

FROM TRADITIONAL TO NEW INSTRUMENTS: THE ROLE OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN CONFLICT PREVENTION

*Res. Assist. Dr. CANSU GÜLEÇ**

Abstract

As the world of the 21st century requires states to deal with more issues with more actors in a more complex atmosphere, diplomacy has become much more multi-faceted. In today's global environment, many people in the world have easy and instant access to all kinds of information, and many of them have the ability to influence their governments' positions. In such environment, states need to undertake a wider set of issues like presenting abroad a state's national image and brand, as well as to put more emphasis on issues such as trade, finance, migration, human rights, and environmental concerns. Such openness and multi-level cooperation also necessitates the pursuit of more collaborative diplomatic relations with various types of actors. As a result, diplomacy cannot be considered only in terms of relations regarding central governments or foreign ministries. The diplomatic world involves more actors, which include regional and international organizations, multinational corporations, local and city government and influential individuals.

There has been an increase in the number and activity of global actors who are not states; the information revolution has changed the diplomacy field as well as information gathering is concerned; and diplomacy now involves many more participants who are experts in matters other than diplomacy, and hold their positions outside foreign ministries. Public diplomacy is about building relationships that comprises understanding the needs of other countries, cultures and peoples, communicating the points of view and correcting misperceptions. This paper highlights the role and importance of public diplomacy for conflict prevention in international arena. Diplomacy is always based on dialogue, usually between two countries, and dialogue is a crucial element of success as a mean for resolving conflict. Whether the conflict has a historical dimension or is the result of current circumstances, it is important to bring the sides together. When governments do not want or cannot engage in dialogue, it is important to involve parties from the non-government sector. Although in itself will not be the sole solution for peace between the countries, public diplomacy can implement programs to strengthen mutual trust, both within countries with a high degree of risk and in areas with conflict potential. Accordingly, after definition of diplomacy in a general framework, the evolution and role of public diplomacy mechanisms in conflict prevention will be elaborated in this paper.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Public Diplomacy, Culture, Conflict, Conflict Resolution

Özet

21. yüzyıl dünyası, devletlerin daha karmaşık bir ortamda daha fazla aktörle daha fazla meseleyi ele almasını gerektirmiş, bu nedenle de diplomasi çok yönlü hale gelmiştir. Günümüz küresel ortamında, insanlar her türlü bilgiye kolay ve hızlı bir şekilde erişebilmektedir ve

* Res. Assist. Dr. MEF University Department of Political Science and International Relations, e-mail: cansu.gulec@mef.edu.tr

bunların çoğu hükümetlerinin pozisyonlarını etkileme yeteneğine sahiptir. Söz konusu ortam, devletlerin bir ülkenin ulusal imajını ve markasını yurtdışına tanıtılmasını; ticaret, finans, göç, insan hakları ve çevre sorunları gibi konulara daha fazla vurgu yapılması ihtiyacını beraberinde gerektirmektedir. Böyle bir açıklık ve çok düzeyli iş birliği ortamı, çeşitli aktörlerle daha fazla iş birliğine dayanan diplomatik ilişkiler kurmayı da gerekli kılmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, diplomasi sadece merkezi hükümetler veya dışişleri bakanlıklarının yürüttükleri ilişkiler olarak değerlendirilememektedir. Diplomatik dünya, bölgesel ve uluslararası örgütler, çokuluslu şirketler, yerel yönetimler ve etkin bireyleri içeren daha fazla aktörü kapsamaktadır.

Devlet dışı küresel aktörlerin sayısı ve faaliyetlerindeki artışla beraber, bilgi devrimi, bilgi toplamanın yanı sıra diplomasi alanını da değiştirmiştir. Diplomasi günümüzde diplomasi dışındaki konularda uzman olan ve dışişleri bakanlıkları dışında yer alan çok daha fazla katılımcıyı da içermektedir. Kamu diplomasisi, diğer ülkelerin, kültürlerin ve halkların ihtiyaçlarını anlama, bakış açılarını iletme ve yanlış algıları düzeltme gibi konuları kapsayan ilişkiler kurmakla ilgilidir. Bu çalışma uluslararası alanda çatışmaları önleme konusunda kamu diplomasisinin rolünü ve önemini vurgulamaktadır. Diplomasi genellikle iki ülke arasındaki diyaloga dayanmaktadır ve diyalog, çatışma çözümünde bir araç olarak başarıya ulaşmanın önemli bir unsurudur. İster tarihsel bir boyuta sahip olsun, ister mevcut koşullara dayansın, bir çatışmada tarafların bir araya getirilmesi büyük önem arz etmektedir. Hükümetlerin diyalogu istemediği veya kuramadığı durumlarda, hükümet dışı tarafların sürece dahil edilmesi önemlidir. Her ne kadar ülkeler arasında barışı sağlamada tek çözüm olmasa da kamu diplomasisi hem yüksek çatışma riskine sahip ülkeler hem de çatışma potansiyeli olan alanlarda karşılıklı güveni güçlendirmek için yapıcı olabilir. Bu hususlar dahilinde bu çalışmada, diplomasi genel bir çerçevede tanımlanmasının ardından, kamu diplomasisi mekanizmalarının çatışmaların önlenmesindeki rolü ve gelişimi ele alınacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Diplomasi, Kamu Diplomasi, Kültür, Çatışma, Uyuşmazlık Çözümü

INTRODUCTION

As a political activity and an instrument of statecraft in diplomacy, communication has been considered as the significant point. In that respect, diplomacy consists of communication between officials designed in order to promote foreign policy by formal agreement or tacit adjustment.¹ Accordingly, diplomacy attempts to manage the goals of foreign policy through implementing goals and preparing foreign policy decisions. As a governmental activity, diplomacy is regarded as the whole process of policy making and implementation rather than only a particular policy instrument.

In recent years, diplomacy has become much more multi-faceted, as the world of the 21st century requires states to deal with more issues with more actors in a more complex environment. States need to undertake a wider set of issues like presenting abroad a state's national image and brand, as well as to put more emphasis on economic and trade interests. Issues such as trade, finance, migration, human rights, and environmental concerns have begun to matter more in global affairs. As a result, diplomacy cannot be considered only in terms of relations regarding central governments or foreign ministries. The diplomatic world involves more actors, which include regional and international organizations such as La Francophonie and the International Committee of the Red Cross, supra-national bodies such the European Union, multinational corporations, local and city government, advocacy networks, and

¹ G.R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*, (NY: Pelgrave Macmillan, 2005), 1.

influential individuals.²

In today's global environment, many people in the world have easy and instant access to all kinds of information, and many of them have the ability to influence their governments' positions. Such openness and multi-level cooperation necessitates the pursuit of more collaborative diplomatic relations with various types of actors.³ As a result, the need to build cooperation has gained importance for actors throughout the world.

Indeed, this does not mean that hard power has completely lost its matter in the conduct of international affairs. Nevertheless, in the information society "soft power"- used by Joseph Nye, in his book "Bound to Lead" - becomes more important, which based on the attractiveness of a nation's values, culture and policies and it causes people to act through co-operation rather than coercion.⁴ In other words, it can be argued that International Relations have witnessed the growing use of "soft power" mechanisms in diplomatic relations.

The discipline of International Relations is generally distinguished into two broad approaches while studying the use of power by the actors: one is "hard power", the other is "soft power".⁵ Hard power is achieved through military threat or use, and by means of economic menace or reward, and it obliges its addressees to consider their interests in terms of calculable costs and benefits.

Nevertheless, Joseph Nye described 'soft power' as "the ability to persuade through culture, values and ideas, as opposed to 'hard power', which conquers or coerces through military might". And, the British political think-tank Demos has defined "hard power" as the 'ability to coerce', and "soft power" as 'the means to attract and persuade'.⁶ In this context, Nye used "soft power" to call attention to the ability to get others to want what you want. This ability to affect the preferences of others tends to be associated with intangible power resources such as culture, ideology and institutions, which are distinguished from the hard power usually associated with tangible resources like military and economic strength.⁷

Culture, education, arts, print and visual media, film, poetry, literature, architecture, higher education (universities, research centers, etc.), NGOs, science and technology, the capacity for innovation, tourism, platforms for economic cooperation and diplomacy are regarded as important factors that feed soft power. Soft power includes a combination of these elements, and it gives people an idea about a country's cultural richness and social capital. In addition, a political system that prioritizes freedoms and liberties, guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms, and that is also justice, transparency and democracy are other key factors, which define a country's soft power capacity.⁸

² Simon Mark, "A Comparative Study of the Cultural Diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India", (PhD. Thesis, The University of Auckland, 2008): 34.

³ Jan Melissen(ed.), "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice" in *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations*, (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 5.

⁴ Joseph S. Nye, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, (NY: Basic Books, 1991).

⁵ In addition, in recent years "smart power" has been increasingly used by the scholars, which is the ability to combine hard and soft power in successful strategies in different contexts.

⁶ Kirsten Bound, Rachel Briggs, John Holden and Samuel Jones, *Cultural Diplomacy*, (London: DEMOS, 2007)

⁷ David A. Baldwin, "Power and International Relations", in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, (London: Sage Publications, 2005), 186.

⁸ İbrahim Kalın, "Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in Turkey", *Perceptions*, Volume XVI, Number 3, (Autumn 2011): 9.

It can be argued that the “hard power” approach has historically used as the policy of governments in conducting their international and regional relations. However, as mentioned before, the increasingly interconnected world stage highlights the need for co- operation at a new level. This is where cultural diplomacy as a form of “soft power” becomes significant. With reference to Nye, in international politics, the resources that produce soft power arise largely from the values an organization or country expresses in its culture. And, it is claimed that public diplomacy has the potential to become a more powerful tool for improving a country’s image and its relations with other countries when it is better understood.⁹ It may also contribute to domestic nation-building. Accordingly, it can contribute to national social cohesion within a political system which prioritizes freedoms and liberties, guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms, and which is also transparent, just and democratic. In other words, a country’s soft power capacity has crucial role in the success of its public diplomacy as much as does the integrity and efficacy of its policies. Although Public Diplomacy by itself will not be the only solution for peace between the countries, it can implement programs to strengthen mutual trust, both within countries with a high degree of risk and in areas with conflict potential. Accordingly, in this paper after definition of diplomacy in a general framework, the evolution and role of public diplomacy mechanisms in conflict prevention will be elaborated.

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

The term public diplomacy was first coined in 1965 by Edmund Guillon. According to him, “public diplomacy is concerned with the influence of social standpoints have on the formulation and implementation of foreign policy”. It covers aspects of International Relations that fall outside traditional diplomacy. It is interested in the areas and issues like influencing public opinion abroad, mutual impacting by private groups and pressure groups in one another’s countries, reporting on events abroad and their impact on politics. The communication between diplomats and foreign correspondents, and the process of inter- cultural communication are important aspects of public diplomacy.¹⁰

Nye defines “public diplomacy” as an instrument that governments use to mobilize these resources to communicate with and attract the public of other countries, rather than only their governments. Public diplomacy tries to attract by bringing attention to these potential resources through broadcasting, subsidizing cultural exports, arranging exchanges, and so forth.¹¹

Additionally, there are also some different definitions and references of public diplomacy:¹²

According to Edward Murrow, who was speaking as director of USIA (The United States Information Agency) in 1962 “Public diplomacy differs from traditional diplomacy in that it involves interaction not only with governments, but primarily with non-governmental organizations and individuals. Furthermore, public diplomacy activities often present many differing views represented by private American individuals and organizations in addition to official government views”. Sir Michael Butler, former British permanent representative to the

⁹ Simon Mark, “A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy”, *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, (April 2009): 1.

¹⁰ Public Diplomacy Alumni Association, <http://publicdiplomacy.org/pages/index.php?page=about-public-diplomacy> (accessed in September 2011).

¹¹ Nye, “Public Diplomacy and Soft Power,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (2008): 95.

¹² Mark Leonard, **Public Diplomacy**, (London: Foreign Policy Center, 2002), 1.

European Union in 2002, says that “the purpose of public diplomacy is to influence opinion in target countries to make it easier for the British Government, British companies or other British organizations to achieve their aims. The overall image of Britain in the country concerned is of great importance – but this is not to say that it is the only factor. The most important factor will usually be the actual policies of the British Government and the terms in which they are announced and explained by Ministers. In most countries, a broadly internationalist posture will be positive. A narrow and open pursuit of national interests at the expense of others will be negative”.

As it is generally known, public diplomacy is about building relationships that comprises understanding the needs of other countries, cultures and peoples, communicating the points of view and correcting misperceptions. It can be stated that there has been an increase in the number and activity of global actors who are not states; the information revolution has changed the playing field as well as information gathering is concerned; and diplomacy now involves many more participants who are experts in matters other than diplomacy, and hold their positions outside foreign ministries.¹³ The result of that has been the emergence of a wide range of human activities which owe little or nothing to geographical location, time of day and, most important of all, to government permission or regulation.

Thus, public diplomacy is different than the traditional diplomacy in the sense that the former one involves a much broader group of people on both sides, and a broader set of interests that go beyond those of the government of the day.¹⁴ Apart from these general functions of it, public diplomacy can increase people’s familiarity with one’s country through making them think about it, updating their images, turning around unfavorable opinions; it can increase people’s appreciation of one’s country through creating positive perceptions, getting others to see issues of global importance from the same perspective; it can engage people with one’s country through strengthening ties from education reform to scientific co-operation; encouraging people to see us as an attractive destination for tourism, study, distance learning. It can also influence people through getting companies to invest, publics to back our positions or politicians as a favored partner.¹⁵

In his book, Cull uses the term “new public diplomacy” for drawing attention to key shifts in the practice of public diplomacy. In the following table, he analyzes the differences between the old and new public diplomacy by dividing the areas into main characteristics.¹⁶

Table 1. The Old and the New Public Diplomacy

Dominant Characteristics	Old Public Diplomacy	New Public Diplomacy
Identity of International Actor	State	State and non-state

¹³ Richard Langhorne, “The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors,” *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 16:2, (2005): 311-332.

¹⁴ Leonard, *Public Diplomacy*, 8.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

¹⁶ The figure is taken from Nicholas J. Cull, **Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past**, (Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, 2009), 14.

Technological environment	Short wave radio Print newspaper Land-line telephones	Satellite, internet, real-time news, mobile phones
Media environment	Clear line between domestic and international news sphere	Blurring of domestic and international news sphere
Source of approach	Outgrowth of political advocacy and propaganda theory	Outgrowth of corporate branding and network theory
Terminology	“international image”, “prestige”	“soft power” “nation brand”
Structure of role	Top down, actor to foreign peoples	Horizontal, facilitated by actor
Nature of role	Targeted messaging	Relationship building
Overall Aim	The management of the international environment	The management of the international environment

While discussing this shift, these following points can be underlined:

- The international actors are increasingly non-traditional and NGOs are especially prominent;
- The mechanisms used by these actors to communicate with world publics have moved into new, real-time and global technologies, especially the Internet;
- These new technologies have blurred the formerly rigid lines between the domestic and international news spheres;
- In place of old concepts of “propaganda”, Public Diplomacy makes increasing

- use of concepts on such as ‘nation branding’, ‘soft power’ and ‘branding;’
- The New Public Diplomacy speaks of a departure from the actor-to-people Cold War-era communication and the arrival of a new emphasis on people- to-people contact for mutual enlightenment, with the international actor playing the role of facilitator; and
 - Instead of top down messaging, the prime task of the new public diplomacy is characterized as “relationship building”.¹⁷

According to Rourke, public diplomacy is a process of creating an overall international image that strengthens a country’s ability in order to achieve diplomatic success. This is also crucial for propaganda. However, propaganda is an attempt to influence another country through emotional techniques rather than minds by creating fear, doubt, sympathy, anger or other feelings. Nevertheless, public diplomacy includes traditional propaganda, but it goes beyond that. It also includes what is actually said and done by political figures, practices of self-promotion and other forms of public relations that are utilized by business.¹⁸ In other words, similar to propaganda, public diplomacy is about influence. However, unlike propaganda, that influence is not a one-way street from the speakers to their target. Public diplomacy is perceived as a two-way street: a process of mutual influence, in which the foreign public is seen as an active participant.¹⁹ Nye argues that public diplomacy that only fails to convince, but can undercut soft power. Soft power depends upon an understanding of the minds of others. The best public and cultural diplomacy are seen as a two-way street.²⁰

During the Cold War, the U.S. and the Soviet Union sought to shape public attitudes all over the world towards their respective ideologies. Their main weapon was international broadcasting and radio stations, such as the Voice of America (VOA), Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe on the American side, and Radio Moscow on the Soviet side. In the late 1980s, the U.S. government added overseas television programmes, such as Worldnet and Dialogue, to its area of public diplomacy media channels. The Reagan administration established Radio and Television Marti designed to destabilize the Castro regime in Cuba, and President Bill Clinton established Radio Free Asia - primarily to promote protection of human rights in China - and Radio Free Iraq - to undermine Saddam Hussein’s regime.²¹

There is a common agreement on the idea that the end of the Cold War has made public diplomacy much more important. The spread of democracy, the media explosion and the rise of global NGOs have changed the nature of power, and put more constraints on the freedom of action of national governments.²² In recent years, public diplomacy has been used in non-traditional formats, including new participants such as non-state actors; new types of relations between state and non-state actors; and new goals, such as cultivating support in a foreign country to maintain cordial relations rather than pursuing propaganda means.

Cultural activities are one of the major tools of public diplomacy that includes academic, professional, cultural and student exchange programmes, conferences and lectures on economic and social problems, literature, film industry, theatre art, art exhibitions and

¹⁷ Ibid., 13-14.

¹⁸ Rourke, 279-281.

¹⁹ Cull, “Public diplomacy: Seven Lessons for Its Future from Its Past,” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy Vol. 6, 1*, (2010):12.

²⁰ Nye, “Soft Power and Cultural Diplomacy,” *Public Diplomacy Magazine, Issue 3*, (Winter 2010):124.

²¹ Eytan Gilboa, “Diplomacy in the Media Age: Three Models of Uses and Effects,” *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12:2 (2001):6.

²² Leonard, *Public Diplomacy*, 2-3.

performances. All these cultural diplomacy activities, as a public diplomacy tool, can create opportunities for the establishment of a constructive dialogue and the creation of a positive image of the countries.²³

In addition to these cultural activities, social media can be used to promote both ideas of democracy and those of violence. One such example was the social uprisings in the Middle East in the protests, when everything spread with Facebook and Twitter. At that time, social networks became the main tool of communication and coordination of actions by activists. Since ideas spread quickly following the democratization process, social protest movements can easily be organized by using social media.

While the process of the Arab Spring is expected to be an opportunity to promote the values such as democracy, human rights and the rule of law, terrorist organizations like Al-Qaeda expanded their bases by spreading the belief that they are protectors and securers of justice.²⁴ In addition, ISIS uses this communication channel to spread propaganda and recruit new members to its movement. These organizations claim to stimulate “self-respect” for the beliefs that they exploit.²⁵ Taking this into consideration, using policies under different forms of public diplomacy will be useful for understanding the main sources of motivation of the opposite side. Despite the use of internet by terrorist groups as a propaganda tool frequently, new technologies can be used to promote ideas of human rights, democratic values and civil liberties.

As it is known, every society has its characteristics and cultural differences and values. When people travel to another country representing their organization or project, other people will form an opinion of that country and have ideas based on the words and actions. Therefore, it is important to create bilateral exchange programmes. Young students should travel abroad, but it is also worth inviting foreigners too. When the experts from a country speak to a foreign audience, he shares insights about the living conditions in his or her country and takes away with him other people’s point of view of the situation thanks to the questions they ask. This is a two-way street. Experts from different locations of the world share their knowledge, but also return to their country with a deeper understanding of the situation in that country. Even if the speakers have different opinions from the official policy, it is significant to allow them to speak freely. There is always a need for promoting the right to intellectual freedom and open debate.²⁶

Moreover, music and dance can be strong tools for getting into the hearts and minds of people around the world thanks to their superiority over ordinary language and their ability to touch people’s feelings through the use of metaphors. There is a big difference between direct statements on the part of cultural diplomats about relevant actual problems and the use of the arts, which convey the idea figuratively, for that purpose.

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR OPEN DIALOGUE

Diplomacy is always based on dialogue, usually between two countries, and dialogue is a key element of success on the path to resolving conflict. Whether the conflict is rooted in

²³ Irina Prokofieva, “Cultural Diplomacy Opportunities for Resolving a Conflict”, *Second Cultural Diplomacy Forum of Ukraine*, April 27, 2016, <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/en/article/cultural-diplomacy-opportunities> (accessed August 12, 2018)

²⁴ SAM Workshop Report, “The Role of Diplomacy and Soft Power in Combatting Terrorism - Concepts, Fighting Methods and Case Studies”, http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/TMMM_-_Seminar-Report.pdf (accessed August 4, 2018)

²⁵ SAM Workshop Report, “The Role of Diplomacy and Soft Power in Combatting Terrorism - Concepts, Fighting Methods and Case Studies”, http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/TMMM_-_Seminar-Report.pdf (accessed August 4, 2018)

²⁶ Prokofieva, “Cultural Diplomacy Opportunities for Resolving a Conflict”, *Second Cultural Diplomacy Forum of Ukraine*

history or is the result of current circumstances, it is important to bring the two sides together. In cases where governments do not want or cannot engage in dialogue, it is important to involve parties from the non-government sector. Public cultural projects that are understood by all can be effective ways of collaboration between countries and resolving conflicts. In the past, there were some examples of use of public diplomacy for conflict prevention or for retrieving the relations between fighting countries.

The partition of India and the emergence of Pakistan in 1947 were accompanied by a high degree of violence. Around 2 million people died as a result of this religious and ethnic conflict. In October 1947, the Indo-Pakistani war ended with the division of the disputed territory of Kashmir. The war over the territory continued in 1965 and 1971. Throughout the entire conflict, a significant portion of Hindus left the territory that was to become Pakistan and a section of Muslims left the territory that was to become India. In 1984 there was an attempt to resolve the conflict by implementation of cultural diplomacy. At the time, crossing the border separating the two countries was incredibly difficult, in spite of the fact that the inhabitants of Punjab on both sides of the border spoke the same language and shared many cultural values. It was decided that an international conference would be organised on the topic of postmodernism. The idea was to bring the people of India and Pakistan to Lahore, together with scientists from Turkey, England and the USA.

A literary scholar from India who studied at Yale University, a leading Indian poet with Jewish roots as well as architects, artists and dancers representing the postmodernist school were invited to the conference. The key speaker was an American scientist born in Egypt. Two literary scholars from Turkey, a British architect and an American choreographer, also took part in the conference. In spite of the difficult negotiations, the Indian and Pakistani authorities were able to organize the conference.

In addition, after the signing of the Dayton Agreement in 1995 that ended the war in Yugoslavia, the US ambassador decided to establish a cultural and inter-confessional dialogue in the region, using for that purpose his residence in Vienna. Representatives of four communities – Catholic Croats, Bosnian Muslims, Orthodox Serbs and Sephardic Jews met on several occasions at the residence, where they were able to discuss common problems and issues on neutral territory. As a result, they prepared a statement of principles promoting the idea of peace and tolerance among their communities. Also with the agreement signed by Bosnia and Herzegovina, the USA and Austria on the establishment of the Centre for Democracy in Vienna, the library of the American House in Vienna and its exhibition space were used as a place for dialogue and staging cultural events attended by representatives of the four communities of Sarajevo. Bosnian parliamentarians, writers, journalists and artists of all ethnic groups took part in many of events.²⁷

As it is seen with these examples, it can be argued that it is essential to create neutral places for meeting, where all parties would be able to feel at ease and be equal with one another, where it would be possible to promote dialogue among the different ethnic groups.²⁸ False perceptions can be changed by working on them. In order to prevent conflicts, there is a need for the endeavors to comprehend people's needs and problems. On the other hand, the definition of violence is also crucial. According to Köse, cultural and structural elements like welfare distribution can lead to direct violence. Cultural violence is more difficult to deal than other types of violence and conduce to physical violence. Within this framework, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, intolerance and radicalism are used as factors for legitimizing direct violence. Moreover, transnational agents like human rights organizations, financial institutions

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

or religious-ethnic groups, have a power distribution which weaken the state by gaining power over it in time.²⁹

UN SYSTEM

After the Cold War, the UN peace agenda has undergone some transformations to include innovative methodologies and integrated visions of peace through implementing cultural initiatives. For UN system, peace is not only related only with war and large-scale violence, but also with social justice, poverty alleviation, women's empowerment and the young people and children's welfare.³⁰ In that sense, environmental, health and cultural concerns, including heritage, music, theatre and sports are also taken into consideration which are part of public diplomacy activities.

The UN and its associated agencies have analyzed peace in many ways with their respective specializations and competencies. UNESCO stands out with its foundational commitment to nurture the defenses of peace in human consciousness through transformative education, culture and scientific knowledge. The founders of UNESCO envisioned an integrated approach to peace, and an idea of peace as a non-violent or anti-war mindset, consisted a humanistic perspective. It bases on a transformation of global consciousness through encouraging dialogue and peace rather than conflict and violence. In 1989, UNESCO conceptualized a "culture of peace" with more inclusive approach. According to this approach, peace has been articulated with human rights, development and cultural diversity.

According to Article 8 of UNESCO declaration: "A key role in the promotion of a culture of peace belongs to parents, teachers, politicians, journalists, religious bodies and groups, intellectuals, those engaged in scientific, philosophical, creative and artistic activities, health and humanitarian workers, social workers, managers at various levels as well as to non-governmental organizations".³¹ Although the "culture of peace" began as a UNESCO programme, in 1997 it was adopted by the UN General Assembly. This programme characterized peace as "respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women".³²

Moreover, the UN General Assembly proclaimed 2013–2022 the International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (IDRC). In 2012, resolution on the "Promotion of Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue, Understanding and Cooperation for Peace", was published by the UN General Assembly. It acknowledged and reaffirmed the role of UNESCO "to promote dialogue among civilizations, cultures and peoples, as well as activities related to a culture of peace".³³ The IDRC represents a crucial culture and education-based component of "sustaining peace". It is based on the idea of achieving peace through non-violence and peaceful dialogue. The International Decade has preferred the word 'rapprochement' that implies an emphasis on a mutually enriching synergy between cultures. The Draft Action Plan for the

²⁹ SAM Workshop Report, "The Role of Diplomacy and Soft Power in Combatting Terrorism - Concepts, Fighting Methods and Case Studies", 4.

³⁰ UNESCO, "Long Walk of Peace: Towards A Culture of Prevention", <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002628/262885e.pdf> (2018): 23.

³¹ UN Documents Gathering a body of global agreements, "Resolution adopted by the General Assembly" <http://www.un-documents.net/a53r243a.htm> (1999).

³² General Assembly of the United Nations <http://www.un.org/en/ga/62/plenary/peaceculture/bkg.shtml> .

³³ UN General Assembly, *Promotion of interreligious and intercultural dialogue, understanding and cooperation for peace : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*, 26 March 2013, A/RES/67/104, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/51e65b0e4.html> [accessed 27 September 2018]

International Decade defines the term *rapprochement* as an extension of similar terms such as *'unity-in-diversity'*, *'routes of dialogue'*, *'tolerance'*, *'culture of peace'*, *'dialogue among civilizations'* and *'intercultural and interreligious dialogue'*.³⁴

The IDRC document mentions that “international security and social inclusion cannot be attained sustainably without a commitment to such principles as compassion, conviviality, hospitality, solidarity and brotherhood which are the cornerstones of human coexistence inherent in all faiths and secular ideologies. To discover these values across worldviews to practice them more universally, we need dialogue”.³⁵ This highlights the imperative of intercultural and interreligious dialogue to develop a better understanding of otherness. Rising above prejudice can encourage greater interest in different histories, heritage, and religious and cultural beliefs.³⁶

The UN’s public diplomacy is depended on cooperation in support of a culture of peace, dialogue and alliances through focusing on youth, women and the media and civil society. Therefore, media literacy is regarded as significant for efforts to establish peaceful societies and increase the civil society participation in strengthening democratic institutions. The UN’s action on ‘Information at the service of the humanity’ involves cooperation with civil society, academic communities and scientists to promote the global peace agenda. The UN Messengers of Peace and the Goodwill Ambassadors programme is also important public diplomacy tool of UN system.³⁷

UN agencies also investigate the role of social media in violent radicalization processes. A report prepared by UNESCO in 2017, entitled “Social Media and the Radicalization of Youth Leading to Violent Extremism” refers the need for further research into the impact of social media on the radicalization of vulnerable individuals. Nevertheless, the report argues that actual violent radicalization is not reducible only to internet exposure. According to report, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there is a causal link between extremist propaganda or recruitment on social networks and the violent radicalization of young people. The synthesis of evidence shows that social media is an environment that facilitates violent radicalization, rather than driving it.³⁸

UNESCO has increased its efforts to foster free, independent and pluralistic media in print, broadcast and online, with a special focus on promoting mutual understanding and avoiding situations where control of the media tends to enable the indoctrination of populations towards aggression, war and genocide. Indeed, the majority of people would prefer to resolve their differences, given a choice of information and ideas, including information about options that represent dialogue, rather than a closed or censored information environment.³⁹

CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

As mentioned before, Public Diplomacy seeks to prevent, contain and end the conflict from the moment it became violent. And while the local political, military or social conditions will always differ from one conflict situation to another, the process through which public diplomacy tries to address conflict prevention would almost be similar, whether it concerns the issues in Nagorno-Karabakh, the Middle East or the Balkans.

³⁴ UNESCO, “Long Walk of Peace: Towards A Culture of Prevention”, 51.

³⁵ UNESCO, “Agree to Differ”, <http://www.fscire.it/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/agree-to-differ-ilovepdf-compressed-compressed-1-1.pdf> (2014): 46.

³⁶ UNESCO, “Long Walk of Peace: Towards A Culture of Prevention”, 51-52.

³⁷ They are elected from the fields of art, literature, science, entertainment, sports or other fields of public life, who have agreed to help focus worldwide attention on the work of the United Nations.

³⁸ Séraphin Alava, Divina Frau-Meigs and Ghayda Hassan, “Youth and Violent Extremism on Social Media: Mapping the Research”, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002603/260382e.pdf> (2017): 6.

³⁹ UNESCO, “Long Walk of Peace: Towards A Culture of Prevention”, 66-67.

There may emerge some obstacles to carry public diplomacy efforts out effectively, both in direct and indirect ways, even when the embassy remained open within a conflictual situation. The authorities may restrict the initiatives through putting restrictions on educational programs, restrictions on official contacts, restrictions on media or restrictions on governments' institutions.

On the other hand, in order to overcome those obstacles, some points should be underlined especially in violent conflict areas in order to keep the identities of the parties involved in the conflict and reach a peace agreement sooner and easier.

For successful outcome, the one of the most essential condition for successful mediation is "timeliness". Before the first shots are fired, considerations other than military force will weigh upon the parties. Nevertheless, timeliness will not always mean involvement early on. At the initial stages, many conflicts may resist the diplomatic intervention. The situation must be ripe for outside mediation and sensitive to outside pressures. However, there should thus be those who claim that the earliest moment for public diplomacy to engage with any hope of success.⁴⁰

Another condition for success of public diplomacy in conflict prevention is "clarity of purpose". If countries want to initiate public diplomacy efforts, they must know what they want to achieve. Unless there is no clarity about the desired outcome or the way to bring it about, the fighting between the parts might materialize, and then some kind of political solution would need to be found to establish a dialogue, exploration and negotiation.⁴¹

Moreover, "leverage" is one of the most crucial condition for successful public diplomacy. Without it, diplomacy is reduced to appeals which the parties in the conflict can heed or reject without having to pay for a negative response or gain an advantage from a positive one.⁴² With the powerful leverage, it will be easier to formulate agreements between parties in the resolution of the conflict. In doing this, collaboration with other governments, their broader civil societies and NGOs is necessary. In order to engage a real dialogue, more open and humble approach, in which no one has a monopoly of truth, should be put forward. The aim remains to convince other publics of the core values. However, the effort the convince is set in the context of listening.⁴³

CONCLUSION

Although Public Diplomacy may not be sufficient to resolve conflicts by itself, it can be an instrumental way. When people are contacted and got to know each other, perceptions may be flawed and bring people together.

Since social media has become more important, it has been used in delivering the message and basically creating a movement for democracy and promoting rule of law. Also, when culture is used as a tool of negotiation between countries and people, then it contributes the increase the level of communication among today's international community, which is very complex. Each country has its own experience, its own contribution to the conflict prevention and solution. Public diplomacy creates an opportunity for each to broaden the friendship relations between the two or more countries. In short, it is a crucial way of bringing people, politicians together and soldiers together. Public Diplomacy practices, and cultural activities,

⁴⁰ Christoph Bertram, "Multilateral diplomacy and conflict resolution", *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 37:4, (1995): 73.

⁴¹ Ibid, 74.

⁴² Ibid., 76.

⁴³ Shaun Riordan, "Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm?", *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no. 95, 10-11.

collaboration with NGOs can facilitate the transmission of the intended messages to the people of conflicted parties.

Initiatives for conflict prevention developed on multi-sided platforms should not be conducted by certain countries. They should be supported and implemented by many countries.

As stated in the Culture of the Peace Programme of UNESCO, it is possible to transform a threat and difficulty into challenge to cooperation and growth by working locally and globally. The problems which may turn into conflict can be solved by individuals and institutions through learning new attitudes and behaviors and acting with solidarity and cooperation.⁴⁴ Along with actions at the level of traditional local and national institutions, actions on an international level through inter-governmental organizations and through other international agencies should be used to promote and pursue peace. All the actors in international arena should become more proactive and civil society should be mobilized through NGOs at global level to promote public diplomacy initiatives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alava, Séraphin, Divina Frau-Meigs and Ghayda Hassan. “Youth and Violent Extremism on Social Media: Mapping the Research”, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002603/260382e.pdf> (2017).
- Baldwin, David A. “Power and International Relations”, in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.). *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Berridge, G.R. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. NY: Pelgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Bertram, Christoph. “Multilateral diplomacy and conflict resolution”, *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*, 37:4, (1995): 65-82.
- Bound, Kirsten, Rachel Briggs, John Holden and Samuel Jones. *Cultural Diplomacy*, London: DEMOS, 2007.
- CPP UNESCO, “Towards A Global Culture of Peace”, *Second International Forum on the Culture of Peace Manila, Philippines*, (November 1995).
- Cull, Nicholas J. *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, 2009.
- Cull, Nicholas J. “Public diplomacy: Seven Lessons for Its Future from Its Past”, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy Vol. 6, 1*, (2010):11-17.
- Gilboa, Eytan. “Diplomacy in the Media Age: Three Models of Uses and Effects”, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 12:2 (2001): 1-28.

⁴⁴ CPP UNESCO, “Towards A Global Culture of Peace”, *Second International Forum on the Culture of Peace Manila, Philippines*, (November 1995):1.

- Kalın, İbrahim. "Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in Turkey", *Perceptions*, Volume XVI, Number 3, (Autumn 2011): 5-23.
- Langhorne, Richard. "The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 16:2, (2005): 311-332.
- Leonard, Mark. *Public Diplomacy*. London: Foreign Policy Center, 2002.
- Mark, Simon. "A Comparative Study of the Cultural Diplomacy of Canada, New Zealand and India", Unpublished PhD. Thesis, The University of Auckland, 2008.
- Mark, Simon. "A Greater Role for Cultural Diplomacy", *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, (April 2009): 1-44.
- Melissen, Jan (ed.). "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice" in *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Nye, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. NY: Basic Books, 1991.
- Nye, Joseph S. "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (2008): 95-109.
- Prokofieva, Irina. "Cultural Diplomacy Opportunities for Resolving a Conflict", *Second Cultural Diplomacy Forum of Ukraine*, April 27, 2016, <https://www.culturepartnership.eu/en/article/cultural-diplomacy-opportunities> (accessed August 12, 2018)
- Public Diplomacy Alumni Association.
<http://publicdiplomacy.org/pages/index.php?page=about-public-diplomacy> (accessed in September 2011).
- Riordan, Shaun. "Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm?", *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, no. 95,(2004): 1-15.
- SAM Workshop Report, "The Role of Diplomacy and Soft Power in Combatting Terrorism - Concepts, Fighting Methods and Case Studies", http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/TMMM_-Seminar-Report.pdf (accessed August 4, 2018).
- UNESCO, "Agree to Differ", <http://www.fscire.it/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/agree-to-differ-ilovepdf-compressed.compressed-1-1.pdf> (2014).
- UNESCO, "Long Walk of Peace: Towards A Culture of Prevention", <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002628/262885e.pdf> (2018): 23.

UN Documents Gathering a body of global agreements, “Resolution adopted by the General Assembly” <http://www.un-documents.net/a53r243a.htm> (1999).

UN General Assembly, *Promotion of interreligious and intercultural dialogue, understanding and cooperation for peace: resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*, 26 March 2013, A/RES/67/104, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/51e65b0e4.html> (accessed 27 September 2018).