



LUND UNIVERSITY

Inducing Cosmopolitan Dialogue in the 21st Century:

**The Role of Web 2.0, Ideals and Practices of the New Public Diplomacy
In the Case of the U.S. Mission to Denmark**

Airlangga Soediono
851010-6795

International Master of Science in Global Studies
Supervisor: Prof. Annette Hill

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to Professor Annette Hill for her insightful mentorship to make this research process rigorously empirical and yet of high quality.

I would also like to thank Professors Tobias Olsson, Fredrik Miegel, Tina Askanius, Peter Dahlgren, and Yiannis Mylonas for their inspirational and useful academic guidance for this research.

I also express my special appreciation for the cooperation and opportunity provided by the United States Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark, in conducting this research and developing professional experience.

To my mom, dad, and sister who have always poured their unwavering support in every step of the way.

ABSTRACT

In carrying out foreign policy in the 21st century, it is indispensable for a global force such as the United States to focus on decisions made by the civil society. Particularly, by implementing foreign policy that balances between hard power and soft power diplomacy, the practices of the new public diplomacy enable nation-states to interact with the public culturally and personally by encouraging and facilitating participation in the global dialogue. The objective of this research paper is to analyze the ideals and practices of the new public diplomacy with the specific context of the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark, in its specific program that focuses on youth and the marginalized community. Particularly by using elite interviewing method, the findings of this research aim to present understanding about U.S. public diplomacy practices based on its policy and theoretical concepts such as the public sphere, cosmopolitan citizenship, mediapolis, deliberative democracy, participation, and the architecture of the web 2.0. Since the 21st Century Statecraft policy of the U.S. Department of State is implemented in the use of social media in its public diplomacy capacity, multi-site web analysis method is used to understand the levels of participation that take place on social media platforms and how the infrastructures impact the participation of the public. Furthermore, findings of this research also incorporate Dahlgren's concept of the civic culture where the integrity of the circuit could indicate successful practices in developing an environment that is conducive for deliberative decision-making at the cosmopolitan level. Ultimately, considering that the focus of the new public diplomacy is inducing free participation of the global civil society, this research also discusses the underlying structural power relations between the state, society, and individuals.

Keywords: the new public diplomacy, the public sphere, cosmopolitan citizenship, participation, architecture of the web 2.0

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 Research Questions	3
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	4
2.1 Smart Power	5
2.1.1 The New Public Diplomacy.....	6
2.2 Public Sphere	10
2.2.1 Deliberative Democracy.....	12
2.2.2 Cosmopolitan Citizenship.....	13
2.2.3 Mediapolis.....	14
2.3 Participation	17
2.3.1 Voice Recognition	19
2.4 Civic Culture	20
2.5 Architecture of the Web 2.0	22
2.6 Summary	23
3. METHODOLOGY	24
3.1 Elite Interviewing Method	25
3.1.1 Interviewing Process.....	27
3.1.2 Qualitative Data Analysis.....	27
3.2 Web Analysis	28
3.3 Limitations	30
4. THE CASE STUDY	31
5. ANALYSIS	32
5.1 Thematic Analysis	32
5.1.1 Public to Public, Listening & Advocacy.....	32
5.1.2 Disseminating U.S. values.....	35
5.1.3 Positive Imaging, Stage Managing	37
5.1.4 Inclusion and Exclusion	39
5.1.5 State, Society, and Individuals.....	43
5.1.6 Multiplier Effect.....	46
5.1.7 Ethics	49
5.2 Multi-site Analysis	50
5.2.1 U.S. Embassy Denmark	50
5.2.2 Ambassador Laurie S. Fulton.....	55
5.2.3 Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders	59
5.2.4 Generation Change	61
5.2 Summary	63
6. CONCLUSION	65
7. REFERENCES	68
8. APPENDICES	72
8.1 Appendix A: Semi-structure Interview Questions	72
8.2 Appendix B: Sample of Transcript	73
8.3 Appendix C: Sample of Coding & Themes Tables	81
8.4 Appendix D: Sample of Clustering	86
8.5 Appendix E: U.S. Embassy Denmark Facebook Page	93
8.6 Appendix F: Ambassador Fulton’s Facebook	94
8.7 Appendix G: Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders Facebook Page	95
8.8 Appendix H: Generation Change Facebook Page	96

1. INTRODUCTION

A headline from The Copenhagen Post reads, “Somali-Dane delegation takes inspiration from the U.S.” (Wheeler, 2012). Although the newspaper article primarily talks about the exchanges of ideas and conversations between marginalized communities at the global level, it actually reflects on the U.S. *smart power* foreign policy in its attempt to connect with the civil society culturally and personally. Particularly, by using the soft power approach the U.S. was able to facilitate the marginalized community to learn from each other to be part of the overall society. This overall foreign policy effort demonstrates government’s focus on the civil society in the globalized world. As Castells (2008: 82) articulates, “Globalization is the process that constitutes a social system with the capacity to work as a unit on a planetary scale in real or chosen time...This is because all the core economic, communicative, and cultural activities are globalized. That is, they are dependent on strategic nodes connected around the world”. Coupled with the rise of the global civil society, the globalization process also points to the shift from state-centric to multilateral global decision-making process. Held (2010: 32) further claims, “Accordingly, global governance is a multi-actor complex insofar as diverse agencies participate in the development of global public policy”. To add, the nature of the recently developed web 2.0 that is interactive, contributory, and participative also offers a promising tool that could facilitate global citizens to engage in any dialogue that has the potential to generate a progressive difference. Although this gives the legitimacy for multiple participation, it does not guarantee equal influence and voice for public and private actors.

Where global dialogue becomes critical is in the area of post 9/11 current state of international relations. Particularly, it is in the interest of the United States in its “war on terror” to strive to win the hearts and minds of individuals overseas—especially the world’s Muslim population—and restores its “superpower leadership” by conveying its values around the world. In deploying a new U.S. foreign policy, during her confirmation hearing before the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee the then Secretary of State-Designate Clinton broached:

The President-Elect and I believe that foreign policy must be based on a marriage of principles and pragmatism, not rigid ideology...Our security, our vitality, and our ability to lead in today’s world oblige us to recognize the overwhelming fact of our

interdependence. I believe that American leadership has been wanting, but is still wanted. We must use what has been called “smart-power”: the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economics, military, political legal, and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation (U.S. Department of State, 2009).

The new *smart power* policy has been designed in response to anti-Americanism that resulted from the previous post 9/11 policy. In their survey study on anti-Americanism, Fitzpatrick, Kendrick and Fullerton (2011: 166) point out, “The finding that the Policy dimension, which encompassed disagreement with U.S. policies; distrust of U.S. leaders; fears of American power; and views of the United States as an arrogant and self-interested nation, had the highest overall mean score suggests that issues related to both the substance of U.S. policies and the perceived motivation of U.S. officials responsible for them significantly influence foreign publics’ views of the United States”. Since the current *smart power* policy involves combinations of approaches that balance hard power diplomacy of economic sanctions and military aggression with soft power diplomacy, within soft power itself the new public diplomacy has become a crucial instrument that is used to build more personal and stronger relationships with the foreign publics. Cull (2009: 116) elaborates, “A key feature of the New Public Diplomacy has been the rise of the term ‘Soft Power’...as an expression of the ability of an actor to get what it wants in the international environment because of the attractiveness of its culture rather than military or economic leverage...The advantage of the term ‘Soft Power’ is that it has moved the conversation around PD into the realm of national security and provided a language for arguing that attention be paid to PD”. As a result, soft power has been elevated and leveled with hard power diplomacy within the U.S. foreign policy.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the comparison between the ideals of public diplomacy and practices through a case study of the United States Mission to Denmark. Although Denmark is one of U.S. staunchest allies with shared democratic values, an important public diplomacy opportunity for the U.S. is in facilitating marginalized community of immigrant backgrounds in Denmark to be part of the society. This thesis will analyze the case study using the fundamental tenets of public diplomacy that aim to strategically communicate and build stronger relationships with the public through cultural and value exchanges (Melissen, 2005). Furthermore, it will also analyze whether the case study builds the public spheres as claimed by Castells (2008) where individuals can freely engage in dialogue at the global level. In

relation to this, this thesis will use the concept civic participation to assess the type of interactions that result from the public diplomacy practices in relation to inclusive and public dialogue. Whereas this analysis unfolds the underpinning aspects of democracy and the public sphere, another element of this thesis also focuses on the role of the “web 2.0” within the soft power approach. Furthermore, in spite of the traditional role U.S. public diplomacy played during the two world wars and the Cold War, this thesis will analyze and discuss the hegemonic power relations in the forms of propaganda and nation branding between nation-states, civil society, and individuals in the context of the new public diplomacy, specifically the continuous struggle toward the maximalist participation.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions of this thesis are based on a case study of public diplomacy practices of the United States Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark. In particular, this thesis will focus on the specific program that focuses on inclusion of marginalized community and youth in order to make them part of the overall society. Since this program demonstrates public diplomacy ideal of facilitating civil society in their global dialogue, the following research questions are put forth:

1. What is the role of *smart power* in building the public sphere, with the specific reference to the U.S. Embassy in Denmark?
2. In what ways can new public diplomacy be used to facilitate public sphere concepts: civic culture, civic participation, deliberative democracy, global/ cosmopolitan citizenship, and inclusiveness?
3. How does the “web 2.0” within the new public diplomacy practices encourage, promote, or hinder public sphere concepts?
4. How have structural and hegemonic communication power relations in the forms of propaganda and nation branding between the government and the civil society changed within the practices of the new public diplomacy?

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In conjunction to ideals, practices, and trajectory of the new public diplomacy; first this section will explain the fundamental principles of *smart power* that has recently been deployed as the core foreign policy of the United States. Specifically, it will focus on soft power and the implementation of public diplomacy as a tool that has been moved in the area of national security. This will be followed by the new public diplomacy theory that has been developed by contemporary communication scholars and implemented in the daily professional activities. Furthermore, although the new public diplomacy is a U.S. foreign policy and an instrument used in its diplomatic relations, the concept itself uses ideals, discourses, and concepts from participation. In particular, since scholars point to how the public sphere is facilitated by the new public diplomacy in the globalized world, this section will progress to explain the public sphere, which is a communicative space where individuals can participate.

In terms of the public sphere, this thesis will begin with the discussion of the Habermasian concept of the sphere and how it has progressed to its current conceptualization. Whereas the early Habermasian public sphere emphasizes the need of critical rationality, its current concept points to the communicative spaces that are open to the global society. Since the global public sphere indicates the engagements of individuals at the cosmopolitan level that traverses territorial boundaries, this will be followed by a discussion on how the media has the capability to facilitate these global engagements. More specifically, Silverstone's (2007) concept of the mediapolis will be explained because it pinpoints the moral responsibility of the media in communicating the fragmented global community.

Moreover, in relation to this global sphere, the agency embedded in the concept participation equally plays a crucial role in explaining the practices of new public diplomacy. In this case, this thesis will progress to explain Carpentier's (2012) synthesized discussion on participation. In relation to public diplomacy, the distinction between the politics and political participation comes into play. Whereas domestically citizens participate in the politics of representation, in working with the foreign publics the new public diplomacy facilitates participation that operates outside of the institutional politics. With the focus on political participation that Mouffe (2000) discusses, this thesis will also discuss on Carpentier's (2012)

concept of the struggle toward maximalist participation. Particularly this is relevant in explaining how the foreign publics participate at the cosmopolitan level to deliberate on global issues.

Collectively, theories of the public sphere and participation point to the inclusion of participatory mechanisms such as, deliberative democracy, voice recognition, and “prod-user” interactions in the Internet. With the hegemonic power relation issues that are systematically embedded in participation, ultimately this section will also elucidate the architecture of the “web 2.0” that provides the understanding for more interactive and participatory tools and hierarchical communications between the public and private institutions.

2.1 Smart Power

In ushering a new foreign policy approach, *smart power* has been instrumental in how the U.S. faces issues at the international level. In explaining the theoretical framework of *smart power* based on the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Seib (2009: 5) emphasizes:

Smart power means developing an integrated strategy, resource base and a tool kit to achieve American objectives, drawing on both hard and soft power. It is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but it also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships and institutions at all levels to explain American influence and establish the legitimacy of American action.

However, since historically hard power diplomacy has been the dominant approach in any international relations practices, the focus is on the balanced role that soft power diplomacy plays in the contemporary age of globalized world with the threats of transnational terrorist activities. In his explanation that diplomacy of bureaucracy, economic sanctions, and military aggression are not sufficient in facing these threats; Nye (2000: 94) contends, “The current struggle against international terrorism is a struggle to win hearts and minds, and the current over-reliance on hard power is not the path to success”. Contrastingly, soft power diplomacy heavily invests in cultural, societal, and individual interactions. Furthering Nye’s (2000) theoretical definition, Cull (2009: 16) articulates soft power, “...as an expression of the ability of an actor to get what it wants in the international environment because of the attractiveness of its culture rather than military or economic leverage”. Where soft power becomes concrete practices is in the area of public diplomacy, which has been heavily utilized in the realm of national security and international engagements. Particularly, by considering soft power and especially

public diplomacy as a priority at the policy level, the U.S. puts an emphasis on its attempt to connect with the foreign publics culturally and personally in order to maintain closer global relationships between the state, society, and individuals.

2.1.1 The New Public Diplomacy

Within the soft power capacity, public diplomacy plays a crucial role in the practices of U.S. foreign policy. In his introduction of the fundamental concept of public diplomacy, Cull (2009: 16) stresses, “PD can be the mechanism to deploy soft power, but it is not the same thing as soft power, any more than the army and hard power are the same thing...The advantage of the term ‘Soft Power’ is that it has moved the conversation around PD into the realm of national security and provided a language for arguing that attention be paid to PD”. Furthermore, Gregory (2008: 276) adds, “Diversity in aims and concepts notwithstanding, public diplomacy can be viewed as a political instrument with analytical boundaries and distinguishing characteristics. It is a term that describes ways and means by which states, associations of states, and non-state actors understand cultures, attitudes, and behavior; build and manage relationships; and influence opinions and actions to advance their interests and values”. In developing these types of relationships, the mechanism that builds public diplomacy is equivocally important because in this thesis it explains how the state builds relationships to support public participation.

Neither mere public relations nor strategic communication approach, public diplomacy involves six components that make it an effective soft power tool. Studied by scholars, these components are listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, international broadcasting, and psychological warfare. Whereas some of these components play more important roles than the others, all of the components have been practiced in the development of public diplomacy over time. Particularly whereas listening and advocacy have been associated closely to the contemporary public diplomacy practices, psychological warfare was heavily used during the Cold War. In unpacking these components, Cull (2008: 32) elucidates, “Listening is an actor’s attempt to manage the international environment by collecting and collating data about public and their opinions overseas and using the data to redirect its policy or its wider public diplomacy approach accordingly.” Additionally, playing a dominant role in American public diplomacy, “Advocacy in public diplomacy is an actor’s attempt to manage the international environment by undertaking an international communication activity or actively promote a

particular policy, idea, or that actor's general interests in the minds of foreign public". Furthermore, in bridging societal exchanges in public diplomacy, where "Cultural diplomacy is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment through making its cultural resources and achievements known overseas and/or facilitating cultural transmission abroad,...exchange diplomacy is an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by sending its citizens overseas and reciprocally accepting citizens from overseas for a period of study and/or acculturation...the element of reciprocity has tended to make this area of public diplomacy a bastion of the concept of 'mutuality': the vision of an international learning experience in which both parties benefit and are transformed" (Cull, 2008, p. 33). This mutuality is especially imperative for this thesis because it provides a framework for the global dialogue of the public.

As a complement to these components, the media also plays an equally crucial role in the sharing of values and cultures in the international arena. Coined international broadcasting, Cull (2009: 34) explains the role of radio, television, and the Internet and articulates that media platforms overlap with and expands the other outreach functions. Whereas these five components are commonly used in the conventional public diplomacy, scholars continuously debate on the merit of psychological construct to be considered as the last component. Controversial in its nature, in his earlier manuscript Cull (2007: 19) points, "In an international information context psychological warfare can be defined as an actor's use of communication to achieve an objective in wartime, usually through communication with the enemy's public". Although psychological warfare has been highly contested in the academic debate, it points to the issues of propaganda, hegemony, and power relations embedded within contemporary practices. Particularly it explains how political actors and the media influence communications of the public.

Whereas public diplomacy is traditionally associated as an American influential foreign policy approach during the two world wars and Cold War, current globalizing forces have transformed foreign policy practices to shift to the concept new public diplomacy. In relation to these globalizing impacts, Fitzpatrick (2007: 198) asserts, "Whether one believes that public diplomacy encompasses the actions of non-state entities or is an inherently government enterprise, the reality is that non-state actors have become more involved in efforts to influence foreign publics' views of nation-states and therefore require the attention of public diplomacy professionals". As a result, not only does the new public diplomacy allow the involvements of other actors other than government figures, but to a greater degree the transformation of

hierarchical power relations between nation-states, the society, and individuals. In his articulation on the underlying power-relations, Castells (2008: 84-86) further argues, “The decreased ability of nationally based political systems to manage the world’s problems on a global scale has induced the rise of a global civil society”. Further linking to the contributions that time-compressed media add in the global context, he consistently insists, “It is through the media that these organizations reach the public and mobilize people in support of these causes. In so doing, they eventually put pressure on governments threatened by the voters or on corporations fearful of consumers’ reactions”. Moreover, despite the rise of the global civil society and partnerships in the new public diplomacy efforts between nation-states and non-state actors, government and civil society, as well as authorities and individuals; scholars carefully point to structural hierarchy that is embedded in the practices of the new public diplomacy.

Although most globalization and international relations scholars have concluded the growing involvements of the global civil society, nation-states are still highly influential in exerting its power in communicating with the public. Castells (2008: 88) contends, “Global society now has the technological means to exist independently from political institutions and from the mass media. However, the capacity of social movements to change the public mind still depends, to a large extent, on their ability to shape the debate in the public sphere”. Specifically, three dimensions of the new public diplomacy are at play in influencing the hierarchical communication power structure: propaganda, influential element of nation branding, and cultural relations. Explaining propaganda as narrowing target publics’ minds, Melissen (2005: 18) describes, “Modern public diplomacy is a ‘two-way street’, even though the diplomat practicing it will of course always have his own country’s interests and foreign policy goals in mind...It is persuasion by means of dialogue that is based on a liberal notion of communication with foreign publics. In other words, public diplomacy is similar to propaganda in that it tries to persuade people what to think”. Equally influential is the nation branding mechanism that is embedded in public diplomacy. By drawing its similarity with marketing approach, Melissen (2005: 20-21) confirms, “Branding and public diplomacy are in fact largely complementary. Both are principally aimed at foreign publics but have a vitally important domestic dimension, and in contrast to much conventional diplomacy both have foreign rather than one’s own perceptions as their starting point”. Although scholars may perceive cultural relations in a more positive light for the structural power relations in public diplomacy, this dimension actually projects

hegemonic influence on values. Evidently, "...there are still plenty of reasons for traditional foreign cultural activities, but in the view of many practitioners cultural relations as a wider concept now also include new priorities, such as the promotion of human rights and the spread of democratic values, notions such as good governance, and the role of the media in civil society" (Melissen, 2005, p. 22). Since values such as human rights and the spread of democracy are core in U.S. ideology, when applied to the foreign publics these values exert the hegemonic American values. Not only does the new public diplomacy consist of dimensions that pose propaganda and hegemony, the power relation issues ensue with deeper structural aspects. Specifically in applying power relations to the case of U.S. public diplomacy that facilitates participation for marginalized community and youth, this criticism helps unveil whether or not the foreign public engage and participate fully in its attempts to derive at deliberative decision-making process.

Albeit some scholars argue on the power relation issues in the new public diplomacy, others claim that it actually builds the Habermasian public sphere in the contemporary world. At the fundamental level, Habermas (1989) conceptualizes the public sphere as a free and equal access to the space where public rational dialogue occurs. Nonetheless in its contemporary understanding itself, the Habermasian public sphere has been criticized for its exclusive participation based on the high level of rationality. In their summary of the contemporary criticism and understanding of the public sphere, Crossley and Roberts (2004: 11) argue, "In other words Habermas is accused of idealizing rational discussion as it relates to the public, ignoring 'the extent to which its institutions were founded on sectionalism, exclusiveness and repression (Eley, 1992: 321). Rational communication is not merely an end product as Habermas is apt to suggest". Consequently, contemporary scholars view the public sphere not in its strict rational argumentation, but communicative spaces that are global and open for dialogue.

Since the focus of the new public diplomacy is on the global civil society, it also points to the relationships between the state and public. Re-emphasizing the involvement of the global civil society in the international arena, Castells (2008: 90) points out, "The transition from these pragmatic forms of sociopolitical organization and decision making to a more elaborate global institutional system requires the coproduction of meaning and the sharing of values between global civil society and the global network state". Additionally, instrumental to the public sphere dialogue and decision-making process is the role media and communication technologies play. Tremayne (2007: 91) concurs, "The global public sphere is built around the media

communication system and Internet networks, particularly in the social spaces of the Web 2.0, as exemplified by YouTube, MySpace, Facebook, and the growing blogosphere that by mid-2007 counted 70 million blogs and was double in size every six months”. Coupled by the proliferation of the Web 2.0 and media conventional practices, the rudimentary purposes of the new public diplomacy in developing two-way communications and fostering conversations with the foreign publics exude that it builds the public sphere. In discussing the global civil society, Castells (2008: 92) confirms:

Public diplomacy is the diplomacy of the public, that is, the projection in the international arena of the values and ideas of the public. The public is not the government because it is not formalized in the institutions of the state...The implicit project behind public diplomacy is not to assert the power of a state or of a social actor in the form of ‘soft power’... Instead, to harness the dialogue between different social collectives and their cultures in the hope of sharing meaning and understanding...The goal of public diplomacy...is to induce a communication space in which a new, common language could emerge as a precondition for diplomacy, so that when the time for diplomacy comes, it reflects not only interests and power making but also meaning and sharing.

The communication space that public diplomacy induces relates to this thesis because it aligns with the objective of the U.S. embassy in facilitating the participation of the civil society. By facilitating the global civil society for idea sharing, the new public diplomacy enables the public to engage in free dialogue. Furthermore, this suggests that the new public diplomacy reduces the hierarchical power relations between the state, society, and individuals.

2.2 Public Sphere

Since the new public diplomacy consists of the rise of the global civil society and public dialogue, equally important is the theory of public sphere. Developed in the late twentieth century in response to the influential power of the state, the Habermasian public sphere is a communicative space that mediates the relationship between the state and individuals. Particularly in its earlier conceptualization Habermas (1989) emphasizes that the public sphere can only exist within the bourgeois public because it requires critical rationality in forming the intellectual public opinion. In explaining the rationale behind the critical rationality, Habermas (1989: 83) asserts, “Public debate was supposed to transform *voluntas* into a ratio that in the

public competition of private arguments came into being as the consensus about what was practically necessary in the interests of all”. In further explaining this concept, Dahlberg (2005: 111) adds, “Habermas describes the public sphere as an ‘intersubjectively shared space’ reproduced through communicative rationality. Such rationality, also referred to as rational-critical discourse or argumentation, is where participation is coordinated through acts of reaching understanding, rather than through ego-centric calculations of success”. Although the critical rationality required in forming the Habermasian public sphere is meant to create intellectual public opinion in relation to politics, in its strictest sense it actually implies an exclusive space reserved for elite members of the public. Consequently contemporary scholars point to the criticism of the normative concept and suggest for inclusive spaces.

Moreover in the contemporary criticism, scholars have developed and reformulated the normative concept of the Habermasian public sphere to be inclusively plural spaces for any members of the public. Especially in relation to the critical rationality required to form the public sphere, Crossley and Roberts (2004: 11) contend, “...the bourgeois public sphere disparages the emancipatory potential of ‘counterpublic spheres’”. Furthermore by idealizing rationality in the public sphere, the proletariats have been excluded from any public opinion making. As a result, Dahlberg (2005: 112) has reformulated the public sphere and defines:

When talking of the public sphere, Habermas is not talking about a homogenous, specific public, but about the whole array of complex networks of multiple and overlapping publics constituted through the critical communication of individuals, groups, associations, social movements, journalistic enterprises, and other civic institutions. By the public sphere, Habermas is also referring to the universal public appealed to in moral-practical claims about justice.

Particularly it is a communicative and dialogue space where the public can freely participate without the influence and intervention of the state. In further elucidating the public sphere, Dahlgren (2009: 72) adds, “The political public sphere is normatively seen as comprised of the institutional communicative spaces, universally accessible, that facilitate the formation of discussion and public opinion, via the unfettered flow of relevant information and ideas”. In relation to this thesis, the public sphere concept explains the communicative spaces for public dialogue that are facilitated by the state.

This updated conceptualization of the public sphere is consistent with the cosmopolitan citizenship that Kant developed in his seventeenth century manuscript *Toward Perpetual Peace*. In this perspective, the public is not viewed based on the different social hierarchies but rather as individuals with equal basic rights as human beings. Consequently, Habermas (2006: 126) updates his concept as, "...the critical function of an emergent global public sphere that mobilizes the conscience and political participation of citizens all over the world, because 'violation of law in one place of the earth is felt in all' (Kant, *Toward Perpetual Peace*, p. 330)". The concept global public sphere is crucial when applied to the new public diplomacy because it provides the explanation of the spaces that are facilitated through its practices. Particularly in the case of this thesis, the global public spheres are the potential dialogue spaces where marginalized community and youth can engage in the deliberative decision-making process.

2.2.1 Deliberative Democracy

The concept deliberative democracy relates directly to participation and the new public diplomacy because of the equal participation to be heard in any global political arena based on reasoning, cosmopolitan rights, and the public sphere. Whereas public spheres are spaces where individuals of equal rights can participate, deliberative democracy explains the participatory mechanism. In relation to the public sphere, Carpentier (2011: 35) explains, "Habermas's work is one of the main sources of inspiration for the model of deliberative democracy. His older work on communicative rationality and the public sphere plays a key role in grounding deliberation in the inter-subjective structures of communication". Consistent with how cosmopolitan citizenship (Held, 2011) affords the rights to participate in public spheres, reciprocity and rationality are crucial elements of deliberative democracy. Dahlgren (2009: 87) asserts, "The dynamics of deliberative democracy are characterized by the norms of equality and symmetry; everyone is to have an equal chance of participation...Another important principle is that the reasons should be made accessible to all concerned; this means not only that they should in some manner be made public, but also be comprehensible". Although deliberative democracy portrays the mechanism in which the global civil society equally participates in the dialogue and decision-making processes of the world affairs, in and of itself deliberative democracy also indicates the participation of exclusive members.

In debating the applications of deliberation democracy, academic circles question about the nature of dialogue promoted by the new public diplomacy practices. Explaining deliberative democracy needs to strike the delicate balance between procedural and substantive aspects, Gutmann and Thompson (2004: 3) defines, “Most fundamentally, deliberative democracy affirms the need to justify decisions made by citizens and their representatives. Both are expected to justify the laws they would impose on one another. In a democracy, leaders should therefore give reasons for their decisions, and respond to the reasons that citizens give in return”. However, this substantive aspect indicates that it requires rationality for all of the citizens to deliberate. When applied to participation, this strict requirement for rationality actually negatively impacts public dialogue because of the social discomfort and fear of isolation as described by Neolle-Neumann’s (1993) spiral of silence and the same exclusive dialogue explained in the original Habermasian public sphere. Contrastingly, Dahlgren (2009: 89) offers that as the “soul of democracy” everyday conversation has the potential to materialize as political engagement and contends, “The upshot here is civic talk should always be encouraged, but we should avoid the impulse to dress it up in a fancy, formal deliberative suit when this is not mandatory. A chattering society is more likely to lead to participation than a tight-lipped one”. By the same token, in the ideal new public diplomacy any social dialogue discussed by the global civil society has its civic component that has the potential to be political engagement in resolving social issues. In relation to the new public diplomacy program discussed in this thesis, deliberative democracy plays an important role because it allows the global dialogue to arrive at decision-making process. However, in facilitating the public the chattering society should always be encouraged because this kind of dialogue always has the potential to become deliberative.

2.2.2 Cosmopolitan Citizenship

In order to understand the public sphere deeper, the concept cosmopolitan citizenship plays a crucial role in demonstrating many of the logics that are also pertinent to the new public diplomacy. Stemming from the same concept developed by Kant’s *Toward Perpetual Peace*, Benhabib (2004: 21-22) reasons based on the fundamental concept *human Existenz*, “The human condition refers to those circumstances under which life is given to human beings. These circumstances constrain our choices, but nevertheless we are free to choose our fate.” Binding this basic condition is the Kantian hospitality as she further contends, “...hospitality is a right

that belongs to all human beings insofar as we view them as potential participants in a world republic”. Evident in human rights that are universal in nature and nation-state order that has been liquidated, Held (2010: 42) underlines the necessity of global dialogue and stresses, “Cosmopolitan right connoted the capacity to present oneself and be heard within and across political communities; it was the right to enter dialogue without artificial constraint and delimitation”. Furthermore, Held (2010: 179) defines, “At the heart of a cosmopolitan conception of citizenship is the idea that citizenship can be based not on exclusive membership of a territorial community, but on general rules and principles which can be entrenched and drawn upon diverse settings...These principles create a framework for all persons to enjoy...equal moral status, equal freedom and equal participative opportunities”. In applying cosmopolitan citizenship in the participation of the public in the global spheres, equal rights of individuals should ideally enable them to collectively deliberate on crucial decisions.

Whereas ideally cosmopolitan citizenship underlines the multilateral dialogue in the world’s decision-making process, Habermas (2006) warns on the reality in which the unilateral voice of the U.S. eclipses the global order. Particularly in the post-9/11 global constellations, “The world has grown too complex for this thinly veiled unilateralism. Even if Europe does not pull itself together and play its appointed civilizing role, the emerging global power China and the waning power Russia will not so readily accommodate themselves to the *pax Americana* model. Instead of the kind of international police operation we had hoped during the war in Kosovo, we have, once again, old-fashioned wars...” (Habermas, 2006, p. 5-6). Although Habermas (2006) discusses the unilateral force at the nation-state level and international relations context, he demonstrates the U.S. power in the global decision-making at the cost of other societies’ ideologies. This explains the hierarchical power relations that the U.S. exerts around the world that could be contributed through its public diplomacy approach. Furthermore, the multilateral decision-making process that Habermas (2006) pinpoints should ideally parallel cosmopolitan citizenship that is facilitated by the global presence of media and communication technology in linking people. In relation to the new public diplomacy practices, the concept cosmopolitan citizenship is important in understanding the multilateral decision making process.

2.2.3 Mediapolis

Since cosmopolitan citizenship explains the transnational nature of the Habermasian public sphere that the new public diplomacy is supposed to build, it is also the responsibility of

the media in facilitating the heterogeneous and full participation of the global citizens. Beck (2006: 42) confirms the predicaments faced during the contemporary world and the ideal role of the media and stresses, "...insofar as global everyday existence becomes an integral part of media worlds, a kind of globalization of emotions and empathy occurs. People experience themselves as parts of a fragmented, endangered civilization and civil society characterized by the simultaneity of events and of knowledge of this simultaneity all over the world". In order to resolve the troubling realities that the media has become environmental and significantly influences people's orientation of the world, Silverstone (2007) offers his theory of the mediapolis. Specifically referring to public sphere and cosmopolitan citizenship, he defines:

The mediapolis is, I intend, the mediated space of appearance in which the world appears and in which the world is constituted in its worldliness, and through which we learn about those who are and who are not like us. It is through communications conducted through the mediapolis that we are constructed as human (or not), and it is through mediapolis that public and political life increasingly comes to emerge at all levels of the body politic (or not) (Silverstone, 2007, p. 31).

In conjunction to cosmopolitan citizenship, mediapolis promotes inclusiveness, pluralism, and hospitable space where the global community is able to fully participate. Applicable in the use of media in the new public diplomacy's attempt to building the public sphere, the concept mediapolis examines whether the media facilitates or hinders civil society participation. Particularly with the power exerted by the media, this could present the issue where the media influences the public participation based on the free flow of ideas and information.

In its responsibility in facilitating the diversity, hospitality, reciprocity, and the deliberative decision-making at the global level; it is critically imperative that morality is consistently embodied in mediapolis. In his argumentation, Silverstone (2007: 7) emphasizes, "...the morality of the media refers to the generality of orientation and procedure within which the world is constructed by the media and within which the other appears". Consistently the relationships between individuals and the media are explained by Berlin (1990: 1-2), "These beliefs about how human life should be lived, what men and women should be and do, are objects of moral enquiry; and when applied to groups and nations, and, indeed mankind as a whole, are called political philosophy, which is but ethics applied to society". In explaining on the role media plays in an interdependent world, in relation to mediapolis Silverstone (2007: 8)

asserts, “Insofar as they provide the symbolic connection and disconnection that we have to the other, the other who is the distant other, distant geographically, historically, sociologically, then the media are becoming the crucial environments in which a morality appropriate to the increasingly interrelated but still horrendously divided and conflictful world”. Since the technology embedded in the media enables connection of human beings who experience the fragmented civilization as described by Beck (2006), the concept mediapolis implies that the media is charged with moral responsibility. Particularly, the ability of the media for connection and disconnection provides it with the power to provide the fragmented world’s communities to engage in the global dialogue. In relation this thesis, since the social media plays a crucial role in facilitating communications among the public, as a new communication tool it is also charged with the same moral responsibility. Furthermore, considering that in the overall public diplomacy its daily practices also involve the subtle dissemination of propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic cultural values; in working with the foreign publics the new public diplomacy is also challenged with its moral values as well as ethical practices.

By the same token, the plurality and inclusiveness that the mediapolis facilitates operate in a similar light to the rights afforded by cosmopolitan citizenship (Held, 2010, Benhabib, 2004, Beck, 2006). Using the contemporary mediapolis platform YouTube to exemplify the reciprocal citizenship in the media, van Zoonen, Vis, and Mihejl (2012: 260) state, “In the classic ‘right’ and ‘obligation’ terminology of citizenship, and articulated with the affordances of YouTube, this would involve both the right to speak/show and the obligation to listen/watch”. Both morality and reciprocity of the mediapolis are important in the new public diplomacy. The full and equal participation of the global civil society is not plausible without the means afforded by the media and communication technology that is moral and reciprocal. Furthermore although mediapolis is an ideal theoretical framework, its link to the new public diplomacy can be observed in the dialectic conversation between nation-state and non-state actors. In particular it could potentially reduce the hierarchical power relations. Consequently, the mediapolis could also promote the rise of the global civil society that is consistent with the overall notion of the new public diplomacy. However, since the new public diplomacy itself still receives criticism on the structural power relations by communicating propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic cultural relations; the substance of the new public diplomacy practices may influence members

of the public in their full participation. This issue points to the constant struggle for the maximalist participation due to the exercise of power from multiple social actors.

2.3 Participation

Participation is an important concept in individuals' agency for their involvements in the public spheres, including the ones built by new public diplomacy practices. In his discussion on participation, Carpentier (2011) relates it closely with democratic principles of political representation and actual citizenry because of the political decision-making processes. Particularly, Spivak (1990: 108) asserts on the need to balance between representation and political participation. Under institutionalized democracy, "Political representation is grounded in the formal delegation of power, where specific actors are authorized on behalf of others 'to sign on his behalf, to act on his behalf, to speak on his behalf' and where these actors receive 'the power of a proxy' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 203)" (Carpentier, 2011, p. 16). However, the political participation that Carpentier (2011) discusses operates outside the institutions, continuously progressing toward maximalist, heterogeneous, and multidirectional political participation. Pointing to the differences of participation arena, Carpentier (2011: 101) uses Mouffe's (2000) definition:

By 'the political', I refer to the dimension of antagonism that is inherent in human relations, antagonism that can take many forms and emerge in different types of social relations. 'Politics' on the other side, indicates the ensemble of practices, discourses and institutions that seek to establish a certain order and organize human coexistence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual because they are affected by the dimension of 'the political'.

By using the political arena, which occurs in all aspects encompassing each individual's life, participation is not restricted at the elite, representative, and nation-state level. In relation to the role of the new public diplomacy that ideally builds the global public sphere, Carpentier (2011: 39) confirms, "Whether they are called interest groups, old/new social movements, civil society or activists, these actors broadened the scope of the political and made participation more heterogeneous and multidirectional". By using political participation, individuals are encouraged to participate without the strict rationality required in the deliberative democracy process. Particularly in relation to the new public diplomacy where the nation-state facilitates for the

development of civil society engagements, the concept political participation promotes public engagements in the global public sphere.

In conceptualizing participation Carpentier (2011) also pinpoints that it is a constant struggle between various social actors, organizations, and especially the media. At the center of this constant political participation struggle is the force of power-relations. Using Foucauldian discursive model, Carpentier (2011: 141) explains, “Discursive power (obviously) functions within the world of ideas and has a close connection to the notions of representation, ideology and hegemony”. Furthermore, consistent with Foucault’s (1980: 30) concept in which power influences each individual’s daily behavior and attitude, it also crucially impacts meaning-making process (Laclau, 1988, p. 254). Whereas social actors, especially the institutional political actors, exert this type of power, the media also projects its power in the political participation, emphasizing that mechanism of hegemony that Gramsci (1999) theorizes. Pointing to this hegemonic media power, Carpentier (2011: 145-146) articulates, “Couldry’s work on media power points to the role that media organizations play in constructing their own centrality, through processes of framing, ordering, naming spacing and imagining (Couldry, 2003, p. 178)”. Further elucidating the hegemonic power of media, Carpentier (2011: 273) confirms, “Media technologies are the objects of hegemonic projects that (aim to) fixate their meanings, and aim to normalize these always particular meanings. Here, the discourse of neutrality is a discursive tool to serve this post-political strategy. Media technologies are rigidly embedded in societal contexts, and in this sense they are never neutral”. Furthermore, Laclau and Mouffe also argue, “Hegemonic practices are an exemplary form of political articulation which involves linking together different identities into a common project” (Carpentier, 2012, p. 142). These scholars point to systemic and hegemonic power relations that have already been ingrained in the meaning-making processes, individual attitudes, behaviors, and more importantly identities concerning political and mediated participation. In relation to new public diplomacy there are tensions between the ideals that build on the dialectic public sphere conversation with equal participation, and the ideological underpinning of soft power diplomacy from a powerful country like the U.S. Evident in the criticism of the new public diplomacy based on the propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic relations (Melissen, 2005); the struggle toward the maximalist participation and the systemic power relations provide the subtle opportunity for the state to exert its power and influence the foreign public to its own benefit. As a result, although in the new

public diplomacy the public engages in participation that is outside of the institutional politics, political actors are still involved in influencing public opinion and impeding the aim of maximalist, multidirectional, and heterogeneous participation.

2.3.1 Voice Recognition

In relation to the struggle of participation to be maximalist, diverse, and multidirectional; the theory voice recognition explains the political participation at the individual agency level. Whereas the new public diplomacy attempts to develop public dialogue within the civil society, voice recognition, as theorized by Honneth (2007), provides individuals with the agency to converse in political. In describing voice as agency and socially constructed, Couldry (2010: 91) confirms, “Important is voice’s role as the means whereby people give an account of the world in which they act. As such, voice is socially grounded, performed through exchange, reflexive, embodied, and dependent upon a material form”. Dependent on the environment in which it occurs, democracy gives the opportunity for voice recognition. Similar to the public sphere, “Honneth analyzes democracy as a way of living together organized by the end of ‘social cooperation’ based on mutual recognition” (Couldry, 2010, p. 105). Furthermore, involving individual agency and morality that are embodied in the cosmopolitan rights in building what Honneth (2007) terms ‘the community’, Couldry (2010: 106) elucidates Honneth’s (2007) theory, “...we must recognize in each other an ability through voice to contribute to concrete decision-making”. Furthermore, in explaining the constant struggle between voice recognition and violations, Couldry (2010: 107) asserts, “The status of voice as achieved in politics depends, then, on becoming ‘*visible*’, not in the sense of being physically seen—any more than voice itself...depends necessarily on being physically heard—but in the sense of being *regarded* as relevant to the distribution of speaking opportunities”. Equipped with the media and communication technology, the ideal new public diplomacy is supposed to encourage voice recognition for the marginalized to participate in the cosmopolitan decision-making process.

Although the concept recognition may encourage certain members of the society to participate, the process of recognizing itself has been influenced by the power exerted by various social actors, in particular the ideals of neoliberalism. In explaining how neoliberalism has percolated into the overall society and has affected participation, Couldry (2010: 33-34) asserts:

Voice...having the basic resources from which you can give an account of oneself on which trust might be built—is increasingly an essential resource for capitalism but its sustainability is systematically ignored by neoliberal discourse and undermined by the new spirit of capitalism...It is significant in this context that the pressure towards ‘commodifying the human’ inherent to a connexionist world is not being developed into practices of self-promoting and self-branding.

Furthermore in relation to voice recognition, neoliberal ideals that are facilitated and amplified by the media have been ingrained into the daily activities that it affects meaning making process. Specifically in demonstrating this issue, Couldry (2010: 126) demonstrates, “...but contrast to much talk and imagery that affirms the role of corporations in supplying children’s needs, contributes not so much to the opacity of the social world, as to a new and strong reading of that world as a place where children associate democracy with the unfettered right to consumer”. In associating the new public diplomacy with voice recognition, by providing the marginalized and youth with recognition to participate the new public diplomacy simultaneously helps promote and sustain the already embedded neoliberal ideals in the society. As a result, even the marginalized community who has gained recognition socially is influenced to participate based on the neoliberal ideals. These neoliberal ideals could also be the opportunity that is used in nation branding and hegemonic cultural relations where the U.S. exerts its values.

2.4 Civic Culture

Whereas participation indicates the agency involved in the public sphere, civic culture depicts the environment suitable for that agency. Theorized by Dahlgren (2009), civic culture is particularly embedded within the same ‘democratic community’ conceptualized by Honneth (2007), Carpentier (2011), in the cosmopolitan citizenship (Held, 2010), and the Habermasian public sphere. Prior to explaining the civic culture environment, Dahlgren (2009: 103) establishes the concept civic agency and asserts, “Such agency, involving the capacity to make decisions and an act in accordance with a coherent sense of self, of identity, can never emerge or function in a vacuum; it must be an integrated and dynamic part of a larger cultural environment that has relevance for politics”. Shaped by the circuit of six dimensions of knowledge, values, trust, spaces, practices, and identities; Dahlgren (2009: 103) defines the plural civic cultures because of the many ways to achieve agency:

Cultures...consist of patterns of communication, practices, and meaning...They are internalized, intersubjectively among groups: They exist ‘in our heads,’ as it were, guiding and informing actions, speech, and understanding, while offering affordances ‘out there’—concrete possibilities for action, communication, and meaning-making.

The concept civic culture is imperative in explaining how the agency of individuals in the foreign publics is formed in participating in the global conversation. Particularly, the circuit of six dimensions indicates how the environment of civic culture influences the public’s participatory efficacy in engaging with the each other in making political decisions.

In order to achieve the civic culture, the circuit of six dimensions needs to cohesively operate together. More particularly, they cannot be separated as they influence each other as Dahlgren (2009: 108) confirms, “...each of the dimensions can impact on the others in various ways...They are closely intertwined, and in fact, to pull them apart and identify them individually for schematic purposes may convey a misleading impression of their individual independence, but it is necessary for heuristic purposes”. In terms of knowledge, Dahlgren (2009: 108-109) specifies the term knowledge acquisition and articulates, “Some degree of literacy is important; people must be able to make sense of that which circulates in public spheres, and to understand the world they live in”. Moreover, the dimension of values consists of substantive and procedural values as Dahlgren (2009: 111) elucidates, “We can distinguish between substantive values such as equality, liberty, justice, solidarity, and tolerance, and procedural ones, like openness, reciprocity, discussion, and responsibility/accountability. Both categories should be treated universally...” Additionally, trust also plays an important role in the civic culture. Dahlgren (2009: 112) specifically defines, “The bearers of trust are usually seen as the citizens, and the objects of trust are the institutions or representatives of government”. Whereas the dimension of spaces indicates the global public spheres that have been facilitated by the Internet and other media, the dimension of practices signifies habitual and concrete participation activities. Furthermore, Dahlgren (2009: 118-119) explains that the dimension of identities is the individual’s subjective view as a member of the society. The circuit of six dimensions is important in the new public diplomacy practices because its integrity is an analytical tool that can be an indicator on how effective the public diplomacy in building participatory environment for the foreign public.

2.5 Architecture of the Web 2.0

Whereas public spheres and mediapolis are utopian, the Internet is the concrete space where participation of the global civil society conversation actually takes place. As analyzed by many scholars as an important component in empowering civic engagements (Dahlgren, 2009) and daily participatory practices (Olsson and Svensson, 2012), the contemporary Internet “web 2.0” provides the infrastructure that is interactive and transformative for the converging media. In explaining the concept “web 2.0”, Olsson and Svensson (2012: 42) point out, “Web 2.0 marks the transformation of the web into a more interactive, contributory and participatory internet, where information exchanges become more complex and users get a richer experience...(BrandMe, np., translation from Swedish)”. Specifically in explaining what Jenkins (2006) conceptualizes the participatory and convergence culture of prod-user, “Both concepts have in common that they stress the importance of more interactive—and social—web technology in creating a cultural infrastructure of users’ active participation within various forms of co-production (usually exemplified by applications such as Twitter) and social networking (applications such as Facebook) online” (Olsson & Svensson, 2012, p. 46). Consistent with the notion that the web 2.0 fosters the development of multiple public spheres, Dahlgren (2009: 116) confirms, “Significantly, online spaces can facilitate offline activity, coordinating political interventions in ‘real-life’ spaces. Moreover, given that these technologies are so ubiquitous in everyday life, they help foster, even at the nonpolitical level, taken-for-granted cultures of networking”. Those are the same cultures that enable public dialogue and conversations that have the potential to become deliberative.

Despite the interactivity and participatory convergence, the new infrastructure also poses the intractable and systemic structural power-relations. Pointing out the hierarchical power-relations in the web 2.0, Olsson and Svensson (2012: 42-43) demonstrate, “...what might appear to be genuinely participatory practices among users...might very well be practices that are steered by, or even conjured up by, organized interests aiming at capitalizing on the participatory potential of web 2.0”. Specifically, the underpinning architecture of the web 2.0 is not merely built for participatory purposes, but it also strategically developed for the benefits of producers. In relation to the hegemony and embedded power-relations in the web 2.0, Carpentier (2011) stresses the continuous struggle toward maximalist participation based on the power exerted by political actors and the media. In this case, not only does the architecture of web 2.0 project the

unequal participation of the global publics, but also more importantly it consistently showcases the hegemonic and propagandistic public diplomacy as criticized by Melissen (2005). In applying the architecture of web 2.0 to the specific public diplomacy practices of this thesis, social media platforms have become an important tool in how the U.S. reaches out and facilitates the foreign public in its engagements. On the one hand, these social media platforms have unleashed the potential in encouraging and facilitating high levels of participation in the global public sphere. However, the restrictions and limitations imposed by either political actors and the media may also hinder participation.

2.6 Summary

The new public diplomacy is aimed at encouraging and facilitating the rise of the global civil society. Especially with the most updated theory of the public sphere, it provides the unfettered communicative spaces where cosmopolitan citizens can participate fully and freely. Moreover with the advancements in and capabilities offered by media technologies, it is through Silverstone's (2007) concept of mediapolis that the media is charged with the moral responsibility in providing spaces for dialogue where the global civil society can participate equally. Whereas Castells (2008) claims that these ideals of the new public diplomacy build the public sphere with participation outside the institutional politics, the actual practices still challenge this notion based on the struggle toward the maximalist participation based on the power exerted by the nation-state and the media. Particularly new public diplomacy practices that are studied in this research question the propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic cultural relations. Furthermore with the proliferation of the claimed interactive, contributory, and participatory social media; the theory developed by Olsson and Svensson (2012) also points the actual impacts web 2.0 has on the new public diplomacy where participation is steered to benefit powerful state and the media.

3. METHODOLOGY

In order to study the new public diplomacy practices with the specific program mentioned earlier; a combination of qualitative elite interviewing and web analysis methods was used to answer the research questions. In his fundamental explanation on qualitative methodology, Silverman (2001: 32) contends, “The methods used by qualitative researchers exemplify a common belief that can provide a ‘deeper’ understanding of social phenomena than would be obtained from purely quantitative data”. Since the research questions asked and data collected were not based on the positivist research tradition, qualitative methods were used to gain rich and deep information based on the theoretical framework. Consistently, Merton (1968: 39) terms this type of methods middle range of concepts that, “... mediate between concrete research techniques and more grand theoretical frameworks” (Jensen, 2002, p. 236). However, unlike quantitative methodology, qualitative methodology is challenged by the reliability and validity afforded by the positivist academic tradition. In conjunction to this argument, Silverman (2001: 34) confirms, “Some qualitative researchers argue that a concern for the reliability of observations arises only within the quantitative research tradition. Because what they call the ‘positivist’ position sees no difference between the national and social worlds, reliable measures of social life are only needed by such ‘positivists’”. By the same token, he also points to the problem of validity, “Validity is another word for truth... Sometimes one doubts the validity of an explanation because the researcher has clearly made no attempt to deal with contrary cases. Sometimes, the extended immersion in the ‘field’... leads to a certain preciousness about the validity of the researcher’s interpretation...” (Silverman, 2001, p. 34). Whereas the lack of reliability questions the data measured and how they relate to the research, the weakness of qualitative methodology in validity points to the difficulty in building clear understanding of the research topic. However, triangulating various methods helps overcome these predicaments.

For the purpose of this thesis, both elite interviewing and web analysis methods were used to mediate between the social empirical phenomenon of the new public diplomacy practices and connected theories. Particularly, the three advantages in qualitative methodology enabled this thesis to answer the research questions. Miles and Huberman (1994: 10) explain that one of these advantages is studying the social phenomenon under its natural settings. Furthermore, they

also point to the thick descriptions nature that indicates the rich understanding the data provides. Lastly, the interpretive nature of qualitative methodology also provides the research with cultural context and the meanings located in the phenomenon. Whereas the elite interviewing method provided empirical data that explained the new social policy of *smart power* and set the context for further analysis, the web analysis method used in this research provided the specific data and explanation of the actual participation that is facilitated by the new public diplomacy. In using elite interviewing method, the reliability of this research was strengthened using semi-structured questions, full transcription, and consistent coding during the analysis process. Moreover, the validity of this research was enhanced by the multi-site nature of the social media analysis because the different sites were highly relevant and provided answers to this research.

3.1 Elite Interviewing Method

Consistent with the social inquiry fundamentals of qualitative methodology that aim to gain deeper knowledge of the research subject matter, interviewing is an important method in in-depth understanding of social phenomena. As a qualitative method, interviewing enables the research process to gain in-depth understanding of the social phenomenon through the account of the informant. In his description of interviewing method, Rapley (2004: 15-16) asserts:

The face-face interview is presented as enabling a ‘special insight’ into subjectivity, voice and lived experience (Atkinson and Silverman, 1997)...Interviews are, by their very nature, social encounters where speakers collaborate in producing retrospective (and prospective) accounts and versions of their past (or future) actions, experiences, feelings, and thoughts.

By interacting with the interviewees, interviewing method enables the researcher to gain the information as provided through the lens of the informants who experience the social phenomenon that include their subjective accounts, understandings, and emotions, which also add to the depth and richness of information provided. In applying interviewing method, this research was able to understand the new public diplomacy practices through the lenses of the informants in the field who experienced the practices of public diplomacy on the daily basis.

Since the new public diplomacy has mostly been the result of the new U.S. foreign policy of the new administration since 2009, specifically elite interviewing method was used in order to gain deeper understanding and answer the research questions that are based on a new social

policy. In explaining elite interviewing method, Moyser (2006: 85) asserts, “The use of interviews to study those at those at the ‘top’ of any stratification system...The study of elites touches on some of the major and perennial issues of social analysis”. The nature of this social phenomenon that involved new social policy made elite interviewing method highly suitable for this research. Moreover, Hochschild (2009) also pinpoints the advantages of conducting elite interviews:

As the research content itself, a set of these interviews is clearly appropriate for the study of recent historical change, process-tracing studies of policy enactment or implementation, the role of memory and perception in political or social activity, and the role of elites...in a political, social, or economic process. Second, elite interviews can function as a sort of pre-test to help one discern which institutions or processes should be carefully studied through some other means such as content analysis, formal modeling, or statistical manipulation. Third and most generally, elite interviews can give substance and meaning to prior analyses of institutions, structures, rule-making, or procedural controls.

Consistently, by using elite interviewing method this research was able to gain in-depth understanding and answer the research questions on the social policy shift based on the U.S. *smart power* foreign policy, its implementation in the form of new public diplomacy practices, and its implications in the society through the perspectives of government officials. Additionally, prior to triangulating with the web analysis method this method also brought in the context and meaning before proceeding to specific analysis of the social media. However, there were limitations in using this method. Moyser (2006: 87) asserts that the most important elements for elite interviews are trust and rapport. Whereas before the interviews these had been established through prior professional experience working with these practitioners, comprehensive research on foreign policy on topics that touch on national security requires access to top-security classified information. As a result, the information provided by officials does not explain as deep and as complete as access to classified information would provide. Additionally, as a qualitative method elite interview cannot be generalized to explain the overall approach of the new public diplomacy that the U.S. foreign policy projects worldwide.

3.1.1 Interviewing Process

The interviewing process involved several steps, including developing pilot semi-structured interview questions, pre-testing the pilot questions, revising for the final questions, and conducting individual interviews. In the initial step of developing interview questions, theoretical framework and research questions were compared, resulting in preliminary questions on concepts such as the new public diplomacy, strategies, participation, deliberative democracy, the public spheres, and global civil society. After conducting a pilot interview, the finalized semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix A) were developed based on the overarching topics on smartpower and directives, public sphere values, the role of social media, and relationship between state and civil society. In this case, eight total respondents from both the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark and Danish Ministry of Social- Integration and Affairs were recruited. Whereas due to a schedule complication one of the respondents could not participate in the interview, two others declined to be interviewed. As a result, five face-to-face individual interviews were conducted with practitioners who were involved in the public diplomacy social inclusion program. Due to the sensitivity of the data that sometimes involved classified information for national security purposes, some of the questions had to be rephrased during certain interview sessions but they still reflected to overarching topics. By the same token, although the interviews were recorded using digital voice recorder, all of the interviewees asked that their responses to be treated as background information. After the completion of all five interviews, recorded sessions were fully transcribed (see Appendix B). By using full and complete transcription of the interviews, this research strengthened its reliability. In supporting reliability in qualitative interviewing method, Silverman pinpoints (2001: 230), “At a more basic level, when people’s activities are tape recorded and transcribed, the reliability of the interpretation of transcripts may be gravely weakened by a failure to transcribe apparently trivial, but often crucial, pauses and overlaps”. Furthermore, after all of the interviews had been transcribed, the transcripts were utilized for Qualitative Data Analysis.

3.1.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

In analyzing the interviews, Qualitative Data Analysis was used to analyze the data in the transcripts. According to Rapley (2011) Qualitative Data Analysis involves two main overarching steps of coding and thematic analysis. Whereas during the coding phase large

chunks or sections of the text are identified, highlighted, and labeled to reflect findings that are related to the research questions and later on combined to structure underlying themes; during the thematic analysis codes and themes are identified and interpreted based on the theoretical framework of the research. Furthermore, Miles and Huberman (1994: 56) confirm, “This part of analysis involves how you differentiate and combine the data you have retrieved and the reflections you make about this information. Codes are tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study”. In order to establish reliability, consistent coding based on repetitions, comparisons, and metaphors were implemented. According to Ryan and Bernard (2003), three main consistent techniques of identifying repetitions, comparisons, and metaphors are used in enhancing the reliability of coding. Once themes have been identified, they are categorized, reviewed, and refined to develop main and overarching themes that reflect the theories in order to answer the research questions (Rapley, 2011, p. 280-288). Consequently, the thematic analysis results in forming relationships and patterns between codes and core themes that are further compared with the theoretical framework to answer the research questions.

During the Qualitative Data Analysis of this research, each of the transcripts was coded to identify data that was related to the theoretical framework of this research. Based on the consistent coding of word repetitions, comparisons, and metaphors; concepts such as public-to-public, facilitating the public, promoting and sharing values, as well as social media were identified as concepts. After all of the coding had been completed in all five transcripts, the codes were then listed in tables for the next step of identifying themes (see Appendix C). During the theme identification step, codes were combined to make logical patterns and structures that eventually generated themes of the transcripts. After all of the themes had been identified in the tables, they were then continuously reviewed and refined by clustering codes and themes together (see Appendix D) in order to come up with core themes that would be used for the thematic analysis. Furthermore, in order to ensure that all of the data and findings were exhaustively interpreted, this step also involved reviewing, refining, and going back-and-forth between transcripts and coding sheets.

3.2 Web Analysis

Since the dialogue and participation of the public in the inclusion program takes place on social media platforms, in studying the U.S. new public diplomacy this research used web

analysis method. In referring to studying the Internet, Hine (2011: 569) points out, “As a phenomenon which makes interactions of diverse kinds persistent, traceable and amenable to sociological gaze (Beer and Burrows, 2007; Savage and Burrows, 2007), the internet provides a rich resource for studying the way that people engage with media”. In applying this to the case of participation on the web 2.0, particularly multi-site analysis approach (Hannerz, 2003) enables to capture globalization issues in the same nature as the accessibility of social media participation. Hine (2011: 581) confirms, “By being mobile in our approach, we are positioned to look at how various interpretations of media circulate, become fixed, and acquire moral and political force”. Particularly, in analyzing participation of Internet users online, multi-sited participant observation provides the depth and richness of research through the immersed descriptions of the phenomena that occur on social media. In his emphasis on the link between sites, Hannerz (2011: 205) stresses, “The sites are connected with one another in such ways that the relationships between them are as important for this formulation as the relationships with them...One must establish the translocal linkages, and the interconnections between those and whatever local bundles of relationships which are also part of the study”. Since social media is a place where these relationships and interconnections between the global public occur, multi-site analysis provides a method that descriptively and interpretively investigates activities in their native virtual environment. Furthermore, Hannerz (2011: 211) also warns, “Probably the time factor has a part in making many multi-site studies rather more dependent on interviews than single-site studies”. Consistently, in this research the elite interviewing method was also implemented previous to the multi-site analysis to understand the context of the social media participation.

In analyzing the participation facilitated by U.S. public diplomacy that occurs on the web 2.0, four Facebook-based social media forums that were referred to during the elite interviews were analyzed using multi-site web analysis. Having been referred through the elite interviews, the four sites were Facebook pages of U.S. Embassy Denmark, Ambassador Fulton’s personal account, Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders, and Generation Change (see Appendices E-H). First, each of the Facebook pages was analyzed for its overall function and purpose. Afterwards, the relationships between participants and how they participate were described. After all aspects of each of the pages were described, they were then interpreted and compared with the theoretical framework with concepts such as participation, civic culture, mediapolis, and the architecture of web 2.0. Whereas the descriptions on the overall functions and purposes involved the analysis

using the theories of the ecology and architecture of the web 2.0; the descriptions of the relationships between participants and their online interactions involved the analysis using the theories that focus more on participation, civic culture, and cosmopolitan citizenship. In order to fully understand this social media participation, elite interview data were also referred and combined to explain the phenomena. Moreover, by using a multi-site analysis approach the mobile nature of this method and the social media improved the validity of this research in addition to the consistent interviewing process and analysis.

3.3 Limitations

In conducting this research, some of the limitations faced during this research were the inability to comprehensively study the digital divide between online and offline participation, a more complete comparison across different social media forums and platforms due to the relatively new tool social media was for the U.S. public diplomacy, and immersion in analyzing the pages. Since this research focused on the new policy and how it was reflected in the participation of public spheres on the web 2.0 platforms, there was a digital divide between how the level of participation, interaction, and engagement online and whether or not people actually felt inclusive in reality. Although interviewing participants may have illuminated further findings about this digital divide, the respondents would not correspond to the online participants. Furthermore, although the four Facebook pages that were referred to by interviewees reflected on-going new public diplomacy practices in facilitating civil society participation, there were many other social media pages and platforms that could shed more light in order to get a more complete understanding on the participation on web 2.0, the different levels of participation, and ecologies of the different platforms. However, social media itself was still relatively a new tool for the U.S. government in its foreign policy. Additionally, this research also had the deficiency in immersing fully in the web analysis process. In applying his multi-site concept, Hannerz (2011) actually refers to ethnography that requires longer time for the researcher to immerse and to be part of the phenomenon. Since time was constrained to only six months in this thesis research study, the immersion in online participation was limited to analyzing the web.

4. THE CASE STUDY

The United States Embassy in Copenhagen, Denmark is a diplomatic mission representing American foreign policy and relations with Denmark. As an organization that directly represents the U.S. government and people, it carries a mission that corresponds to the diplomatic relations between the United States and Denmark. Its mission statement declares:

Our two most important objectives are to advance the prosperity and safety of Americans abroad and at home and to carry the policy priorities of the U.S. government. All employees at the U.S. Embassy Denmark share a responsibility to promote U.S. values and advance the economic, political, and security interests of the United States...We coordinate closely with the Danish government to deal with the many challenges all democracies face with in the 21st century: promoting democracy and human rights; advancing our shared political and humanitarian goals; and fighting international terror and extremism wherever they occur (U.S. Department of State, 2013).

One of the prominent capacities in implementing this mission is the opportunity to use public diplomacy and in particular the inclusion program that encourages and facilitates marginalized community and youth to participate in the global civil society. Whereas public diplomacy itself is an instrument resulting from the smart power policy that intends utilize the soft power approach, the specific program this capacity has been working on is linked directly to national security to prevent radicalization and develop positive sentiment about the U.S. Since the implementation of this program is a matter of international relations, it involves collaborative work with the host government, specifically the Danish Ministry of Social- Affairs and Integration. In terms of concrete public diplomacy practices, together the U.S. embassy and the Danish Ministry of Social- Affairs and Integration reach out to civil society organizations of marginalized groups such as Somali and other immigrant groups in Denmark, as well as youth. The collaborative organizations also facilitate exchanges of people, ideas, and values between the two countries and provide workshops where these groups can learn from basic societal to democratic values of participation. Moreover in carrying out the 21st Century Statecraft part of the *smart power* policy, the U.S. embassy also utilizes social media technology in its outreach and facilitation efforts to support the dialogue participation of these civil society organizations.

5. ANALYSIS

5.1 Thematic Analysis

Following the refining and clustering process, the core findings of this thesis are that U.S. public diplomacy aims to facilitate public-to-public interactions, its dissemination of U.S. values to encourage participation, the positive imaging and stage managing efforts in order to gain sentiment and credibility, its attempt in encouraging for inclusive participation of marginalized community. In addition, the findings also point to the relationships between the state, society, and individuals; the role of social media in expanding communicative spaces globally; and some ethical values in public diplomacy practices.

5.1.1 Public to Public, Listening & Advocacy

Consistent with the overall definition of the new public diplomacy, the U.S. public diplomacy is an overall government effort in facilitating public-to-public interactions and dialogue. This is demonstrated as something that the government encourages but where the public is not pushed to participate. In the transcript the interviewee T.S explains:

If you look at traditional diplomacy: it was government to public. Now what you're seeing, the latest development is public to public. What role does the embassy play...in sort of facilitating? That's when we do a program but we step back and we leave the interaction and even the follow up to the public.

Furthermore, by facilitating these interactions U.S. new public diplomacy enables the public to meet its needs. Contrastingly, in the previous cases of state-to-public interactions there is a mismatch in fulfilling public needs. The interviewee T.S. explains, "When government to public, it's a little bit of a mismatch: 'this is what we think the public needs' and we're bound by government regulation, whereas when we're sending a delegation to the United States they're interacting with anyone that...they meet and gain broader experience". Both of these demonstrate that the overall U.S. new public diplomacy practices only encourage and facilitate for public dialogue without the influence of the state, allowing the dialogue to arrive with what the public needs. In this case, the notion public-to-public demonstrates the public sphere.

In explaining the public sphere and cosmopolitan citizenship, by merely facilitating public-to-public interactions the U.S. new public diplomacy shows that it promotes the communicative space that Habermas (1989) describes in its normative and its most updated conceptualization. The facilitation of public-to-public interactions demonstrates that the state facilitates spaces for the public to share ideas, consistent with the intersubjective shared space. However unlike the Habermasian public sphere, the spaces facilitated by the U.S. public diplomacy do not require strict rationality. Particularly, it supports any public dialogue that has the potential to decision-making process at the global level. This is enabled by the unfettered flow of information that members of the public share with each other, which consequently fulfills their needs. Consistent with the contemporary conceptualization of the public sphere, public needs that are met and satisfied reflect the co-production of meanings that leads to the formation of decision-making process. In this case, without the social discomfort from the rationality requirement, the open spaces public diplomacy provides enables the potential deliberation of decision-making process by global citizens.

Another important aspect of public diplomacy practices that facilitates public-to-public interactions is the mechanism of listening and advocacy. Accordingly, listening and advocacy operate reciprocally as the fundamentals of public diplomacy in order to understand and fulfill the public's needs. In demonstrating this point, the interviewee P.H. elucidates, "You can certainly boil it down to listening and advocacy...I would say that one of the things that works within public diplomacy is using the listening when you create the advocacy. So you advocate things that hopefully make sense for the audience". Whereas listening and advocacy certainly confirm the basic components of public diplomacy as explained by Cull (2008), more importantly the reciprocal mechanism between the two addresses the issue of systemic power relations and struggles for the maximalist participation in a way that levels the relationship between social actors. In further explaining specific practices, the interviewee T.S. demonstrates, "You see this in more sensitive places like Pakistan where we're doing a lot in terms of really engaging and asking the public: what is it that the embassy can do for you. I think there's this more sort of back-and-forth and building relationships". In his conceptualization of participation, Carpentier (2011) points to the systemic issue in which the exercise of power in the society is a constant struggle between the various social actors. Although the media institution exerts influential power as discussed by Carpentier (2011), the ideal public diplomacy showcases that

through listening and advocacy the U.S. attempts to build stronger relationships with the public, thus reducing the hierarchical power relations between the state and the public in the overall effort to facilitate participation.

Supporting Civil Society Interactions

The main practices of public diplomacy demonstrate how it promotes the public sphere concepts of participation and cosmopolitan citizenship. In terms of encouraging participation, interviewee R.K. points out, "...our role is to promote dialogue...such as the Speakers program where it was not American officials who came but private citizens who came". Furthermore, this is also explained further as, "State develops spaces where public can engage freely in dialogue through exchanges of individuals values, best practices; Speakers program with free citizenships informing each other openly with complete information; and encouraging marginalized group to participate and to be part of the society" (T.S. transcript). In addition to supporting the public sphere mentioned earlier, public diplomacy practices that support civil society interactions also indicate that they attempt to encourage participation. Particularly, the dialogue that is generated through these interactions operates outside of the institutional politics as discussed by Carpentier (2012). Ideally, political interaction leads to the kind of maximalist, heterogeneous, and multidirectional political participation. Consistent with Dahlgren (2009), these ideal practices encourage the participation of everyday dialogue with the potential to become civic engagement.

In conjunction to facilitating participation, public diplomacy also demonstrates its support of cosmopolitan citizenship. This is demonstrated through the interactions between foreign publics that allow them to exchange views and values. The interviewee T.S. argues, "I think just that [exchange] experience is really important: it's not only about information gathered about each other, it's not just that the Americans who have come to Denmark learn more about Denmark, but that interaction itself...it's a healthy bi-product that they learn this cosmopolitan worldview of exchanged ideas". The exchanges among private and non-governmental actors enable the public to partake in the cosmopolitan citizenship. Particularly, this is consistent with the same *human Existenz* that Benhabib (2004) emphasizes where the public can freely engage with each other based on their fundamental fact and rights as human beings. Related to this, the interactions also enable what Held (2010) conceptualizes as cosmopolitan dialogue with the potential of deliberative global decision based on the information and ideas they share. In this case, the public is not bound by the territorial boundaries to participate in the global discussion.

The claimed “healthy bi-product of cosmopolitan worldview of exchanged ideas” reflects this potential because individuals have equal status and participation opportunity.

Letting Civil Society Grow Organically

Many of the public diplomacy practices also involve the government to initiate and encourage participation and then step back to let the civil society to take over, which builds the public sphere and civic culture. In demonstrating these points, the interviewee T.S. emphasizes, “I think if you push them, they’re feeling like they’re being dragged in...I think the key is creating whether it’s actual physical space, mental space, civil society, or its social media space where they feel they can join in”. Furthermore, the interviewee N.I. supports this notion and confirms, “Creating places like coffee shops...places where young kids could come and seek advice, and learn about the Danish society, learn how the different sectors function...then, educating these kids who then could go back to their parents...” By providing these spaces, the practices of U.S. public diplomacy do not only facilitate the spheres for public dialogue, but it also promotes the development of civic cultures. As articulated further, the interviewee T.S. elaborated, “I don’t think we need to push, I think we need to create an environment where they can come on their own”. The kind of environment that allows the public to freely come and participate is consistent with the dimension of spaces (Dahlgren, 2009) as the environment suitable for participation agency. Whereas by only initiating the dialogue and then let the civil society take over the U.S. public diplomacy demonstrates that it builds the global public sphere, the social media helps provide the space at the cosmopolitan level. In explaining this dimension, Dahlgren (2009: 115) asserts, “The objective presence of public spheres is of course a prerequisite, but in the context of civic cultures, I stress the experiential proximity to citizens, that citizens feel that these spaces are available to them for civic use”. In this case whether public diplomacy facilitates physical or mental spaces, the social media operates as the mediapolis that Silverstone (2007) theorizes. That is, it has the moral responsibility to connect the fragmented global communities and equip them with equal rights to participate. In the attempt to provide the civic culture, this kind of environment is conducive to maximalist political engagements and participation.

5.1.2 Disseminating U.S. values

In facilitating the public to participate, the U.S. uses public diplomacy to promote its democratic values that encourage public participation. The interviewee A.T. elaborates on basic

objectives of public diplomacy and claims, "...the classics: engaging with local community, explaining U.S. society and politics, and democratic principles...promoting civic participation...we do encourage people to participate and their civic duties". Furthermore, this is supported by the idea that U.S. democratic values encourage participation as T.S. confirms, "I think it's important that the platforms we use—whether social media or face-to-face or exchanges—that we are one giving as many people the possibility to participate in those platforms as possible...So it's not just numbers, but also giving rights to participants". Consistently, this demonstrates the ideal of the new public diplomacy in attracting the public using cultural values and facilitating civil society participation.

Two components that support this participation are civic culture dimensions of knowledge and values. During the interview, the interviewee P.H. agrees, "A lot of time and money spent on that are basically educating, and part of that is also educating people in English, so they can read all of this text...then it will generate good public sphere of people who have some level of shared ideas and shared values and who are deliberative about it". By educating, the U.S. public diplomacy equips individuals to understand social issues discussed in the public spheres so they can engage. Furthermore and an equally important dimension of the circuit in this case is values. In applying the two types of values that Dahlgren (2009) discusses whereas values such as civil duties and inclusive participation indicate substantive, others such as democratic principles demonstrate procedural values. Both knowledge acquisition and values disseminated encourage members of the foreign public to participate in the global public sphere. However, in disseminating U.S. values public diplomacy also demonstrates the structural power relations that hampers the maximalist participation.

In disseminating democratic values public diplomacy also projects other values that could be considered as other components of democratic values but they are actually part of the embedded fundamental hegemonic American beliefs. In justifying the promotion of democratic values, R.K. asserts:

...make no mistake about it: we do believe that democracy is the best system of government for the people of the world specifically because it allows for the people of the world to select their own leaders. Those are the types of values that we promote...In terms of the other values we try to promote: freedom of speech—again it is just simply by

definition. It is what our values are...we do speak about that. We do speak out against about anytime there are attacks on free speech...

By the same token, this is also reflected as T.S. re-asserts, "...I think a lot of what we do in public diplomacy would reflect what the global values are: human rights, respect for minorities, respect for women, respect for all people. Those values play a big part of public diplomacy". Although at the surface level these values may seem to promote the maximalist participation and public spheres, some of them actually indicate what critics of public diplomacy charge as hegemonic cultural relations. In promoting these values to the foreign publics, the U.S. public diplomacy strongly believes that these values would encourage participation when they actually exert U.S. hegemonic and cultural power. Consequently, hegemonic cultural relations also impact the actual kind of participation that the public engages in. Particularly, in terms of cosmopolitan citizenship this phenomenon demonstrates the unilateral *pax Americana* illustrated by Habermas (2006) in which the U.S. exerts its hegemonic and structural power to influence the public at the cost of other ideologies. Whereas Carpentier (2011) argues on the hegemony of the media, the same mechanism occurs with political actors where there is already structural and systemic meaning-making process in which the values such as human rights, freedom of speech, and respect for minorities are thought to represent values that encourage participation when these values have actually been ingrained in the society to influence their opinion and participation.

5.1.3 Positive Imaging, Stage Managing

In addition to disseminating its democratic values, in facilitating public-to-public interactions the U.S. public diplomacy also projects positive imaging to the foreign public in order to gain sentiment and credibility. In demonstrating this the interviewee P.H. notes, "...put it sort of blunt and short, I would say the function of public diplomacy is to create sentiment or awareness in the host government's population that will make them more positive toward the U.S. foreign policy, toward the U.S. culture, or toward the U.S. in general". Furthermore, he provides further justification and points out, "...it's all about the national security—that a country as a whole thinks as positively about the U.S. at it can" (P.H. transcript). In applying the fundamental criticism of public diplomacy, this poses the problem of nation branding. Consistently, this demonstrates that as the U.S. projects positive image to the foreign publics to gain sentiment and awareness, at the same time public diplomacy complements the marketing

approach that works to the benefit of the U.S as pointed out by Melissen (2005). Moreover, in projecting its positive image, the U.S. public diplomacy utilizes the press as a vehicle in influencing the public perception. The interviewee P.H. elucidates, "...we spend a lot of time looking into what's in the press. We spend a lot of time talking to the press and communicate through the press as much as we can. Those are important and I think the base of what U.S. hopes to get through the public diplomacy is as informed as the U.S. perspective and policy as possible". Although in this transcript the interviewee mentions the aim of U.S. public diplomacy for well-informed foreign public, specific practices involving the press demonstrate the dissemination of a positive image. In explaining about the opportunity of public diplomacy overseas in informing and promoting the U.S., the interviewee T.S. asserts, "...that we're not giving bad information—I think that's important. No bad information has ever been given out by the U.S. government". In this case, it is clear that there is an underlying effort to project positive image by promoting the U.S and its culture., which is consistent with nation branding and hegemonic cultural relations.

In addition to the use of press to project U.S. positive image to the foreign public, many of the practices involving the media pose the issue of stage-managing. Similar to the mechanism that projects positive image of the U.S., the press is heavily involved in the stage-managed public diplomacy practices. In demonstrating how the press is involved as a vehicle in stage-managing many of practices, the interviewee A.T. confirms, "...from the press angle I think it's so stage-managed and I think it's in danger of losing credibility...I wish I could come up with stuff that is a bit more real. Often, we come across as just so superficial: we breeze in, we do our thing, we have the photo spread for the newspaper, and we breeze out again. I think we need to work on to have more credibility". In stage-managing its practices, the U.S. public diplomacy attempts to gain sentiment from the foreign public, but these practices lack substance. The interviewee A.T. further notes:

I think we only talk about engagement with the public...again, people feel so limited to what they can actually say and if people get to say something a little but more substantive...you could be in trouble. I think in general, that is the weakness with public diplomacy: it's all dumbed down, it's all too much platitude, we never get to the nitty-gritty.

Both of these quotations show that although the new public diplomacy attempts to facilitate global dialogue for the public, in reality many of these practices indicate as mere opportunities to increase sentiment without substantive information.

Positive imaging and stage managing aspects of the U.S. public diplomacy point to the lack of credibility, which relates to the civic culture dimension of trust. As Dahlgren (2009: 114) explains, “Without this kind of modest level of trust, activist groups, networks, social movements, and political parties would be impossible”. These practices are aimed at creating sentiment, but the public is left with partial information that has been modified to the advantage of the U.S. and because of the lack of substance As a result, the lack of credibility in actual public diplomacy practices impedes the potentially active and full participation. Consistent with the cohesiveness of the circuit of civic culture that Dahlgren (2009) emphasizes, trust is a crucial component in the circuit that ensures the reciprocal relationship between the state and the public. In this case, without the trust dimension public diplomacy’s attempt to promote dialogue cannot work optimally in encouraging full civic participation in the global dialogue.

In terms of the press that is highly involved in the positive imaging and stage managing, this poses the issue of media and morality that is addressed by Silverstone (2007). Particularly, in working with the foreign public the media carries the moral responsibility to ensure the diversity, hospitality, and reciprocity needed for the cosmopolitan citizens to participate. In his mediapolis, Silverstone (2007: 10) argues, “The media have this unique role in global culture. They provide a technological and cultural framework for the connectivity, positive or negative, without which the globe would be merely a shadow”. In contrast to what Silverstone (2007) conceptualizes, in informing the foreign public the press has been influenced by the positive imaging and stage managing efforts for nation branding of the U.S. Consequently, it generates the disconnect of the global fragmented communities because of the hegemonic power of framing and imagining exerted by the media that impacts the struggle toward maximalist participation for the foreign public.

5.1.4 Inclusion and Exclusion

In facilitating public-to-public interactions and engagements, many public diplomacy practices also focus on the marginalized community and youth in the foreign public. Particularly, in the case of the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen this type of practices is aimed at encouraging inclusive

participation for the Somali diaspora community. The interviewee T.S. explains the overall aim of this type of practices and points, “I think what we are trying to do is...creating an environment where everyone feels like they are part of the society. People ask, ‘Well, what does it have to do with U.S. foreign policy? Why is the United States focused on making, helping people feel part of their society?’ The easy answer is when people feel part of the society, they contribute to the economy and they stay out of trouble”. In this case, these practices are consistent with the policy of the new public diplomacy that builds the global civil society and in particular the public spheres. This is implemented by providing exchanges of people, ideas, and best practices; promoting U.S. values and encouraging participation of these communities; and empowering these people by recognizing their societal roles.

In terms of sharing ideas and values, the U.S. public diplomacy facilitates exchanges between minority groups in Denmark and the United States. In the process, it generates public-to-public dialogue. In demonstrating this public diplomacy practice, the interviewee R.K. informs:

We’ve been engaged with exchanges in the city of Minneapolis where there’s a number of Somali-Danes who have gone to Minneapolis, a number of Somali-Americans who have come here, and a number of officials who’ve tried to work on the various aspects of integration program who have gone back-and-forth. Something with the idea of sharing best practices in terms of how you best make people feel so they’re part of the greater society.

Moreover, this claim is also supported by the interviewee P.H. who confirms, “Where they then have experiences on what works and what doesn’t work...there are some success stories in the U.S. and there are some issues in Denmark, so those two can meet and create success stories in Denmark”. The exchange experiences between foreign publics facilitated by the U.S. government is consistent with Castells’s (2008) notion that the new public diplomacy builds the global civil society and the public sphere where individuals can interact in co-production and sharing of values to generate social dialogue.

Furthermore these exchanges also represent the concepts cosmopolitan citizenship and participation. Consistent with Held’s (2010) global dialogue and ability for participation, by facilitating these exchanges U.S. public diplomacy reflects the fundamental rights and provides

the opportunity for marginalized community in the global participative dialogue. Especially this relates to the global citizenship as Held (2010: 42-43) further confirms:

Cosmopolitan right connoted to the capacity to present oneself and be heard within and across political communities...this right extended the circumstances which allow people to enjoy an exchange of ideas (and goods) with the inhabitants of other countries, but that it did not extend as far as the right to permanent settlement or citizenship to their homeland.

In this case, specifically public diplomacy efforts provide the marginalized community the Kantian hospitality that is the right to participate and be heard within the global civil society to make deliberative decision-making process. Moreover, by sharing ideas on how to solve the problems they face, marginalized communities both in the U.S. and Denmark engage in the participation toward the multilateral and collaborative global efforts to solve many issues, including social exclusion that are experienced by these participants.

Encouraging Participation

Another approach that U.S. public diplomacy capacity utilizes to ensure societal inclusion is by encouraging participation through listening and advocacy as well as promoting democratic values to the marginalized community. This is reflected in the transcript as the interviewee T.S. mentions:

That idea that if you have strong civil society...if people feel engage, if people are part of the process, they are going to work within the system and they are not going to choose paths that don't fit in our world order. In terms of what we do here is supporting Danish initiatives, to help all parts of the society—especially those who are new to Denmark—to be part of the system: participation, engagement.

Particularly, this is done by promoting democratic values as the interviewee N.I. further comments, “This is what we’ve done with these groups, but also something which is a part of the curriculum within schools...it has received a strong focus from the government as well—the idea that we need people to understand what democracy is, why freedom of speech is so important. These core values that define our society”. Whereas encouraging inclusive participation through engagements with this community parallels the listening and advocacy components of public diplomacy as explained by Cull (2008), the overall approach indicates U.S. public diplomacy’s

effort to build some of the aspects in the civic culture environment that can potentially lead to the participation efficacy and agency.

By promoting values that are crucial for societal participation U.S. public diplomacy facilitates the marginalized with education necessary for this community to understand and make sense of the overall societal dialogue. This is consistent with the knowledge acquisition that Dahlgren (2009: 108-109) explains is necessary to make sense of the public sphere. Additionally, by specifically educating this community with values such as democracy, freedom of speech, and other societal values; public diplomacy also supports the civic culture circuit of values that Dahlgren (2009: 111) asserts should be treated as universal. In this case whereas substantive values are promoted through education, procedural values are implemented by demonstrating that marginalized community also plays societal values in public participation. The interviewee A.T. confirms, "...We do encourage people to participate and their civic duties and stuff. The Public Diplomacy Officer has been trying to get underneath the surface and engage in many meaningful ways and I think that's obviously important". By educating the public with these universal values, the U.S. equips the foreign public with some of the components of the environment that could potentially turn into political participation.

Targeting

In conjunction to encouraging marginalized community to participate in the overall society, U.S. public diplomacy uses targeting approach to youth and the marginalized. In explaining one of the groups that the U.S. embassy focuses on, the interviewee P.H. points out, "I think this is one thing that I have seen is the focus on youth and not just showing hip bands or whatever..., but actually going and talking to young people—getting young people to talk to officials about what are their concerns, what are their fears, what do they want to see from U.S.-Danish collaborations, for instance what they want to see from U.S. foreign policy". Whereas the focus on youth indicates listening and advocacy that promote dialogue, there is also a similar focus on marginalized community. The interviewee N.I. demonstrates this by mentioning, "...for us having this inclusion focus derives from the fear of someone might be radicalized. So, that's why we have this focus now because if you don't feel accepted, then you are more inclined to take a protest identity". Both, focusing on youth and the marginalized, indicate that public diplomacy attempts to promote full participation, particularly through voice recognition. Couldry (2010) explains that Honneth's (2007) voice recognition provides the agency for individuals in

political discussions. Specifically, Couldry (2010: 106) elaborates, “A particular advantage of Honneth’s emphasis on recognition, however, is its sensitivity to the role that acknowledging others’ accounts of themselves must play in a just social and political life”. As demonstrated by public diplomacy practices, by focusing on and recognizing youth and marginalized community the U.S. makes their voices visible, which enables them to participate in the overall society.

Although the recognition provides to youth and marginalized are aimed at encouraging their participation in the political decision-making process, the kind of societal participation that is promoted and facilitated through public diplomacy is actually influenced by the embedded neoliberal ideals. In recognizing marginalized community, the interviewee N.I. points out:

We taught people with minority background who now have managed to find their paths and become included into the society—find jobs, education, and so...If you really want, of course you can be a Muslim working for the government or you can...be a policeman if that’s what you want...no one is discriminating you because of your race. If so, they are probably discriminating because of your lack of...qualifications. So, as long as you can get your qualifications right, then you can do everything that you want to do.

In this case, in order to gain societal recognition youth and members of marginalized community are encouraged to follow neoliberal expectations such as gaining education and finding jobs in order to participate fully in the society. Furthermore, although education and qualifications improve inclusiveness for marginalized community in the overall societal participation, there is some aspect of hegemonic cultural relations in which these societal expectations are actually based on U.S. culture and values, evident in the protest identity that the U.S. attempts to prevent. In this case, by providing voice recognition U.S. public diplomacy practices simultaneously encourage and promote its cultural values, which is consistent with the branding effort.

5.1.5 State, Society, and Individuals

Since the aim of the new public diplomacy is to facilitate global civil society interactions, this is also reflected in the relationships between the state, society, and individuals through public outreach. On the one hand, public diplomacy is utilized to reach out and inform the foreign public in order to gain its grassroots mass support of U.S. foreign policy. In this case, in garnering mass support U.S. public diplomacy utilizes hegemonic propaganda to influence the public opinion. On the other hand, the use of social media enables U.S. public diplomacy to

engage with the public in a more approachable and informal way, which builds closer and personal relationships. Consequently, these closer relationships that are provided by the social media demonstrate public sphere dialogue where individuals and officials can participate.

Grassroots Support

One of the crucial goals that U.S. public diplomacy attempts to accomplish is to build and maintain relationships with the public in order to receive favorable support for U.S. foreign policy. In showing this approach, the interviewee T.S. summarizes one of the overall goals, "...if you keep in mind that public diplomacy is directly part of the foreign service and it's not its own agency kind of things, when you have a policy or something you are trying to accomplish from the top you also get the support of the masses". This indicates that the structural and hierarchical power relations between the state, media, and global civil society take place within the communication spaces. Particularly, the media plays an important role in shaping public opinion as T.S. later elaborates on how public diplomacy gained the support from the foreign public by bringing an American speaker who talked about a new U.S. trade agreement policy with Europe:

...within a few days there were op-eds from party leaders, politicians, foreign ministers who had been in those meetings with him were writing op-eds with titles like "Why We Need the Americans". So you can see why these government, leaders talking at the top—President Obama talking to the E.U. or Secretary Kerry talking to foreign ministers around Europe about this important trade agreement, meanwhile we're generating very good conversations and public discussion about it. So that supports top-level diplomacy.

In terms of power relations, this kind of practices actually relates to the propaganda within the criticism of public diplomacy. As described by Melissen (2005) although the new public diplomacy focuses on the public, there are still domestic and foreign policy interests that need to be fulfilled. As a result, propaganda is embedded within public diplomacy practices in influencing public opinion and how the public thinks. Consistent with the propaganda aspect of the new public diplomacy, the interviewee P.H. observes, "If you take the really long perspective, it's all about the national security—that a country as a whole thinks as positively about the U.S. as it can". In this case, public diplomacy is used in the same light as marketing and branding in reaching out and building relationships with the foreign public in order to gain the mass support in favor of the U.S.

Whereas at the state level U.S. public diplomacy influences the public in supporting its foreign policy, by the same token the media institution, particularly the press, is involved in persuading for favorable public opinion. This mechanism is used as a branding effort to promote the same unilateral *pax Americana* decision and policy that Habermas (2006) points out. Specifically, members of the public are influenced by the media to support U.S. policy at the cost of their societies' own ideologies. By doing so, the U.S. actually exerts its power and continues its unilateral police operation in the global arena. As the result of this unilateral force, it influences people in overlooking other ideologies, an opportunity which otherwise would provide the multilateral decision-making that is based on the cosmopolitan rights of the public.

Engaging with Officials

Moreover, U.S. public diplomacy also enables dialogue spaces between the state and the public, which relationships are facilitated by the social media. In this case, the relationships that are maintained through social media are more personal, making the state more approachable in engaging in dialogue with the public. The interviewee T.S. showcases the kind of relationships between state, society, and individuals that social media platforms have enabled and describes:

What we're trying to do though is through social media. For example, you take the ambassador's and the embassy's Facebook...the conversations and engagements we're able to have with all segments of the Danish population is important that not only we learn from each other about everything, but also for someone to take a step back and say, 'Wow, here I am I recently immigrated from Somalia or Palestine or wherever I came from and here I am in Denmark and I am engaging with the ambassador of the United States, just like a Danish politician or a Danish CEO'. If you see friends or who likes the embassy's Facebook, you can see that everyone from the young, new Dane to the Minister of Social Affairs, very high ministers and government officials are engaging in that same platforms; it helps to know that they are equal parts, they have the same access to the United States....as government official does.

What this part of the transcript reflects is the partnerships between state and non-state actors in facilitating the development of the global public sphere where individuals can engage in dialectic conversation as indicated in the ideal of the new public diplomacy. Moreover, the architecture of web 2.0 allows for this more personal, approachable, and equal relationships between the state and individuals. The architecture of web 2.0 is particularly described as the infrastructure that is

interactive, contributory, and participatory by Olsson and Svensson (2012); thus enabling the convergence of prod-user in online participatory coproduction. Whereas the convergence creates equal relationships between the state, as represented by the ambassador and other government officials, and individuals, as exemplified by the minority group members; the infrastructure of the architecture of web 2.0 also makes possible the participation in public dialogue that crosses national boundaries. van Dijck (2013: 45) explains, “Facebook...simultaneously constructs and reflects the value of cultivating weak ties and self-expression...Connectivity has become the material and metaphorical wiring of our culture, a culture where everyone and everything is connected through digital and mostly corporately owned platforms”. Specifically by facilitating human connections that are more personal and sustainable, the social media platform Facebook supports the kind of public diplomacy outreach and building relationships with civil society. Although this is the ideal case, as cautioned by Olsson and Svensson (2012) the architecture of social media could also pose the issue of what may appear as genuine interactive conversation is actually utilized to benefit the producer. In this case, the use of Facebook to make the U.S. embassy and officials seem more approachable for public dialogue is actually linked to the same marketing and branding attempts to promote the U.S.

5.1.6 Multiplier Effect

The use of social media in public diplomacy also facilitates the participation of individuals in interacting with each other and the dissemination of information from the state. Particularly, the architecture of the social media does not merely provide the interactivity accessible to the public, but it also contributes to the amplification of messages conveyed through public diplomacy. In elucidating both of these impacts, the interviewee T.S. relates to the exchanges between marginalized communities in the U.S. and Denmark and stresses, “So, you’re taking physical trips to the United States and turning it into a much bigger virtual kind of experience where even those who couldn’t go on those trips are part of the experience, hearing about it on the social media, seeing the pictures, and people are as they’re on those trips posting. You have this multiplier effect—I think that’s the most important thing of social media”. The multiplier effect that can be accessed just by anyone points to the nature of social media that crosses national boundaries. In demonstrating this effect on public diplomacy, the interviewee R.K. emphasizes, “the reality with social media is because it is self-selecting that anybody can

log on...anybody who wants to make themselves or make their views heard”. Furthermore, because of this nature that social media provides, it supports public diplomacy efforts in facilitating toward full participation of the foreign public. In conjunction to this, the interviewee R.K. further elucidates, “We try to have a Facebook page there and the dialogue there so that people can express what their free views are: whether or not they are for us, against us, critical of the Chinese government, critical of the American government...whatever”. Since U.S. public diplomacy uses social media to provide platform where people can discuss their free views, this consistently suggests that they facilitate the public spheres. In supporting this idea, the interviewee P.H. adds, “If U.S. public diplomacy is successful; then it will generate a good public sphere of people who have some level of shared ideas and shared values and who are deliberative about it”. That is, when combined with the capability of social media in expanding communications, public diplomacy has the potential to support and build global public spheres where civil society can interact and discuss.

The multiplier effect that social media offers demonstrates the mediapolis concept that Silverstone (2007) theorizes. Particularly, the idea that social media enables facilitates dialogue of the global fragmented communities is consistent with the mediated spaces that cross national boundaries that mediapolis provides. In this case, the mediapolis facilitates the dialogue afforded by the public spheres as Silverstone (2007: 31) asserts, “The mediapolis is...the mediated space of appearance in which the world appears and in which the world is constituted in its worldliness, and through which we learn about those who are and who are not like us...it is through mediapolis that public and political life increasingly comes to emerge at all levels of the body politic”. Moreover, the applicability of the mediapolis in the social media use for self-selected individuals points to facilitation of the cosmopolitan dialogue where Held (2010) theorizes based on the equal right to present oneself and to be heard in a way that traverses political boundaries. As a consequence, the equal rights manifest in the self-selecting use of social media provides the foreign publics with the potential to deliberate on global issues.

Whereas Held (2010) discusses deliberative participation in terms of equal rights in participation and reciprocal two-way communication, van Zoonen, Vis, and Mihejl (2012) applies this concept in the case of the contemporary participation through the social media. In using YouTube as a social media platform example, van Zoonen, Vis, and Mihejl (2012: 260) consistently confirm, “In the classic ‘rights’ and ‘obligations’ terminology of citizenship, and

articulated with the affordances of YouTube, this would involve both the right to speak/show and the obligation to listen/watch”. In this case of the global dialogue that public diplomacy facilitates through social media, the concept deliberative democracy still applies in virtual spaces where participation takes place. The nature of social media that enables self-select participants and crosses territorial boundaries provides spaces where people can both speak and listen to each other and participate deliberatively.

Viral Promotion

Despite its role in expanding the accessibility of dialogue spaces, the multiplier nature of social media has also been utilized to promote values, project positive image of the U.S., and influence public opinion in public diplomacy practices. In demonstrating this point, the interviewee A.T. explains, “I think clearly...explaining how policies and also you can find out very easily through our website, Facebook page, Twitter accounts, more and more links you can go into and easier to navigate. So I think that social media is a major component of it”. Whereas this particular instance shows that social media platforms are used to promote policy, they are also used to promote the U.S., which points to the propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic power relations. In terms of propaganda and nation branding, the U.S. public diplomacy utilizes a combination of social media and celebrity status to influence public opinion. In illustrating how U.S. public diplomacy was able to amplify President Obama’s speech during his visit to China, the interviewee T.S. argues:

...President Obama has been a great public diplomacy tool around the world because he’s got the star-power, but not as a president but as a person...all of these things that he represents to people...So we were able to...as he was speaking, we had a live feed of his speech going out on social media platforms...They were able to use the same tool that Obama used to energize grassroots and people everywhere getting involved in the campaign—they were able to use the same kind of tool to engage with the foreign audiences. Not they are voting, but they’re choosing to be on the same side as the U.S.

In this case, a combination of both social media technology and celebrity status enables public diplomacy to promote the U.S., indicating these practices attempt to project positive image of the U.S. Furthermore, public diplomacy also utilizes social media to disseminate hegemonic cultural values. In explaining the role of social media in public diplomacy, the interviewee A.T. elaborates, “On the subliminal level, I see that the U.S. promotes these values...sometimes it is

very heavy-handed, ‘The United States believes in human rights, democracy, and freedom of speech’. So, yes obviously it is promoting democracy, but again I’m not too sure if we’re smart about it or if it comes across a bit in your face”. This part of the transcript demonstrates the attempt to connect at the personal and cultural level that is consistent with the soft power approach that attempts to win the hearts and minds of individuals. However, this is challenged as it is done to benefit the image of the U.S.

These uses of social media are consistent with what critics of social public diplomacy charge as propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic cultural relations. Consistently, Melissen (2005: 18-22) underscores that whereas by using propaganda public diplomacy attempts to influence the foreign public’s opinion, the application of nation branding is similar to how marketing operates in positively promoting an entity. Moreover, it is through cultural relations that public diplomacy exerts the hegemonic power relations where the foreign publics are influenced by the dissemination of U.S. values and culture. Consequently, by using the three approaches, U.S. public diplomacy impacts the structural relations in terms of the participation of the public, where in making decisions individuals are actually influenced by the state to make their well-informed opinion and decisions.

5.1.7 Ethics

In working with the foreign public, there are ethical practices that U.S. public diplomacy follows. Particularly, since the U.S. embassy practices public diplomacy at the global level, it claims to uphold moral values that are universal in nature. In demonstrating these moral values that are reflected in daily public diplomacy practices, the interviewee T.S. asserts, “I think a lot of what we do in public diplomacy reflect what the global values are: human rights, respect for minorities, respect for women, respect for all people. Those values play a big part of public diplomacy”. Not only does public diplomacy carry the moral values of human rights and respect for people, but it also involve other values that the U.S. considers as crucial. The interviewee R.K. confirms, “I’d say that our views and ethics have promoted religious tolerance, religious diversity, religious respect. I’d also say that we’ve also supported good governmental practices: anti-corruption, things like that... We’ve been looking at issues such as good governance and the war against corruption in many places. So, I think our ethics have been very good”. Whereas these ethical values are universal, the reality demonstrates that unethical practices such as

corruption could even occur in the U.S., indicating that at some level it is an attempt for the U.S. to exert its hegemonic values around the world, similar to the unilateralism of *pax Americana*. Particularly, although all of these universal moral values and ethical practices are claimed to facilitate the public-to-public dialogue, they are actually the same attempt to influence the foreign public's mind using marketing and branding. In elaborating the branding mechanism that is embedded in any public diplomacy, Melissen (2005: 22) criticizes on the structural and hegemonic relations that is exerted through public diplomacy and asserts, "...in the view of many practitioners cultural relations as a wider concept now also include new priorities, such as the promotion of human rights and the spread of democratic values, notions such as good governance". Moreover, many of the practices actually lack substance as the interviewee A.T. contends, "I think that that kind of thing just blips on the radar screen, people's lives who are disadvantaged and then just go out again. I think that is unethical because it's almost liking people a little better...I hope somebody cares. It's supposed to be that someone really do care, but it doesn't come across that way". Since many public diplomacy practices actually lack substantive moral values it claims to uphold, these practices actually indicate the struggles toward maximalist participation of the foreign because the dissemination of ethical values that empower and facilitate participation actually lack substance and more of an attempt to influence the public based on the hegemonic U.S. values. This is consistent with Carpentier's (2011) notion that the struggles involve not only the media and individuals but also political actors. Consequently, since the foreign public is not able to participate fully, this issue also impacts the spaces where they can perform public dialogue.

5.2 Multi-site Analysis

5.2.1 U.S. Embassy Denmark

The U.S. diplomatic mission to Denmark maintains a Facebook page, which according to its Facebook page has activated its account since February 2010. U.S. Embassy Denmark page (see Appendix E) utilizes the Facebook page feature in order to support America's public diplomacy practices. In informing the overall role of social media, a U.S. embassy official confirms:

Even now sort of the 21st century public diplomacy statecraft, that it is two-ways. With social media platforms you're able to not only push information out, but have a dialogue and through that dialogue...you're not only getting information between the two but

that's between the interaction itself is carrying important public diplomacy goals, participation, and that's especially true in a non-democratic country, less democratic country (interviewee T.S., transcript).

As a result, this is reflected in the Facebook page that has been made public for any users to follow. In terms of social media platform where people can interact in any dialogue freely and openly, this particular openness for accessibility of the page as a dialogue space demonstrates the U.S. embassy's overall effort to facilitate the public spheres where any individuals can join and engage in discussions. The page especially showcases the intersubjective communicative space where the participants can share ideas as described by Dahlberg (2005). Although this is the case at the surface and objective levels, the U.S. Embassy Denmark page also suggests the ecology of web 2.0 interactions and various types of participation between the U.S. embassy and the public. Whereas in terms of media ecology the embassy Facebook page indicates branding attempt to the advantage of the media producer, specific participation with and between the public demonstrates power struggles toward the maximalist participation.

Architecture of Facebook Page

As a standard Facebook page, the layout of the U.S. Embassy Denmark consists of the logo of the Public Affairs section of the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen on the top left-hand corner, general information of the organization, a collection of photos, number of "likes", map feature where it shows where the physical embassy is located, live events, a collection of video clips, and notes. All of these features are followed by the "Timeline" feature of the Facebook page where the content manager—in this case a U.S. official working at the embassy—posts new highlights. In describing this feature, Facebook indicates that this feature is catered to businesses, organizations, and brands in their effort to connect with people (Facebook Help Center). As a social media platform, the overall function that Facebook claims to provide instantaneous and omnipresent connections with people consistently lines up with that of the 21st century objective of the U.S. embassy. However, the branding aspect of this Facebook page demonstrates the strategic use of this platform to the benefit of the embassy as described by Olsson and Svensson (2012). Manifest in the layout of the page with the logo, cover page, and the number of "likes"; it particularly suggests the practices at the interest of nation branding that Castells (2008) points to. Moreover as evident in the incorporation of the 2,400 "likes" at the top of the page, it also consistently demonstrates the U.S. embassy's attempt to project positive image of the U.S. that

influences public opinion. In relation to the architecture of web 2.0 that is supposed to be contributory, participative, and interactive; the attempt to brand the U.S. embassy as an organization results in the unequal relationships between the producer and consumer. Instead of creating a space where people can participate equivocally, by using the marketing approach the U.S. embassy actually exerts influence on how the public perceives the U.S.

At another level, the infrastructure of this page also impacts the convergence culture in which the producer and the consumer co-produce in their act of participation. Following the top layout of the page, the U.S. Embassy Denmark Facebook page also consists of its “Timeline” feature where both the embassy’s postings and individual messages are located. In terms of postings, the content manager actively shares messages such as informing about current events and U.S. foreign policy and agreements, promoting U.S. values on human rights, educating the public about U.S. historical facts. Although followers of the page can freely comment on these postings, the infrastructure of this page demonstrates that there is an agenda setting mechanism in which the embassy is involved. Consistent with the branding effort, by setting the tone of the social media dialogue the infrastructure of the U.S. Embassy Denmark page affects the prod-user culture. In explaining the ecology of media participation, Olsson and Svensson (2012: 46) argues, “As prod-users, people previously known as users (or audiences), become involved in co-constructive interactions with both traditional media producers (with a capital P) and other prod-users in collaborative media practices”. In contrast to the nature of the architecture of web 2.0 and collaboration, the infrastructure of the page specifically demonstrates a one-way communication at the interest of the producer.

Participation of Followers

The interactions that occur on the page include the social media activities in which the content manager post messages, images, and video clips where followers can view and comment in the main “Timeline” function and a “Recent Posts by others” box on the right-hand of the highlights where followers can communicate with the embassy with any questions and comments they have. The postings under the “Timeline” function dominates much of the participation involved on the Facebook page where the content manager generates the conversation for the followers to comment. On the other hand, postings under the “Recent postings by others” consist of more dialectic conversations between followers and the embassy and among the followers who can comment on each other’s postings. Consistent with the overall effort of U.S. public

diplomacy in facilitating public dialogue, a U.S. embassy official explains their social media policy, “No blocks, anyone can post whatever he or she wants. If people again and again...post stupid stuff, we’ll remove them but we’re fairly large...what we usually do is when people post stuff that doesn’t make any sense, we’ll take away but we don’t censor” (interviewee P.H, transcript). Although this policy and the page functions may indicate an unfettered communicative space of the public sphere, the different types of social media participation challenge the equal social hierarchies and power structures that this platform potentially offers.

A type of social media interactions that dominates the page is the reactive participation where the content manager of the Facebook page posts messages, images, and video clips with the expectation of the followers to comment on or indicate their approval with the “like” button. Some of the postings include specific topics such as Secretary Kerry’s speeches on investing in foreign policy, the climate change and Arctic policy, and trade agreements; the ambassador’s engagements and activities; women’s rights and human rights as some of the core values that the U.S. believes in; cultural understanding on jazz as part of American culture; as well as historical facts behind President’s Day. Furthermore, coupled with acknowledging new followers, in its effort to promote participation from its followers the U.S. Embassy Denmark page also offers weekly quizzes on the topics of U.S. culture, society, and history. In this case, the winner of each week’s quiz is incentivized with a prize. In elaborating on the overall effort, a U.S. embassy official explains, “I think that social media is a major component of it. Also, it’s got a role to play in the fact that day-to-day update on what we’re actually doing. I think today would be a lot better idea if people at all interested what the U.S. embassy is doing” (interviewee A.T, transcript). Although these efforts are aimed at the followers to react and participate, there are only very few comments from the followers and most of them only show approvals of postings.

Consistent with the nation branding that the architecture of the page provides, it is power relations between political actors, the media, and individuals and the struggle toward maximalist participation that impact this public diplomacy effort. In addition to the architecture of the page that leans toward one-way communication, the content manager as a political actor exerts his or her power in the participation of the followers. As explained by Carpentier (2011), the hegemonic and structural power relation influence on how the followers of the page think and, consequently, the way they participate. Furthermore, in this case Facebook as the media also exerts its power as demonstrated by the infrastructure in the way that it influences the way the

followers participate. In showcasing the power of the media with the particular case of Facebook, Fuchs (2013: 28) indicates, "...social media and the Internet are dominated by corporations and that the Internet is predominantly capitalist in character". Evident in the overall marketing and branding attempt, consequently the kind of participation involved on this page is a one-way communication in which the followers are fed with information on U.S. hegemonic values.

In addition to the one-way communication that is reflected on its main page, the Facebook page also provides the communicative space for its followers to engage in dialogue with the embassy and each other. Under the box "Recent posts by others" the page allows any users to comment and participate in open dialogue. Similar to the main "Timeline" function of the page, this function also allows the users to post messages, images, and video clips. In this function, the topics that have been brought up and discussed by the page followers include questions about specific requirements and procedures for consular services, sharing information about events and projects, and more political dialogue that both the embassy and other followers engage in. Furthermore, because of its architecture the page that is global in nature, the followers range from being physically in Denmark to Facebook users from anywhere in the world. Although the Facebook page with this specific function encourages dialogue, the level of participation is not very active as one of U.S embassy officials explains:

...people aren't feeling intimidated to talk just about anything but I think that there is still some sort of reluctance on the embassy Facebook page...We don't get to debate what we would like...also, maybe we are ourselves are too reluctant when we message that we shouldn't be too bold, but it would certainly be great if people were more open to discuss stuff, trivial or non-trivial...The bottom line is that we don't have the debate. The debate isn't as lively as it should be and sort all over the place as it would be nice if it were (interviewee P.H., transcript).

In this case, although social media provides for the maximalist, multidirectional, and heterogeneous participation that is not influenced by the power of political actors or the media; the level of political engagement is low. Furthermore, consistent with how Dahlgren (2009) emphasizes the need for a chattering society, by opening up this space and encouraging people to participate in the dialogue the embassy prevents Noelle-Neumann's (1993) spiral of silence in the political engagement. In demonstrating this particular effort to encourage active political engagement, a U.S. embassy official confirms, "That's also from the knowledge that posting

stuff that doesn't work is actually worse than not posting anything at all because it drives people away, then people become less active and fewer people receive...its like a downward spiral and you can quit" (interviewee P.H., transcript). However, what this space lacks in terms of ensuring for active political engagement and maximalist participation is an environment that is conducive to active participation. In describing the civic culture, Dahlgren (2009: 103) explains it as a crucial environment that is relevant for politics and it involves the six dimensions. Whereas knowledge, values, spaces, practices, and identities are supported by the social media practices of public diplomacy; in the case of the U.S. Embassy Denmark page the environment lacks its trust circuit. Dahlgren (2009: 113) elucidates, "Politics involves conflicts of interest, as well as identities in opposition, which insert an element of mistrust into these social relationships from the start". In relation to the branding effort of the U.S. public diplomacy, there seems to be a conflict of interest in terms of what the U.S. embassy attempts to accomplish through its overall foreign policy and what the foreign public intends in the global dialogue. As a result, even in the dialogue space where its followers can freely participate, it still lacks the political engagement.

5.2.2 Ambassador Laurie S. Fulton

As a top official and diplomat representing the United States in Denmark from July 2009 until February 2013, Ambassador Fulton opened and she has been maintaining her personal Facebook account (see Appendix F) as part of U.S. public diplomacy capacity in engaging with and facilitating the public. The Facebook account indicates that the account has over 1,800 friends consisting of relatives, close friends, and members of the foreign public who have become her social media friends. In explaining the overall intention behind the Ambassador Facebook account, a U.S. embassy official elaborates:

...take the ambassador's Facebook...the conversations and engagements we're able to have with all segments of the Danish population is important that not only we learn from each other about everything, but also for someone to take a step back and say, "Wow, here I am I recently immigrated from Somalia or Palestine or wherever I come from and here I am in Denmark and I am engaging with the ambassador of the United States, just like a Danish politician or a Danish CEO" (interviewee T.S., transcript).

As reflected in the daily practice of maintaining the ambassador's own Facebook page, the U.S. embassy has been able to utilize social media for the equal participation it offers. Particularly,

this claim is supported by Bengtsson (2013: 167) as she argues, “Internet supporters have pointed to the many positive dimensions of Internet based democracy, such as its capacity to make information available to the public; to erase social hierarchies and power structures; and to facilitate communication based on equal terms (c.f. Rheingold 1993, Dahlberg, 1998)”. Whereas on the one hand the equal term participation points to the architecture of social media that enables the co-production between officials and the public, on the other hand the participation of her Facebook friends as members of the public involves more active dialogue and engagements that have the potential to become more political in nature.

Leveled Plain Field

In an attempt to support the overall public diplomacy capacity, former Ambassador Fulton has been part of the social networking culture since the beginning of her tenure. Particularly, as the most commonly used feature of Facebook, the account allows the users to connect and co-produce with social media friends. Consistent with Facebook’s overall mission to empower people to share and make the world more open and connected, as a regular account feature the architecture of the ambassador’s Facebook is exactly the same as other users. Similar to the layout of the Facebook page feature, the personal account’s layout includes a cover photo and a profile picture at the top of the page, followed by the Timeline feature where both the user and his or her friends can post and share comments, images, and video clips; basic information about the user; uploaded photos of the user; a list of friends; and locations of where the user has visited and tagged. Although friends of Ambassador Fulton can freely comment on any parts of her Facebook “Timeline” or even generate discussions in new postings, they can only do so after they have become friends with the ambassador on this platform. The ecology of social media participation of the ambassador’s Facebook account is consistent with what Jenkins (2006) conceptualizes as the convergence culture where prod-users interact with each other, where government officials and the public can equally participate.

The architecture of social media enables U.S. official’s use of this platform to interact with the foreign public without the hierarchical and structural power relations of political actors. Consistent with what Olsson and Svensson (2012) term cultural infrastructure; the interactive, contributory, and participatory nature of the ambassador’s Facebook account allows her and the public to engage in co-production of active participation in equal term. In further elucidating Olsson and Svensson (2012), van Dijck (2013: 45) particularly points to Facebook and adds,

“These platforms appear to accommodate some profound users’ needs: the need to be connected to (anonymous) others, the need to be constantly updated on the status of others, the need to build one’s presence online, and the need to express oneself creatively and exchange cultural content online”. Particularly, this ecology shapes the political subjects and the potential that the co-production could become civic and political. In explaining the advantages of using social media and in particular Facebook for their public diplomacy capacity, a U.S. embassy official articulates, “It’s certainly changed the way we communicate much more informal, much faster...So that’s changed the audience reach, it has changed how we communicate and who we communicate with” (interviewee P.H., interview).

The informal and instantaneous nature of the social media dialogue enables the kind of ecology where both the producer and consumer converge and collaborate in the information production process. As a result, the architecture of web 2.0 that Facebook utilizes supports the new public diplomacy efforts in facilitating the global civil society in their dialectic conversation. Particularly, by providing opportunities to participate equally on social media platforms, this specific practice creates communicative relationships that are equal between the state, society, and individuals.

Equal Term Participation

Since the architecture of Ambassador Fulton’s Facebook account provides for contributory, participatory, and interactive space; consequently it allows full participation. Some of Ambassador Fulton’s postings include a combination of text and images of her engagements with the public such as her meetings with Danish officials, American cultural events that she inaugurated, her seminars with students and youth, as well as engagements with local and marginalized communities across Denmark. Consistent with the co-production culture, these postings demonstrate that the ambassador shares information and stories with her virtual friends. Furthermore, her virtual friends also reciprocally interact with comments in relation to her postings, new postings that they want to share with the ambassador, and approvals of postings by indicating their “likes”. Whereas some of her postings that have generated active dialogue include shared stories that touch on political topics such as the ambassador’s recent seminar on global woman leaders and her engagements with youth in encouraging sustainable energy and economy, others involve more trivial postings including the ambassador’s postings on how she spent her Independence Day, her fourth year anniversary as an American ambassador, and her

departure from her post from Denmark. Furthermore, although most of the discussions are sincere, there are a handful of postings that have received critical responses from her friends. The kind of participation that is demonstrated by these interactions demonstrates not only full participation, but also the approachable and reciprocal exchanges between a government official and the public that has the potential to become civic talk.

Since the discussions between the ambassador and the public involve equal communicative exchanges, it enables full participation that has the potential for civic and political engagements. In pointing to the approachable nature of Facebook as a platform of social networking, a U.S. embassy official observes:

The new idea of the ambassador having a Facebook page so that she can interact with average people...I do think that is really good to the ambassador's Facebook page because we come across to as unapproachable. Nobody in the past would have been able to get anywhere near having a conversation with the ambassador. But people do write in and say, "Oh, that was a great event" or "You're doing a good work" and the ambassador would give some feedback...we don't seem as austere and threatening. I do think that it's become more approachable, so I definitely think that social media has been an advantage of public diplomacy (interviewee A.T., transcript).

What this approachable conversation demonstrates is the ability to have the maximalist, multidirectional, and heterogeneous participation despite the power that the media industry exerts in commodifying the users. Although almost all of the ambassador's postings involve topics within the institutional politics, the active discussions generated by her friends point to political participation outside of the conventional representative politics. In this case, in relation to Mouffe's (2000) political participation the foreign public is able to present their differing opinions and views without the strict institutional requirement for rationality and representation. Additionally, the informal and approachable nature of the interactions also encourages the civic talk that Dahlgren (2009) points could result from the chattering society. Particularly by allowing and engaging in discussions with topics that are both trivial and political, this social media platform provides a dialogue space that can potentially become political engagements at the global context because of the equal relationships between the state and individuals.

5.2.3 Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders

As another public diplomacy effort in facilitating public-to-public dialogue, Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders Facebook page (Appendix G) is a platform that was initiated by the embassy. The page itself, which was activated beginning March 2012, reflects the embassy's earlier public diplomacy effort with the partnerships with private actors and civil society organizations such as Impact and the German Marshall Fund in initiating dialogue and a space for leaders of minority backgrounds in Europe and North America to share stories, values, and best practices. With an actual conference that took place in Copenhagen on April 24, 2012, the page has been used to maintain further dialogue and relationships between these leaders and more participants. Consistent with one of the ideals of the new public diplomacy that only facilitates the public to interact and engage within itself, the Facebook page has since been taken over by the civil society. In one of the interviews, a U.S. public diplomacy officer confirms, "Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders...young elected minority leaders around the world, between Europe and the United States met face to face but they continued to engage on social media platforms. Recently, they had a follow-up conference in Europe. They did it on they own, we weren't even invited" (interviewee T.S., transcript). Although the motivation behind this Facebook page is to facilitate public-to-public space for dialogue that is consistent with the global public sphere, the architecture of social media discourages the maximalist participation of the global civic society that public diplomacy intends to achieve. Specifically in this case the media industry exerts its power that consequently hinders the full participation behind this initiative.

Infrastructure of Branding

In an effort to promote a civil society engagement, Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders initiative uses the page feature of Facebook that is aimed at organizations, companies, and businesses. Similar to other Facebook pages, the layout of the Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders page consists of a cover page picture, its logo, information about the organization, a clickable boxes with a collection of pictures, the number of likes, and notes. This is followed by the "Timeline" function where the content manager and followers can participation in any types of discussion. Furthermore, in order to be part of the page the user needs to be invited by the content manager of the page. Similar to the U.S. Embassy Denmark page, the kind of infrastructure that Facebook provides for this page demonstrates an attempt for branding.

Particularly, by using the marketing approach of branding this social media platform is consistent with the overall idea of market capital and social capital for the corporate world. In elucidating this idea, a manuscript by Olsson (2013b) refers to Hunt (2009) and argues, “As a consequence, companies will need to build their social capital by allowing customers to participate in efforts to (re) create brand, which then is interpreted as a form of consumer empowerment”. Although Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders is neither a profitable company nor a thriving business, this mechanism is useful in encouraging and empowering the users to co-produce and participate.

In addition to the branding mechanism that encourages participation, the virtual architecture also has been restricted to participants who have been engaging with the Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders conferences. Since the page is a “closed group”, it has around 230 members who have only been exclusively invited by the content manager, including primarily young minority leaders from the United States and across Europe, some non-governmental organizations, and the U.S. embassy. Having been invited, the page allows the participants to both view the postings generated by the content manager and engage freely in the co-production of any dialogue online. Although the closely-knit page allows for a virtual community to actively engage, it hinders for the maximalist participation inclusive of the overall global cosmopolitan community. Moreover, the exclusive membership to this page builds the virtual community in which the members can share ideas and build closer relationships with each other. This social media infrastructure that provides for a virtual community is consistent with what Rheingold (1993) theorizes. In explaining virtual communities further, Bakardjieva (2013: 145) elaborates, “A number of their peculiar properties such as the construction of strong relationships despite the absence of physical encounter, the establishment of shared values, norms and techniques for effective communication through innovative means adjusted to the new environment have been documented”. Coupled with the branding mechanism, in this close-knit community the members are highly encouraged to participate based on their close relationships with each other. Furthermore, this “closed group” infrastructure also demonstrates that whereas it builds relationships that could potentially generate high quality interactions between the members, the participation itself lacks the diversity that the rest of the global community offers.

Active Exclusive Participation

The participation involved on the page involves the content manager sharing issues and knowledge about the practices of minority leaders in the forms of text, images, and video clips

under the “Highlights” function of the page. Some of the postings over the past year are about ensuring racial and ethnic equity, the diversity at the leadership level initiative in France, and hate crime in which the members can freely comment on. By the same token, members of the page also have the capability of posting text, images, and video clips under “Recent posts by others” function. Some of these postings include members sharing links and articles about trafficking, racism, and best practices for minority leaders. Particularly in combination with video clips and images, the members have been engaged actively and co-produce both with the contents generated by the page manager and each other with their various views and opinion. In applying the concepts public sphere and participation, the practices reflected through Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders page reflect that it allows participation to occur at the cosmopolitan level especially the rights to present oneself and be heard conceptualized by Held (2010) and later on van Zoonen, Vis, and Mihejl (2012). However, it lacks the equal participative opportunities for the rest of the global community because of its exclusive membership. Whereas Benhabib (2004) speaks of *human Existenz* as the rudimentary rights that are embodied in every human being, the exclusiveness of this forum’s membership challenges the full participation based on the cosmopolitan citizenship. As a result although the participation may seem politically active, it only involves a handful of members whose exclusive membership demonstrates the same representational participation.

5.2.4 Generation Change

As a part of U.S. public diplomacy’s effort in reaching out to and facilitating the marginalized community, Generation Change (see Appendix H) is a Facebook-based virtual community page that is catered to empower youth of minority backgrounds to participate in the global exchange of ideas that could make positive impacts for the local communities and the world. Recently launched in 2011, the mission of this social media forum itself is readily available under the basic information of its Facebook page as it states:

Generation Change is a youth-led global network dedicated to empowering the next generation of innovators and leaders. It provides a platform for the free exchange of ideas across borders and cultures, and a community of peers and mentors who use their collective resources to positively impact communities locally and globally...The network

can provide a forum for exchanging ideas and creating projects that can have impact on a global scale, both through offline events and online connections.

Consistent with U.S. public diplomacy that focuses on the marginalized and youth to prevent radicalization; the forum is a State Department's initiative to facilitate the engagements of the global civil society. However as a global forum that supposedly facilitates the public, the page involves a complex architecture of web 2.0 that consequently impacts the level of participation in this forum. Whereas the producer heavily controls the infrastructure of the page where interested participants need to apply membership for, consequently the level of participation is also influenced by the power exercised by both political actors and the media.

Restricted Infrastructure & Participation

As a global forum that facilitates exchange of ideas, Generation Change Facebook page actually includes heavily controlled media infrastructure. As a Facebook page, the layout of Generation Change consists of a cover photo, its logo, and linkable boxes of its basic information, uploaded images, application for new members, and the number of "likes". Similar to the other pages, this layout is aimed at promoting and branding the organization. However, in order to engage in the global exchange of ideas, a Facebook user needs to apply and gets approved to fully access the page. In the application process itself, the following questions are asked: basic information about the application, the reason to join the forum that points to the applicant's proven commitment in interacting with the online community, expertise and contributions that the applicant can provide, and specific area of interest. Furthermore once the application has been submitted, it will then be reviewed for the invitation to the full access to the virtual community. In confirming this complex architecture of the platform, a U.S. embassy official points out, "Generation Change is a closed Facebook group, you have to be invited to it...basically you have to be invited to a State Department program"(interviewee T.S., transcript). As a result, the infrastructure of this page is consistent with what Olsson and Svensson (2012) criticizes as an infrastructure that is steered to the benefit of the producer. Particularly what appears to be genuinely participatory is actually a branding attempt with power exerted by political actors—in this case a State Department initiative—and the media.

Consequently the level of participation reflected by the page that is accessible for the general public is more of a one-way communication. Since the launch of the page in 2011, the postings in the "Timeline" feature merely share stories about Generation Change activities in different

countries. Generated by the content managers, these postings have not received many comments from the public. Only members who have been invited to join this “closed group” can participate fully in the forum. Albeit Generation Change aims to facilitate global discussion based on the cosmopolitan citizenship that Held (2010) describes, the actual participation that is restricted to invited members indicates that it discourages people from participating. Particularly, although this could be explained by Carpentier’s (2011) conceptualization on the power exerted by the political actors, the lack of active participation itself is explained by Dahlgren’s (2009) notion where the strict rationality and exclusive dialogue impacts Noelle-Neumann’s (1993) spiral of silence. Consequently, global online users are discouraged at participating in this forum.

5.2 Summary

The findings of this thesis have answered this research based on the thematic analysis and multi-site analysis of the social media pages. The thematic analysis has confirmed the ideals new public diplomacy policy at the overall objective of the U.S. embassy practices and it has also pointed to flaws in the actual practices in relation to participation, civic culture, and the role of web 2.0. In terms of the overall objective, U.S. public diplomacy practices confirm that the fundamental aim is facilitate public-to-public interactions, which is consistent with the fact that the new public diplomacy is supposed to support the rise of the global civil society and the global public spheres. By the same token, by encouraging and empowering the marginalized community and youth to exchange ideas globally, the new public diplomacy demonstrates the idea of cosmopolitan citizenship where the public can freely interact with each other, particularly facilitated by the social media technology that crosses territorial boundaries. However, the transcripts show that in many of the practices actually U.S. public diplomacy simultaneously attempts to project the positive image without substantive practices. As a result, this challenges the U.S. new public diplomacy in a way that it lacks credibility. Furthermore, whereas in encouraging participation the U.S. embassy disseminates universal values that parallel the civic culture, it also promotes U.S. cultural values that indicate the attempt for branding.

The multi-site web analysis has indicated that the four Facebook pages utilized in the practices of U.S. public diplomacy holistically aim to expand the communicative spaces where the public can interact with each other and the state. The architecture of social media clearly impacts the type of participation online. By creating a personal Facebook account, the

ambassador enables equal term participation for the public and state officials to engage in dialogue, which is consistent with the soft power and new public diplomacy policy in which the state facilitates global civil society engagements. In the case of the embassy's Facebook page, as the result of its branding attempt, the kind of participation that occurs is more of reactive and one-way communication where the producer sets the conversation for the public. On other pages that are more specifically aimed at encouraging participation for the marginalized community and youth, the combination of infrastructure and restrictions set by political actors point to participation of elite communities whose members have been chosen to participate.

6. CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis has been to compare the ideals and practices of the new public diplomacy through the specific program that focuses on the marginalized community and youth as implemented by the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen based on the *smart power* foreign policy. In analyzing these ideals and practices, the concept the new public diplomacy itself has been used in order to understand specific communicative theories of the global public sphere, cosmopolitan citizenship, the mediapolis, participation, civic culture, and the architecture of the web 2.0. Consistent with soft power diplomacy, the new public diplomacy supports the global civil society and facilitates the public sphere where individuals can interact in the unfettered dialogue. Nonetheless, the practices of new public diplomacy show that in addition to these concepts; there are universal values of human rights, listening and advocacy, and democracy that are embedded in the foreign policy. Whereas in and of itself these are the values that reflect on morality, ethics, and humanity and relate directly to the concepts global public sphere and cosmopolitan citizenship; when reshaped by U.S. foreign policy some of these values generate tensions. Particularly, on the one hand it creates a global force for good where universally individuals are encouraged in the cosmopolitan dialogue, on the other there are some aspects of nation branding that is inherently ingrained in the overall public diplomacy.

In answering the first research question, both the thematic analysis and multi-site analysis have demonstrated that the overall ideal of the new public diplomacy is to consistently facilitate the rise of the global civil society by providing both physical and virtual spaces where the public can hold dialogue. In contrast to the early Habermasian public sphere, the public is facilitated with spaces where they can engage in the free exchange of ideas and information in which the U.S. government initiates and then steps back to let the global civil society grow organically. In relation to the advancement and proliferation of web 2.0, the use of social media in new public diplomacy demonstrates that its technological capabilities help shape the spaces for global dialogue. Both of these show that at the policy level, *smart power* facilitates the public sphere.

The new public diplomacy also facilitates the concepts of civic culture, participation, deliberative democracy, cosmopolitan citizenship, and inclusiveness, which answer the second research question. In terms of civic culture, the findings show that the practices of U.S. public diplomacy strive to generate all six dimensions that make up civic engagement environment as

demonstrated by providing physical and virtual dialogue spaces, disseminating substantive and procedural democratic values, educating the public with knowledge to engage in the global dialogue, and acknowledging the identities of even the marginalized community as part of the overall society. However, the practices are challenged in optimally facilitating public dialogue because of the lack in the dimensions of trust, as related to the credibility that is overshadowed by nation branding, and practices, since public diplomacy does not ensure routine participation of the foreign publics. In relation to participation, the findings show that U.S. public diplomacy practices facilitate for maximalist participation operates outside of the institutional politics. This is demonstrated by specific practices of listening and advocacy, recognizing the marginalized, and the application of social media. However, this political participation is challenged by hegemonic powers of political actors and the media. Moreover, in contrast to the strict rationality required for deliberative democracy, the findings point out that the practices encourage the chattering society that reflects Dahlgren's (2009) "soul of democracy". Additionally, U.S. public diplomacy also facilitates cosmopolitan citizenship as evidenced in its use of the basic understanding of equal rights to support the deliberative decision-making at the global level. Closely related its support of the cosmopolitan citizenship, the findings also show that U.S. public diplomacy also provides the marginalized with voice recognition, which indicates its effort for inclusive participation.

This thesis has also been able to answer the question pertaining to how the web 2.0 within the new public diplomacy practices encourages, promotes, or hinders the public sphere concepts. Although at the overall level social media facilitates the connections of human beings and global dialogue, findings from the multi-site analysis illustrate different dynamics of participation based on the architectural restrictions imposed by different platforms and social actors. The ambassador's Facebook account demonstrates equal term participation where it encourages active dialogue that reduces the hierarchical power relations between the state and individuals. Nonetheless, overshadowed by the branding attempt of the embassy's page, the producer overpowers the communications of the consumers. By the same token, both Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders and Generation Change pages discourage active global dialogue based on the exclusive participation that these sites require. These cases point to the fact that despite the technological capabilities, the struggle toward maximalist participation still prevails.

Ultimately, this thesis has also provided answer to the last research question on the hegemonic and structural communication power relations between the various social actors. Although the ideals of the new public diplomacy suggest that there has been a shift from a state-centric one-way communication to multidirectional global civil society dialogue, the findings have revealed that in many of the practices the state still exerts its power in influencing participation of the global civil society. Particularly this is demonstrated in positive imaging and stage managing in order to gain sentiment from the public, some element of propaganda to gain mass support of U.S. policy, and the dissemination of values that are actually to promote the U.S. The three mechanisms of propaganda, nation branding, and hegemonic cultural relations are still very much present in the new public diplomacy, indicating that one-way communication from the government to the public still operates in daily practices at the subliminal level.

The new public diplomacy is the diplomacy of the public where the state and the media facilitate the fragmented global community to participate in the public spheres to deliberate on global issues. This thesis has shown that these ideals are actually challenged by practices, as demonstrated by the specific case of the program implemented by public diplomacy practitioners. Although the concept cosmopolitanism is antiquated, it remains critical today in relation to this specific initiative that aims to connect with the foreign public at the personal level to be part of the overall global society. Particularly as Held (2010) contends, the full participation in the global public spheres is an imperative starting point in resolving many of the critical global issues. This thesis has contributed to the further understanding of public diplomacy and the role of the emerging social media in its practices. However, there have been limitations to this attempt that could be enlightened by future research. Where this thesis focuses on the participation that takes place on social media platforms, future research could study whether or not dialogue facilitated by public diplomacy that takes place online correspond to the actual empowerment of physical participation. In relation to this, since Facebook is a new culture of sharing and co-producing between anonymous strangers, it is also equally important to further study on whether or not over time this social platform could elevate the level of participation that has the potential to realize the Kantian cosmopolitan project in order to allow the global civil society to deliberate on its many critical issue. Particularly, where the ideals of deliberative democracy and political participation in this thesis have been hampered by elite democracy, the overall media certainly plays a crucial role in facilitating the maximalist global dialogue.

7. REFERENCES

- Atkinson, P. & Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's immortality: The interview society and the invention of the self. *Qualitative Inquire*, 3 (3), 304-325.
- Bakardjieva, M. (2013). Bringing up bg-mamma: Organized producers between community and commerce. In Olsson, T. *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beer, D. & Burrows, R. (2007). Sociology and, of and in web 2.0: Some initial considerations. *Sociological Research Online*, 12 (5). Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/5/17>
- Bengtsson, S. (2013). The producer as vendor. In Olsson, T. *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Berlin, I. (1990). *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*. London: John Murray.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. (ed. John B. Thompson). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Carpentier, N. (2011). *Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-Democratic Struggle*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Castells, M. (2008). The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and global governance. *The Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Sciences*, 2008 (61), 78-93.
- Chiozza, G. (2009). *Anti-Americanism and the American World Order*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Clive, S. et. al. (2004). *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage
- Couldry, N. (2003). *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2010). *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism*. London: Sage.
- Crossley, N. & Roberts, J. M. (2004). *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dahlberg, L. (1998). Cyberspace and the public sphere: Exploring the democratic potential of the net. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 4 (1), 70-84.

- Dahlberg, L. (2005). The habermasian public sphere: Taking difference seriously? *Theory and Society*, 2005 (34), 111-136.
- Dahlgren, P. (2010). *Media and Political Engagement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eley, G. (1996). Nations, publics, and political cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century. In Calhoun, C. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2007). Advancing the new public diplomacy: A public relations perspective. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2 (2007), 187-211.
- Fitzpatrick, K. R., Kendrick, A. & Fullerton, J. (2011). Factors contributing to anti Americanism among people abroad. A retrospective view from the frontlines of u.s. public diplomacy. *International Journal of Strategic Communications*, 5 (3), 154-170.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interview and Other Writings 1972-1977*. (ed. Colin Gordon). New York: Pantheon.
- Fuchs, C. (2010). Class, knowledge and new media. *Media, Culture & Society*, 32 (1), 141-150.
- Fuchs, C. (2013). Social media and capitalism. In Olsson, T. *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Gramsci, A. (1999). *The Antonio Gramsci Reader. Selected Writings 1916-1935*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gregory, B. (2008). Public diplomacy: Sunrise of an academic field. *The Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Science*, 2008 (616), 274-290.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Habermas, J. (2006). *The Divided West*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hine, C. (2011). Towards ethnography of television on the internet: A mobile strategy for exploring mundane interpretive activities. *Media Culture Society*, 2011 (3), 567-583.
- Hochschild, J. L. (2009). Conducting intensive interviews and elite interviews. Workshop on Interdisciplinary Qualitative Research. Retrieved April 11, 2013, from: <http://scholar.harvard.edu/jlhochschild/publications/conducting-intensiveinterviewsand eliteinterviews>
- Hunt, T. (2009). *The power of Social Networking*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jensen, K. B. (2002). *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. Routledge: New York.
- Kant, I. Zum Ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Emtwurf. (1795). In Immanuel Kants Werke (Shriften von 1790-1796). Ed. A. Buchenau, E. Cassirer and B. Kellerman. Berlin: Verlag Bruno Cassirer, 1923.
- Laclau, E. (1988). Metaphor and Social Antagonisms. In Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. (ed.). *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Melissen, J. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook, Second Edition*. London: Sage.
- Nye, J. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Sciences, March 2008*, 94-109.
- Hannerz, U. (2003). Being there...and there...and there! Reflections on multi-site ethnography. *Ethnography, 4 (1)*, 201-216.
- Honneth, A. (2007). *Disrespect*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.
- Moyser, G. (2006). Elite interviewing. *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. Retrieved April 11, 2013 from: <http://srmo.sagepub.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/view/the-sage-dictionary-of-socialresearch-methods/n60.xml?rskey=EcGp7Y&row=3>
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1993). *The Spiral of Silence, 2nd ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Olsson, T. (2013). *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Olsson, T. (2013b). "The architecture of participation: For citizens or consumers?", manuscript, held by Olsson, T., Department of Communication and Media, Lund University, Sweden
- Olsson, T. & Svensson, A. (2012). Producing prod-users: Conditional participation in a web 2.0 consumer community. *Javnost—The Public, 19 (3)*, 41-58.

- Rapley, T. (2004). Interviews. In Clive, S. et. al. *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.
- Rapley, T. (2011). Some Pragmatics of Qualitative Data Analysis. In Silverman, D. *The Qualitative Research: Third Edition*. London: Sage.
- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (2005). *The Course of Recognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ryan, G. & Bernard, H. R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods*, 15 (1), 85-109.
- Savage, M. & Burrows, R. (2007). The coming crisis of empirical sociology. *Sociology*, 41 (5), 885-899.
- Seib, P. (2009). *Toward a New Public Diplomacy: Redirecting U.S. Foreign policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction, Second Edition*. London: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Qualitative Research: Third Edition*. London: Sage.
- Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and Morality: On the Rise of the Mediapolis*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). Practical Politics of the Open End. In Harasym, S. (ed.). *The Post-Colonial Critic. Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York: Routledge.
- Tremayne, M. (2007). *Blogging, Citizenship, and the Future of Media*. London: Routledge.
- U.S. Department of State. (2009). Clinton's nomination hearing to be secretary of state [online]. [Accessed 10 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/01/115196.htm> [press release]
- U.S. Department of State. (2013). U.S. mission to denmark [online]. [Accessed 10 May 2013]. Available from: <http://denmark.usembassy.gov/about-us.html>
- van Dijck, J. (2013). Social media platforms as producers. In Olsson, T. *Producing the Internet: Critical Perspectives of Social Media*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- van Zoonen, L., Vis, F., & Mihejl, S. (2010). Performing citizenship on youtube: Activism, satire and online debate around the anti-islam video fitna. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7 (4), 249-262.
- Wheeler, J. (2012). "Somali danes seek American spirit", *The Copenhagen Post*, 7 September, p.6.

8. APPENDICES

8.1 Appendix A: Semi-structure Interview Questions

Elite interviews: Public Diplomacy Section, United States Embassy, Copenhagen
Interview questions to be asked to every staff member involved in public diplomacy implementations.

1. How would you describe (new) public diplomacy?
2. Could you tell me how smart power policy has shaped the strategies/directives of public diplomacy and how do these strategies fit into daily examples/practices?
3. What are the basic public diplomacy practices that the United States government does through its embassy in Copenhagen? Probe: six components, ethical practices
4. Which is the most important public diplomacy practice? Why does it work well?
5. What are some of the primary objectives that the U.S. aims to achieve by implementing public diplomacy?
6. How does public diplomacy relate to promoting values such as, democracy, dialogue, listening, civic participation, shared values, freedom of speech and social inclusiveness? Probe: any other values promoted through PD practices
7. If so, could you provide concrete examples of public diplomacy events and/or campaigns?
8. In conjunction to “smart power” that has become a fundamental pillar of U.S. foreign policy, could you tell me on how social media have affected public diplomacy practices? Probe: social media
9. What was the role of social media in this public diplomacy practice? Probe: any particular social media platform that was highly used.
10. How do these particular social media platforms relate to participation and concepts such as, democracy, dialogue, listening, shared values, freedom of speech
11. How does the U.S. government view on the role of civil society (i.e., international organizations, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations) in relations to its soft power and/or public diplomacy practices? Probe: role of counterparts in the Danish government, civil society, individuals.
12. Anything else you would like to add?

8.2 Appendix B: Sample of Transcript

P.H. Transcript

Q: How would you describe the new public diplomacy?

P: I would say with the time that I've been here there are massive changes that are created by technological advances...the social media and the website and what they can and cannot do. I would certainly say that we are now targeting a different group of people, to a much general public and not specific organizations. It's a more random targeting...if you will, but it certainly opens doors to new groups of people who wouldn't have otherwise gotten.

That said, there certainly is...for instance, Facebook there is a high level of self-selection with the audience because you need to choose to like the page to see what's on it. So it doesn't give you the same possibility as broadcast radio would for instance. But there's certainly been a change from the years that I've been here.

Q: But how would you describe, from your perspective, public diplomacy?

P: You mean: how you use it or how it works?

Q: What is its function?

P: Well, to put it sort of blunt and short, I would say the function of public diplomacy is to create sentiment or awareness in the host government's population that will make them more positive toward the U.S. foreign policy, toward the U.S. culture, or toward the U.S. in general.

The other end of the argument, they will that say they will vote for people who will agree with the U.S. on as many issues as possible or they will work with the U.S. on as many issues as possible. So that's...and there're many other things that come before that: mutual understanding, good relations, people traveling and meeting each other, and businesses, and these things; but the bottom line is a national security bottom line where...how do we make sure that people in a given country are positive towards whether the U.S. may come up with...or more positive than otherwise may have been, I guess.

That's, I guess, sort of the bottom line of it.

Q: Could you tell me how smartpower policy has changed or shaped the directives and strategies?

P: I think that...you know...it's one of those that smartpower is sort of the State Department's phrase for softpower or whatever and I think public diplomacy has always been about that. It has always been about creating a positive image of the U.S. so that the people will like it because they think it's cool or nice or appealing or whatever. I would say that the emphasis of smartpower is that has been addressed as a concept...I think this one thing that I have seen is the focus on youth and not just showing hip bands or whatever...or saying that rock and roll and those things, but actually going and talking to young people—getting young people into the embassy much more than we used to, getting young people to talk to officials about what are their concerns, what are their fears, what do they want to see from U.S.-Danish collaborations,

for instance what they want to see from U.S. foreign policy. The Youth Council being a very good example of that, where they take some selection of grant people and talking about what they see as of use. That is sort of the new thing, but certainly the idea of creating positive image of the U.S.—I wouldn't say it's a new thing...I wouldn't say...this is a Danish saying called "old wine in new bottles"...I wouldn't say it's that either, but I think that what's entailed by smartpower and softpower has always been in public diplomacy bag, if you will. I haven't seen a bunch of "now, do this thing" because it corresponds to smartpower directives...I haven't seen a lot of that.

Q: But there is a more focus toward youth?

P: Definitely, and it's not only talking to youth. It's listening to youth. It's seeing, appreciating concerns that young have around the world. So that's a change or something that is more addressed, if you will.

Q: What are the basic practices of public diplomacy here in at the embassy?

P: You can certainly boil it down to saying that listening and advocacy...those are the two things. Those are also the things that in the other sections here do just to their target audience. I would say that one of the things that works within public diplomacy is using the listening when you create the advocacy. So that you advocate things in a way that hopefully makes sense for the audience. You just don't blast out standard message, but you figure out some of the concerns and take it from there and say, "How do we advocate whatever it is we need to advocate" and put that in mind. So that's certainly a big aspect of it for it to work.

Also, one of the things that's been particularly difficult for an organization like State Department—which is really big—is to grasp the differences of audiences around the world, especially with the new social media where it's more and more diverse audience within a country. They need to say, "Well, if we want to talk to this side of the political spectrum, it's a different form of argument. So certainly it's not easier to go back to the radio thing where in the past you could broadcast stuff from the radio as the U.S. still does it many countries. In a country like this, it certainly wouldn't work: you need much more segmentation in your target audiences, you need think much more about how different sections of the society react to.

Q: Has there been a change from a one-way communication public diplomacy to a two-way communication, participation for the public?

P: Absolutely, yes. And definitely the listening aspect and the partnership aspect—a lot of what we do here is actual partnership with organizations where we go out and say, "Okay, if you do half, we'll do half and then we'll make something good out of it" and some people will be happier than they were before. So that's certainly good and you can always...when people as, "What do I do?" and you can sort of joke and say, "It's propaganda". But propaganda is just the old-fashioned one-way communication where "We're telling you this message and we don't actually care". The way public diplomacy works now and I think how it has worked most of the times for the U.S. that it is a two-way...you need to understand your audience. So you need to listen and you need to make sure you don't tell stuff that is not true—don't lie to people. Basically, so that is an ethical component that does not exist in many countries, propaganda.

So, that is very much our component that we're very much aware of: one daily basis whatever we say has to be true.

Q: Is there an ethical public diplomacy practice and unethical public diplomacy practice? I mean working at an international environment there is...well maybe not, a universal value on what is right and what is wrong?

P: I mean that is where it gets somewhat difficult because what we can do is we can say, "This is what the U.S. thinks on a given subject" or "These are the facts about the U.S.", like statistical facts. So we can't really go and argue with the host country and say, "What you are saying is wrong based on our opinion about things are"...that certainly would be kind of funny and we don't do that in Denmark as far as I know. Certainly on issues where it's a matter of opinion or political stance or...whatever, then we pretty much stay off clear out of those things...or just say, "This is how the U.S. sees it. This is our opinion about something: where we think democracy is a good thing, freedom of religion is a good thing" and not say, "You are wrong for some reason".

Q: What is the most important public diplomacy practice and what are the primary objectives?

P: Again with the objectives: if you take the really long perspective, it's all about the national security—that a country as a whole thinks as positively about the U.S. as it can. In more and more countries either people like politicians, so if the people like the U.S. then their politicians will also. Even in countries where people don't actually like their politicians, they to a less and lesser degree can ignore their politicians. So in authoritarian regimes, there will be protests...it will be more cumbersome for regimes if they're not on the same page as the population. So the primary objective is to make sure that the people are as well informed and as positive as possible. What is the important is really hard to say because it all works together. It's really...it's a machine with a whole bunch wheels, so it really takes a whole package to get to where public diplomacy is. You have elite outreach with public diplomacy, you have mass audience outreach, you have everything in between—you find little strange organizations that are maybe misinformed or maybe need a little help or to meet other same organizations in the U.S. So there're all these little wheels that somehow work nicely together. If you can then communicate some of the elite outreach to mass audiences and say, "Look at what we're doing to make people understand each other better", then that's certainly a plus to it but I don't think any of them could stand alone. I think many of the mass outreach things are new with the social media stuff. So I think some of them could stand alone maybe 20 years ago, but again with publics getting more and more insight than politicians do it definitely makes sense for them to say, "Okay..." to know what their politicians are up to, to know as much as possible what these international collaborations are taking place, to get an understanding on how intertwined countries are. You know, being a law-enforcement in Denmark isn't just about being a law-enforcement in Denmark, it is also about meeting colleagues in U.S. or in the region to know that you're on the same page and know what you want to do in a given situation...all of those things.

Q: How does public diplomacy relate to promoting values like democracy, public dialogue, global civic participation, deliberative democracy, and social inclusiveness at the global level?

P: It definitely does all that and it does it to different extents in different countries. For instance, in a country like Denmark that has a high rate of democracy and has a larger degree of civic participation than the U.S. does, it's less about that—I mean it's about appreciating and encouraging it, but it's less about that and it's more about informing about the U.S. and giving people opportunities to ask their questions and whatever they have.

If you go to countries that aren't democratic or democracy is fragile or human rights aren't adhered to, then it's a lot more of that: it's about democracy this and democracy that and make sure you follow human rights and all of those things—those are central in public diplomacy in many countries; also minority rights and religious rights. A lot of time and money spent on that are basically educating, and part of that is also educating people in English, so they can read all of this text and they can gain more appreciation of the U.S. So that certainly does take a large chunk of it and, I guess, if U.S. public diplomacy is successful; then it will generate a good public sphere of people who have some level of shared ideas and shared values and who are deliberative about it...if you think about it, but it won't create global democracy...but it will create democratic sentiment around the world.

Q: What about social inclusiveness? Does public diplomacy attempt to include people who feel left out in?

P: I would say it does. We've spent a lot of time here trying to reach out to parts of Danish society that where one is feeling left out or aren't willing to integrate or aren't as included in the society...it should be! So that's certainly a part of it and I know that many of the countries where there are real minority issues that is part of the big...you know, reaching out to people and making sure that...reaching out to organizations and to government and say, "You should probably better at including...doing this". That's again a risky territory to go into because countries may feel strongly in one way or another about issues. They have their own policy and they may have their own reasons to have their policy. So you often hear in many countries if the U.S. or someone else goes it and says, "You should be better with the minorities for human rights" and then those countries will say, "Don't interfere our internal affairs".

It is a sensitive issue and of course no one likes to be told that something is wrong. But it plays a big part, being inclusive and part of the American history as a nation that employs that. That is important.

Q: Could you provide any concrete examples of any PD events that promote those values?

P: We've done a lot with the Somali in Denmark, reaching out to Somali groups and Somali organizations to make sure what they need come parts from the U.S. Where they then have experiences on what works and what doesn't work...there are some success stories in the U.S. and there are some issues in Denmark, so those two can meet and create success stories in Denmark. We have an overall outreach that goes out to minorities just to make sure that they are included and to hear what issues they have. Again, not to knock someone on the head and say, "You need to be a member", but by bringing people from the U.S. where many communities have been many of these things maybe 50 years ago, 20 years ago, or whatever. Then, have them share their experiences in Denmark so that they can hopefully come out better.

So there are projects of varying scales and it can be anything from a large official trip to the U.S. to us providing some computers for a club somewhere so that they can express themselves

through music or art. So there are many different levels of how this is done and probably that is how this should be that it works nicely at different levels and you reach different types of people and you can reach different people...who are...opinion makers who can also go bottle up and say, "We'll get these people a chance to have a voice that they didn't have for social or financial reasons and now they have it"...and that's good.

Q: You've also mentioned that smartpower is pretty much the same public diplomacy, but the changes on focus to youth and social media. Could you tell me how social media has affected public diplomacy practices?

P: Certainly, social media is a new thing...maybe now we've done it for four to five and a half years. It's changed everything: it's taken of a lot of what we would usually put on our embassy webpage and no one would ever see it. So we've scaled that down a lot and it's prompted us some thoughts on overall changes to okay, why do we have the website, what should we do with it, what should be on it. But it's certainly changed the way we communicate much more informal, much faster, and literary much much faster. I mean, sometimes we posted stuff that...we posted it and then it happened and that would be impossible with the website system we have and it's unusual for this organization to do that. So that's changed a lot and that's changed the audience reach, it has changed how we communicate and who we communicate with. So, absolutely, a whole lot of changes. It's also given us a lot of work and it's been a steep running curve actually—figuring what works on social media, what doesn't work. When we were still somewhere in the middle of this steep running curve—figuring out why do we post stuff on Facebook or Twitter and what do we need to get out of it and what gives us the outcome that we want from it...So we're not at the finish line definitely with figuring out how to use it, but we're much further than we were a few years ago. We can also see that often what is perceived as a good idea in Washington may not be a good idea in 200 different countries: it may be a great idea in some of them but not in all of them. We can actually see a change in how Washington communicates to posts with regards to social media postings where you go back a year or two. They would say, "Post this" and now they say, "Post this if it makes sense". That's a huge change because they still come about a bunch of stuff, but it's...there's a lot of control and guidelines because they do make a lot of things, but they also say, "If this doesn't make sense in your audience, then don't post it". That's also from the knowledge that posting stuff that doesn't work is actually worse than not posting anything at all because it drives people away, then people become less active and fewer people receive...it's like a downward spiral and you can quit. It certainly does correspond to the listening and advocacy parts. It's one of those things that the listening comes first before the advocacy...or it's like a back-and-forth—where we post stuff, we do things, we see how it works, and then we change accordingly. Still giving a mind on what people actually say stuff, but making sure that what we say gets to people...because if we say stuff that doesn't get to people then it's not worth to say it. So, listening is a big part of that and social media is a powerful tool because it delivers statistics: how many people see this, when they do it, when we post this, how do that affect and where... That's absolutely a wonderful tool so that you can see what works and what doesn't and it's very surprising sometimes on what works and what doesn't. A large part of social media is being a social person, it is about...I'm not going to say friendship, but sounding like a normal person and saying stuff that's engaging...what people care about basically.

Q: And then is it also the same as the goal of soft power with social media, except it enables you to do more compared to the previous radio broadcasting and TV?

P: Yes, I would...if you say that the basic idea of soft power is someone to like you for being you and not because you carry a big stick, then that is certainly a huge and important aspect that you show that you care about your audience and that you communicate so that people appreciate what you do.

Q: What is the role of social media in this outreach to Somali project? For example, does it encourage values that we talked about such as, participation, civic engagement, and others?

P: It does and it's interesting with minorities and how they use social media in comparison to regular Danes. There are huge differences here and the interesting aspect is that, if you generalize, you could argue that minorities in Denmark use social media the way that is...closer to how Americans use social media. They are much more politically active, they have many more actual debates on social media that we don't necessarily take part in, but we listen to them and follow to see where things are going. They are more serious debates so these groups of people have used social media to a very large extent—and larger extent than Danes do. We can also see from membership from our Facebook that...we haven't actually gotten the chance to look at where everybody lives, but just judging from names that we have very large parts of people who are either Middle-Eastern descent or from the Middle East...way, way larger than in the Danish population. So there's a huge possibility there because these people are on social media and they use them more politically and they use them more...actually I would say, more deliberative way. It's not just people following..., but it is about really based. I think it has something to do that they come from countries that have real issues and I think the downside is that a lot of being debated is their home country's issues and they just take them here—it's like a little diaspora page, if you will. But the use of social media as a debate tool, as democratic tool, is there to a really large extent. You could see the Arab Spring where a lot of it took place via social media in one way or another. So, there's a huge potential there in reaching out to groups of people that's otherwise not necessarily super easy to get to. It's actually a potential that we haven't tapped into that much, but it is also a difficult one because how do you...you know, a part from your normal messaging and normal posts, how do you target to minorities on Facebook without getting weird. So that certainly required some hard thinking on how to do that.

Q: Which platform would you say is more effective than the others?

P: We basically only use Twitter and Facebook and I would still say that Facebook is our more important platform, but Twitter is catching on. We actually more followers on Twitter than we do on Facebook but they are not to the same extent from Denmark and to a larger extent sort of companies, newspapers and stuff but not necessarily Danish newspapers and just all the media. Twitter also doesn't give you the possibility to communicate like complex arguments.

Q: Do you see the differences in when people engage in public physically that sometimes they feel uncomfortable talking about stuff that may be perceived as trivial even though it matters for them and when they engage on social media?

P: I think on Facebook in general probably, yes that people aren't feeling intimidated to talk just about anything but I think that there is still some sort of reluctance on embassy Facebook page. We have few regular crazies who post stuff that doesn't make any sense and I think that...it's just the way it is. We don't get to debate what we would like...also, maybe because we are ourselves are too reluctant when we message that we shouldn't be too bold, but it would certainly be great if people were more open to discuss stuff, trivial and non-trivial. When we usually look at feedback, the really harmless posts are the ones that get the most feedback or the ones that show significant appreciation that takes place in Denmark—those are the ones that work better. To the extent that we post on “serious” issues and the people who respond are American studies or political science people, we don't have a mass reaction to, “Yes, trafficking is bad”...that just doesn't happen. That is in the nature of Facebook that people aren't—minority discussing politics aside—people aren't as open discussing politics, especially on U.S. Embassy Facebook page. Public diplomacy certainly allows the public to participate deliberatively in any decision making process on whatever issues they have and we welcome crazy debates going all over the place, but they don't happen. I think if you look at other embassies, that situation may be different but in many ways it's similar to if you go to a conference with a self-selected audience that the vast majority won't say anything and then there are just a handful of outliers who will say stuff on the edges. So it's a similar situation to that and then you can usually gauge where is the mood of this entire crowd. So that is another difficult issue with social media, actually...to gauge public opinion because it's self-selected audience and because the number is so small. We also try not to say, “Oh, Danes think this or that” given that you know two Danes who think this or that. The bottom line is that we don't have the debate. The debate isn't as lively as it should be and sort all over the place as it would be nice if it were. People have the option to say whatever, but people just don't. Even when we encourage people, “What are your thoughts on this”, we only get one or two responses where it would be great to have 20 and if 15 of them disagree with you, it's even better. It could be a forum for debate and that is not what happens. I would say overall it does facilitate democracy, dialogue, and participation and it does with people who choose to use it. Of course, it doesn't to a larger extent provide you with an option to get information to people who would otherwise never get it. Again, if you were in a country that has two radio stations and you get to broadcast on one, that's a pretty good situation. Here where people select where they want to be on Facebook, they select what they like: select how they want to be configured and then they have a million other things that shout out at the same time. It's certainly important not to overestimate the power of a website or a Facebook page. For instance, for ours we have over 2300 fans—which is a lot of people, but if you look at Denmark with 3 million people on Facebook that's not a lot of people...it is less than 1% of the population. So it's important not to overestimate whatever influence it may have.

Q: Content-wise, there is freedom of speech?

P: No blocks, anyone can post whatever he or she wants. If people again and again and again post stupid stuff, we'll remove them but we're fairly large. I think what we usually do is when people post stuff that doesn't make any sense, that doesn't have anything to do with either the U.S. relations; we'll take away but we don't censor.

Q: Last question: how does the U.S. government view the role of civil society?

P: That's very important, definitely. We spend pretty much all of our time reach out. We do have some government contacts but not a lot, so it's all about NGOs, different types of organizations. Denmark the way it is, some of them may be government funding but they are not colored by whatever government in place. Of course, the press...we spend a lot of time looking into what's in the press. We spend a lot of time talking to the press and communicate through the press as much as we can. Those are important and I think the base of what U.S. hopes to get through the public diplomacy is as informed as the U.S. perspective and policy as possible. If people want to argue back-and-forth on Facebook, that would be splendid but they just don't. If you get that thing going and have more civil society being aware in taking on any informed position. I would say that if I say that the U.S. doesn't set the tone for civil society, that would be a little naïve. I think that it's all about making sure that wherever the tone lands, it will be as informed as possible and as understanding the view and perspective as possible. If that helps modify the tone or change agenda in one way or another, that's just great. I think in other countries you can see a situation where U.S. public diplomacy tries to set the tone on certain issues and here if you look at something really important like participation with NATO in Afghanistan, we've certainly have had op-eds signed by the ambassador: "This is really important and that's why the U.S. wants support from Denmark". I guess you can say that is trying to set the tone to a certain extent. One of the things that has succeeded was one of these inclusion things where many years ago—I think before I started here—there was this issue about how immigrants were always interviewed because they were immigrants. They never interviewed about taxes or about a new company or a closure of a road, they were all only interviewed on immigrant issues and that has changed because I think the debate about that was initiated by this place and it was taken up by many media. Now you see immigrants being interviewed about things that have nothing to do with their ethnic or religious background.

Q: Anything else you would like to add?

P: No, I don't think I can add anything else.

8.3 Appendix C: Sample of Coding & Themes Tables

Codes and Themes for P.H. Transcript

Code	Theme
Technological advances	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new P.D. has been defined because of technological advances in social media and also the web. 2. Social media allows for targeting for new groups of people and the public that the U.S. attempts to reach. 3. In using Facebook the U.S. is able to target to the public but the public is also able to self-select on the kind of pages it wants to have a dialogue with.
Social media	
website	
Targeting groups	
public	
Random targeting	
New groups of people	
Facebook	
Self-selection	
Public awareness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. P.D. functions as to create public awareness, positive image about the U.S. that is created through building relationship with the public, exchanges and shared understanding between the publics. 2. Since P.D. functions to projects positive image of the U.S., it has been raised as a national security strategy.
Positive image of U.S.	
Shared understanding	
relationship	
exchanges	
National security	
Positive image of U.S.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Smartpower is about soft power in which P.D. practices engages with the public to promote positive image of the U.S. 2. In reference to smartpower, P.D.'s focus is on youth and specifically engaging, talking and listening to them, as well as promoting positive image of the U.S. to them. 3. Smartpower is not a new policy in a way that the practices have always been the same softpower, but it has just been hyped and branded differently.
Soft power	
Positive image of U.S.	
smartpower	
youth	
Engaging with public	
youth	
Engaging with youth	
Talking/listening to youth	
Positive image of U.S.	
“Old wine in new bottles”	
Compr: Smartpower and softpower	<p>With the focus on youth, P.D. practices include listening and talking to youth.</p>
Talking to youth	
Listening to youth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic P.D. practices involve listening and advocacy. 2. In listening and advocating, P.D. also targets to certain groups of people instead of disseminating the same messages to the general public. 3. By targeting, P.D. is able to listen and advocate in a way that makes sense to the audience. 4. Social media enables P.D. to target to the diversity in the global audience and engage with the public that has differing opinion.
Listening	
advocacy	
targeting	
“blast out standard message”	
Advocating the public	
Listening to the public	
Social media	
targeting	
Global audience	

“Talk to this political spectrum, different form of argument”	
Engaging with public	
targeting	
listening	<p>1. The new approach of P.D. focuses on listening to, building relationships with the public, and engaging with the civil society.</p> <p>2. Unlike the old P.D. where it was more of propaganda and one-way communication to inform the people without understanding them, the new P.D. is a two-way communication that listens to what the public needs.</p> <p>3. In the two-way communication with the public, P.D. disseminates accurate information that also demonstrates the ethical component of P.D. as opposed to the propaganda.</p>
Building relationships	
Engaging with civil society	
Propaganda	
One-way communication	
“We’re telling you this message and we don’t actually care”	
Compr: Old v. New P.D.	
Two-way communication	
Listening to public	
Accurate information	
Ethical component	
Accurate information	<p>The ethical practices of P.D. include disseminating accurate information/complete picture of the U.S., respecting people’s opinions, and promoting U.S. values.</p>
Opinion	
“This is how the U.S. sees it”	
Disseminating U.S. values	
National security	<p>1. The main objective of P.D. is lined up with national security policy for it promotes positive image of the U.S. in the foreign public.</p> <p>2. Particularly by informing the public on the positive image of the U.S. and reaching out to the public, P.D. attempts to gain support of both grassroots level civil society and public and politicians on U.S. top-level policy.</p> <p>3. P.D. practices are like “little wheels that work nicely together” in facilitating public-to-public interactions, reaching out to the public in informing the public and sharing values.</p> <p>4. Social media is a big component in the new P.D. practices that enables public outreach and information.</p>
Positive image of U.S.	
Compr: People/politicians	
Informing the public	
“Machine with a whole bunch wheels”	
Outreach to public	
organization	
“Little wheels that somehow work nicely together”	
Public-to-public	
Shared values	
Outreach to public	
Social media	<p>1. P.D. promotes U.S. values such as democracy and civic participation and gives the opportunity for the public to participate in any discussions.</p> <p>2. Specifically, the U.S. promotes democratic values such as human rights, minority rights, and women’s rights.</p> <p>3. P.D. supports the public by educating and informing them so it can gain positive image of the U.S.</p> <p>4. By providing the opportunity for people to participate, P.D. “generates good public sphere for people” to share values and ideas</p>
Informed public	
democracy	
Civic participation	
Disseminating U.S. values	
Providing participation	
Democracy/democratic values	
Human rights	
Supporting the public	
Positive image of U.S.	
“It will generate good public sphere for people”	

Shared values/ideas	5. Although P.D. practices “won’t create global democracy”, it helps project positive image of the U.S.
Compr: “Won’t create global democracy”/positive image	
Reaching out to public	1. In terms of social inclusion initiative, P.D. reaches out to the marginalized/excluded community so they can be part of the society. 2. By reaching out to this marginalized community, P.D. attempts to understand issues that it faces. 3. Since it can be a “risky territory” in which the U.S. gov’t intervenes with domestic policy of another country, P.D. reaches out to the marginalized by promoting U.S. values.
Marginalized/excluded group	
Part of the society	
Minority issues	
Reaching out to public	
“risky territory to get into”	
policy	
Gov’t intervention	
U.S. values	
Somali	
Reaching out excluded groups	
Supporting public needs	
sharing	
Outreach to minority	
Social inclusion	
listening	
“Not to knock someone on the head”	
Public-to-public	
sharing	
Providing/facilitating public	1. The development of social media has changed the way the U.S. embassy communicates to the public in a way that is informal and faster and P.D. has scaled down its webpage efforts. 2. By using Facebook and other social media platforms, the U.S. is about to post things online and target to specific groups of the public. 3. However, social media is still a learning curve in understanding it as a new tool and how to communicate and target to specific groups. 4. There has been a change from one-way social media communication that did not consider targeting to a new back-and-forth approach that listens and advocates to public. 4. In the learning process of using social media, it is a better P.D. practice to post things online that do not work rather than not posting at all. 5. By not posting the U.S. embassy projects a downward spiral that discourages people to participate in any
Reaching out to public	
“Go bottle up”	
Social media	
webpage	
“We’ve scaled that down”	
Communication change	
Informal, faster	
Posting online	
Targeting	
“Steep learning curve”	
Facebook	
Communication restrictions	
Compr: Posting/not posting	
Online participation	
Listening, advocacy	
“Downward spiral and you can quit”	
Back-and-forth	
Posting online	
listening	
advocacy	

Listening to public	discussion altogether. 6. By using social media that is a powerful tool, the U.S. is able to engage with the public more as a social person.
targeting	
“Social media is a powerful tool”	
Social person	The overall soft power approach is to promote positive image of the U.S., listen and communicate to the public, as opposed to telling people what to believe in.
Soft power	
Positive image of U.S.	
“carry a big stick”	
Listening to public	
Communicating the public	<p>1. In terms of social inclusion initiative, social media has enabled marginalized/ excluded community to participate actively in political conversations without any government intervention.</p> <p>2. The role that the embassy plays is listening and advocacy on what the public debates for.</p> <p>3. By using social media minority/excluded community is able to participate in dialogue that is more deliberative and as a democratic tool.</p> <p>4. Social media such as Facebook enables P.D. to reach out to and target the public, but the embassy has not tapped into it much because it is still a new tool.</p>
marginalized/ excluded group	
Social media	
Social media participation	
Politically active	
No gov’t intervention	
Listening & advocating the public	
debates	
Social media participation/dialogue	
Minority/excluded group	
Social media use	
“more deliberative way”	
“democratic tool”	
Reaching out to public	
“haven’t tapped into that much”	
targeting	
Facebook	
Facebook/Twitter	In the P.D. effort of communicating with the public, the embassy uses a combination of social media platforms of Facebook and Twitter as well as traditional media of press.
Traditional media	
Communicating information	
Facebook	<p>1. In conversing with the public, Facebook enables social media participation but there is reluctance in the way people participate fully in social media dialogue depending on whether or not messages communicated are too bold.</p> <p>2. Ideally, by using social media P.D. attempts to provide social media participation that allows people to discuss any types of issues, trivial or non-trivial, particularly the marginalized community in participating in any political dialogue.</p> <p>3. The embassy provides dialogue spaces/platforms where it is open for people to discuss anything because of the “self-selected audience” nature of facebook.</p> <p>4. Despite the lack of active political dialogue on social media platforms, specifically there have been a handful of outliers who say stuff on the edge without any restrictions</p>
Social media participation	
“reluctance on Facebook page”	
Social media dialogue	
Messages too bold	
Disseminating message	
Compr: trivial/non-trivial	
posting	
Social media participation	
Excluded group	
Discussing politics	
deliberatively	
Providing dialogue	
spaces/platforms	
“self-selected audience”	
“handful of outliers who will say	

stuff on the edges”	<p>which participation has been provided by social media.</p> <p>5. As a new tool, the use of social media in P.D. has not been able to gauge public opinion, but it provides and encourages participation and enables them to listen to the public.</p> <p>6. Social media of Facebook and website is powerful because it is a forum for debate that facilitates participation and provides information for the public.</p>
“gauge public opinion”	
Lack of active dialogue	
Providing participation	
Encouraging participation	
listening	
“forum for debate”	
Facilitating participation	
Providing information to public	
“power of a website or Facebook page”	<p>In the practices of using social media, P.D. enables people to participate by posting online without any censorship on the contents they want to discuss.</p>
No censorship	
participation	
Online posting	<p>1. The overall role that the U.S. gov’t plays through P.D. is reaching out to public to support civil society in a way that is not influenced by the gov’t policy.</p> <p>2. Social media and traditional media help the public to be informed with social media’s role that specifically promotes and enables participation and dialogue.</p> <p>3. P.D. practices use the press to inform the public with the complete picture about the U.S. but it also sets the tone in the kinds of information disseminated by the U.S. gov’t.</p> <p>4. In terms of the marginalized immigrants, the press has helped to set the tone in a way that promotes social inclusion.</p>
Reaching out to public	
Civil society	
“not colored by whatever gov’t in place”	
Traditional media	
Informing the public	
Social media participation/dialogue	
Complete information	
“wherever the tone lands”	
“set the tone”	
Social inclusion	
Marginalized /excluded groups	
media	

8.4 Appendix D: Sample of Clustering

PUBLIC TO PUBLIC/ STATE TO PUBLIC

THEMES:

-The U.S. public diplomacy is an overall government effort to facilitate public-to-public interactions and dialogue by reaching out to, building relationships with, and supporting the civil society without state intervention. Particularly, U.S. public diplomacy practices include facilitating exchanges of people, ideas, cultures; providing complete and accurate information about policy and agreements; and opening up face-to-face and online spaces for public dialogue.

- P.D. focuses on and assists, particularly by creating an inclusive environment where marginalized/excluded community can be a part of.

I think what we are trying to do is basically find what we...how we can assist the Danish government and the Danish public in making...well, in terms of public affairs I guess...creating an environment where everyone feels like they are part of the society

- Since it's part of the strategy, feel-good diplomacy is supposed to facilitate the public and encourage participation through dialogue, as opposed to pushing information out.

I think if you push them, they're feeling like they're being dragged in...but to be included in that there's space for you. I think the key is creating: whether it's actual physical space, mental space, civil society, or it's social media space where they feel they can join in.

- The new P.D. works by reaching out to non-government/civil society, focusing on the public, and public-to-public engagements and interactions, but there is also some elements of targeting to certain groups in informing the public.

"Public diplomacy has always been reaching to the non-government people, the public...and I think with more sort of engagement, often they...the word engagement used, and it's not just putting information out there for those who want it. It's actually targeting who needs this information"

- On reaching out to the public, P.D. involves the back-and-forth process of engaging and asking the public on its needs.
"You see this in more sensitive places like Pakistan where we're doing a lot in terms of really engaging and asking the public: what is it that the embassy can do for you. I think there's this more sort of back-and-forth and building relationships".
- P.D. also builds relationships through the exchanges of people, providing platforms for the public to interact to share information and values; as opposed to the old PD where it is government-to-public information sharing.

- With no government intervention, P.D. operates by facilitating public-to-public involvement, creating spaces and links for public to interact, exchange values, and then gov't steps back.
- P.D. facilitates public-to-public exchanges—with the focus on youth—allows the public to inform each other “with no restrictions gov't officials would”
- The U.S. gov't only facilitates public-to-public interactions, then follow up in order to “let the civil society take over”
- The new policy attempts to balance U.S. foreign policy so that diplomats engage with the foreign publics, which has been the same P.D. approach
 - Consistent with the new P.D., but engaging with the public diplomats also demonstrate their public outreach that is embedded throughout the structure of the organization.

We've been combined since then, so maybe what the Secretary was getting at that time was that she wanted to make sure that the different cones of the embassy were in balance. I would have to say that that is a little bit of a remix or a retro back to what we were already doing...or simply spitting it out to reinforce the notion that diplomats, especially diplomats targeted in the P.D. cone, should be getting out there and simply speaking as Americans.

- P.D. facilitates public-to-public information by bringing speakers as free citizens and without any gov't intervention.
 - But in the process which speakers to bring in and which not, the state influences and sets the tone

We brought to Denmark and fellow named Dan Hamilton, who's served as an official in the Clinton administration but for the last several years has been advocating free-trade policy between the Americas and Europe. He is not a member of the current U.S. government, he's not a member of State Department. He talks a lot of the policy line that we are complementary to him...we are supportive of him. But he does not carry the policy line. There are differences. He does lobby the U.S. government, he does lobby the Obama administration, so he is a free citizen. Be it as it may, we brought him to talk what his perspectives are. He actually talked about his perspectives to a number of publics, representing that viewpoint within American society and not the official American viewpoint.

- Overall P.D. attempts to promote public-to-public dialogue and not in a propagandistic way that is linked directly to the objective and policy of the U.S.
- P.D. facilitates public-to-public interactions without any government intervention.

promote dialogue and not to be the straight propagandist. Obviously people will think and say that in fact that is what you're doing because it is true that there are certain policies, goals, objectives, or values that we inherently have; but other than that our role is to promote dialogue...I would just simply reiterate back to the examples I have already used such as, the Speakers program where it was not American officials who came but private citizens who came, our Facebook page that on any given day does get dozens of hits—sometimes hundreds of hits, sometimes thousands of hits...it is to

promote dialogue on that page. People who post obviously can do so regardless as to whether or not they like the United States or whether or not they agree with what our position is.

- Through P.D. practices the U.S. promotes its values to the marginalized group on social inclusion and being part of the society so they are less inclined to become terrorists.
-This also points to disseminating U.S. values, cultural hegemonic relations.

So the Americans are doing something right that we are not in terms of...if you have to fix extremism and that is that inclusion is a really important focus. If you are included in the society, then the less inclined you become a terrorist. That's what we've learned from Americans. That's what we've worked a lot intensely with the American embassy because there are so many ideas that we can work together on. It's been a really good boost that the Americans have had such as a useful focus on minority groups.

- P.D. practices operate by providing and facilitating public-to-public engagements.

They are all in charge of making sure that people can come about the daily life and help access to the information and to channel and to...pretty much have access to that particular part of the society, which is interesting...important for them.

- Overall, P.D. practices reflect that the role of the government is to facilitate and support the public for the inclusion of all parts of the society.
- The new approach of P.D. focuses on listening to, building relationships with the public, and engaging with the civil society.

the listening aspect and the partnership aspect—a lot of what we do here is actual partnership with organizations where we go out and say, “Okay, if you do half, we’ll do half and then we’ll make something good out of it” and some people will be happier than they were before. So that’s certainly good and you can always...when people as, “What do I do?”

- The overall role that the U.S. gov’t plays through P.D. is reaching out to public to support civil society in a way that is not influenced by the gov’t policy.

We spend pretty much all of our time reach out. We do have some government contacts but not a lot, so it’s all about NGOs, different types of organizations. Denmark the way it is, some of them may be government funding but they are not colored by whatever government in place.

- Basic P.D. practices include exchanges of public ideas and values, social media, and traditional media in disseminating information.

I think you can see through the various ways of how our jobs are carved up. The basic areas are the Speakers program, exchanges, social media, and the regular media.

- Practices of P.D. are facilitating cultural exchanges, public-to-public engagements so people can share values, promoting U.S. values, and disseminating information.
- P.D. objectives include engaging with the public, the marginalized group, and promoting U.S. values.

I guess the classics: engaging with local communities, explaining U.S. society politics, and democratic principles. You know, promoting civic participation. Also, looking at the Somali stuff, the basic immigrant community that we're doing. People know that we're doing it so that people embrace democracy and so they won't become terrorists and stuff like that, which again is really a difficult path

Mismatch/public sphere

THEMES:

-State to public relationships are a mismatch because state doesn't know exactly what the public needs, but by facilitating public-to-public interactions and then step back the state lets the public grow organically

-State develops spaces where the public can engage freely in dialogue through exchanges of individuals, values, best practices; Speakers program with free citizens informing each other openly with complete information; and encouraging marginalized groups to participate and to be part of the society.

-In its dialogue with the public, the state understands what the public needs through two-way communication of listening and advocacy.

- The job of the U.S. gov't in PD is only to facilitate, support, and fund civil society and then step back in order to "let the initiatives grow organically" as they come from the public.
-public to public/government to public and by letting civil society take over and make the conversation grow organically, the state enables the public to find out its needs, as opposed to the mismatch state-to-public interactions.

If you look at traditional diplomacy: it's was government to public. Now what you're seeing, the latest development is public to public. What role does the embassy play in that in sort of facilitating? That's when we do a program but we step back and we leave the interaction and even the follow up to the public...So I think that's to me the most important shift and change...is creating this platform where we remove the government element and let civil society take over.

- On the one hand f the gov't interferes with the public, "it is a little bit of a mismatch" because they're bound by regulation on what information to disseminate.

On the other hand, public-to-public interactions allow people to gather information about each other through the exchanges of ideas and without gov't regulations to have "cosmopolitan worldview"

-Finding out public needs and building sphere where people can interact and gain experience

Recognizing though sometimes when government to public, it's a little bit of a mismatch: "this is what we think the public needs" and we're bound by government regulation, whereas when we're sending a delegation to the United States they're interacting with anyone that we deem important...but also anyone that they meet that they gain a much broader experience...I think just that experience is really important: it's not only about information gathered about each other, it's not just that the Americans who have come to Denmark learn more about Denmark, but that interaction itself...it's a healthy bi-product that they learn this cosmopolitan worldview of exchange ideas

- By engaging with the public, the U.S. gov't particularly supports the public in terms of their engagements and participation in solving public issues that cannot be solved by agreements.
- Instead, by creating sphere where the public can participate and engage without gov't intervention, the public is able to solve problems locally and organically.
- PD practices include supporting the public, enabling two-way communication, asking on what the public needs.
- The opportunity that P.D. has outside is that through its values the U.S. is able to promote participation, the development of civil society and through the public-to-public interactions provide a complete picture of the U.S. so the public can use correct information to make informed decision, which lines up with ethical perspective.

I think yes, there's definitely ethics in terms of making sure what we say and what we do is true...that we're not giving out bad information—I think that's important. No bad information has ever been given out by the U.S. government. It is important that what we're providing is accurate and complete. That's why often times it's important that it's public-to-public because then you get the full picture. When it's the government, you're only getting one perspective.

- Both social media and face-to-face exchanges through P.D. practices provide opportunities public participation, and social inclusion.
- In terms of providing the opportunity for inclusive public participation, the U.S. is "giving rights to the participant".

So it's not just we go out and do a program, but we also have to target in terms of making sure we're giving as many people and as many parts of the society the chance to participate. So it's not just numbers, but also giving rights to the participants.

- The new P.D. is similar to old P.D. in ways that it engages with scholars and reaches out to public.

Many of the things, we've been doing since the office of the United States Information Agency was formed just after World War II and perhaps before. Some of the key programs we've been engaged in since World War II include the Fulbright

Scholars program, the International Visitor program, those are two of the hallmarks of what public diplomacy does and they're on-going.

- P.D. is not propagandistic because it provides a complete picture of the U.S. through public-to-public speaking engagements that exposes people to foreign publics with no gov't intervention
-but it still aims to promote U.S. values, nation-branding, cultural relations.

I'd say those are outstanding efforts to reach out to publics in ways that are not designed—and clearly not design—to just simply be propaganda of the embassies and U.S. foreign policy: the International Visitor program introduces foreign visitors to all aspects of American life and to the diversity of American opinion, so does the Fulbright Scholars program

- Instead of propagandizing, the U.S. uses P.D. to promote its values through public-to-public casual and other exchanges without gov't intervention.

Specifically again not to promote or propagandize the straight U.S. foreign policy is, but to convey that there're private views on these matters and the people who we bring in are private speakers who're entitled to speak about what their private views are without an interference.

- In the engagements with the foreign publics, P.D. approach has also been the same in bringing speakers for public-to-public interactions.
- P.D. practices promote government policy by supporting and advocating public-to-public engagements to increase public dialogue.
-By presenting a complete picture people can make informed decision in supporting top-level policy and agreements.

That would be a good case in point where we bring people to Denmark just to simply increase the dialogue, even if some of the things that they say maybe not completely in support of the U.S. foreign policy. Sometimes, there's even other example where people could even be much opposed to U.S. foreign policy or current directives of the administration but their view is still worth hearing.

- In representing the U.S., P.D. engages to promote U.S. and democratic values such as, dialogue, discussion, and freedom of speech around the world.
-But many of these values are actually U.S. values, presenting cultural hegemonic relations

Well, I'd say basically by definition it does. The fact that we engage in fora which promote discussion as opposed to just simply outright lobbying...is just simply a representation of democratic values. I mean we make no mistake about it: we do believe that democracy...is the best system of government for the people of the world specifically because it allows for the people of the world select their own leaders as equals. Those are the types of values that we promote.

So, simply the way we conduct our programs and the way we conduct ourselves, I'd say is a reinforcement of that because we do promote good dialogue and discussion. In terms of the other values we try to promote: freedom of speech—again it is just simply by definition. It is what our values are...we do speak about that. We do speak out against about anytime there are attacks on free speech, including on the various cartoon crises, burn of Qur'an crisis—which people did die, and the bizarre home-made video that got so much attention...

Each time and each instance we had to say that America in its core does believe in speech, so there was nothing that we could do to prevent certain types of speech that others might find offensive simply because that's the way we're as a people. While we've defended attacks on all religions, we have also defend the right of all people to speak out even if it is in rage which we objected to within certain realms.

Also, on freedom of religion as well: it's clear that our country does not take a specific religious advent to it with one exception of the Christian Christmas holiday—that's the only secular holiday on the American holiday calendar, but that's based on tradition as the most of anything else.

- P.D. supports public engagements for the social inclusion of minority by creating an inclusive environment so that they can participate.

These are the different focus areas, including kids with minority background. Umm, so yes this is pretty much what we've done. We taught people with minority background who now have managed to find their paths and become included into the society—find jobs, education, and so. And we've had some of them to go out and speak to kids, youngsters, within the environment for them to understand that there are opportunities.

- In engaging with the youth in the marginalized group, P.D. encourages the public by discussing about the future.

I was just speaking to some kids in (inaudible) and I asked them what they really want to do. The majority of them they were just doing some kind of street gang...That's how they were making their money, by being some sort of a gang and so on. And then, there were a few of them who were really smart and I asked them, "come on if you really want to do something with your life what you want to do"

- The U.S. also uses P.D. to engage with and provide the marginalized group knowledge about social exclusion and inclusion so they are able to be a part of the society.

So that's the reason we have this inclusion strategy because then more of these people feel more included, welcomed into the society, the less of them end up doing some attempts of terrorist attack.

8.5 Appendix E: U.S. Embassy Denmark Facebook Page

facebook Search for people, places and things Agga Soediono Home

U.S. Embassy Denmark
2,443 likes · 123 talking about this · 445 were here

Consulate & Embassy · Government Organization
Embassy of the United States of America in
Copenhagen, Denmark – Maintaining good relations
since 1827: <http://denmark.usembassy.gov/>

About - Suggest an Edit

Photos Likes Map Live Events

Highlights

Post Photo / Video
Write something...

U.S. Embassy Denmark
9 hours ago

Welcome to our 69 newest friends Sung, Stephen, Jamil, AbdulRahman, Siapakah, Babi, James, CDIMP, Aiperi, Zach,

24 Friends
Connected to U.S. Embassy Denmark

24 friends like this

3 friends were here

Create Page
maj! Mer info här!
Karriärresa till NYC?
De som som har flest blivande studiecoacher i sitt personliga nätverk vinner. Tävla här!
Erna Dzin likes My Academy.

Now
2012
2011
2010
1964
1941
1933
Founded

8.6 Appendix F: Ambassador Fulton’s Facebook

The screenshot shows the Facebook profile of Laurie S. Fulton. At the top, the Facebook logo and search bar are visible. The profile picture is a large group photo of many people standing in front of various national flags. A smaller inset photo shows Laurie S. Fulton speaking at a microphone. Below the profile picture, the name "Laurie S. Fulton" is displayed, along with "Friends" and "Message" buttons. The navigation tabs include "Timeline", "About", "Friends 17 Mutual", "Photos 215", and "More".

About

- Ambassador at U.S. Embassy Denmark**
Past: Williams & Connolly LLP 1989–2009
- Studied at Georgetown University Law School**
Past: Brookings, South Dakota
- Lives in Copenhagen, Denmark**
- From Alexandria, Virginia**
- Followed by 100 people

Post **Photo**

Write something...

Mohsin A Jafri shared a link via **Joe Satin**.
April 30

SEAL Team 4 Commanding Officer Best Known For Finding & Then Killing Osama Bin Laden Commits Suicide
thelastgreatstand.com

Calvin Harris till Gbg!
tickster.com
7 juli spelar Calvin Harris i Göteborg! Biljetter släpps 10 maj! Mer info här!

Flyg snabbare med Finnair
Res till över 70 destinationer i världen. Besök Finnair så får du veta mer.

Now
2013
2012
2011
2009
2008
1989
Born

8.7 Appendix G: Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders Facebook Page

The screenshot shows the Facebook page for 'Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders'. At the top, the Facebook navigation bar is visible with the search bar and the user's name 'Agga Soediono'. The page header includes the event title 'Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders' and the dates 'March 14-18, 2013' in 'Brussels, Belgium'. A large banner image shows a crowd of people in a city square, with a logo on either side that reads 'LEADING TOGETHER'. Below the banner, the page name 'Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders' is displayed with '229 likes' and buttons for 'Liked', 'Message', and a settings icon. A 'Cause' section explains that the German Marshall Fund is hosting a networking and training opportunity for young diverse elected leaders. Navigation tabs for 'Photos', 'Likes', and 'Notes' are visible, with 'Notes' showing 8 items. A 'Highlights' dropdown menu is present. On the left, there is a 'Post' section with a 'Write something...' text box and a 'Photo / Video' option. Below that, a post from 'Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders' dated April 17 is shown, with the text: 'Further insights into the S&D initiative: Last week, Lyon played host to a debate on 'Integration: living together better', the latest event from the S&D'. On the right, there is a '7 Friends' section with a 'Like Transatlantic Inclusion Leaders' prompt and a row of profile pictures. Below that, a 'Recent Posts by Others' section shows a post by 'Parag Mehta' from March 17 at 5:34pm, which says 'In light of Friday's conversation, this seemed fitting.' and has 13 likes, 1 comment, and 2 shares. A sidebar on the far right contains advertisements for Calvin Harris, iPhone 5, and telenor.

8.8 Appendix H: Generation Change Facebook Page

facebook Search for people, places and things Agga Soediono Home

Generation Change
715 likes · 10 talking about this

Non-Profit Organization
Generation Change is a youth-driven global network dedicated to fostering the next generation of innovators and leaders in youth communities around

Welcome & FAQ **Apply now!** **Likes** 715

Highlights

- Generation Change shared Kisirisa Muhammed "Slum Ambassador"'s album. April 12
- And we're proud of you too! Proudly Generation Change Maker (6 photos)
- U.S. Embassy Dublin Government Organization - Consulate & Embassy - Embassy Like
- U.S. Embassy Khartoum Government Organization Like

Sponsored
Calvin Harris till Gbg! tickster.com
7 juli spelar Calvin Harris i Göteborg! Biljetter släpps 10 maj! Mer info här!
Byt till iPhone 5 telenor.se
Förläng ditt abonnemang och uppgradera till en iPhone 5!