

Public Diplomacy “Winning Hearts and Minds”

PhD. candidate **Shkodran REXHAJ**¹
PhD. candidate **Armend KRASNIQI**²

Abstract

Public diplomacy is a type of diplomacy that focuses on using public communication to influence public opinion and achieve political goals. This type of diplomacy can be seen as a replacement for traditional diplomacy in some cases, but it is not a complete replacement. In some cases, public diplomacy can replace some aspects of traditional diplomacy, such as the use of private talks between governments. Public diplomacy can be used to stimulate public debate about an international issue, raise public awareness, and create a climate conducive to a possible solution. In this case, public diplomacy can partially replace private talks between governments, creating a new space for public dialogue. Traditional diplomacy involves secret talks between governments, lobbying and various negotiations at different levels. These are aspects that cannot be made public and are important to reach agreement between governments. For this reason, public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy are not alternatives to each other, but must be used together to achieve foreign policy goals. Public diplomacy can help create a positive atmosphere in public opinion, while traditional diplomacy can help reach agreements between governments.

Keywords: *diplomacy, digital, public, traditional, government.*

JEL Classification: K33

1. Introduction

"Winning hearts and minds" is a phrase commonly used in the context of public diplomacy, which refers to the efforts made by governments, organizations, and individuals to communicate and influence foreign publics.

The term "winning hearts and minds" was first coined during the Vietnam War, where it was used as a strategy to gain support from the Vietnamese people and prevent them from supporting the communist insurgency. Today, the phrase is still used to describe efforts to create a favourable image of a country or group in the eyes of foreign audiences, with the goal of building trust, understanding, and cooperation.

In the context of public diplomacy, "winning hearts and minds" includes a variety of activities, including cultural exchanges, educational programs, media engagement, and public speaking events. These activities are aimed at promoting the values, interests and policies of a country or group and creating a positive image of them in the minds of the foreign public.

Successful public diplomacy campaigns have a significant impact on a country's reputation and influence in the world, as well as its ability to achieve foreign policy objectives. By engaging with foreign audiences and building relationships based on trust and mutual understanding, public diplomacy can help create a more peaceful and secure world.

Public diplomacy is the communication of an actor with the citizens of foreign countries. This actor can be a representative of civil society, a non-governmental or multinational organization, a journalist or medium, a specialist of any different sector of industries, of politics or a member of any public. Public diplomacy means the communication of state and non-state actors, non-governmental organizations, corporations, individuals, etc. - with external publics, in order to inform, influence and engage them to achieve the country's political and economic objectives. To achieve these objectives, it communicates with foreign audiences through various mechanisms, including international media, cultivating international journalists and researchers, cultural activities, educational exchanges and student scholarships, visits and programmed conferences, publications, etc.³

Despite giving the above definitions, the problem remains with a definition which would be

¹ Shkodran Rexhaj - Master studies in Political Science and Diplomacy, AAB College in Kosovo, shkodrann.rexhaj@gmail.com.

² Armend Krasniqi - Master studies in Political Science and Diplomacy, AAB College in Kosovo, armendkrasniqi@hotmail.com .

³ Saliu, H. (2013). *Komunikimi në diplomacinë publike: sfidat e soft power-it të Kosovës në rritjen e imazhit ndërkombëtar*. Tiranë: tezë doktrature, p. 4.

widely accepted by all. Public diplomacy has been defined several times by different actors, researchers and practitioners of this field, but it is not possible to give a stable definition which would include a wide range⁴.

Public diplomacy includes all formal and informal efforts to persuade targeted sectors of foreign opinion to support a government strategy. Governments achieve this through various methods such as campaigns developed by government organizations that deal specifically with public diplomacy.

Public diplomacy is very important especially for small and developing countries because through public diplomacy the improvement of the international image is required. States use cultural communication strategies to convey a better image of themselves to others (foreigners). Ideally, the effect of this form of public diplomacy is to facilitate cooperation on a variety of issues with other countries.

In international relations, public diplomacy or, as it is otherwise known, people's diplomacy, is any effort by the government that aims to communicate directly with the foreign public to establish a dialogue that seeks to inform and influence with the aim that this foreign public it will support a certain government goal⁵.

The term public diplomacy entered the vocabulary of political and international affairs during the Cold War, i.e. in the mid-1960s. However, the essence of this diplomacy, which is the communication of governments with foreign publics, can be said to be as old as itself. the history of mankind.

2. What is public diplomacy?

Diplomacy is the management of international relations through negotiations or the method by which these relations are regulated or managed. According to Gilboa⁶, the policies of democratic governments are determined and pursued by diplomats capable of achieving the maximum objectives set (national interests) with a minimum of expenses, in a political system where war remains an option.

Many names have been used for public diplomacy, such as cultural diplomacy, media diplomacy, public information, political action, etc. Despite the names, these all have more or less the same function and purpose. Diplomacy provides the appropriate means to influence foreign publics without the use of force. We have defined public diplomacy as a tool for promoting national interest and national security through understanding, informing and expanding the dialogue between citizens and institutions of one country with counterparts, namely citizens and institutions of another country.

Public diplomacy also represents a mechanism of mutual understanding. According to Riordan⁷, public diplomacy is effective communication with foreign publics to understand, appreciate and imitate the vision and ideas of a country, which has traditionally been considered one of the most powerful tools to penetrate and influence the foreign public. The meaning of public diplomacy has changed over time. According to Snow⁸, public diplomacy has expanded from government actions to influence foreign publics within their foreign policies, to communication and interaction among many participants including large multinational corporations, media, non-governmental organizations, etc.

Of all the definitions, Gregory's⁹ definition presents a more complete picture of what public diplomacy is and represents. According to him, public diplomacy is an instrument used by states – governments and non-governmental actors – to understand culture, attitudes and behaviours; to manage links and interactions; to influence opinions and mobilize actions to advance certain values

⁴ Ibid, p. 4.

⁵ Gilboa, E. (2007). Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12(2), p. 7.

⁶ Ibid, p. 17.

⁷ Riordan, S. (2005). Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: a Neë Foreign Policy Paradigm? *The New Public Diplomacy*, p. 38.

⁸ Nancy Snow, "U.S. Public Diplomacy: A Tale of Two Who Jumped the Ship at State," (Silver City, NM & Washington, DC: Foreign Policy In Focus, May 27, 2004) at <<http://www.fpif.org/papers/0405taleoftwo.html>>.

⁹ Gregory, B. (2011). American Public Diplomacy: Enduring characteristics, Elusive Transformation. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 6(4), p. 353. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187119111X583941>.

and interests.

So, public diplomacy, in addition to being different from traditional diplomacy in the fact that it addresses the "public" and not just governments, is also different from the actors who participate in it. So, traditionally, diplomacy has been defined as the process through which governments, through official agents, have communicated with each other¹⁰.

3. Actors of public diplomacy

It is known that "public policy" is a new way of exercising power in the time of global computerization, in which we live. Public diplomacy, which is closely related to this direction of politics, is a "space" where the main actors are politics, culture, science and education, media, NGOs and users of social networks¹¹.

Before the introduction of new technologies of the 21st century, diplomacy was isolated and entirely representative of foreign affairs. Diplomats have negotiated and developed diplomacy only with their counterparts, away from public attention and investigation by civil society organizations. Nowadays, however, the public and some non-governmental organizations (NGOs) demand transparency and accountability from their representatives abroad. Advances in new technologies, connectivity, easy access to information, media coverage, and social media platforms have facilitated communication and interaction with diverse publics that have hitherto been overlooked by diplomats¹².

Both state and non-state actors are involved in public diplomacy, because ministries of foreign affairs deal directly with non-state actors.

Diplomats are still the main leaders of diplomacy and negotiators with the heads of other states. However, the participation of non-state actors in public diplomacy is important to create and maintain dialogue because these actors are experts in many fields and as such have extensive networks both locally and internationally. Many of them build trust and many have also gained legitimacy due to their ability to persuade and ability to act.

Building trust is not easy for professional diplomats because they are constrained by the guidelines and reputation enjoyed by the institution they represent. Non-state actors in public diplomacy are in a more favourable position. In the field of public diplomacy, state agencies may lack credibility in certain networks or certain parts of these networks.

There are local or domestic non-state actors that may enjoy more credibility and may have more social capital in those networks where the state does not have that credibility for various reasons. When credibility becomes an obstacle to penetrate certain publics, cooperation with actors who enjoy respect can facilitate communication that further leads to easier penetration of state agents into these networks¹³. Cooperation or delegation of some tasks to non-state actors who may have more credibility can bring better results for the purposes of public diplomacy.

Often, public diplomacy is seen as a form of expression of a state's personal interest that can be taken as propaganda. This can damage a country's credibility. To overcome this problem, many states expand the objectives of public diplomacy beyond those related only to national interests, to show commitment to some universal values. These can be general public goods such as environmental protection, peace building, harmony and mutual understanding, increasing national security, etc. Achieving these objectives is difficult, perhaps even impossible, without the involvement of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations¹⁴.

By emphasizing what public diplomacy can achieve beyond narrow diplomatic interests and cooperation with stakeholders to fulfil them, it can also influence the reinforcement of other goals of

¹⁰ Elmer Plischke, *Modern Diplomacy: The Art and the Artisans*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1979, p. 32

¹¹ Yves, L. (2006). *Environmental Impacts and Benefits of Information and Communication Technology Infrastructure and Services, Using Process and Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment*. École Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne: Master thesis.

¹² Schultz, K. (2001). *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 73.

¹³ Ibid, p. 74.

¹⁴ Henrikson, A. (2008). Niche Diplomacy in the world of public arena. *The new public diplomacy*, 1(3), p. 68.

public diplomacy in the long term.

In the field of public diplomacy, non-state actors have therefore occupied a central position, due to the fact that they are such. They can have access to those segments or parts where the state finds it difficult to penetrate. The human and financial resources of any country are limited, just as technical skills and knowledge on certain issues are also limited. In these segments, non-state actors may be centrally positioned, with wider networks than the state itself.

4. Public diplomacy and soft power

Although soft power has been considered a vague concept, it has been closely related to public diplomacy. Soft power is the ability of a country to obtain the desired result through attraction and not coercion or payment¹⁵. More recently, soft power has been defined as a country's ability to get what it wants through agenda-setting, persuasion, and positive attraction.

Nye¹⁶ states that public diplomacy is an instrument used to mobilize resources that produce soft power to communicate and attract foreign publics. When public diplomacy focuses on launching dialogue and cooperation projects with target (receiving) countries, soft power is an easily accessible concept for public diplomacy in attracting foreign publics. In traditional diplomacy, the concept of influence has been very important and used because it is related to the achievement of national interests. In soft power and the new public diplomacy, the emphasis falls on dialogue, communication and mutual understanding as a "softer" form of influence.

5. The difference between public diplomacy and related concepts

Public diplomacy is often identified with foreign policy and traditional diplomacy, if a clear line of distinction is not drawn between the two terms. Scholars have often used propaganda, public relations, international public relations, psychological warfare, instead of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is often equated with soft power. In this part it will be shown that despite being close, public diplomacy differs from each of these terms. First of all, public diplomacy differs from foreign policy. The first is an additional instrument to support the implementation of foreign policy. A close connection between foreign policy and public diplomacy can damage a country's credibility when communicating with foreign publics¹⁷. Foreign policy often involves narrow interests that may not always be shared with foreign opinions.

Public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy have similarities but also many differences between them. The similarities are related to their goals. Both require implementation of foreign policy and protection of political, economic or cultural interests. Both types use the same communication channels to send messages to foreign publics, although traditional diplomacy is more reserved about using public diplomatic channels. Where these two differ the most, is in the actors of communication, the way of communication and the field for which they communicate¹⁸.

Traditional diplomacy represents communication between governments, while public diplomacy is the commitment of governments to communicate with the goal of influencing the opinion and society of another country. So, in traditional diplomacy, we have communication with high levels of states, while in public diplomacy, we have communication with the citizens of another country.

There are also differences between public diplomacy as well as public relations and international public relations. According to Saliu¹⁹, public relations represent actions and tools to negotiate and change relations between organizations and the public.

Public relations differ from international public relations to the recipient of the message. These

¹⁵ Nye, J. (2010). *Soft Power and US Foreign Policy Theoretical, historical and contemporary perspectives*. London: Routledge, p. 6.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 95.

¹⁷ Brian, H., & Melissen, J. (2015). *Diplomacy in the Digital Age*. Netherlands: Clingendael, p. 67.

¹⁸ Saliu, H., *op. cit.*, 2013, p. 5.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 6.

two differ from public diplomacy in terms of communication actors, communication channels, and the content and form of communication. In public relations, communication specialists contact the public by giving a message or an actor advised through a specialist (e.g. a politician) contacts the public. In public diplomacy, many actors communicate who are not advised by communication experts.

Public relations specialists use the media as a channel of communication or direct contact. In public diplomacy, in addition to the media, cinematography, film, book, theatre and any other field that can arouse interest in the foreign public can also be used as a communication channel. These channels are used little or not at all in public relations. As for the differences in content, public relations are special activities that direct seductive messages to the public, "massage" the message, while in public diplomacy, the messages that are exchanged are more authentic and, in addition to words, are more related to actions such as: meetings, student exchanges, financing of projects in the host country, etc.²⁰

In public diplomacy, it is possible to communicate even without any concrete product, such as the Diaspora, the attitudes that students have about the foreign country in which they completed their studies, etc.

6. Digital diplomacy

Digital diplomacy is a new concept and as such has not yet been treated as much as other concepts such as public or traditional diplomacy. There is debate as to whether digitization enhances public diplomacy or whether it creates something entirely new, known as digital diplomacy. Unlike public diplomacy, digital diplomacy does not have a widely used definition. This lack of definition has caused digital diplomacy to be studied in different ways, focusing on many things, from cyber security, social networks to e-government. One reason for the lack of definition for digital diplomacy comes from the fact that it is often referred to by different names, such as "cyber-diplomacy", "net-diplomacy", "e-diplomacy", "twiplomacy", etc.²¹

Although the terms mentioned above mean more or less the same thing, each prefix deals with a more specific field which should be used in the right context. For example, the prefix "cyber" is commonly used when discussing security issues in digital diplomacy, "twi" for the social network Twitter, etc. The definition provided by the DiploFoundation, an organization that focuses on the interface between digital technology and diplomacy, describes digital diplomacy as a process of new methods and ways of doing diplomacy with the help of the Internet and Information Communication Technologies (ICT) and a process which describes their impact on contemporary diplomacy practices²².

Nowadays, diplomats and political leaders are beginning to make efforts to understand how they can use new technologies in this digital age in which we live, to strengthen international relations and develop their country's interests.

Scholars agree that digital diplomacy began in the United States when former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton shaped the State Department's foreign policy strategies to harness new technologies. During her time as secretary of state, Clinton successfully integrated social media into nearly every program initiated and led by the State Department. So, it sought to create a platform for 21st century state building that goes beyond traditional government-to-government relations and engages directly with people around the world²³. Its commitment to give due importance to digital diplomacy is also demonstrated by the fact that the State Department today has more than 25 different points in its headquarters that focus entirely on digital diplomacy, with over 1,000 engaged workers. On a daily basis, the State Department also uses social media to monitor information posted online

²⁰ Saliu, H. (2020). Public Diplomacy and Related Concepts from the Perspective of Lasswell's Communication Model. *Europski časopis za bioetiku*, 11(22), p. 360.

²¹ Brian, H., & Melissen, J., *op. cit.*, 2015, p. 71.

²² DiploFoundation. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy, E-diplomacy, Cyber diplomacy*. <https://www.diplomacy.edu/ediplomacy>.

²³ Corneliu, B., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, p. 67.

because it can respond to public opinion and can monitor Twitter in over 100 languages²⁴.

Ever since the United States of America began to adopt digital diplomacy, countries around the world have begun to follow suit. It is now quite common for embassies and consulates to have interactive communication websites, and for various state departments to have active accounts on social networks such as Facebook or Twitter. Some countries have started to create headquarters or special offices of digital diplomacy. England leads in this field. As for the Asian regions, India leads with digital diplomacy, with the Ministry of External Affairs having posted the first "tweet" in 2010. Other regions, such as Africa, have not yet made sufficient progress in this area²⁵.

A debate that has existed and continues to exist among scholars is whether digital diplomacy uses new technology to develop public diplomacy in a more modern way or whether this diplomacy fundamentally changes the way public diplomacy works. As we have said, public diplomacy is about how states communicate with foreign publics in an effort to fulfil their interests. As a field, it appeared in the 20th century, when radio became popular and began to be used as a means of communication. Various political groups such as the Nazis or the Bolsheviks used the radio to spread their propaganda to the people of other countries. For the first time, these groups were able to communicate directly with foreign publics without having to communicate with their own governments²⁶.

Interactions with the public became important and necessary for the success of international policies. While meetings between government representatives are important, public opinion is also essential in the design and shaping of international policies. Such a form of diplomacy has continued to this day. Diplomats try to penetrate the public of a country and not just the elites of that country. But, this is not always achieved. It often happens that diplomats, in an effort to communicate with the public, find themselves separated from them, thus unable to interact or communicate with them. This happens mainly because embassies are often set up in inconvenient places, in the suburbs, where people find it difficult or shy to enter. Thus, unwittingly, barriers are created for diplomacy with the public, while they should be reduced or eliminated altogether.

Because of these barriers, digital diplomacy, which is developed with the help of new technology, allows diplomats to use the Internet and social media to connect directly with the citizen in a way that neither radio nor other means of communication have been able to do it. From this interaction, of course, the states benefit because they can accept and then decipher what really happens with foreign publics. While in public diplomacy through radio, a message is sent to many people, that is, communication is one to many, on the Internet, that is, in digital diplomacy, people are exposed to different views and people can choose the information that suits their interests. Here, each individual who can have influence with his own views, can be "the media in itself". So here communication is many to many²⁷.

7. Digital diplomacy as a form of public mediation diplomacy

Until recently, the promotion of soft power to foreign audiences was done with the help of what are known as "people-to-people" programs. Such programs are, for example, educational and cultural exchanges or language programs. However, people's participation in these programs is limited, so the general public learn about a country's foreign policies through the media rather than from such programs. For this reason, there is a need for governments to seek alternative means to reach the wider masses of the population. One of the best and most efficient ways to do this is through the use of modern telecommunication platforms which include digital platforms such as social networks, websites, blogs. In this way, these become tools that mediate communication between

²⁴ Juyan, Zh. (2013). A Strategic Issue Management (SIM) Approach to Social Media Use in Public Diplomacy. *American Behavior Scientist*, 57(9), p. 1321.

²⁵ Corneliu, B., & Holmes, M., *op. cit.*, 2015, p. 57.

²⁶ Roberts, W. R. (2007). What is public diplomacy? Past practices, present conduct, possible future. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 18(4), p. 38.

²⁷ Cull, N. (2013). WikiLeaks, public diplomacy 2.0 and the state of digital public diplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 7(1), p. 6.

governments and foreign publics²⁸.

Studies in the field of mediating public diplomacy have focused on governments' efforts to manage information by channelling foreign policy through television and elite journalism. However, the widespread distribution of digital platforms allows governments to almost completely exclude from use what are known as "traditional gatekeepers" of information, i.e. the large warehouses through which information has passed and filtered, such as television, magazines or radio, and instead use platforms such as YouTube, Facebook, Twitter or Instagram, to engage the foreign public. It is precisely the massive engagement of governments in digital platforms that has influenced the creation of the field known today as digital diplomacy.

Digital diplomacy deals with how diplomats at different levels use a range of information and communication technologies such as e-mails, social networks, various messaging applications, etc. to communicate with others²⁹. This need for governments to "migrate" to social media is closely related to the need for diplomats to frame different events, actors and issues in a new global media ecology enabled by social media platforms. So, now more than ever, governments are willing to share information and events with others the moment they happen, thus competing with media institutions, journalists, etc. who until recently had the privilege of broadcasting. This makes the messages less censored and more authentic.

Thus, mediating public diplomacy is an umbrella term for digital diplomacy as it deals with the distribution of content in digital environments. The numerous opportunities of interaction with foreign publics offered by digital platforms have opened the doors for more actors to be part of public diplomacy. Governments today also use social media to shape the attitudes of journalists, when it is known that today more than ever, journalists create their news by taking from the posts of governments or different actors, on social networks³⁰. For example, Poland's Ministry of Foreign Affairs devotes considerable digital resources to reshaping the media's portrayal of Poland's role in Nazi atrocities during World War II. So the MFA and Polish embassies around the world very carefully monitor global publications and demand and intervene to label the concentration camps as Nazi camps in occupied Polish territory and not Polish concentration camps. In this way, Poland tries to distance itself from Nazi crimes and be seen as a positive country with valuable values such as multiculturalism and tolerance³¹.

8. Twitter diplomacy. Twiplomacy

The need to involve and engage the public during the process of disseminating information or misinformation has become very important, especially with the large use of social networks. Public diplomacy has been enriched by communication on social networks. As a result, a new term "Twiplomacia" has been born to describe the heavy and intensive use of social networks, especially Twitter, by foreign affairs agencies. Presidents, prime ministers, ministers, deputy ministers, deputies, ambassadors, etc. have joined social networks to form the "twiplomats" group.

Twiplomacy refers to a new form of communication in which modern-day individuals create connections or relationships by "following" each other on Twitter. Researchers are interested in seeing the effects this may have on real international relations. Various examples in the world confirm the importance and positive impact of Twiplomacy. One such example is the one between the United States of America and Cuba, which was able to adjust relations with the latter after several years of issuing an embargo on Cuban products. In 2015, the State Department decided to "follow" the Cuban State Department on Twitter. Later that day, China did the same. This online connection happened 2 months before the two countries officially welcomed each other to their networks³².

²⁸ Gilboa, E. (2015). *Public diplomacy*. John Wiley & Sons, p. 18.

²⁹ Cassidy, J., & Manor, I. (2016). Crafting strategic MFA communication policies during times of political crisis: A note to MFA policy makers. *Global Affairs*, 2, p. 337.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 338.

³¹ Manor, I., & Crilley, R. (2019). The mediatization of MFAS: Diplomacy in the new media Ecology. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 15(1-2), p. 19.

³² Twiplomacy. (2016). *Twiplomacy Study*. Gjetur Tetor 2021, <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2016/>.

Despite the fact that the talks about renewing the alliance between the two countries took place even before this event, this example shows how social media can be used to develop or improve relations between countries. Other states have also followed suit, trying to create or restore relationships with just the click of a button. Research into the phenomenon of Twiplomacy has shown how small countries have used the power of social networks to attempt to establish relations with the rest of the world. Peru is an example of this. This country follows about 509 world leaders on Twitter.

Another important advantage of digital diplomacy is that it enables increased transparency. In modern times, people post everything online. Individuals share a lot about their lives with the public by updating statuses on Facebook or posting various pictures on Twitter. This trend, along with the natural desire to know what others are doing (what the governments of other countries are doing) has led to a public demand for transparency. Knowing that diplomacy is a profession known for its confidentiality, it has been difficult for many diplomats to find a balance between the two. So, not to hide too much, but also not to expose what is not preferable to be exposed³³. Despite this, it is important that diplomats use this new technology to its full potential. By creating personalized posts about the activities they are conducting, diplomats and political leaders are able to make the public feel like they are involved in important conversations.

The former president of the United States, Donald Trump, is known as the president with the highest number of daily tweets on his personal Twitter account. Through them, he informed his followers about each of his meetings and about the discussions he would have within those meetings. Research has shown that personalized messages like these have a positive impact because they make the public/audience pay more attention to the information they read, creating visual images in their minds. Research has also shown that those tweets that are emotionally charged receive the most attention online³⁴. The statement of former President Trump regarding the normalization of diplomatic relations with Israel is also worth noting here, where Trump made a mistake in a tweet like this: *"Another great day for peace in the Middle East - Muslim-majority Kosovo and Israel have decided to normalize ties and establish diplomatic relations. With many Muslim countries and Arab countries will follow" and the world media spreads this tweet/blunder very quickly, since it makes Kosovo as part of the Middle East, so the idea is that Digital DP is not only done by the internal people of a state.* In these cases, when the name of the state is mentioned, a kind of digital public diplomacy takes place, an image is created and the curious can research, in this case about Kosovo, where is this country, this state, etc. and indirectly Kosovo becomes part of a debate or topic that inadvertently becomes viral!

Many of President Donald Trump's tweets are often retweeted, sent to others, making his message shared with a large number of people. This form of personalization is useful for diplomats and political leaders to interact with the public while creating the impression of transparency.

9. Challenges and limitations of digital diplomacy

Digital diplomacy brings many advantages, but of course it also has its own challenges. One of the challenges is that some of its advantages are not fully fulfilled in practice. For example, although social media sites offer government officials the ability to expand their influence by being interactive, personal and transparent, not all leaders take advantage or know how to take advantage. In a study on the communication strategies used by Western countries on social media, the results are disappointing, as it shows that a large number of diplomats are not connected and do not interact with diplomats from other countries. Research also finds that the non-governmental institutions they decide to follow are not very diverse and are mostly businesses³⁵. This shows that states and their representatives are still not using social media to their full potential.

The results of digital diplomacy in relation to efficiency are often misleading. It is commonly

³³ Brian, H., & Melissen, J., *op. cit.*, 2015, p. 71.

³⁴ Nadine, S., Kruikemeier, S., Meulen, H., & Noort, G. (2015). Digital diplomacy in GCC countries: Strategic communication of Western embassies on Twitter. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(2), p. 371.

³⁵ Ibid, p. 372.

thought that a greater number of followers means greater influence. However, this does not always hold. Indonesia's ambassador Djalal, has managed to gather a large number of followers on his Twitter account, but the rankings show that he has less influence than ambassadors with fewer followers. This means, despite having a large audience, he does not create tweets that increase engagement with the follower or are intended to increase influence. Many other officials are thought to be using Twitter without knowing exactly what they are doing. For example, Sweden's foreign minister, Carl Bildt, in some tweets had made some logical errors which had caught the attention of his followers. These mistakes have hurt his image instead of helping it.

An example of the mistake was also seen in the way the French ambassador to the United States of America spoke after Donald Trump was elected president. He had written that with this action, the world was coming to an end and that the voters of Donald Trump should feel ashamed of themselves. Since he was an ambassador stationed in the United States of America, this tweet was described as controversial and unacceptable for a person in that position³⁶. This example shows that the presence of social media is not enough, but that it should be used in the best way to serve the interests of the country and to build important relationships.

Many states have seen fit to provide training on the use of social media, precisely to avoid some of the problems mentioned above. Some government officials have begun hiring communications professionals to oversee their social media accounts, leaving it entirely up to these professionals how best to share their ideas. Many authors have worked on their books to help diplomats with social networks. Based on this, it is understood that digital diplomacy is challenging because there is no specific protocol on how it can be used successfully.

Another challenge of digital diplomacy is related to cyber security. Although the rapid dissemination of information is considered an advantage of digital diplomacy, at the same time it can be a major drawback or challenge. The possibility of disclosure of information that may be confidential and the possibility of accounts being hacked is a phenomenon that has been present quite a lot in digital diplomacy. Attackers have sophisticated their methods of attack, therefore protecting against them is becoming more and more difficult.

The best illustrative example of information disclosure (leaking) can be found in the United States of America, in the scandal known as WikiLeaks. When this organization released hundreds of copies of official foreign policy documents exchanged between embassies and the State Department, the entire world had access to candid and detailed assessments made by American diplomats about other world leaders and their countries³⁷.

WikiLeaks' direct attack on the United States raised fears for other countries that their foreign policy information could be exposed to the general public, and this fear raised many doubts and hesitations about the continued use of digital diplomacy. In other words, this scandal left many countries with the dilemma of whether it is worth exercising digital diplomacy for the advantages it offers when it is known that the drawbacks can be very dangerous and threatening. This information exposes individuals to physical danger. Also, cyber attacks or as they are also known as cyber weapons, which can interfere with government systems, have added even more to these doubts.

Within cyber security is the threat posed by online anonymity. Social media and the Internet have limited the need for physical communication, leaving people to communicate and interact only through the letters they type through their devices and the photos they choose to share. Because of this, it is very easy for users to hide behind a computer screen and pretend to be someone they are not. This can cause problems, especially if the public relies on social media as the only source of information for government officials. If this account is hacked, they may be exposed to false information thinking it is being shared by the official and as a result may believe it.

Fake news is a concern in politics and diplomacy. These news became the main part of discussions among researchers and policy makers especially after the 2016 presidential elections in the United States of America, when it was thought that these news had enough influence to cause the

³⁶ Olubukola, A. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), p. 136.

³⁷ Ilan, M. (2015). *The digitalization of Diplomacy: toward clarification of a fractured terminology*. Oxford Digital Diplomacy Research Group, p. 43.

defeat of the candidate Hillary Clinton against Donald Trump. These news, sponsored mainly by Russia, were distributed massively on social networks, especially on Twitter. Many bots (fictitious accounts) were created to look like real accounts that retweeted and spread false news about candidate Clinton. They were shared so quickly that even the backlash from Twitter was insufficient to stop their onslaught.

The ability to be anonymous has had the effect of encouraging negative behaviour. For example, if a person knows that he can verbally attack someone and not be caught and punished for it, then this encourages involvement in bad and problematic behaviours³⁸. Because one's true identity can be easily hidden online, cyber-attacks occur frequently. This is worrying for an environment which should promote diplomacy.

Threats from cyber attacks have created the impression that digital diplomacy is impossible, at least not to the extent that was proclaimed when it was first used. However, over time governments are making serious investments to prevent information disclosure and various attacks that could jeopardize a country's foreign policy. By taking the right preventive measures, countries are able to benefit from digitization. Even the training of diplomats on education for the proper use of social media has influenced that negative perception on digital diplomacy after the WikiLeaks scandal, to fade a little.

Perhaps the biggest challenge for diplomats who belong to the era of digital diplomacy is the fact that their role as diplomats is changing. Before digitization, the main responsibilities of diplomats were to represent their governments while abroad and to report to governments when they returned to their home country. Because diplomats were mostly unable to communicate with their governments while they were away, the information they gave or provided after they returned was new and valuable. With the help of social media, now anyone can be a producer or consumer of information³⁹.

Diplomats have lost their monopoly on being able to report what is happening in other countries. They compete with journalists and citizens, that is, they are in an open battle about who has the information and who breaks it faster. In this race, diplomats will always be losers. Due to this change brought about by technology and its use, governments are no longer "in the dark" when their diplomats are in embassies of foreign countries. Officials have real-time access to international media and are able to tailor their foreign policy missions accordingly. Because of this, today's diplomats are less free to develop relations between the country they come from and the country they are in.

The challenge mentioned above can be overcome if diplomats adapt their role to adapt to this new communication system. If diplomats do not simply report on the information they have gathered, but are able to analyze it, they will also be able to play an important role in international relations. Scholars have noted that the WikiLeaks incident underscored the importance of the quality of analysis that diplomacy experts have made about the countries they have been involved with. At a time when a large amount of information is distributed online, the need for professional diplomats who can decipher what is true and what is not is greater than ever. If diplomats in modern times can move from simple reporting of information to hypothesis makers and discussion facilitators, they will be able to have greater influence on foreign policy decisions⁴⁰.

10. Advantages of using public diplomacy

Public diplomacy is a term that in its modern form was first used in 1965 by Edmond Gullion, dean at Tufts University. For him, public diplomacy is about communicating effectively with publics around the world, so that those publics understand and appreciate the visions and ideas of a country.

Since then, this term has evolved, especially due to the great and rapid development of Information and Communication Technology. In traditional diplomacy, the main and only actors have been the governments, which have had in their composition experienced diplomats who have held

³⁸ Jovan, K. (2017). *An Introduction to Internet Governance*. Geneva: DiploFoundation, p. 47.

³⁹ Westcott, N. (2009). *Digital Diplomacy: The impact of the internet on international relations*. Oxford Internet Institute: Research Report, p. 15.

⁴⁰ Ilan, M., *op. cit.*, 2015, p. 43.

meetings and conversations, often away from the eyes of the media and the public.

In digital public diplomacy, the way diplomacy is done has changed radically. This form of diplomacy is more open than ever before and participants in it are not only governmental actors, but also non-governmental ones. The use of public diplomacy requires a clear and strategic plan to convey messages in a sustainable and effective manner to the foreign public.

Some of the main advantages of using public diplomacy are:

- **Analysis of the foreign public:** In order to create a successful public diplomacy strategy, it is important to understand the foreign public, their needs, interests and expectations in a sustainable manner.

- **Effective communication:** Public diplomacy requires a sustainable and effective communication with the foreign public, using clear and reliable messages in the right way.

- **Partnerships and collaboration:** Public diplomacy can be most effective when it works in collaboration with partners and allies in the follow-up arena.

- **Use of technology and social media:** Technology and social media can be a powerful tool to reach foreign audiences and create a relationship with them.

- **Crisis management:** Public diplomacy can also be an effective tool for crisis management regarding the image and reputation of a state or organization.

The use of public diplomacy also requires a professional staff with expertise in communication and strategy, as well as an adequate budget to develop and implement such a strategy successfully.

11. Conclusion

The primary aim of this research is to explain the concept of public diplomacy and how it differs from traditional diplomacy. Public diplomacy refers to the communication between a country's people (not just its government) and the public of foreign countries.

As we live in a world where information spreads quickly, public diplomacy is increasingly used to enhance a country's international image. The term "Public Diplomacy" was first used in its modern form in 1965 by Edmond Gullion, who believed that it involved effectively communicating with people around the world so they understand and appreciate a country's ideas and visions.

Since then, the term has evolved, especially due to advances in Information and Communication Technology. Traditional diplomacy involved only government officials, who would hold meetings and conversations away from the public eye. In contrast, digital public diplomacy is much more open and inclusive, with both government and non-governmental actors participating.

Public diplomacy has two main goals. The first is to promote a country's image and improve its international relations. A country can use public diplomacy to communicate with international audiences through various means, such as social media, cultural events, and international conferences. Governments and international organizations can use public diplomacy to build trust and support for their policies and initiatives, foster international cooperation, and promote a country's image globally.

The second goal of public diplomacy is to shape public opinion and international discourse on important issues, including human rights, climate change, and international peace and security.

By doing so, public diplomacy can raise global awareness and promote shared values and interests.

Bibliography

1. Brian, H., & Melissen, J. (2015). *Diplomacy in the Digital Age*. Netherlands: Clingendael.
2. Cassidy, J., & Manor, I. (2016). Crafting strategic MFA communication policies during times of political crisis: A note to MFA policy makers. *Global Affairs*, 2, 331-343.
3. Corneliu, B., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
4. Cull, N. (2013). WikiLeaks, public diplomacy 2.0 and the state of digital public diplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 7(1), 1-8.
5. DiploFoundation. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy, E-diplomacy, Cyber diplomacy*, <https://www.diplomacy.edu/ediplo>

- macy.
6. Gilboa, E. (2007). Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12(2), 1-28.
 7. Gilboa, E. (2015). *Public diplomacy*. John Wiley & Sons.
 8. Gregory, B. (2011). American Public Diplomacy: Enduring characteristics, Elusive Transformation. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 6(4), 351-372. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187119111X583941>.
 9. Ilan, M. (2015). *The digitalization of Diplomacy: toward clarification of a fractured terminology*. Oxford Digital Diplomacy Research Group.
 10. Jovan, K. (2017). *An Introduction to Internet Governance*. Geneva: DiploFoundation.
 11. Juyan, Zh. (2013). A Strategic Issue Management (SIM) Approach to Social Media Use in Public Diplomacy. *American Behavior Scientist*, 57(9), 1312-1331.
 12. Manor, I., & Crilley, R. (2019). The mediatization of MFAS: Diplomacy in the new media Ecology. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 15(1-2), 1-27.
 13. Nadine, S., Kruikemeier, S., Meulen, H., & Noort, G. (2015). Digital diplomacy in GCC countries: Strategic communication of Western embassies on Twitter. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(2), 369-379.
 14. Olubukola, A. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 127-151.
 15. Riordan, S. (2005). Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: a Neë Foreign Policy Paradigm? *The New Public Diplomacy*, 34-65.
 16. Roberts, W. R. (2007). What is public diplomacy? Past practices, present conduct, possible future. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 18(4), 36-52.
 17. Salii, H. (2013). *Komunikimi në diplomacinë publike: sfidat e soft power-it të Kosovës në rritjen e imazhit ndërkombëtar*. Tiranë: tezë doktorature.
 18. Twiplomacy. (2016). *Twiplomacy Study*. Gjetur Tetor 2021, nga: <http://twiplomacy.com/blog/twiplomacy-study-2016/>.
 19. Westcott, N. (2009). *Digital Diplomacy: The impact of the internet on international relations*. Oxford Internet Institute: Research Report.
 20. Yves, L. (2006). *Environmental Impacts and Benefits of Information and Communication Technology Infrastructure and Services, Using Process and Input-Output Life Cycle Assessment*. École Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne: Master thesis.
 21. Nancy Snow, "U.S. Public Diplomacy: A Tale of Two Who Jumped the Ship at State," (Silver City, NM & Washington, DC: Foreign Policy In Focus, May 27, 2004) at <<http://www.fpiif.org/papers/0405taleoftwo.html>>.
 22. Elmer Plischke, *Modern Diplomacy: The Art and the Artisans*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1979, 456 p.

List of abbreviations

MFA - Ministry of Foreign Affairs
ISO - International Organization for Standardization
USIA - United States Information Agency
NGO - Non-Governmental Organizations
USA - United States of America
GM - Genetic Modifications
BIO - Biotechnology Innovation Organization
USAID - United States Agency for International Development in Kosovo
CPI - Committee on Public Information
BBC - British Broadcasting Corporation
UN - British Council