation for the purpose of turning the policy of the target nation to advantage” [Potter 2002: 3]. From among European scholars we can find a similar understanding of the notion public diplomacy, for instance from German expert Daniel Ostrowski [2010: 48], who defines it as a “complex of measures adopted by state actors involved in foreign policy which target the public abroad, and whose goal is the strengthening of the soft power of the state which these actors [of public diplomacy – author’s note] represent”.

When selecting the most appropriate definition for “public diplomacy”, one that is the most universally applicable in theory and practice, it is rational to work with such interpretations which are a) established and widely used in diplomatic theory and practice, b) sufficiently precise to enable us to identify the range of activities of public diplomacy in practice, and at the same time also c) specific, therefore understanding public diplomacy as an independent process or concept and not only as a synonymous or alternative value for another phenomenon. If we take into account the three abovementioned criteria, then it is most suitable to understand public diplomacy – for the purposes of the theory and practice of diplomacy, and therefore also for the purposes of this work – in the latter “Gullion” meaning; the complex of activities carried out or supported by state which focuses on influencing public opinion abroad with the goal of reaching or promoting a certain foreign-policy interest.

2. DEFINITION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

In practice it is possible to identify public diplomacy – in its “Gullion” interpretation – and differentiate it from processes similar or related to it through several characteristic features.

One of them we can consider to be the primary purpose or motive of the implementation of public diplomacy, which is the furtherance of a certain foreign-policy interest of the state. In their definitions, several authors point to this characteristic feature when emphasising that public diplomacy is carried out by the state “in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas” [Tuch 1990], “with ambition to transform the policy of the target state for its benefit” [Potter 2002], or “with the aim to facilitate the fulfilment of the government’s goals” [Butler 2002, quoted in Leonard 2002: 1]. This functional, inter-connection between public diplomacy and the foreign-policy goals of the state is understandable and logical. If we take as the point of departure the fact that public diplomacy is a certain form or specific part of diplomacy, and diplomacy is a tool of foreign policy realisation, then public diplomacy likewise has to serve the foreign-policy interests of the state and thus is carried out primarily with the purpose of attaining a certain goal. This is not affected at all by the fact that the observed foreign-policy objective may not always be clearly visible amongst the background of public diplomacy activities – especially if these activities are carried out through non-state actors (such as NGOs). To this we have to add that this indiscernibility may also often be a part of the “strategy”. The point is that these days, activities openly associated with the promotion of a foreign-policy interest of foreign governments tend to be perceived by the public with a certain dose of mistrust, or even objection. To this fact points Jan Melissen [2007: 15], whose opinion is that an overly visible “linkage of public diplomacy with foreign policy” may “damage the credibility of the particular state in its communication with the foreign public”, and thus decrease the overall effectiveness of its public-diplomatic activities.

Similarly, Mark Leonard [2002: 72] notes that a “conspicuous government involvement in public diplomacy” may be “counter-productive”, because governments these days tend not to be perceived as trustworthy, public diplomacy actors. Due to this, today ministries of foreign affairs in the interest of a higher trust and therefore also a higher efficiency of their public diplomacy activities often prefer to choose forms of practical realisation in which the observed foreign-policy interest is not openly declared, but is promoted rather indirectly and/or inconspicuously. Such forms of public diplomacy may then outwardly seem as apolitical and/or even altruistic activities, although in fact, a certain foreign-policy goal remains in the background. Another characteristic feature by which we can define public diplomacy is its primary **target group**, which is the foreign public. In this sense, several authors emphasise that public diplomacy is a “process of communicating with foreign publics” [Tuch 1990: 3], or that it is the influencing of opinions of “citizens of other nations” [Pratkanis 2009: 112]. The focus of public diplomacy on a foreign environment is logically “justifiable”: if public diplomacy is a certain form or part of diplomacy, and diplomacy in general is understood as a process carried out “internationally”, therefore in the relationship between various states – on which today most academics and diplomats agree – then public diplomacy, as one of the forms or parts of diplomacy, should likewise be understood as a process carried out between states relative to foreign countries. At the same time, it in no way calls into question the theory today often emphasised by a number of experts that for effective influence of public opinion abroad it may be, from the viewpoint of the state, extraordinarily useful to communicate and cooperate also with its own citizens, or with domestic social actors, who may significantly contribute to the opinions of the foreign public through their activities.²

We may consider the **method of operation**, typically influencing public opinion through communication of information, another characteristic feature of public diplomacy. In this regard, several authors describe public diplomacy, inter alia, as “the effort...to influence public opinion of another nation” [Potter 2002: 3] or “promotion of national interests through influence” [Pratkanis 2009: 112]. The fact that swaying public opinion as a method of operation is an important feature of public diplomacy testifies to this. An interesting fact is that in France, public diplomacy is often referred to by the term *diplomatie d’influence*, which literally means “diplomacy of influence”. By its method of operation, public diplomacy differs from “traditional” government-to-government diplomacy, which is based on direct communication and the exchange of information among diplomats and/or statesmen.

From the method of operation follows the **means and techniques** which are typical for a practical realisation of this form of diplomacy. As public diplomacy primarily attempts to influence a wider public, in its practical realisation the means and techniques of mass communication are used to a great extent. These are employed much less within “traditional” government-to-government diplomacy. The reason is the fact that government-to-government diplomacy mostly entails direct communication between diplomats and/or statesmen, which is more suitable to realise in practice through other means and techniques (e.g. through negotiation techniques).

² However, the actual communication of a state with its own citizens falls under government public relations and not public diplomacy. We deal with the relationship between public diplomacy and government public relations in more detail in a separate part of the work.

From a theoretical viewpoint, we could thus define and identify public diplomacy in practice through its

- motive of realisation: the achievement of a certain foreign-policy goal
- target group: the foreign public
- method of operation: influencing the opinion of the public through targeted communication
- means of realisation: to a great extent based on using the tools of mass communication

3. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY VS. GOVERNMENT PUBLIC RELATIONS

Government public relations usually refers to a mixture of activities carried out by governmental institutions within the process of communication with the domestic people, the goal of which is, above all, to inform citizens about current policies and activities of the government, to ensure citizens' active participation and reflect public opinion in the government's decision-making process, to increase the involvement of citizens and other social actors in matters of public interest and to maintain a positive image among the domestic public. Generally, the motive of government public relations is primarily an effort to support the activity and to advance the mission of government agencies or/and to advance the goals of democratic society [Lee 2008; Neeley and Stewart 2012], in particular, to enhance the democratic accountability of government institutions. Since the foreign affairs ministries are by their nature not only diplomatic but governmental bodies, too, government public relations are a part of their activities. In practice, the typical activities of government public relations conducted by the ministries of foreign affairs include: the publication of information about activities of the foreign affairs minister and other high representatives of the ministry through press releases, discussion forums, seminars and conferences about the priorities of state's foreign policy and/or current issues of the foreign service, attended by representatives of the ministry of foreign affairs and public experts; lectures for students at universities about foreign policy priorities and/or the organisation and functioning of foreign service; the presentation of new services offered by the ministry of foreign affairs for citizens or companies; support and coordination of activities of local non-governmental entities promoting the state and its foreign policies abroad; organising "open door days" at the ministry of foreign affairs and other similar events focusing primarily on the presentation of the activities of the foreign service before the public.

Government public relations activities have two distinct features in common with public diplomacy. The first is a primary focus on the wider public, and the second, a frequent use of the means and techniques of mass communication. Unlike the activities of public diplomacy, however, government public relations pursuits have a different motive; fulfilling the government's information duty to its own citizens and not the promotion of foreign-policy goals. This represents a different primary target group, which is the domestic and not foreign public, and partly also a different method of operation, which – similarly as in the case of activities of public diplomacy – despite being based on communication with citizens, nevertheless has the ambition to inform the populace, "educate" them, or reflect their opinions and requirements rather than influencing them in line with its own interests.

Table 1. Public diplomacy and government public relations: common and different features.

	Public diplomacy	Government Public Relations
Purpose	to influence public opinion in order to achieve foreign policy goals	to inform the public in order to maintain government accountability to citizens
Target group	foreign public	domestic public
Method	communication of information by means of dialogue	communication of information by means of dialogue
Instruments	mainly means of mass communication	mainly means of mass communication

Source: Author's own processing.

It is true that in practice it may be problematic at first sight to distinguish between the activities of the ministries of foreign affairs in the area of public diplomacy and government public relations. Not only with respect to some of their external common features as described above, but also with respect to their partial overlap and close interrelatedness. Even some experts understand the government public relations of foreign affairs ministries – or at least a certain part of their activities – as a part of public diplomacy, including under this term not only activities of the state performed in relation to the public abroad, but also activities of the state relative to domestic social actors, the goal of which is to gain the support of these people for its foreign-policy goals and/or coordinate joint steps in the promotion of these goals [e.g. Bátorá 2005, d'Hooghe 2015, Peterková 2017]³. The proponents of such a wide understanding of the concept of public diplomacy usually argue that in the process of influencing public opinion abroad states nowadays have to increasingly rely also on the domestic public that is on domestic social actors, who can influence the foreign public much more efficiently through their own activities. From this they derive the conclusion that as part of public diplomacy it is necessary to consider not only those activities of the state that focus on the actual influence of opinions of the foreign public, but also the state's communication with domestic social actors who contribute to influencing the opinions of public abroad. We may certainly agree that if a state wishes to effectively influence public opinion abroad in line with its own foreign-policy interests, it should focus not only on gaining the support and sympathy of the public in foreign countries themselves, but also on procuring support of the domestic public or domestic social actors – this being especially due to the reason that citizens and non-governmental entities may be exceptionally effective actors of public diplomacy because their actions affect the community of a specific country in a more trustworthy way. Moreover, the support of the domestic public endows the state's foreign policy with a higher legitimacy. In practice, this creates preconditions for better “justification” in relation to foreign partners also on the level of traditional

³ In this relation, some academic sources mention two “dimensions” of public diplomacy; “international”, which is oriented towards the foreign ambience, and “domestic”, which is focused internally, towards one's own state [see e.g. Bátorá 2005, Huijgh 2013, Peterková 2017].

government-to-government diplomacy. But that in itself by no means calls into question the “Gullion” understanding of public diplomacy as a process of communication of the state, focusing exclusively on the public abroad. Nor does it justify expansion of the definition of the term “public diplomacy” to include state activities focused on the domestic people to gain support for its foreign policy. On the contrary, there is at least one good reason why it is more suitable to use the term “public diplomacy” exclusively for denoting the activities of the state that focus on communication with peoples abroad; the risk that a joint designation of public diplomacy will also refer to parts of government public relations activities which could lead to the tendency to overlook a fundamental difference between the primary purpose of the government’s domestic communication - seeking to inform, educate or reflect the opinions of the public - and the primary purpose of the government’s foreign communication activities, whose goal is to influence public opinion in line with its own interests. It is namely due to this reason that, for example, the government in the USA has the duty, even rooted in legislation, to draw a strict line between public diplomacy as a process of communication with foreign public whose goal is “to shape the opinions, actions and perceptions of people of other nations to be more in line with U.S. national interests”, and government public relations, (in the USA referred to as public affairs), as a process of communication with its own citizens, the goal of which is “to provide information to the public...allowing the evaluation of the policies, decisions and functions of their government” [Heller and Persson 2009].

4. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY VS. PROPAGANDA

In the contemporary political theory, the notion of propaganda is usually understood to denote a process of influencing public opinion with the desire to reach a certain political goal. In this sense, propaganda in academic literature tends to be defined by individual authors as a “deliberate attempt to influence the opinions of an audience through the transmission of ideas and values for a specific persuasive purpose, consciously designed to serve the interest of the propagandists and their political masters” [Welch 1999], as “efforts to influence the opinions of a public in order to propagate a doctrine” [Newsom, Turk and Kruckeberg 2004: 400] or as “the use of mass communications to reinforce or change public opinion” [Berridge and Lloyd 2012: 301]. In this context, state can realize propaganda inwards, that is towards its own citizens, which is so called domestic propaganda, or outwardly, that is in relation to the people in foreign countries which is known as foreign propaganda. The latter tends to be compared to and confused with public diplomacy.

It is unquestionable that foreign propaganda shares several features with public diplomacy. Both have the same motive, which is the achievement of a certain foreign-policy goal, and the same target group, which is the foreign public. They also, to a great extent, rely on means and techniques that utilize the same instruments – the tools of mass communication. Another common feature between foreign propaganda and public diplomacy is the fundamental method of their operation which is based on influencing the public opinion through targeted communication of information. But it is namely in the method of operation that we may also identify certain differences between public diplomacy and foreign propaganda, those being in the manner of communication. Whereas propaganda is especially about influencing the public opinion through “one-way messaging” and “narrowing people’s minds”, public diplomacy is rather about influencing public opinion “by means of dialogue that is

based on the liberal notion of communication with foreign public” [Melissen 2007: 18]. But we have to add that the difference between public diplomacy and foreign propaganda defined in this manner may be very hard to identify objectively in practice, because even a dialogue intended to influence public opinion, may be more or less purposefully influenced – such as by the selection of the topics discussed, through which it is possible to establish certain “opinion limits” within the discussion.

Table 2. Public diplomacy and foreign propaganda: common and different features.

	Public diplomacy	Foreign propaganda
Purpose	to influence public opinion in order to achieve foreign policy goals	to influence public opinion in order to achieve foreign policy goals
Target group	foreign public	foreign public
Method	communication of information mainly by means of dialogue	communication of information mainly by means of one-way messaging
Instruments	techniques of mass communication mainly	techniques of mass communication mainly

Source: Author’s own processing.

Some authors see the difference between foreign propaganda and public diplomacy in the truthfulness or objectivity of the information which is communicated. In this context, the notion of propaganda tends to be associated with spreading disinformation, half-truths, or a purposeful selective presentation of arguments, whereas the notion of public diplomacy is used to denote a manner of communication based on the dissemination of truthful and objective information [e.g. Misyuk 2013]. We encounter rather often a similar view of the difference between public diplomacy and propaganda in international political practice, where politicians tend to use the term propaganda to refer to all the “cunning”, “lying” or “manipulative” information-spreading activities of the state, whereas, as a rule, they call “truthful” communication of the state with a foreign public “public diplomacy”. But it has to be said that the use of propaganda and public diplomacy very often tends to be purposeful. Since the term “propaganda” currently has a markedly negative connotation in the minds of the public, statesmen attempt to avoid the use of this term by all means to name the activities of their own or possibly some allied state, having at the same time the tendency to purposefully use this term to denote all the “uncomfortable” or “politically undesirable” communication of foreign countries, regardless of the “truth value”. The intentional use of the terms “propaganda” and “public diplomacy” in political language testifies to the fact that the same activity of a particular state in practice is sometimes called public diplomacy by one state and propaganda by another. As an example, the Russian Federal Agency for the Commonwealth of Independent States Affairs, Compatriots Living Abroad, and International Humanitarian Cooperation (Rossotrudichestvo) describes its information and communication activities focusing on the wider public abroad as public diplomacy [Rossotrudnichestvo 2018], whereas the European Parliament has

termed the activities of this Russian governmental agency a part of the Russian government's propaganda [European Parliament 2016].

Even if we ignore the frequently purposeful use of these terms by politicians, the lack of truth of information disseminated does not seem to be a suitable criterion according to which it would be possible, in theory and practice, to unequivocally differentiate between public diplomacy and foreign propaganda. The reason is the fact that in communication with a foreign public focused on reaching various goals of foreign policy, states nowadays nearly always, in some way, purposefully select or edit the information communicated, as a minimum emphasising or, on the contrary, omitting some aspects of the truthful, objective image of reality. For example, a diplomat whose role is to support the influx of foreign investments into his state at a presentation given before businessmen in a foreign country, will quite understandably speak about the positives of investing in his country and will underline the availability of qualified labour force or developed traffic infrastructure, and on the contrary, will be silent on the negatives, such as complicated bureaucracy or a difficult law enforcement. Similarly, diplomats charged with the task to draw foreign tourists into their state will, within communication with the public in the foreign state, rather naturally present the most attractive tourist destinations in their home country and speak about various benefits, discreetly leaving out disadvantages like poor public transportation or a lower quality of services. In both of these cases, there undoubtedly occurs the spreading of purposefully distorted – and hence not wholly truthful – information, with the aim to reach some foreign-policy goal. If we thus differentiated propaganda and public diplomacy only on the basis of whether it works with true or with purposefully distorted, and therefore untruthful, information then we would have to rank both abovementioned practices under propaganda rather than under public diplomacy. However, this would run contrary to our contemporary reality and the universally accepted diplomatic practice, within which the activities described above, either within the support of foreign investments or tourism, are considered a completely legitimate, natural, or even necessary part of states' diplomatic activity, and hardly anyone would call them propaganda. In addition, if the term "public diplomacy" should only be strictly associated with the spread of truthful information, or with the presentation of a state's honest image, then this notion would be basically nearly empty because as previously stated, with the aim of reaching their foreign-policy goals states in some way nearly always purposefully distort the information communicated to the foreign public.

CONCLUSION

For the purposes of diplomatic theory and practice, it seems most suitable to understand public diplomacy as a combination of activities whose goal is to reach or support a certain foreign-policy interest of the state, executed with the desire to influence opinions of the foreign public through goal-oriented communication of selected information, but based on the principle of liberal dialogue. It is necessary to thoroughly differentiate public diplomacy from government public relations, which focuses primarily on the domestic and not foreign public, and whose mission is specially to inform the public and not influence its opinions in line with its own goals. At the same time, it is necessary to differentiate public diplomacy from foreign propaganda, which is based rather on one-way communication of information and gives the public abroad a relatively narrow space for interpretation of the message.

But this difference between public diplomacy and foreign propaganda may be very hard to identify in practice, and may also be subjective to a certain extent. In this respect, it is very important to avoid a purposeful use, confounding the notions of public diplomacy and propaganda, to which especially politicians, but also journalists, incline heavily in contemporary practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The study is published within the framework of the VEGA project no. 1/0949/17 “Concept of the soft power in the context of the transforming international environment and its potential for the small states strategies“.

REFERENCES

- Bátora, J., (2005), Public diplomacy in Small and Medium-Sized States: Norway and Canada. In: Discussion Papers in Diplomacy. No. 97, pp. 1-26.
- Berridge, G. R., Lloyd, L., (2012), The Palgrave Macmillan Dictionary of Diplomacy. Third Edition, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills and New York.
- Delaney, R. F., Gibson, J. S., (1967), American Public Diplomacy: The Perspective of Fifty Years, The Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Medford.
- d’Hooghe, I., (2015), China’s Public Diplomacy, Brill Nijhoff, Leiden and Boston.
- European Parliament, (2016), European Parliament resolution of 23 November 2016 on EU strategic communication to counteract propaganda against it by third parties (2016/2030(INI)). (online) available at: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P8-TA-2016-0441+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>
- Heller, K. S., Persson, L. M., (2009), The Distinction Between Public Affairs and Public Diplomacy. In: Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy. Routledge, New York and London, pp. 225-232.
- Huijgh, E., (2011), Changing Tunes for Public Diplomacy: Exploring the Domestic Dimension. In: Exchange. The Journal of Public Diplomacy. Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 62-73.
- Kruckeberg, D., Vujnovic, M., (2005), Public relations, not propaganda, for US public diplomacy in a post 9/11 world: Challenges and opportunities, in: Journal of Communication Management. Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 296-304.
- Lee, M., (2008), Public Relations in Public Administration. In: Government Public Relations. A reader. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 3-20.
- Leonard, M., (2002), Public Diplomacy, The Foreign Policy Centre, London.
- Melissen, J., (2007), The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice. In: The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke a New York, pp. 3-27.
- Misyuk, I., (2013), Propaganda and Public Diplomacy: the Problem of Differentiation. In: Humanities & Social Sciences 2013, 21-23 November 2013, Lviv, pp. 76-77.
- Neeley, G., Stewart, K., (2012), Introduction. In: The Practice of Government Public Relations. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 1-8.

- Newsom, D., Turk, J., Kruckeberg, D., (2004), *This is PR: The realities of public relations*, Belmont, Wadsworth.
- Ostrowski, D., (2010), *Die Public Diplomacy der Deutschen Auslandsvertretungen weltweit. Theorie und Praxis der deutschen Auslandsöffentlichkeitsarbeit*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.
- Peterková, J., (2017), *The Impact of the EU Accession on the Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy – the Czech Case*, in: *Politické vedy*. Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 8-26.
- Peterková, J., (2008), *Veřejná diplomacie*, Aleš Čeněk Publishing, Plzeň.
- Potter, E. H., (2002), *Canada and the New Public Diplomacy*. In: *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*. No. 81, pp. 1-19.
- Pratkanis, A., (2009), *Public Diplomacy in International Conflicts. A Social Influence Analysis*, in: *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. Routledge, New York and Abingdon, pp. 111-153.
- Rossotrudnichestvo, (2018), *About Rossotrudnichestvo*. (online) available at: <http://rs-gov.ru/en/about>
- Schneider, C. P., (2004), *Culture Communicates: U. S. Diplomacy that works*. In: *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*. No. 94, pp. 1-22.
- Simons, G., (2014), *Russian public diplomacy in the 21st century: Structure, means and message*, in: *Public Relations Review*. Vol. 40, pp. 440-449.
- Snow, N., (2009), *Rethinking Public Diplomacy*, in: *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. Routledge, New York and Abingdon, pp. 3-11.
- Tuch, H., (1990), *Communicating with the World: U. S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, Washington.
- Welch, D., (1999), *Powers of Persuasion*. In: *History Today*. Vol. 49, No. 8, pp. 24-26.