



Full Spectrum Diplomacy and Grand Strategy

Reforming the Structure and
Culture of U.S. Foreign Policy

John Lenczowski

Full Spectrum Diplomacy and Grand Strategy

Full Spectrum Diplomacy and Grand Strategy

Reforming the
Structure and Culture of
U.S. Foreign Policy

John Lenczowski



LEXINGTON BOOKS

A Division of

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC.

Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK

Published by Lexington Books

A division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

A wholly owned subsidiary of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706

<http://www.lexingtonbooks.com>

Estover Road, Plymouth PL6 7PY, United Kingdom

Copyright © 2011 by Lexington Books

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lenczowski, John.

Full spectrum diplomacy and grand strategy : reforming the structure and culture of U.S. foreign policy / John Lenczowski.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7391-5065-8 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-7391-5066-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. United States—Foreign relations—21st century. 2. United States—Foreign relations administration. I. Title.

JZ1480.L45 2011

327.73—dc22

2010052925

™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

To Susan

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements	ix
1 The Problem: The Absence of an Influence Culture in U.S. Foreign Policy	1
2 The Problem of Defining the Problem	11
3 Historical Background	25
4 The Knowledge Problem: The Failure to Understand Integrated Strategy and All the Dimensions of Political Influence	45
5 The Structural Problem: The Absence of a Supportive Culture, Strategic Planning, and Interagency Integration for Public Diplomacy	59
6 Solutions: To Build an Influence Culture and an Integrated Strategy	99
Appendix: Cultural Diplomacy, Political Influence, and Integrated Strategy	159
Works Cited	193
Index	199
About the Author	213

Preface and Acknowledgements

This study is designed to contribute to the current efforts to reform the United States' foreign policy and national security capabilities. While it addresses contemporary problems with specific policy and structural recommendations, it also aims to teach lessons in diplomacy and strategy that apply to all times and places. The fact that America is fighting two wars only adds a sense of urgency to this project: our country needs a successful long-term strategy to influence the world positively and to restore its ability to win friends, allies, politically motivated intelligence sources—and the resultant ability to achieve peace and security.

Public diplomacy receives much attention in these pages. As that aspect of statecraft that concerns relations with—and influence over—foreign societies, foreign publics, and foreign opinion makers, it is an important part of any long-term strategy. But public diplomacy is not, as too many diplomats see it, a function that in its essence serves as a “support for foreign policy,” a “public relations” and information policy tool designed to “explain policy,” or, to put it less elegantly, to “spin” it. Instead, it is the ground on which the hearts and minds are won and lost, and it constitutes the tools with which the perception of America is formed.

Some believe that perceptions are not something fought over, lost, or won; and that to be perceived as good, it is enough to be good. The truth is that the world does not work this way. In the real world, countless saints are martyred, their exemplary goodness notwithstanding. But hoping for a vindication in the hereafter while resigning oneself to a fate of a martyr cannot be a viable model of a nation's foreign policy; nor is it a risk that any democratically elected Administration, regardless of ideology, would be willing to take. Doing good is important, then, but so is making sure that the world does not misrepresent or misconstrue the deeds. The successful defense of our vital national interests and possibly even the political survival of the nation depend on doing both.

Understanding the distinction between actions and perception in foreign affairs goes back to ancient times and most certainly to the birth of the Republic. The Founding Fathers clearly understood the difference between the imperative to be good and the political expediency of ensuring that the goodness be recognized. As Commander in Chief, George Washington told his army not to abuse captured British soldiers in any way. But as a political realist, he realized that the perception of humane treatment by the Continental Army would both enable his forces to occupy the moral high ground and to make it easier for British soldiers to surrender. Meanwhile, at another level, he relied on Benjamin Franklin's skills in diplomacy and political warfare to conduct an extensive—and most successful—political influence and public diplomacy campaign in Europe to ensure the proper perception of the American cause. It can be argued that the hearts and minds of the Old World constituted the other, not always acknowledged, front on which the War of Independence was successfully fought. Now, more than two centuries later, perception of America's actions remains a crucial element of every conflict in which our country is involved. The U.S.

government must therefore possess the ability to conduct foreign policy that does not neglect the hearts and minds of our friends, allies, neutrals, rivals, adversaries, and potential enemies.

That is why I argue in these pages that for U.S. foreign policy to be successful, it requires a capability to conduct “full spectrum diplomacy”—a combination of traditional, government-to-government diplomacy with the many components of public diplomacy (defined, as will be done below, in the largest sense of the term) as well as the integration of these two functions with other instruments of statecraft. And truly effective full spectrum diplomacy necessitates recognition that public diplomacy requires its own set of policies that are distinct from those that govern traditional diplomacy. The conduct of full spectrum diplomacy thus involves the proper orchestration of both traditional and public diplomacy in such a fashion that the policies governing each function do not jeopardize the effectiveness of the other. This orchestration is, in turn, part of what I call “integrated strategy”—a concept that requires the coordination of all the instruments of statecraft, including military policy, intelligence, counterintelligence, economic policy, etc. After all, integrated strategy is what grand strategy ought to be, and what passes for grand strategy cannot be grand unless it is integrated.

The ability to devise and implement integrated strategy depends as much on existing government structures as on prudential policy judgments since those judgments are all too often affected by the institutional cultures of individual agencies. It is with this in mind that this study makes the case that U.S. government agencies responsible for the conduct of foreign policy—principally the Department of State—are conceptually, culturally, and structurally unable to pursue full spectrum diplomacy effectively and consistently. It is therefore the purpose of this critique to identify persistent conceptual and

structural weaknesses and to recommend solutions that will give our country a renewed strategic capability that has been present only sporadically throughout recent history.

The absence of a culture of influence within our diplomatic community is the principal weakness that needs to be addressed. Its cause is partly a lack of knowledge of all the elements of political influence and of how they work and partly the presence of structures within the U.S. government that are not conducive to the formation and flourishing of such a culture. I make several recommendations to address this main weakness, notably certain reforms in the Department of State and the establishment of a new U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency under the Department's umbrella. The new agency would be responsible for both the making and implementing of public diplomacy policy in all its dimensions. It would also be sufficiently independent of traditional diplomacy that when conflicts between the two occur, they will be reconciled at the highest levels of the Department as necessary.

Since I assert a widespread lack of professional knowledge within the larger foreign policy community of how various elements of strategic influence work, I include an appendix with an analysis of one of the instruments of such influence—cultural diplomacy—and how it works. Cultural diplomacy is precisely one of those instruments that has been misunderstood and neglected not only by the “hard power culture” but even by the advocates of “soft power” to the extent that it is dismissed as a factor of peripheral importance and negligible effectiveness. The inclusion of this specific subject is to challenge those who believe that they possess full spectrum diplomatic skills to assess how much they know about just this one element of public diplomacy.

Parts of this study overlap with analyses and recommendations that appear in the recent plethora of books, studies, and blue ribbon

commission reports that address many of the problems at hand—particularly those concerning reform of the national security structure in general and that of public diplomacy in particular. Nevertheless, I believe that the conceptual framework of this study—both its critique and its recommendations—is original and provides a roadmap for a strategic-level reform of our foreign policy structures. Still, it does not pretend to be complete. There are competent studies of public diplomacy that address particular issues and make specific recommendations that deserve their own independent attention.

The overall message of this study—that America must use all the instruments of statecraft and integrate them in national-level grand strategy—has served as the fundamental conceptual framework undergirding the curriculum of The Institute of World Politics since it opened its first classroom in 1992. IWP has been the only graduate professional school in America dedicated precisely to teaching the integrated arts of statecraft, and it has been gratifying to see this conceptual framework gradually seep into the foreign policy culture of the nation. We have seen it manifested in various statements of senior foreign policy and national security officials particularly since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, and most recently under the popular moniker “smart power.” But however much these ideas have appeared in political rhetoric, the problem remains of how to implement them in practice. It is this problem that this study is designed to solve.

* * *

Most of the analysis contained on these pages comes from the benefit of experience and observation. It has been my professional privilege to study many of the elements of full spectrum diplomacy from a position in the legislative branch, to practice them in the State Department and the National Security Council, and later to observe their inner workings for some seventeen years from the perches in

the academic community at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and at The Institute of World Politics in Washington, DC. The scholar in me has always felt humbled by the test of *praxis*; the practitioner has always appreciated the benefit of understanding that comes from knowledge.

Over the years, I have had the good fortune to know some of the foremost authorities on the arts of statecraft to whom I owe many intellectual debts. These include: Carnes Lord, former Director of International Communications at the National Security Council and National Security Adviser to the Vice President, and now at the U.S. Naval War College; my colleagues at IWP, Juliana Geran Pilon, Herbert Romerstein, Walter Jajko, and J. Michael Waller; Robert R. Reilly, former Director of the Voice of America; Anthony Salvia, former State Department official; Mark Palmer, former Ambassador and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; and longtime Soviet human rights activist Vladimir Bukovsky. I am extremely grateful for their contributions to the field and for the many ideas which they have shared with me.

There are many other people who have helped inspire and make this study possible in other ways and I would also like to thank them. They include: Maria Sophia Aguirre of the Catholic University of America and a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; Barbara Barrett, former U.S. Ambassador to Finland and former Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy; Marin Strmecki, Nadia Schadlow, and the trustees of the Smith Richardson Foundation; Joseph Dolan, John Krieger, and the trustees of the Bodman Foundation; Justin Stebbins, Kathy Carroll, and Lucie Adamski of the IWP staff and IWP interns Stephen Krason, Matthew Flynn, Daniel Acheson, and Christopher Charnetsky who all rendered valuable research assistance; IWP students Amanda Caligiuri, Chelsea Markle, and Kristen Beilman for

their assistance with preparing the index; Charles Van Someren of the IWP Press who has given me most creative and careful assistance on many dimensions of this project; Lenore Lautigar and Victoria Koulakjian of Lexington Books; Anna Wellisz, who supplied the most thoughtful possible conceptual and editorial help; a number of officials from the State Department, Agency for International Development, Broadcasting Board of Governors, intelligence community, and armed forces who gave me valuable insights and who must remain anonymous; and finally the many extraordinary benefactors of IWP whose faithful support has enabled our school not only to teach a curriculum that covers all the elements of full spectrum diplomacy and integrated strategy, but to support my own and my colleagues' writing. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for any errors of fact, style, or analysis.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Susan, to whom this work is dedicated, for her wise counsel on the contents of this study, her editorial help, and her patience, understanding, and loving support.

JOHN LENCZOWSKI

Washington, D.C., February 2011

The Problem: The Absence of an Influence Culture in U.S. Foreign Policy

The unfolding of events in the post-Cold War period has definitively exposed serious structural and cultural weaknesses in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. These weaknesses reveal an institutional inability by the U.S. government and particularly the Department of State to conduct what I propose to call “full spectrum diplomacy.” This expression is derived from the most useful term that has been adopted by the U.S. armed forces: “full spectrum military operations,” which refers to the complete variety of military responsibilities including nuclear deterrence, strategic defense, conventional warfare, irregular (or counterinsurgency) warfare, civil military operations, peacekeeping operations, etc. There is no similar concept within the diplomatic community, but there should be, in order to end the systematic neglect of some dimensions of the larger art of diplomacy.

The area of the greatest structural, professional, and cultural weaknesses is in our government’s inability to influence foreign public and elite opinion. Specifically, our government fails to take fully into account the role of information, disinformation, ideas, values, culture, and religion in the conduct of foreign and national security policy. The foreign policy-making system within the U.S. Government and the intellectual and bureaucratic cultural forces influenc-

ing those who serve in it are the principal sources of the problem. The solutions, therefore, must address all three elements of the problem: the structural, the intellectual, and the cultural.

The structure and culture of our policy-making system were created at a time before the arrival of modern mass media—during an era when news of major diplomatic, military or other strategic developments could take weeks to reach our national decision makers. During that first century and a half of American history, both foreign and domestic opinions were surely strategic factors of high importance. However, they could not be affected as instantaneously as in the age of radio and television, greater democratization worldwide, and, even in the absence of democratization, the greater political awareness and sense of national loyalties among both foreign populations and elites that emerged in the 20th century.

With the arrival of broadcasting and the propaganda challenges presented by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, additions to that policy-making system were made. The most notable of these additions were the National Security Act of 1947, the creation of the National Security Council system, and the establishment of several agencies designed to meet the requirements of the new “diplomacy of public opinion”—most notably such agencies as the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the Agency for International Development (USAID), the political action component of the Central Intelligence Agency, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, the Peace Corps, and the institutions that comprise the National Endowment for Democracy. Although activities that could be considered within the broader realm of “public diplomacy”¹ had been conducted in one way or an-

1. I address the definition of this ill-understood term in greater detail below. While there is no consensus among foreign policy specialists on its proper definition, I use it to refer to all the various activities designed to have an impact on foreign public and elite opinion, specifically those activities directed toward relations with, and influence over, foreign people, opinion leaders, and institutions

other since the birth of the Republic, the creation of these agencies heralded the institutionalization of public diplomacy as an integral part of U.S. foreign policy strategy.

According to the tradition of U.S. foreign policy, the Secretary of State has always been considered the principal foreign policy adviser to the President. In the first century and a half of the Republic, power over most foreign policy-making was concentrated in that office. However, with the creation of most of these new agencies, active strategic attention to policy-making concerning their work, not to mention former State Department subsidiaries such as the Foreign Commercial Service and the Foreign Agricultural Service, became significantly diluted. So long as these institutions were not included directly in the budget and direct command structure of the Department of State, it devoted little or no high-level policy attention to them. Insofar as any centralized national-level strategic attention to these institutions existed, it was in the office of the National Security Adviser to the President, the National Security Council staff, and through the creation of interagency groups whose effectiveness was maximized mostly when enforced by Presidential directives and White House (National Security Council) "taskings." The result was that, over time, a diplomatic culture emerged that neglected these related diplomatic functions and failed to integrate them into a coherent foreign policy strategy. Thus, while the work of these outside agencies proceeded apace, it was undertaken all too frequently on a tactical rather than strategic basis.

During the Reagan administration, certain efforts were made to remedy this problem. As will be outlined below, a structure of interagency groups was established by Presidential order (NSDD-77) that attempted to revive and strategically coordinate the public

who/which are outside of government but may have direct or indirect influence over foreign governments' policies.

diplomacy functions that had been neglected during the previous four presidential administrations. Strong attention within the National Security Council staff enabled this structure to succeed for several years. An attempt was also made within the Department of State to create a bureau within it to cover the neglected functions concerning foreign opinion, cultural diplomacy, information, counter-propaganda, political action, and political warfare.² However, this attempt ultimately failed to implement a permanent institutional solution to this enormous problem. Later, in 1987, the NSDD-77 structure was dismantled and never replaced by any worthy substitute.³ Over the course of the next two decades, world events demonstrated the gross inadequacy of the foreign policy-making structure to address many challenges whose roots lay precisely in these realms of information, ideas, religion, and foreign opinion.

Recent events that have exposed the absence of an influence culture

In the decade after the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1991 and the effective end of Soviet-directed anti-American propaganda and “active measures,”⁴ new forms of anti-Americanism and anti-

2. It was this writer who submitted such a recommendation in 1982 to Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Lawrence Eagleburger. It involved the creation of a “Bureau of Political Affairs” which would be responsible for systematic policy-making in all the various functions concerning foreign political influence. This recommendation was accepted by Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who was removed from office before the recommendation could be implemented. His successor, George Shultz, rejected the full recommendation and instead acceded to the establishment of ten positions within the office of the Under Secretary for Political Affairs to address the relevant issues. The Department eventually whittled that number down to zero.

3. For detailed explanation of this episode, see Chapter 3 below.

4. “Active measures” is a KGB term of art referring specifically to disinformation, forgeries, and covert political influence operations.

American propaganda emerged on the world stage. Some of these, notably the ideologies of several Middle Eastern terrorist groups, were originally nurtured in the Soviet Union and included terrorism training. Some grew out of the extremist ideology of Ayatollah Khomeini's Iranian revolution. Some grew out of the export of Wahhabi ideology by Saudi imams—most strategically during the anti-Soviet war in Afghanistan—that resulted in, among other developments, the rise of the Taliban. Others grew out of opposition to the new unilateral superpower status of the U.S., a number of its policies, and, to a certain extent, alienation from Western culture.

In the wake of the al-Qaida attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States enjoyed almost universal international sympathy that continued through the U.S. ouster of the Taliban in Afghanistan. It was not until after the invasion and occupation of Iraq in the spring of 2003 that we witnessed new worldwide foreign public opposition to U.S. policy as well as an intensified anti-Americanism. While the Administration of President George W. Bush succeeded in assembling a “Coalition of the Willing” to participate in the Iraqi operation, it failed to secure the support of the majority of the public of any one of the participants in that coalition. This fact is all the more astonishing when one considers that the coalition included such historically pro-American countries as Poland.

Once in Iraq, the U.S. presence encountered violent and growing opposition within the country rather than the expected widespread gratitude for liberation from tyranny. It also met with ever-greater international opposition to the U.S. attempt to bring about a democratic political revolution via military occupation.

The conventional wisdom has asserted that anti-Americanism and opposition to U.S. policy can variously be attributed to several factors. One of them is strong disagreement with U.S. policies and American presence in the Middle East in general and in Iraq

in particular. Another is widespread perception that America's treatment of Moslems is unjust, including U.S. sanctions on Iraq for over a decade (seen as having targeted the Iraqi people); support for Israeli occupation policies; a desire to secure oil at unfairly favorable terms, etc. Also frequently cited among those factors are renewed fears—not only in large parts of the Arab and Islamic worlds, but in Russia and China as well—of U.S. power, domination, and “imperialism” in the Middle East, Central Asia and elsewhere as well as hostility to elements of American popular culture—particularly pornography, sexual libertinism, homosexuality, materialism, and secularism—that are anathema to traditional Islamic values.

To these factors one might add others, such as the possibility that U.S. policies in the “Global War on Terror” and the Iraq War were formulated without sufficient understanding of Iraqi, Arab, and Moslem attitudes and cultures; that the U.S. was severely lacking an adequate strategic communications and counter-propaganda capability both in the two main theaters of war and globally; that, in the eyes of many around the world, the Administration failed to demonstrate that its invasion of Iraq was truly a policy of last resort and that its policy met all the criteria for a just war, particularly when it comes to the standards concerning proper authority, proportionality, and prospects of success;⁵ and that, in attempting to develop a persuasive *casus belli*, the President failed to make the strongest case possible: for example, he never invoked Saddam Hussein's attacks on U.S. aircraft enforcing the

5. The classical standards of just war doctrine for entering into war (*ius ad bellum*) include: that there be a sufficient *casus belli*, that war be declared by a proper authority (one that is legally constituted and that fully represents the offended state or states), that the use of force be proportional to the precipitating offense, that the war have some reasonable chance of success, that post-war arrangements be an improvement over those pre-war, and that, in the case of preemptive war, there be complete certainty of imminence of attack.

no-fly zones for the humanitarian purpose of protecting the vulnerable Kurdish and Shia populations. It may also be argued that efforts to seek international consensus through the United Nations may have been counterproductive: On the one hand, the Administration might have profitably avoided the UN altogether by asserting that Saddam's violations of the 1991 Gulf War's cease-fire arrangements meant that the previous state of war pertained and that no new authorization for the use of force was necessary; on the other hand, by going to the UN, failing there to secure a consensus, and then invading Iraq in perceived contempt of international opinion, the Administration arguably provoked greater international public opposition than if it had avoided the UN altogether. Furthermore, in the effort to overthrow the Saddam regime, the Administration unintentionally provoked the onset of five other wars in Iraq: the Sunni/Baathist insurgency vs. the U.S. and the U.S.-supported Government of Iraq; al-Qaida-in-Iraq vs. the U.S. and the Government of Iraq; the Shia insurgency (often accompanied by the Iranian Qods Force) vs. the U.S.; the Sunni tribes vs. al-Qaida; and the Sunni vs. Shia civil war (not to mention the occasionally violent intra-Shia conflict over control of the government). These, in turn, precipitated the displacement of 2 million external refugees⁶ and 2.5 million internal refugees,⁷ and presented the world with the prospect of a perceived long-term, quasi-colonial occupation of the country.

While these factors surely explain a large part of recent antipathy to America and U.S. policies, the conventional wisdom also attributes the harvest of anti-American sentiment to the neglect of

6. See Walter Pincus, "Iraq's Slow Refugee Funding Has Ripple Effects," *Washington Post*, May 17, 2008, A12.

7. See Elizabeth Ferris's speech, "Iraqi Internal Displacement and International Law," at the 9th Annual Conference on Public Service & the Law, University of Virginia School of Law (Charlottesville, VA: February 9, 2008).

all those functions that comprise public diplomacy, the failure to incorporate into U.S. policy adequate consideration of international public opinion, and ultimately inattention to deeper knowledge of foreign cultures.

Meanwhile, the actual conduct of the Global War on Terror, and specifically the War in Iraq, exposed another related deficiency in strategic policy-making: the lack of attention to public opinion, culture, ideas, religion, information, counter-propaganda, political action, psychological strategy, and political warfare in the actual conduct of war: in other words, those categories that affect “hearts and minds” not only in conventional warfare but in unconventional warfare as well, and which enhance the possibility of realizing the political objectives of war.

The response of the policy community

As a result, a cascade of studies and special commission reports has fallen upon Washington, recommending various reforms to U.S. foreign policy, with particular attention to public diplomacy.⁸ These reports, which are long overdue, are full of excellent

8. These include: Hady Amr, *The Need to Communicate: How to Improve U.S. Public Diplomacy with the Islamic World*, The Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Towards the Islamic World, Analysis Paper Number 6 (Washington, DC: January 2004); Heritage Foundation, *How to Reinvigorate U.S. Public Diplomacy* (Washington, DC: April 23, 2003); Peter G. Peterson, et al, *Finding America's Voice for Reinvigorating U.S. Public Diplomacy*, Report of an Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations (New York: 2003); Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication (Washington, DC: Sept. 2004); Report of the Public Diplomacy Council, *A Call for Action on Public Diplomacy* (Washington, DC: January 2005); U.S. Department of State U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, 2004, 2005, and 2008 Reports; U.S. Department of State, *Changing Minds, Winning Peace*, Report of the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, 2003.

recommendations to intensify and improve U.S. public diplomatic efforts. Indeed, whatever the merits of President Bush's policies on the war against terrorist groups and their state supporters, most of these studies are right in their assessment that recent Administrations have failed to incorporate an adequate public diplomacy dimension into their strategies.

Another related document that has emerged is the U.S. Army's new Counterinsurgency Doctrine.⁹ This "field manual," precipitated by the rise of several insurgencies, especially in Iraq, was not only written but implemented with a dispatch uncharacteristic of Washington decision-making, thus producing many, if not most, of the positive political developments associated with the "surge" of 2007-8.

Finally, there has arisen a major effort to reconsider and reform the national security decision-making apparatus in a way that produces greater strategic integration of the various instruments of statecraft. This effort, inspired partly by the thrust of recent events and partly by the effectiveness of the Goldwater-Nichols legislation to create greater "jointness" in the operations of our armed forces, has also resulted in the creation of a new sub-agency: the National Security Professional Development Integration Office.

What is noteworthy about all these efforts is that, consciously or not, they all address the failure of the existing foreign policy-making system to include and integrate the various elements of "soft power," elements that this analysis will argue comprise the larger realm of "public diplomacy"—and which must ultimately be subsumed under full spectrum diplomatic operations.

The conventional—and prevailing—understanding of public diplomacy suffers from three principal inadequacies. First of all, it

9. Headquarters, Department of the Army, Counterinsurgency, FM 3-24, MCWP 3-33.5, December 2006.

fails to take into account the full range of the instruments of public diplomacy and how they work (and therefore misses the instruments of “soft power” in its totality). Second of all, it accepts the tertiary status of public diplomacy’s role among the instruments of national strategy. America’s foreign policy and national security culture has rarely given public diplomacy a place of prominence in national strategy. Indeed, as the historical review below will reveal, it has been systematically neglected and under-funded during lengthy periods of the post-World War II era. And finally, the conventional understanding lacks the awareness of how all aspects of public diplomacy must be optimally integrated into grand strategy. This failure has roots in bureaucratic structure and culture, but most importantly, in a conceptual failure to recognize that foreign policy, properly understood, must incorporate into national policy *a strategy of political influence*, consisting of several essential but distinct elements: not just public diplomacy and strategic communications narrowly defined, but the entire spectrum of influence operations including cultural diplomacy, psychological strategy, political action, and political warfare (including ideological warfare)—not to mention the political influence dimension of traditional diplomacy and overall foreign policy-making.

This study proposes to address these three deficiencies in the understanding of public diplomacy and to present a structural and conceptual solution that will create a culture of influence in U.S. foreign policy and ultimately a professional ethic of, and capability to conduct, full spectrum diplomatic operations. To create (or, depending on one’s interpretation of history, to restore) such a culture will require major structural and conceptual reforms in American diplomacy—reforms of the sort that will solve the larger problem of integrating the various instruments of national power at the level of grand strategy.

The Problem of Defining the Problem

One of the central problems in creating a culture of influence has to do with semantics. The words one uses to describe an issue are the key to how one thinks about the issue. The problem we face, therefore, is a lack of consensus about how to describe the instrument(s) of statecraft necessary to solve the problems of anti-Americanism and opposition to U.S. policy.

There is some agreement that the instruments of “soft power” have been neglected. But this term, however useful in many contexts, is sufficiently imprecise in the way it is understood to bring all of its elements to bear in the actual conduct of our foreign policy. Specifically, it can be used by State Department officials to refer mostly to the practice of traditional diplomacy with little reference to many of the other instruments that address foreign hearts and minds.

When one looks for greater specificity, there seems to be some agreement that the issue at hand is one of “public diplomacy.” Another view holds that the larger issue is one of “strategic communications.” There is also a view that the issue is one of “strategic outreach.”

Since, it can be argued, most authorities understand the issue to be one of “public diplomacy,” let us begin here. Public diplomacy is

a term with many definitions, some very restrictive and others that include activities that many public diplomats—particularly U.S. Information Agency alumni—would reject as being part of their portfolio. A large part of the problem with definitions is the fact that no authority on the subject is sufficiently widely accepted. This is partly due to: a) the pervasive lack of professional knowledge of this field among traditional diplomats and within the larger foreign policy community; b) professional turf consciousness within the bureaucratic cultures of the few public diplomacy agencies and offices past and present—with the frequent tendency among many public diplomats to reject more expansive and strategic definitions of the term; and c) the paucity of authoritative academic studies that cover all the dimensions of the subject—studies that are adequately informed by professional practice. With the publication of several recent studies on the subject, such as those by Carnes Lord, J. Michael Waller and Juliana Pilon, this gap may well be on its way to closing.¹

Within the Department of State, as witnessed by this writer, public diplomacy has been widely conceived of as “spin for policy”—i.e., how one explains and propagates the explanations for the various elements of foreign policy. Thus, as one official document defines it:

Public diplomacy supplements and reinforces traditional diplomacy by explaining U.S. policies to foreign publics, by providing them with

1. Carnes Lord, *Losing Hearts and Minds? Public Diplomacy and Strategic Influence in an Age of Terror* (Westport, CT and London: Praeger Security International, 2006); J. Michael Waller, (ed.) *The Public Diplomacy Reader* (Washington, DC: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008), and *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counter-Propaganda, and Political Warfare* (Washington, DC: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008); J. Michael Waller, *Fighting the War of Ideas Like a Real War*, (Washington, DC: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2007); and Juliana Pilon, *Why America is Such a Hard Sell* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).

information about American society and culture, by enabling many to experience the diversity of our country personally, and by assessing foreign public opinion for American ambassadors and foreign policy decision makers in the United States.²

While this definition is true, it is only partly so, *because it fails to recognize that public diplomacy requires its own independent policies that are distinct from those which guide diplomacy toward governments*. Examples that illustrate this point in sharp relief are cases of U.S. relations with countries ruled by tyrannical governments: on the one hand, traditional diplomacy (i.e., government-to-government policy) might dictate cool, limited, but correct relations with the governments of such states, while, on the other hand, public diplomacy would dictate the need for warm and expanded relations with peoples and non-governmental leaders and institutions of those same states. Another example is policy toward transnational movements, whether ethnic, ideological, religious, or others. Policies toward these movements may be made which place higher priority on addressing the movement in question rather than the interests of any specific government.

Other definitions are more inclusive. A recent State Department budget statement describes the purpose underlying its request for appropriations for public diplomacy as: “to inform foreign opinion and win support for U.S. foreign policy goals.” While, on its own, this statement assumes the subordinate, supporting role of public diplomacy, later passages in the same budget statement added such functions as: “to help win the war of ideas,” “promoting democracy and good governance, de-legitimizing terror, and isolating terrorist leaders and organizations.”³ The fact that the main description here

2. United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, 1985 Report, inside cover; cited in Waller (ed.), *The Public Diplomacy Reader*, p. 26.

3. Bureau of Resource Management, U.S. Department of State, *FY 2008 Budget in Brief*, February 5, 2007, cited in Waller, *The Public Diplomacy Reader*, p. 29.

of the mission of public diplomacy places it in the subordinate role demonstrates the clear cultural inclination of the State Department on this issue.

An older Department of State document defined public diplomacy as “government-sponsored programs intended to inform or influence public opinion in other countries; its chief instruments are publications, motion pictures, cultural exchanges, radio and television.”⁴ This definition, while excessively restrictive in its list of “chief instruments,” is nevertheless satisfactorily inclusive, as it uses the critical term “influence,” which can comprise many other instruments than those cited, and which connotes a form of policy-making distinct from simply informing foreign publics about U.S. policy in ways designed to support that policy.

Carnes Lord has stressed this distinction by observing that this State Department definition is ambiguous in a way that indicates much of the conventional misunderstandings of public diplomacy:

To inform—or to influence? The first alternative implies an approach to international communication not far removed from the venerable “public affairs” function of government agencies, or indeed from the commercial media. The second, however, underlines public diplomacy’s character as a strategic instrument of national policy. It is important to understand properly the term “strategic” in this context. The practice of “spinning” the news to create immediate benefit . . . is a well-known aspect of the contemporary media environment. Public diplomacy is too often confused with such essentially tactical manipulation of the interpretation of events.⁵

It is with this tactical view in mind, that many within the larger foreign affairs community see public diplomacy as an instrument

4. U.S. Department of State, *Dictionary of International Relations Terms*, 1987, p. 85.

5. Carnes Lord, “What ‘Strategic’ Public Diplomacy Is,” in J. Michael Waller (ed.) *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counterpropaganda, and Political Warfare*, (Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009), p. 42.

of “crisis public relations”—a function that they believe, if properly used, could quickly change foreign opposition to such policies as the War in Iraq. Here, public diplomacy is seen as a method of perceptions management that could sway foreign audiences to accept the validity of policies—such as the War in Iraq—with which they intensely disagree.

This concept of public diplomacy is also partially true, but it has its shortcomings. On the one hand, it sees public diplomacy as having miraculously transformative powers that in practice it usually does not have. Such an exercise, in the words of some critics, amounts to “putting lipstick on a pig.” On the other hand, this concept of public diplomacy fails to include those elements of the art that involve such efforts as: dissemination of information that is credible and will be seen as credible; increasing audiences for American information and ideas; breaking down barriers to the reception of American messages; building human relationships of trust and mutual understanding; overcoming foreign illusions and misinformation about the United States and U.S. policy; taking actions that have public diplomatic effects (sometimes known as “propaganda of the deed”); etc.

The Defense Science Board defines public diplomacy as a subset of “strategic communications.”⁶ While this view is defensible insofar as one conceives of public diplomacy according to its more limited definitions, a stronger case can be made that strategic communications are a subset of public diplomacy—so long as one understands the term in its larger strategic dimension. This larger strategic dimension includes elements of influence that go beyond communications. For example, cultural diplomacy of various types and foreign economic, agricultural, technological, and medical assistance

6. Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, *Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communications*, p.12.

are powerful forms of foreign influence that could be included in a more strategically expansive definition of public diplomacy. However, these are assuredly matters of more than just “communication.”

In light of all this, one of the most valuable insights into this definitional problem has been supplied by Juliana Pilon. She introduces the term “strategic outreach” which encompasses a wider variety of instruments of influence than either strategic communications or most conventional definitions of public diplomacy. Professor Pilon explains: “Its denotation embraces not only foreign aid, educational and academic exchanges, and democracy building, but also most of what passes for public diplomacy, short of public affairs narrowly understood.”⁷ She concludes that existing semantics have proven to be insufficient to describe the integration of the larger set of international interactions which, she properly observes, are sequestered by the U.S. foreign policy culture in separate categories, both bureaucratic and conceptual. Because of the necessity of their strategic integration, she maintains that, for all the risks of changing semantics, the new term deserves to be introduced.

However, having watched the painful, decades-long attempts to introduce “public diplomacy” into the argot of foreign affairs, I fear that Pilon’s new term would meet an equally painful and protracted birth. I also wonder if this extremely useful concept sufficiently incorporates all the aspects of an overall strategy of *political influence*. Although Pilon includes, for example, certain elements of political and ideological warfare within the term “outreach,” I fear that, however desirable it would be to make such activities more palatable by the use of this euphemism, most observers will find their inclusion under “outreach” as implausible.

7. Juliana Geran Pilon, *Why America Is Such a Hard Sell*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007, p. 8).

Another useful term is that coined by Joseph Nye: “soft power.”⁸ Nye asserts that soft power is principally “attractive power” but also includes the capacity to “manipulate the agenda of political choices.” As Lord has pointed out, however, Nye’s definition of this term has its limits. Whereas Nye identifies the sources of soft power as culture, political values and policies, Lord argues: first, that there are other sources of soft power such as those identified by William Odom and Robert Dujarric—science and technology, higher education, and media; and second, that elements of “hard power” such as military force and economic power, can have what are arguably “soft power” effects, insofar as these elements can *influence* others politically.⁹

While Nye has introduced a most useful term, it can be argued that its greatest utility can be found if its definition distinguished “soft power” from hard power insofar as the latter concerns the application of material things such as armed force and power of money, in contrast with the power of non-material things such as information, ideas and beliefs, culture and cultural products, political and economic systems, and the various forms of diplomacy.

A similarly all-inclusive term that has been used to address the problem of foreign attitudes toward the United States and U.S. policy has been “strategic influence.” This term formed the basis of a short-lived “Office of Strategic Influence” (OSI) that was created within the Department of Defense in 2001 but disbanded shortly thereafter. While that particular office had certain limits to its anticipated mission, the term that formed its name does comprehend a large set of the instruments of statecraft that can be used to address the challenge of foreign political attitudes at hand. There is a

8. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, (New York: Public Affairs, 2004).

9. Carnes Lord, *Losing Hearts and Minds?* pp.16-20

practical problem, however, with the term “strategic influence”: it contains no element of euphemism that can protect certain of the instruments of influence from foreign (and even domestic) opprobrium.

In light of all this, I would like to argue that “public diplomacy” is the best term to describe the entire range of activities necessary to complement traditional diplomacy and ultimately to create a sound policy of political influence. However, to incorporate all the necessary activities, it must be defined in a way that many of its traditional practitioners will not readily accept: it must cover not just the conventional and obvious array of public diplomacy functions, such as information policy, exchanges, broadcasting, etc., as well as elements such as foreign aid that are more conveniently incorporated in the term “strategic outreach.” It must also include and serve as a euphemism and conceptual umbrella for functions that include counter-propaganda, political action, psychological strategy, political warfare, ideological warfare, and actions designed to have impact on public and elite opinion (the “propaganda of the deed”).

The reality of life in the state of nature in world politics is that states conduct these latter kinds of activities and that American statecraft can ill afford to abjure them. There are people in the diplomatic and public diplomacy communities who will argue that some or all of these instruments are dirty and even un-American. To such as these, one must ask: is it preferable to use violence over such non-violent means of conflict? Should one catapult the nation from the lower, diplomatic, and more peaceful rungs of the ladder of escalation options in foreign policy, skipping these middle rungs, to the highest rungs: physical coercion and violent warfare? If one concedes that such activities may become necessary, and given that many of them must be undertaken covertly, then is it more in the national interest to broadcast their conduct or to shield them insofar

as it is possible by some kind of euphemism? It is the conclusion of this writer that euphemism is the lesser of the evils.

Despite the various disagreements over its meaning and political utility, the term “public diplomacy,” with its semantic inclusiveness and elegance, best denotes—and connotes—the full array of instruments of statecraft necessary to address the problems of anti-Americanism, foreign opposition to U.S. foreign policies, and America’s failure to influence both foreign public opinion and ultimately foreign governments. Understood in this context, public diplomacy can be defined as the entire array of diplomatic instruments—cultural, educational, political, ideological, information, and intelligence—designed to have relations with, and influence over, foreign societies, foreign publics, and foreign opinion leaders, with the ultimate effect of influencing foreign opinion.

Cultural diplomacy, or the use of various elements of culture to influence foreign publics, opinion makers, and even foreign leaders,¹⁰ is arguably the most visible, potentially influential, and therefore significant aspect of public diplomacy. Cultural diplomacy is conducted through the arts, education, ideas, history, science, medicine, technology, religion, customs, manners, commerce, philanthropy, sports, language, professional vocations, hobbies, and so forth. The various media by which these elements of culture may be communicated are also among its tools. Cultural diplomacy seeks to harness these elements to influence foreigners in several ways: to have a positive view of the United States, its people, its culture, and its policies; to induce greater cooperation with the United States; to change the policies of foreign governments; to bring about political

10. Cultural diplomacy is a term which is similarly defined in an excessively restrictive fashion in most conventional treatments of the subject. I have addressed this problem in another essay which appears in its totality in the appendix of this monograph: *Cultural Diplomacy, Foreign Influence, and Integrated Strategy*, (Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009).

or cultural change in foreign lands; and to prevent, manage, mitigate, and prevail in conflicts with foreign adversaries. In addition, it is designed to encourage Americans to improve their understanding of foreign cultures so as to lubricate international relations (including such activities as commercial relations), enhance cross-cultural communication, improve one's intelligence capabilities, and understand foreign friends and adversaries, their intentions and their capabilities. Cultural diplomacy may also involve efforts to counter hostile foreign cultural diplomacy in the United States. In short, cultural diplomacy, being designed not only for mutual understanding but for these other purposes as well, is meant to enhance national security as well as protect and advance other vital national interests.

In practice, the conduct of cultural diplomacy relies on the various instruments that establish relationships of trust between Americans and foreigners, from the giving of gifts and philanthropic work to the various forms of people-to-people diplomacy and international exchanges, whether educational, cultural, professional, religious, youth, or others. Educational programs, such as establishing schools, universities and libraries abroad, organizing conferences, or distributing literature that does not relate to official information policy are aspects of cultural diplomacy; the arts, including performing arts, painting, sculpture, and architecture are also diplomatic tools; exhibitions, including science, technology, ethnic culture, commercial products, professional vocations, or hobbies serve a diplomatic purpose as well. Teaching English to foreigners and teaching foreign languages to Americans, thus making them better communicators, are a part of cultural diplomacy—as are cultural aspects of broadcasting, including *belles lettres*, music, religious programs, programs on history, customs, manners, and others. Listening and according respect to foreigners and promoting ideas and social policy, which may be constructive and well received

as well as offensive and counterproductive, are elements of cultural diplomacy. So are the writing and interpretation of history, religious diplomacy, even sports—all of which have the power to influence and shape foreign opinion.

The array of public diplomacy instruments includes several close cousins of cultural diplomacy. One consists of our government's programs to host international visitors, such as the next generation of leaders from foreign lands. Another is our military education programs, which expose foreign military officers to the discipline, ethics, and culture of respect for civilian authority characteristic of the U.S. armed forces. Community outreach civil military operations by U.S. armed forces abroad with their potential to build trust and win foreign publics' sentiment are aspects of public diplomacy as well. One can even include here the promotion of international commerce and specific economic and commercial initiatives, which contain many elements of cross-cultural communication and influence.

Effective information policy, designed to describe and explain the United States, U.S. policies, the policies of other powers, world events, and other international realities, also plays a significant role in influencing foreign publics, their opinion makers, and leaders, and as such, it, too, is an integral part of public diplomacy. International broadcasting—both American and, in the absence of free domestic media, that which serves as a surrogate domestic free press—is of vital importance. Information operations—the use of information by both military and civilian officials abroad—shape foreign views of political and strategic realities. To be effective in reaching foreign publics and elites, public diplomacy also needs information policies specifically designed to counter disinformation campaigns or hostile propaganda and perceptions management—for without counter-propaganda, any diplomatic effort to describe and

explain America and its policies may only be short-lived, especially in a conflict over ideas.

Public diplomacy extends beyond cultural dialogue, information, and counter-propaganda into actions: Actions and policies designed to capture the moral high ground and that have an opinion forming effect are essential instruments of public diplomacy and serve as “propaganda of the deed.” Such policies and actions include human rights policy, refugee and asylum policy, promotion of legitimate government and the rule of law, and others. In a conflict, awareness of the implications of those deeds and policies in the contest over hearts and minds is key to achieving victory while avoiding setbacks in what I have called the “moral battlespace.” Similarly, at a time of peace, foreign assistance in all its forms—economic, agricultural, technological, security, educational, medical, as well as political development assistance, including assistance in building democratic and republican institutions, civil society building, and so forth—plays an important role in ensuring peace, stability, and generating good will towards America.

Under certain political circumstances, political action, such as support for certain political forces abroad accompanied sometimes by the undermining of foreign public support for other political forces, remains an effective public diplomacy instrument. Ideological warfare, the exercise in discrediting certain ideas and promoting others, which, in some cases, may be a subset of cultural diplomacy and in other cases a subset of covert action, is another. Whether as an alternative to or a corollary of military action, public diplomacy also includes political warfare: discrediting, isolating, and dividing enemies; provoking them to take action against their interests; and devising psychological operations against enemies, such as demoralization, disorientation, confusion, inducement of a sense of futile resignation, sowing disunity, and psychological disarmament.

What ultimately should inform the conduct of public diplomacy and the choice of public diplomatic tools is the consideration—as a matter of policy making—of the opinion formation implications in the development and implementation of all foreign policies so that they inspire confidence in the intentions and credibility of the United States. Thus, a full realization of the possibilities of public diplomacy must take into account the necessity of its proper integration with other arts of statecraft where, for example, military strategy incorporates public diplomacy into its calculations (e.g., in behavior toward foreign populations, the treatment of prisoners, etc.), or where the need to exert political influence requires the collection of “opportunities intelligence” on targets of potential political influence, or the use of offensive political counterintelligence operations. It is the entire range of these public diplomatic instruments combined with traditional diplomacy, and finally integrated with the other arts of statecraft that comprise what is missing in U.S. foreign policy: full spectrum diplomacy.

For the necessary integration to take place at the level of grand strategy, public diplomacy cannot be understood solely in its narrowest sense, with its leaders too often having had solely journalistic, political campaign, “public affairs,” “public relations,” or commercial advertising experience. The achievement of such strategic integration requires two essential elements, i.e. knowledge of all the dimensions of public diplomacy and proper structuring of the foreign policy apparatus.

This first element, knowledge—acquired either through professional experience (which, given the neglect of so many diplomatic functions in the recent history, very few people still in government possess), or through a thorough professional education in the field’s various disciplines—requires some understanding of the history of public diplomacy in all the dimensions described

above. What follows, then, is a brief, selective review of this history that can illustrate not only the dimensions of the subject, but, more importantly, its political complexity; it should also demonstrate why effective public diplomacy requires leadership not just with skill in limited, conventionally conceived, public diplomatic techniques but with broad, strategically integrated knowledge of the various arts of statecraft. This history should show how public diplomacy, understood in its largest sense, is not merely a support function of “policy:” it is *an entire set of activities that require their own policy* that may be—and, indeed, often is—wholly separate from policy governing bilateral or multilateral state-to-state relations. And finally, this brief history should demonstrate that relations with people, with societies, over the long term can be more important and can have greater strategic impact than traditional diplomatic relations with foreign governments.

Historical Background

The rise of American political influence capabilities

The various functions that make up my expansive concept of U.S. public diplomacy have had a checkered history, but they are steeped in the culture of the nation. In the struggle for independence, America's Founders utilized various tools of public diplomacy in the broadest sense of the term. In the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, the Founding Fathers told the English king and parliament that "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires" the aggrieved Americans to "declare the causes which impel them to the separation." World opinion mattered from the start. And so the Continental Congress, in one of the nation's finest pieces of international political influence, enumerated the reasons for declaring independence—and gave the world its rationale for recognizing the new, independent United States.

The Declaration was only one element of a much larger campaign of international political influence. Polemics, essays, propaganda, public declarations, street theater, leaflets, satirical cartoons, poetry, and songs were all employed for the purpose of discrediting British colonial rule both at home and abroad, winning foreign sympathy for the independence of the colonies, promoting democratic

republican ideas, and building an international coalition to oppose a common foe. Samuel Adams, for one, pioneered a strategy of ideological attack and political action designed to vilify the British and keep them on the defensive. He employed scandal, outrage, ridicule, shame, and abuse alongside demands for justice, public accountability, and transparency. Under George Washington's direction, he led a propaganda effort targeting public opinion not only in Britain but also in Canada. Meanwhile, Benjamin Franklin used various political influence operations and counter-propaganda to shape opinion in Britain, France and elsewhere on the European continent. In a strategy that promoted the best about the American cause and that condemned the worst about British colonial rule, America's Founders utilized instruments that achieved military objectives by political means.¹

Once independence had been achieved, American foreign policy needed to cultivate goodwill around the world in order to shape international political conditions so that the new country could grow unmolested, avoid the wars of the Old World, and promote mutually beneficial commerce. The growth in American prosperity and the country's global reach led to new public diplomacy initiatives that resulted in a stream of political benefits to the new and expanding country. Among the first, major institutionalized efforts in this field were those initiated by American missionaries and philanthropists in the 19th century in various parts of the world. Motivated by multiple desires—to propagate the Christian faith, to spread American ideas and concepts of liberal education, and to enhance international understanding—these pioneers embarked on private initiatives that

1. See J. Michael Waller, "The American Way of Propaganda: Lessons from the Founding Fathers," in *idem*, *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counterpropaganda, and Political Warfare* (Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008), pp. 25-39. See also, *idem*, *Founding Political Warfare Documents of the United States* (Crossbow Press, 2009).

had major public diplomacy benefits. Some of these efforts included the establishment in 1863 of Robert College in what is now Turkey and in 1866 the American University of Beirut in Lebanon. For over a century, these institutions have yielded rich harvests of goodwill in these parts of the Middle East.

Major new initiatives in the field came during the First World War with President Wilson's creation of the Committee on Public Information, the first official effort at foreign information policy.

In the wake of the Great War, it was increasingly recognized that engagement with the world in ways other than commerce was an essential element of a national strategy to maintain peace and security. So, for example, in 1919, former Secretary of State Elihu Root and Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, founded the Institute of International Education, one of the first major public diplomacy organizations in America. They believed that there could be no lasting peace without international understanding, and that such understanding could best be achieved through international educational exchange.

It was during this period that the Department of State expanded its foreign information efforts by launching its "Wireless File"—a transmission to our foreign diplomatic posts of official U.S. government statements, which could be shared with foreign governments and opinion leaders.

With the rise of mass media and global communications during World War II, U.S. foreign policy met the new challenges in the international competition of information, ideas, and perceptions management with an integrated strategic approach. The U.S. government established several information agencies, the International Visitor Program at the Department of State, and the Voice of America (VOA), whose broadcasts were designed to counter Axis propaganda in various theaters of the war. In 1942, President Roosevelt

established the Office of War Information, whose overseas component became the U.S. Information Service.

During the Cold War, the development of policy and instruments of public diplomacy intensified. The decade following World War II saw the establishment of the Fulbright program, re-education programs for Germany and Japan, and the journal *Problems of Communism*. The Central Intelligence Agency launched Radio Free Europe for the satellite countries of East Central Europe and Radio Liberty for the various nationalities of the Soviet Union (hereafter RFE/RL). These radios differed from the Voice of America in that they served as a surrogate domestic free press for countries denied press freedom. Whereas the VOA broadcast world news and news about American life, culture and ideas, as well as editorials reflecting the views of the U.S. Government, the “freedom radios” broadcast information about matters within their target countries—the news undistorted by the official propaganda; the true history of those countries which could combat the falsified history concocted by the communist governments to erase the national memory, to re-make the national identity, and thereby to create a “new Soviet man;” and religious programs to populations that were denied religious freedom. Then, in 1953, the various information and cultural diplomacy activities of the government were consolidated into a single new agency, the U.S. Information Agency.

Over time, public diplomacy programs expanded under USIA to include production of new periodicals targeted to foreign audiences, exhibitions abroad, book and library programs, and the distribution of film and television programming.

The Cold War also witnessed the development of other programs and agencies involved in public diplomacy. These included foreign aid programs, the launching of the Peace Corps, disaster relief efforts, other humanitarian aid initiatives, and U.S. involvement

in international organizations with such initiatives as the Ten-Year Health Plan for the Americas through the Pan-American Health Organization.

During the Cold War, the U.S. government also embarked on numerous projects that some have characterized as “political action” or “political warfare” but which were so targeted toward influencing foreign opinion that they could also be properly considered public diplomacy. Some of these were run by the Central Intelligence Agency and some were coordinated under the auspices of the newly formed Psychological Strategy Board and its successor, the Operations Control Board. These projects involved the creation and support of political, intellectual, and cultural organizations which promoted the values and principles of the United States. Most prominent among these was the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Its people conducted some of the only meaningful competition against Soviet-sponsored intellectual and cultural subversion. Support was also extended to journals of opinion in various countries abroad, giving intellectuals sympathetic to liberty and democracy a forum where their views and analysis could be published. These included journals such as *Encounter* in Britain and *Quadrant* in Australia. Journals that received such assistance were of the kind that could not otherwise sustain themselves through subscriptions or advertising, yet which had major influence in intellectual, governmental, and opinion-making circles. In some of these cases, the publishers or editors of these journals received their assistance without knowing that it originated from the U.S. Government. In addition, arrangements were made to publish certain books abroad that would not be easily commercially publishable.

Some of these activities also included covert support for anticommunist forces within selected countries threatened by the possibility

of communist takeover. Particular attention was paid to supporting, in cooperation with the AFL-CIO, non-communist elements in foreign trade unions. The effort took its most strategically dramatic form with the support for the free labor union forces within Italy at the conclusion of World War II to prevent a communist takeover there, and support for the Solidarity movement in Poland in the late 1970s and 1980s. As part of these efforts, the CIA developed a capability to conduct covert operations abroad to discredit extremist enemies of freedom, demoralize them, and split their ranks. These capabilities involved, for example, the various components of CIA executive Frank Wisner's "mighty Wurlitzer," such as: newsletters, newspapers, and radio broadcasts abroad; reliance on foreign agents of influence and sympathetic foreign journalists; and the establishment and support of anti-communist organizations abroad. The splitting of Soviet-sponsored "peace movements"—between their hard-core pro-Soviet elements and their larger constituency of well-meaning, non-communist peace activists—was central to these efforts, as was the public exposure of Soviet agents of influence and support for individual anti-communist politicians and political parties abroad.

The years of the Cold War also witnessed the establishment of what has been customarily called a political action capability within our armed forces, such as the U.S. Army's Green Berets. During the Vietnam War, the Army, as well as the CIA, had developed very effective doctrine and methods of conducting counterinsurgency warfare, which focused on winning the "hearts and minds" of the people—methods and doctrine which were much more effective than is commonly understood. Again, because these capabilities involved influencing foreign opinion, they could also be included within the larger heading of public diplomacy.

The *détente*-era decline

During the 1960s and then throughout the 1970s—the era of “*détente*” between the U.S. and the USSR—there began a precipitous decline in U.S. strategic attention to foreign public opinion and propaganda and their impact on U.S. national interests. This arguably began with the failure of U.S. foreign policy to counter Soviet bloc and North Vietnamese propaganda and political influence operations during the Vietnam War.² It was further marked by the neglect of and budgetary constraints on the entire array of U.S. public diplomacy programs, from cultural diplomacy to international broadcasting, as well as the effective abandonment of political action and political warfare programs, counterpropaganda, military counterinsurgency capabilities, the harnessing of cultural anthropological knowledge to the requirements of U.S. foreign policy, and so forth.

As an example, during this period, the international radios were all neglected. Their transmission equipment became obsolete and was allowed to deteriorate. Efforts were made in Congress to shut down RFE/RL, and failing that, to change their names, depriving them of their trademark, and to move their headquarters from Munich to the U.S., thus weakening the radios’ access to the underground lines of communication that had been developed by dissident forces. A number of the Soviet and East European language services were successfully penetrated by Soviet bloc *agents provocateurs*—reflecting the diminishing of counterintelligence protection of these services. (Here, by the way, is an example of the failure to integrate public diplomacy with another essential instrument of statecraft, the

2. To this date, the effectiveness of this propaganda as the decisive element explaining the North Vietnamese victory remains mostly unknown and misunderstood. For a brief testimony by the North Vietnamese generals about the decisive role of this propaganda, see: Stephen Young, “How North Vietnam Won the War,” *Wall Street Journal*, August 3, 1995, p. A8.

counterintelligence task of protecting against foreign covert political influence operations.)

Support for RFE/RL reached such a nadir that when the radios' Munich headquarters were bombed (in a covert Soviet bloc operation), the Carter Administration and Congress compelled the radios to pay for the multi-millions in damage out of existing radio programming funds, thus encouraging yet more attacks of this type. Also during this period, the White House and State Department made efforts to censor the contents of RFE/RL's broadcasts as well as those of the VOA in order to avoid offending Moscow and its satellites.

U.S. political warfare capabilities were severely constrained by the Church and Pike Committees in reaction to unrelated abuses in the intelligence agencies. Thanks to the purge of the CIA's Directorate of Operations by CIA Director Stansfield Turner, a large part of the professional skill and institutional memory in this field was permanently lost. Similarly, with the end of the Vietnam War, the U.S. armed forces began a systematic and steady neglect of counterinsurgency warfare doctrine.

Altogether, the various opinion-shaping instruments were downgraded to the lowest level in the order of national strategic priorities. While the USSR was increasing its already massive public diplomacy and political warfare capabilities, U.S. policy ignored these Soviet activities and effectively stopped collecting intelligence on them. There was no U.S. strategic attention paid to the "balance of political power" as opposed to the balance of military force.

The Reagan revival

When President Reagan came to office, these trends were dramatically reversed. To address the imbalance of political power, public diplomacy became a major strategic focus of the

Administration. The first initiative was the establishment of a State Department-based interagency group on “Shaping European Attitudes” and a second interagency group to counter “Soviet Active Measures.” A major campaign was launched to counter the Soviet propaganda campaign to prevent the deployment of intermediate nuclear forces (INF) in Europe. A \$2.5 billion modernization plan was implemented for our international radios both to strengthen programming and to overcome the massive Soviet jamming operation. Under the leadership of Under Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, the State Department established a central office of public diplomacy policy, along with several regional and functional public diplomacy interagency groups covering Central America, southern Africa, and arms control.

President Reagan signed three Presidential Directives (NS-DDs) with significant public diplomacy content, two of which were exclusively devoted to the subject. One of these directives, NSDD-77, set up four new interagency committees to cover international information policy, international political influence, international broadcasting, and domestic public affairs.

Under the leadership of Charles Z. Wick, the U.S. Information Agency significantly strengthened existing programs and launched numerous new initiatives, including the establishment of Worldnet Television—the first international television broadcasting effort by the U.S. government. Radio Marti and Radio Free Afghanistan—two more surrogate domestic radio services—were established for Cuba and Afghanistan, and major thematic regional initiatives were launched. Public diplomatic policy themes were consciously added to Presidential addresses and other public statements, some of which were targeted directly at foreign publics. Book collections in American libraries abroad were revised and updated. Books presenting alternative ideas were distributed to communist countries. Inten-

sive public information campaigns concerning the wars in Central America and Afghanistan were undertaken. A significant expansion of exchange programs was implemented to expose greater numbers of Soviet officials and “citizens” to the ideas, culture, and other realities of a free society.

Meanwhile, various actions were taken to improve our political warfare capabilities. The National Intelligence Topics (NITs) were revised to include collection on Soviet propaganda and “active measures” since there was virtually no intelligence collection or analysis on these activities during the 1970s and even earlier. Intelligence on active measures was analyzed and declassified, and briefing teams were dispatched worldwide to share that analysis with foreign governments and media. That analysis was also published by the Department of State and the FBI and made available to the public.³ Covert assistance was given to the Solidarity trade union movement in Poland. Covert political and military assistance was rendered to the resistance movement in Afghanistan. Assistance was extended to groups such as Resistance International—a coalition of anti-communist resistance groups in countries around the world ruled by communist governments. In spite of massive internal opposition, the Department of State organized a conference on “Democratization of Communist Countries” in 1982.

Drawing on President Reagan’s 1982 address to the British Parliament which set forth a vision of the world he would like to see in

3. See, for example: the State Department’s series of “Foreign Affairs Notes” on Soviet active measures published between 1983 and 1988; *Active Measures: A Report on the Substance and Process of Anti-U.S. Disinformation and Propaganda Campaigns* (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Publication 9630, August 1986); *Soviet Influence Activities: A Report on Active Measures and Propaganda, 1986-87*, (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Publication 9627, August 1987); and *Soviet Active Measures in the United States*, (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, June 1987).

the future—a world of freedom and democracy—the Administration established the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Its purpose was to enable our two political parties to conduct party-to-party relations with foreign political parties; to establish networks of similarly thinking political groups; to build and support various institutions of civil society and democracy, including free trade unions, private enterprises, and various non-governmental organizations; and to sustain non-governmental organizations dedicated to various aspects of liberty and democracy. The NED structure enabled the U.S. to support democratic forces overtly, thus avoiding the risk of such support being stained by the taint of covert intelligence operations. Furthermore, political activists were dispatched to various international youth conferences formerly dominated by the USSR and its satellites. Various initiatives of economic warfare were conducted through covert political influence operations in several countries. A number of initiatives were taken to challenge the ideologically-based legitimacy of the Soviet regime. In short, public diplomacy became a crucial element of the strategy to turn the tide of the Cold War and win it.

The lists of new measures and initiatives undertaken under President Reagan could be considerably lengthened. They could also be augmented by various private sector initiatives in political warfare that were conducted without coordination with any agencies of the U.S. government. Notable among these were efforts to smuggle fax machines, personal computers, printers, paper, and copying machines to dissident forces within the communist empire.⁴ Some of these initiatives depended on the kind of analysis that only a strategic focus on public diplomacy impels—namely, “opportunities intelli-

4. The most notable of these efforts were undertaken by inventor and industrialist, Robert Kriebel, former Chairman and CEO of Loctite Corporation.

gence” analysis, which, in this case, meant analysis of the *political*—and not military—vulnerabilities of our Soviet adversaries (analysis of which was rarely done within our diplomatic and intelligence communities) as well as the means by which the Kremlin addressed these vulnerabilities.

Thus, in just one arena—international broadcasting—U.S. initiatives were designed to serve multiple purposes. By providing alternative information and ideas, U.S. broadcasting broke the Kremlin’s monopoly of information and education, both of which were designed to serve its internal security requirements by establishing a standard of conformity—the “Communist Party line”—which could facilitate the identification of non-conformists as threats to the regime. Broadcasts also combated the Soviet regime’s strategy of “atomization.” Designed to separate each individual in society from others by creating an atmosphere of complete mistrust, atomization would prevent people from communicating honestly, leaving each person to face the state alone and making it impossible to organize groups independent of Soviet authority which could metamorphose into resistance groups. The information, ideas, stories, and even music heard by Soviet bloc audiences uniquely on the “Freedom Radios” served to create bonds of trust between and among secret listeners that then served to enable the emergence of “islands of autonomy” within the communist system.

The broadcasts also exploited the vulnerability of totalitarian regimes to instantaneous information, which the Kremlin feared as much as it feared the truth. Instantaneous information about events within the Soviet empire prevented Soviet internal security forces from isolating civil disturbances—its chief means of mitigating the effects and contagion of such disturbances. A stronger radio signal that overcame much of the jamming also gave resistance forces the incentive to establish underground lines of communi-

cation, making organized resistance and communication with the public possible.

On these grounds alone, the work of our international broadcasters was arguably the single most powerful instrument we wielded in the political war against Moscow.

All these operations—official, covert, and private—were part of a strategic plan designed principally to embolden domestic resistance to communist rule and undermine the legitimacy of communist regimes. At the same time, these operations aimed to—and did—provide alternative ideas within the communist world and, importantly, compete with communist ideas planted in the free world. They also promoted greater understanding of and sympathy for U.S. policies in the Cold War as well as countered disinformation and propaganda intended to blacken the reputation of the United States, separate it from its friends and allies and isolate anticommunist forces within the NATO alliance from other domestic political forces.

One can argue that without these various public diplomacy actions, which, by my definition, include political warfare measures, the Soviet empire might never have collapsed. But it is difficult to say whether, without other elements of the Reagan strategic plan to force change in the USSR, public diplomacy would have been sufficient in itself to stimulate the requisite internal resistance to communist rule as manifested, among other things, by the millions who joined the Solidarity union in Poland and the millions who took to the streets in major cities throughout the USSR. After all, while far reaching public diplomacy actions made the United States more competitive with the Soviet Union in the global contest of strategic influence—the balance of political power—other elements of the Administration's strategic plan put pressure on the Soviet system: e.g., the military buildup, with such decisive factors as the Strategic Defense Initiative, called into question Soviet military competitive-

ness and effectively caused a crisis in the Soviet military economy—a crisis further exacerbated by the U.S. technology denial measures. Meanwhile, the support of the Afghan resistance and other anti-communist resistance groups in Central America and southern Africa showed the people within the inner Soviet empire that resistance was not futile. The more interesting question, then, is whether these other elements of the strategic plan could have accomplished the same goal without the panoply of public diplomacy actions. The fact remains that the West, in collaboration with the resistance movements and the courageous peoples of the Soviet empire, won the Cold War. This occurred thanks in no small part to the resuscitation of these neglected instruments of statecraft. Indeed, this exercise of full spectrum diplomacy produced the greatest American foreign policy success since the defeat of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan.

Finally, it should be noted that all of the public diplomacy initiatives listed above were *policies and not “support for policy.”* Very few of them were developed by traditional diplomats. And almost all of them ran counter to the traditional diplomatic emphasis of maintaining harmonious, stable, or, at least, correct bilateral diplomatic relations with the USSR and its satellites.

The post-Cold War decline

The collapse of the Soviet empire triggered another post-war U.S. withdrawal from much of the world and a new period of psychological, political, and military disarmament. U.S. public diplomacy capabilities were amongst the greatest casualties. The process of their dismantlement, however, had begun even a few years earlier. In 1987, in response to the use of the National Security Council as the vehicle for covert support of the Central American anti-communist resistance (the “Iran-Contra” affair), the White House stopped all NSC-led functions within the government, so that the NSC would

no longer be, or be seen as, an “operational agency.” This meant the liquidation of the four interagency committees established by Presidential directive NSDD-77. As a result, the vigor of U.S. public diplomacy programs that had been instilled by the White House’s active involvement was sapped, and U.S. public diplomacy, political action, and political warfare programs all began to wither.

Perhaps the most notable element of this decline was the dismantling in 1999 of the U.S. Information Agency, the scaling back of many of its functions, their transfer to the Department of State, and the establishment of a new Broadcasting Board of Governors, a separate agency governing all U.S. international broadcasting. U.S. libraries abroad were closed. America Houses and American cultural centers were shut down. Many language services at the Voice of America ceased broadcasting. Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) was reduced significantly in size, transferred from Germany to the Czech Republic, and its nonpareil research arms were dismantled. In a climate of enthusiasm for high-tech communications and a decreasing sense of need for human contacts, scores of U.S. diplomatic missions abroad were liquidated. All these actions and more were perpetrated by a bipartisan consensus representing a national sense that the collapse of Soviet communism meant that America would not have to worry about questions of war, peace, and foreign relations for quite some time to come.

The 1990s also witnessed a severe reduction of U.S. capabilities in psychological operations and political warfare. The armed forces’ and intelligence agencies’ institutional memory of counterinsurgency warfare capabilities had long since evaporated. The academic community, in opposition to the Vietnam War, withheld its cooperation with the U.S. government on many elements of national security policy, not the least of which was the application of cultural anthropology to strategic planning. Having suffered the major purge

of its Operations Directorate in the 1970s, the CIA was subjected to yet another such purge at the hands of CIA Director John Deutch, who fired 2,400 experienced case officers from the clandestine service. In combination with the retirement of any remaining experts in political and ideological warfare, this action served to gut not only a huge part of the service's human intelligence-gathering capabilities but whatever remained of institutional memory in those public diplomacy functions relevant to the intelligence community.

Most recently—and most incredibly—the rise of anti-Americanism worldwide has been met with consistent failures in U.S. public diplomacy policy. The leadership in the Department of State has been poor, inconsistent, or absent—one Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy served for only a year and a half, the successor for only six months, with no successor for another fourteen months. In the last year of the Bush Administration, the appointment of James Glassman, a figure who demonstrated a strategic understanding of the field, brought a welcome change to the post, but it was regrettably short-lived. There has been a systematic lack of contact with and neglect of the recommendations of the only institutional advocate within the U.S. Government of these strategic functions: the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy (not to mention those recommendations of other commissions and research institutions). The resources are grossly insufficient for the tasks at hand, and strategic interagency coordination is almost completely absent, especially where it is most necessary: at the White House and National Security Council level. There is a widespread failure to include the activities of numerous other government agencies (not usually understood to be “public diplomacy agencies,” despite their important public diplomacy functions) in the process of strategic public diplomacy policy-making and implementation, e.g., the CIA and whatever political action arm it retains, USAID, the Peace Corps,

and the international affairs offices of many agencies working principally on domestic policy issues. Ironically, there has been a severe reduction of visas for visits or study in the U.S. for foreigners from countries posing no terrorist threat. At the same time, the implementation of “public opinion impact analysis” into other elements of foreign and military policymaking is practically non-existent—this has been particularly noteworthy in the failure to analyze the potential impact various policy actions might have on enhancing the ability of terrorist groups to make new recruits.

Public diplomacy is simply not being integrated with other instruments of statecraft. There has been a widespread failure to utilize cultural diplomats and other public diplomats as sources of information and political analysis of foreign political conditions, not to mention the systematic failure to utilize “opportunities intelligence” and “cultural intelligence” to maximize the enhanced effectiveness of attempts to exploit political opportunities through public diplomacy, political action, psychological strategy, and political warfare.⁵ The four-year delay in the incorporation of serious public diplomacy and cultural anthropological components to the counterinsurgency wars in Iraq and Afghanistan was finally reversed by the leadership of the Army and Marine Corps, especially Generals David Petraeus and Raymond Odierno, and the Army’s development of the Human Terrain System, designed to rebuild a base of applicable knowledge of cultural, political, social, economic, public opinion, and ethnographic conditions at the local level in both countries. U.S. government agencies, save, to a very limited extent, our broadcast services, failed to hire experts in ideological warfare or to develop a political war-

5. Please see Chapter 7 below for further discussion of opportunities intelligence. For a thorough analysis of the concept of cultural intelligence, please see: Juliana Geran Pilon (ed.), *Cultural Intelligence for Winning the Peace* (Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009).

fare capability in any agency of the government—even when President Bush was declaring that the U.S. was engaged in a “war of ideas.”

To make matters worse, international broadcasting has been effectively divorced—by legislation—from service to U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives by giving the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) an executive policy-making role that has been, for most practical purposes, independent from national policy. Although, during the Bush Administration, the BBG did expand the quantity of broadcasts to the Middle East by initiating two stations carrying mostly music programming to the Arab world and Iran, as well as new Arabic television broadcasts, the political and intellectual quality of the overall U.S. international broadcasting effort was hurt by the BBG’s closing down of many language services in the Voice of America, including, incredibly, the Worldwide English service and the Arabic service. These decisions reflect a commercial mentality among too many members of the Broadcasting Board of Governors that has focused principally on audience size at the expense of attention to the content of political messages and their delivery to targeted groups. Meanwhile, there is a misguided philosophy that “independent journalism” in our publicly-run international broadcasting services, divorced from any conscious purpose to serve U.S. national interests, will end up serving those interests best—as if by an “Invisible Hand.”⁶

The lack of integration of public diplomacy with other instruments of statecraft is perhaps most evident in the general consistent failure to develop a public diplomacy strategy, despite repeated calls for such a strategy by the Government Accountability Office. A strategy worthy of the name emerged in 2007, but its future remains

6. See chapter 5 below for further discussion of these issues. For a most worthy critique of the philosophy advocating the “independent journalism” approach, see, Carnes Lord, *Losing Hearts and Minds?*, pp.58-60.

uncertain.⁷ The failure to hire a significant cadre of experts with public diplomacy skills in U.S. Government agencies, to test personnel for competence in these skills, to promote personnel on the basis of demonstrated excellence in these skills, to develop strategic career paths for such personnel, and to educate current personnel in the various relevant fields⁸ remains unaddressed.

This ongoing failure to influence world opinion, including public opinion among our allies, during the “Global War on Terror” became so obvious that so many well-established institutions that usually neglect public diplomacy and its related arts of political influence felt constrained to issue the various aforementioned reports on the failure and absence of U.S. capabilities in this area.

7. See the exposé of this failure in the succession of readings in J. Michael Waller, *The Public Diplomacy Reader* (Washington, D.C., The Institute of World Politics Press, 2007), pp. 377-466. Whether the 2007 strategy will be properly staffed, funded, and executed well into the future remains to be seen. If this strategy was developed mostly by career diplomats, there is some chance that it might find some life in the Administration of Barack Obama. If it depended entirely on political appointees installed late in the Bush Administration, its chances of future life may well be limited, unless new political appointees can maintain or constructively modify it.

8. It should be observed here that the Department of State and other foreign affairs agencies have no equivalent to the professional schools run by the armed forces, nor do they use civilian academic institutions to supply the badly-needed professional education.

The Knowledge Problem: The Failure to Understand Integrated Strategy and All the Dimensions of Political Influence

So many of the episodes and examples in this brief history shed light on two central problems afflicting U.S. foreign policy in general and public diplomacy in particular: 1) the lack of widespread knowledge of how public diplomacy produces political influence of strategic significance, and 2) the failure to understand that foreign policy success requires a fully integrated strategic approach—one which incorporates the full spectrum of the instruments of power and influence, most notably those of public diplomacy.

Lack of knowledge of all the instruments of political influence and of how they work

There is little evidence that most practitioners and even scholars of foreign and national security policy appear to understand all the instruments involved in full-spectrum diplomacy—particularly those of public diplomacy—and how they work. While it is difficult to prove what people do not know, one must come to this sorry conclusion on the basis of the observation that these instruments have been systematically neglected, under-funded, almost never studied as part of professional education in foreign policy and national security, and rarely cited as ever having had an impact of strategic importance. Insofar as some authorities may disagree with the proposition

that public diplomatic instruments have had such a strategic impact, there is no literature to this writer's knowledge that makes this argument. Therefore, one can only conclude that the entire field has been subject to neglect born of ignorance and, perhaps, to some extent, of political discomfort with the subject.

When arguments are made about major historic events, the role of public diplomacy is rarely discussed, much less attributed any strategic significance. In a specific case such as the collapse of the Soviet empire, few analyses cite the importance of public diplomacy and the war of ideas.¹ Instead, one set of analyses attributes little influence to U.S. foreign policy, preferring to give credit to Soviet Communist Party General Secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev, as a reformer. Another set of analyses cites the various aforementioned material reasons such as: "spending the Kremlin to death in the arms race," using the Strategic Defense Initiative as the decisive trump card that precipitated the collapse of Soviet will to remain militarily competitive, economic pressures such as the inducement of a decline in oil prices to deprive the Kremlin of hard currency, technology denial programs, the war in Afghanistan, etc. Only occasionally does one hear about the visit of Pope John Paul II to Poland and his use of religious and broader spiritual influences to inspire the Solidarity movement. There is also the occasional reference to the war of ideas. But there are few studies indeed, that fully explicate how that war of ideas was fought and by whom. The rarity of such studies can only reveal that there is certainly no consensus that public diplomacy had a decisive strategic impact. A reader of the larger part of the literature on this subject, then, would probably wonder

1. It is beyond the scope of this study to review the entire, vast, authoritative literature on this subject, or to review the even larger conventional wisdom on the same subject as manifested in journalistic articles, op-ed pieces, and the rhetoric of politicians.

why the first president of post-Soviet Czechoslovakia, Vaclav Havel, on his first official visit to Washington, would make a special, virtual pilgrimage to the Voice of America to thank its staff for its decisive role in helping the Czechs and Slovaks achieve their new-found freedom. Why, from him, was there no word of thanks to the Department of State for all the arms control treaties and summit meetings with Kremlin leaders that dominated all news reporting about East-West diplomacy for decades? Could it be that journalists, too, failed to understand the ingredients of full spectrum diplomacy?

Of course, it is true that the historic collapse of the Soviet empire could indeed be attributed in part to the various material influences as well as to the internal dynamics of the Soviet system.² But the full impact of those influences cannot be fully understood without recognizing the political ideological context in which they appeared and how they affected the ideological underpinnings of the Soviet regime. The brief history related above makes reference to an integrated strategic plan to undermine the legitimacy of the communist regimes and, in the process, weaken those regimes from within by, among other things, emboldening domestic resistance to communist rule.³ But to understand how this plan and its ideological/public diplomacy component worked, one would have to have sufficient knowledge to answer several questions: What difference does legitimacy make to the security of communist rule?

2. This writer has discussed some of those dynamics in *The Sources of Soviet Perestroika* (Ashland, OH: Ashland University Ashbrook Center, 1990). These include a crisis of the legitimacy of the Party.

3. This plan was codified in NSDD-75, the Presidential directive signed by President Reagan in 1983. Its public diplomacy dimension—particularly its ideological component—was explained by the President in his Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty interview of June 14, 1985. To this writer's knowledge, no historian of the period has yet uncovered and cited this interview as a revealing indicator of President Reagan's public diplomacy strategy.

How did the Soviet regime and its satellites legitimize their rule? How does one go about undermining their principle of legitimacy? The answers to these questions, in turn, require knowledge of several other things: first, the importance of legitimacy to the internal security of Soviet-style systems; second, Marxist-Leninist ideology and its role in the internal security of such political systems; third, the main ideological principle that justified Communist Party rule, namely, the principle embodied by the dictum “freedom is comprehended necessity”—a principle enshrined into practical politics by Marx’s lesson on theory and practice, which stated, essentially, that a philosopher’s job is not to contemplate and interpret the world but to change it,⁴ and which, when properly exposed, reveals a gnosticism that rendered its proponents remarkably politically vulnerable;⁵ fourth, knowledge of the role that Soviet foreign policy played in verifying the validity of the ideology, and therefore of the legitimacy of Communist Party rule and its internal security; fifth, an understanding of the vulnerabilities of the ideology and the ideologically-based party system. Without competent knowledge of these things, one could neither conduct an effective war of ideas nor develop a strategy that applied appropriate material pressures that could take advantage of ideological and systemic vulnerabilities. As a participant in policy-making during the Cold War, I must testify to the scant knowledge

4. Karl Marx, “Theses on Feuerbach,” in Robert C. Tucker (ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*, (New York: WW Norton & Company, 1972) p. 109.

5. One example of this intellectual incapacity as witnessed by this writer was the complete intellectual and operational failure of the Department of State to respond to a legislative amendment in the mid-1980s that requested that the Department submit to Congress an analysis of its understanding of Leninist strategy as undertaken by the USSR. While there may have been individuals in the Department capable of writing such an analysis, those assigned to the task demonstrated no competent knowledge of the subject).

among large segments of the foreign policy community concerning these subjects.

When it comes to knowledge of the different elements of public diplomacy and how they work, one can admit to the possibility that some segments of the foreign policy community do recognize their importance. The plethora of external studies and commission reports attest to this. But almost all of these analyses come from outside the government. And then within those reports, which reflect the best of the foreign policy community's knowledge of these matters, there appears to be substantial neglect of various elements in the spectrum of public diplomatic instruments, notably their political, ideological, and psychological warfare dimensions at the "hard" end of the spectrum and cultural diplomacy at the "soft" end. The neglect of, and more properly, the antipathy toward, these "harder" elements is well known and explained elsewhere in this study. But what is remarkable is the neglect of cultural diplomacy and ignorance of how it works and the strategic impact that it can have. It is not unfair to make a sweeping generalization that virtually all sectors of the foreign policy and national security communities view cultural diplomacy as having relatively marginal, if any, strategic importance in comparison to the more obvious instruments of full spectrum diplomacy.

One can enumerate a few examples of what is almost never articulated or recommended in national-level grand strategy outside of selected cultural diplomatic circles, and therefore what is likely not properly understood. First come the lessons about the relationship between beauty, truth, and goodness, as the ancient philosophers taught but are all but unknown to modern generations, and how those lessons, when applied in practice, can have powerful public diplomatic influence. Next comes the understanding of how various cultural diplomatic initiatives entail ways of conducting

international relations without either a *quid pro quo* or any proximate, specific, diplomatic, commercial, or military goals, and yet can have enormously positive political effects. Then there is the understanding of how cultural diplomatic initiatives can serve as a powerful immunization against hostile propaganda—without having to conduct counter-propaganda—and the related knowledge of how cultural diplomacy produces political results by “cultivating the soil” of foreign audiences to make them more susceptible to receiving political messages in the future as well as how various cultural diplomatic methods can psychologically disarm foreign adversaries. In certain respects, these examples may well comprise a part of a hidden iceberg of full spectrum diplomatic operations only whose tip has been acknowledged in official diplomatic circles. More examples of the knowledge problem appear below.⁶

Lack of knowledge of integrated strategy

The second part of the “knowledge problem” is the failure to understand integrated strategy—particularly the strategic planning and coordination of all the instruments of statecraft. Indeed, a large part of the literature on “grand strategy” avoids systematic analysis of the use and integration of all these instruments.

The achievement of foreign policy goals requires a multiplicity of means that can be likened to instruments in an orchestra. The problem with the regnant foreign policy culture and the subcultures within various relevant agencies and Congressional committees is that only some instruments receive national strategic attention and requisite funding while others remain neglected, even though the “music” of our overall foreign policy depends on all the instruments and their proper coordination. In the ac-

6. My detailed analysis of the influence effects specifically of cultural diplomacy can be found in my essay, *Cultural Diplomacy, Political Influence, and Integrated Strategy*, op. cit., which appears as an appendix to this study.

tual playing of the music, what we hear for the most part is the loud, and sometimes even virtuoso, playing of the trumpets and at other times the violins—unfortunately even at those moments in the symphony when we should be hearing the woodwinds and the harp.⁷ This situation is partly due to the absence of political constituencies (thus, for example, weapons programs have large constituencies whereas diplomacy in its various forms has little to none). But it is also due to patterns of career incentives and a lack of education and professionalism.

One of the sources of this inability to effect an integrated strategic approach is the relative lack of strategic thinking throughout the foreign affairs and national security community. At first glance this would seem not to be a problem. After all, most people in the field do tactical work and few of them are ever called to be grand strategists. They fly airplanes, procure weapons and logistical materiel, conduct diplomatic negotiations, recruit agents to supply intelligence, analyze pieces of the larger policy puzzles facing our national decision-makers, and so forth. Why should these soldiers, diplomats, intelligence officers, and analysts worry about grand strategy and be able to think strategically?

They must do so, because our national security and the preservation of peace requires keeping an eye on strategic goals no matter what tactical tasks one is assigned. This lesson is made abundantly clear by the way technology has created the phenomenon of the “strategic corporal”—whereby the speed of decision-making has compelled crucial decisions to be made at ever-lower levels, so that even the actions of a lone warrior—especially in an era of report-

7. This musical metaphor for the conduct of integrated strategy forms much of the conceptual basis for the founding of the The Institute of World Politics, the graduate school with which I am associated, and which teaches the many arts of statecraft that make up the “orchestra” of our national strategy.

ers “embedded” with military units and 24-hour global news coverage—can have a strategic impact. Under such circumstances, even ordinary soldiers must have some capacity to think strategically.

If government agencies did their jobs with an eye to achieving national strategic goals, the inclination of those agencies to work principally for their own bureaucratic agendas and at cross purposes with other agencies would be minimized. As a result of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the Defense Department has absorbed this lesson better than other agencies and has stressed greater collaborative work among the various armed services. The Department’s emphasis on “Joint Operations”—coordinated operations working toward common goals—has reduced the ill effects of “inter-service rivalries” that in the past have pitted, for example, the Navy against the Air Force in competition for the development of new fighter aircraft. This new strategic coordination has made possible the truly powerful force that overthrew the Taliban in Afghanistan and toppled Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

Outside the Defense Department, however, much more work must be done, and the job may be more difficult to achieve than in the Pentagon, because at least there, it is possible for a central authority to enforce greater strategic collaboration.

One of the main obstacles to greater collaborative work among all the relevant agencies is the cultural division within the foreign affairs and national security community. This community suffers from a bifurcation between a culture of “hard power” and another apparent culture of “soft power.” The first consists of guns, money and, to some extent, espionage (mostly of the technical variety). The second consists of such things as dialogue, negotiations, mutual understanding, and, to the limited extent that the “soft power” culture (insofar as it exists as such) chooses to include it, political and cultural influence.

The “hard power” culture tends to fancy itself as the one community that is serious about strategy. It is generally the only culture that uses the term “grand strategy.” It sees its focus on armed force, economic power, and technical intelligence as the most important elements in our ability to protect ourselves in a dangerous world. Emphasizing a philosophy of peace through strength, it tends to measure strength materially: in terms of tangible economic, technological and military assets. It tends to criticize the culture of diplomacy as prone to sentimentality; unwarranted dependence on often-unreliable allies; undue respect for world opinion; “clientitis” (the tendency to “go native”—to begin to represent the interests of foreign powers rather than defending U.S. interests in foreign countries); loss of confidence in its own mission; willful blindness and wishful thinking about the evil nature of America’s adversaries; excessive attention to what are perceived to be strategically peripheral activities, such as foreign aid, cultural exchange, work in international organizations; etc. This hard power culture tends to be impatient with the diplomatic process, especially when the instruments of hard power are seen to enable quicker results. Diplomacy is sometimes all the more mistrusted insofar as it is seen as frequently offering a way for our enemies to distract, confuse and delay us so that they can gain strength and strategic assets which can cost lives when the diplomacy ultimately fails. Finally, the hard power culture tends sometimes to see public diplomacy as an obstacle to unilateral American action—particularly military action—insofar as it concerns itself with the impact of American action on foreign opinion and the consequences to alliances, intelligence sources, and foreign cooperation when that opinion turns adverse.⁸

8. It should be noted that the hard power culture is not synonymous with the armed forces, elements of which are assuredly subsumed within this culture, but

In opposition to the hard power culture, one might posit the existence of a “soft power culture.” There is a problem, here, however. There really does not exist a coherent culture of this type in Washington, since such a culture, properly constituted, would comprise all the instruments of “soft power,” including some which most members of the putative soft power culture would not include as legitimate instruments within their purview (these would include such things as psychological strategy and political/ideological warfare). Another part of the problem is that most people within the soft power culture do not conceive of the tools at their disposal as instruments of “power.” What passes for a soft power culture, then, may best be described as a “diplomatic” culture—one with a very narrow understanding of what constitutes diplomacy: i.e., that which places the highest priority on reporting, consultations, and negotiations with foreign governments—as opposed to a concept of full spectrum diplomatic operations.

The putative soft power culture, then, tends to see itself as the morally superior way of dealing with the world. It tends to eschew the instruments of coercion in the belief that peace is best achieved through negotiations, dialogue, better mutual understanding, establishment of relationships of trust, and the pursuit of justice. It often sees the hard power advocates as too wont to use force as a first, rather than a last, resort. And pursuant to this critique, it distinguishes between wars (or armed interventions) of necessity versus those of choice. It tends to criticize the hard power advocates for indiscriminately demonizing foreign adversaries rather than seeing them as human beings with needs, rights, fears, and aspirations deserving of respect. Its ideal focus is conflict prevention or at least avoidance. It prefers to address the political root causes of conflicts rather than using force to address the violent symptoms of those conflicts. It tends to

other elements of which straddle both the hard and soft power cultures.

focus on various paths to conflict resolution through compromise with, or finding face-saving solutions for, foreign adversaries rather than seeking unconditional victory—all in the interest of minimizing grudges and the perpetuation of mutual hostility. At least to some extent, it sees foreign opinion as having significant political impact and believes that neglect of this opinion can only result in aggravated relations with the rest of the world.

While the hard power culture has incorporated the only serious strategic planning that occurs within our government—the process that produces the Defense Department’s budget and resultant arms acquisitions and military deployments—it has traditionally suffered from serious neglect of the non-military instruments of national power and influence. Thus, the “grand strategy” which is entertained by many in this culture is not so grand after all—so long as it is missing entire sections of the “orchestra”—and this even includes neglect of instruments within the hard power culture’s half of the orchestra. So, for example, the psychological-political dimension of the military art has historically been a tertiary consideration in the Defense Department. For years, mastery of psycho-political operations has not been a requirement for achieving the rank of general. The political and diplomatic work of civil military operations or special operations forces such as the Green Berets has been misunderstood and underemphasized. The art of counterinsurgency has perennially been neglected and especially so in the last three decades as a result of a mistaken notion that these methods failed during the Vietnam War.⁹ Only after a painful experience with the multiple insurgencies in Iraq, have our armed forces begun to redress this situation.

9. For an excellent history of the American experience in irregular and counterinsurgency warfare and the consistent propensity of our armed forces to forget its painfully acquired lessons in this field, see John Tierney, Jr., *Chasing Ghosts*, (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, Inc., 2006).

Just as Defense Department-oriented public diplomacy functions have been misunderstood within the hard power culture, there has been a parallel tendency to misunderstand the vital strategic importance of many of the other instruments of soft power, be they diplomacy, cultural relations, other forms of public diplomacy, the methods of political warfare, or others. It is forgotten that, as Sun Tzu wrote two thousand years ago, to defeat the enemy without the use of armed force is “the pinnacle of excellence.”¹⁰

Segments of the hard power culture tend to be careless about handling allies and are intolerant of unwilling allies, seeing many of them as obstacles that are ultimately unnecessary to the success of our national strategic goals. Allies are often seen as requiring a “lowest common denominator” policy that weakens the effectiveness in the application of power and the achievement of victory in conflict. Those who have harbored such attitudes forget Winston Churchill’s dictum that the only thing worse than having allies is not having any.

Segments of the hard power culture have also had the inclination—which is often psychologically and strategically necessary in wartime—to portray and see the adversary as faceless and inhuman. This tendency, however, can prove counterproductive when the nature of a conflict requires our forces to deal with a civilian population or to take advantage of rifts in the enemy camp. Failure to treat that population with dignity and respect can alienate people who otherwise might be allies or at least neutral. Had Hitler understood this lesson, one could argue that he would have conquered the Soviet Union. In Iraq, it is clear that the Army and Marines have indeed learned it successfully.

10. Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, translated, with introductions and commentary by Ralph D. Sawyer, (New York, Barnes & Noble Books, 1994) p. 177.

Meanwhile, the soft power culture suffers from its own misunderstandings. Perhaps one of its principal conceptual failures is to recognize that the various forms of diplomacy, dialogue, and engagement are forms of power in the first place. This is illustrated by its inability to incorporate into its repertoire other related instruments such as “offensive diplomacy,”¹¹ political action, political warfare, psychological strategy, and perceptions management—especially counter-propaganda. This is of a piece with its tendency to neglect the integration of its diplomatic work with the instruments of hard power. And these tendencies are due all too often to a failure to think strategically. Indeed, the concept of grand strategy (and even the very use of the term) is almost entirely missing from this culture.

In light of all this, it should be clear that grand strategy cannot possess all the connotations of being truly “grand” unless it includes, directs, and integrates all the instruments of statecraft.

It should be understood that the descriptions of the two cultures above are admittedly caricatures drawn for pedagogical purposes. Nevertheless, the rift and frequent mistrust between these two broader cultures is a reality that afflicts foreign policy debates. But however much the critiques that each side has toward the other have significant validity, the fact that the two cultures remain

11. This is a concept that appears to be all-too-absent from the theory and practice of traditional diplomacy. It refers to diplomatic engagement (dialogue and negotiations) in a conflict situation—engagement, depending on the circumstances, that is generally intended as a substitute for other forms of conflict such as economic sanctions or war. Such diplomacy may be specifically designed to gather political intelligence, psychologically disarm our opponents, create divisions within their ranks, disorient them and divert them from their strategy and tactics, derail their strategic momentum, shift the arena of conflict to more propitious terrain, and even, if necessary, deceive them about our intentions, strategy, or tactics.

as far apart as they are impedes our nation's ability to develop and implement a coherent, integrated national security strategy. And the failure to understand all the arts of statecraft that must be comprehended in an integrated strategy has prevented the effective development of a separate doctrine and policy for the most neglected element of that strategy: public diplomacy and, thus, ultimately, full spectrum diplomacy.

If the United States is to realize success in the contest for foreign public opinion and our efforts to have greater political influence in the world, three things are required: 1) greater knowledge and professionalism in all the arts of diplomacy, specifically those concerning public diplomacy broadly understood; 2) a conceptual sea change in strategic thinking that can bridge the gap between the hard power and soft power cultures and, in so doing, significantly increase our ability to protect our vital interests while minimizing the need to use violence to do so; and 3) a revision of the structures and institutional priorities (particularly the importance of public diplomacy institutions) within the U.S. government that reflects such a conceptual sea change. It is the latter issue to which we now turn.

The Structural Problem: The Absence of a Supportive Culture, Strategic Planning, and Interagency Integration for Public Diplomacy

Since the strategic neglect of public diplomacy in all its dimensions lies at the heart of the failure of integrated strategy, any attempt to reform the U.S. foreign policy-making structure must address the centrality of this issue.

There are three principal structural problems that lie at the root of the inadequacy of strategic attention devoted to public diplomacy: The first is the absence of institutional *loci* with sufficient cultural commitment to public diplomacy and with concomitantly sufficient influence within the overall foreign policy apparatus of the government. The absence of any centralized strategic planning and coordination of public diplomacy functions at the senior levels of the various foreign affairs and defense agencies in general and among their various public diplomacy offices in particular is second. The third is the absence of systematic strategic integration of public diplomacy with other arts of statecraft.

Solutions to each of these problems cannot but elevate the strategic importance and impact of public diplomacy on U.S. national security policy, create an influence culture in American foreign policy, and enhance the overall strategic integration of all the instruments of statecraft.

The absence of institutional cultures supportive of public diplomacy

The first of the three problems has been the general rule within the U.S. government even when the U.S. Information Agency existed and the CIA was involved in political action. Even during those halcyon days, public diplomacy was still regarded as a second-class citizen by the larger diplomatic community. This is explained by the normal, creative tension that exists between traditional, government-to-government diplomacy on the one hand and public diplomacy on the other. Traditional diplomats almost always put priority on achieving and maintaining good, or at least correct, relations with foreign governments. To them, public diplomacy often means going over the heads of the government to the people, an act that can upset governments, particularly those whose relations with their people may be characterized by fear and mistrust.

Traditionally, under the President's guidance, the Department of State has played the principal role in making and enforcing foreign policy. Because of the Department's priority on government-to-government relations, it rarely takes the initiative on public diplomacy policy. And it has always subordinated public affairs officers and other public diplomats stationed abroad to the policy priorities of the Department's regional and functional bureaus concerned primarily with government-to-government relations. When the USIA existed, that agency was the principal locus of de facto public diplomacy policy-making. But when a public diplomatic policy issue emerged that conflicted with a traditional diplomatic policy matter under the State Department's jurisdiction, the latter would assert primacy over overall policy-making, and almost always the conflict between the public diplomatic initiative and the State Department priority would be resolved in State's favor.

An example of this arose during the Cold War when a broadcast over the Bulgarian service of the Voice of America supportive of human rights for the Bulgarian people gave offense to the Bulgarian communist government.¹ The Bulgarian foreign minister called in the American ambassador to protest vehemently the offensive broadcast as a severe irritant to good bilateral relations. The U.S. ambassador was mortified by the criticism, apologized for the offense, returned to the embassy, and shot off a cable to the State Department urging that it censor the Bulgarian VOA broadcasts in such a fashion that bilateral relations would no longer be harmed. While, in this case, the censorship effort did not fully succeed, it may well have had a chilling effect on future broadcasts.

An anecdote of a similar broadcast by the BBC had the British ambassador apologize to the communist foreign minister, proffering the excuse that the BBC is an independent service beyond the reach of the influence of the Foreign Office, and try as he and his colleagues may, their efforts to tame BBC broadcasts in the interest of better bilateral relations were always in vain. In this example, British foreign policy was able to maintain both correct bilateral relations as well as remain connected to the public of the country in question—a worthy example of integrated strategy. Unfortunately, the absence of any culture of integrated strategy in the Department of State makes the success of one of its vital instruments considerably more problematic.

When USIA existed, it did harbor within it a culture supportive of the public diplomatic mission. Within its ranks could be found heroic officials, who, despite knowing that their career choice significantly reduced their chances of reaching ambassadorial rank, made the personal sacrifice to serve the higher cause of this decisive instrument of national power. Ironically, their efforts would be

1. This example is a recollection from the author's experience in government.

occasionally thwarted when traditional diplomats would find temporary posting within the Agency and would influence public diplomatic practice with their concentration on avoiding aggravations of government-to-government relations.

The liquidation of the USIA only exacerbated the problem (not to mention the closure of many consulates, libraries, and other American public diplomatic institutions worldwide). When the deed was perpetrated by bipartisan consensus, based on arguments in Congress that USIA was no longer necessary, as it was nothing more than a “Cold War propaganda agency,” the Agency’s functions were transferred to the State Department to be run by a new Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy. Now, public diplomacy was to descend from second-class citizen status to what arguably was third-class citizenship—for, now, ensconced in an institutional culture of traditional diplomacy, it would be even more difficult for a public diplomatic culture to develop and flourish.

What is it about the State Department that makes the success of public diplomacy so difficult? The answer lies in an institutional culture, which, as mentioned earlier, places primacy on four elements: reporting; bilateral and multilateral consultations; diplomatic process, such as negotiations and dialogue; and the secrecy that necessarily attends such functions—a secrecy that militates against the overt nature of most public diplomatic activity. Career advancement has been wholly dependent on conformity with these priorities. Diplomats stationed abroad traditionally spend most of their time consulting with ministries of their host country’s government, reading the local press, attending diplomatic receptions, and reporting on bilateral relations and local political-strategic conditions in routine cables to Washington. Rarely do these diplomats visit with the editors of local newspapers, educators, cultural figures, religious leaders, business leaders, provincial leaders, and so forth.

There are some exceptions. Under the “transformational diplomacy” initiative of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, there was greater emphasis on these types of contacts, and some embassy staffs were assigned public diplomatic functions—usually by political appointee ambassadors. An example is the program of visits to localities throughout Estonia by Ambassador Aldona Wos from 2005 to 2007. In this program, Ambassador Wos assigned teams made up of embassy officers—no matter what their function (thus, even administrative officers, for example, were included)—and foreign service nationals (Estonians working in the U.S. embassy) to travel to every local jurisdiction in the country, paying visits to mayors, provincial governors, high schools, and local newspapers. Ambassador Wos would invite the two top students in a high school she recently visited along with their teacher to a U.S. embassy reception, where they were treated as the guests of honor. The program was a spectacular success, winning favorable local press coverage and many new friends for America at a time of considerable alienation toward America as a result of the Iraq War, even in this very pro-American country.² This kind of program, however, will remain an exception so long as the overall culture of the Department continues to place traditional diplomacy over public diplomacy.

There is another dimension of U.S. foreign policy-making that contributes to the failure to create an influence culture. This has been the extraordinary absence of interagency consideration of overall political strategy toward individual countries or regions of the world. As a rule, policy toward individual countries is made incrementally over time and encompasses continuities such as alliance, commercial, or other special relationships, as well as changes

2. Kelly Adams Smith, “Embassy Outreach Targets Estonian Grass Roots,” *State* magazine, May 2005, pp. 20-21.

brought about mostly by the force of external events and only rarely by strategic forethought.

In this context, it is always easy to convene a meeting of the National Security Council or one or another of the most senior interagency groups—such as that of the Undersecretaries of the relevant agencies—for the purpose of planning a new military assistance package for a major client state, for Presidential participation in a major economic conference such as the G-8, or for a new negotiating initiative in one of the world's most contentious arenas of conflict. But it almost never happens that there should be an interagency macro-strategic review of U.S. policy toward, say, a major country like China, or a strategic area of the world such as the Caucasus and the Caspian Basin. When component elements of policy toward such countries or regions are being formulated, it is often assumed that there is interagency consensus of what the overall national political objectives are toward such countries and regions. And yet, such a consensus often does not exist among various agencies or even between the White House and the State Department.

Since a large part of the job of the Department of State is to be the main custodian of existing policy, it serves as a force of continuity of American policy. The bureaucratic character of the Department protects existing policies and makes them difficult to be radically or capriciously changed by a new President and his or her political appointees whose frequent inclination is to serve as force of change in policy, sometimes in response to the views of the electorate. The constructive tension between these forces of continuity and change is healthy and as it should be. In the absence of a strong National Security Council or Defense Department challenge to existing policy, then, the Department will serve as the dominant policy-making force. Its inclination, as a force of continuity, is not to invite macro-strategic reviews of policy, thereby to give an opening

to other agencies to greater influence. As a result, in the absence of such interagency review, the public diplomacy component of the overall strategic policy is almost never considered.

Greater understanding of the scope of the cultural problem can be gained if one visualizes the State Department as a Department of Government-to-Government Diplomacy and not a Department of Foreign Policy. To repeat: if an element of foreign policy is not included in its budget, the Department does not concern itself with that element. Hence, for example, there is effectively no concern at the Department with the activities of the Peace Corps, the institutions that comprise National Endowment for Democracy,³ the international broadcasters, not to mention other forms of strategic influence, such as counter-propaganda; local civic action, psychological strategy, and information operations in theaters of war; religious-ideological influence, and so forth.

An example of a function of strategic importance that remains neglected by the State Department's institutional culture of traditional diplomacy is America's engagement in the competition of ideas worldwide. Although President George W. Bush declared that the United States is in a "war of ideas," which agency of the government makes it its business to conduct such a war? One would think that this would be the responsibility of the Department that handles foreign policy. But the Department of State has persistently failed to take on this function in any serious way. To do so would necessitate hiring or developing experts in ideological warfare. Such experts would have to be knowledgeable about the history of wars of ideas,

3. These include: the National Endowment for Democracy itself, and its subsidiary organizations, the Republican Party's International Republican Institute, the Democratic Party's National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's Center for International Private Enterprise, and the AFL-CIO's American Center for International Labor Solidarity (formerly the American Institute for Free Labor Development).

the techniques of such wars, the ideas of the enemy, and the ideas which have to be used as weapons—and those may either be: 1) the ideas of democratic capitalism, the ideas underlying the American system of government and civic culture; and the philosophical foundations of the Western, Greco-Roman-Judeo-Christian political-moral-cultural tradition (the ignorance of which, due to the failure of liberal arts education in America, is pandemic⁴); or 2) the ideas of the enemies of our enemies (and here one might include the ideas and theology of politically moderate Moslems who wish that their faith would be treated more as a religion—focused on matters of the spirit and, hence, capable of coexisting peacefully with other faiths—than a radical, political ideology bent on achieving secular political objectives.

Unfortunately, in the past four decades at least, the Foreign Service has never made it a strategic priority to recruit experts who demonstrate excellence in the knowledge of these subjects.⁵ And even if anyone in the Service were to develop such expertise independently—and be allowed to use it—the patterns of diplomatic deployments are such that this knowledge would soon go to waste as the officer is reassigned to another, completely unrelated posting.

4. See, for example, the study conducted by the University of Connecticut of the knowledge of civics by students in fifty elite colleges and universities in the United States. The study found that college seniors know no more about civics than do college freshmen and that college graduates achieve only 13 percent better in tests on the subject than do high school graduates. The study concludes that college education does little to advance knowledge of civics in modern America. *The Coming Crisis in Citizenship: Higher Education's Failure to Teach America's History and Institutions*, a joint study by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute and the University of Connecticut's Department of Public Policy, 2006.

5. For a general discussion of the failure to recruit appropriate personnel for public diplomacy, see U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, 2008 Annual Report.

The situation is further aggravated by the lack of willingness to acknowledge the strategic role of religion in the current conflict and to confront the enemy in that arena. It is as if our government utterly failed to realize that religious/ideological doctrines lie at the heart of what is arguably the central front in the war against terrorist extremism: the process where new terrorists are recruited. Unless this fact is acknowledged and acted upon, U.S. policy toward Islamist extremism will continue to be nothing more than a policy of addressing the symptoms rather than key causes of terrorist action. The reluctance to engage in this arena is based partly on ignorance of the ideological and religious doctrines involved and partly on misguided legal judgments that to engage in any dispute involving faith is to violate the Constitutional prohibition against establishing an official state religion. The fact remains that we are engaged in a conflict that originates in a foreign ideological landscape and takes place principally in foreign lands. It is a conflict that we did not choose but which has been thrust upon us. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us clinically to diagnose the sources of the aggression against America and address them on their own terms—national security and common sense demand it.

There was some evidence that, under the leadership of the Bush Administration's last Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, James Glassman, public diplomacy and its ideological and religious dimensions were treated as a strategic priority. Although he was in office only a short time, his public statements indicated a greater sensitivity to the war of ideas than has been harbored by any senior foreign policy official in recent years.⁶ Under his leadership, much more active and optimal use was made of two interagency committees: the first being the Policy Coordinating Committee on Strategic Com-

6. See, for example, his "Briefing on U.S. Public Diplomacy and the War of Ideas," October 28, 2008: <http://www.state.gov/r/us/2008/111372.htm>.

munications (with an NSC representative as Vice Chairman); and the second being the Global Strategic Engagement Center, which contains representatives from the State and Defense Departments and the intelligence community. These are major structural improvements that reflect the strategic importance of the ideological war. However, whether former Under Secretary Glassman's vision of the tasks of public diplomacy can be realized and whether the resulting interagency structure can be retained, institutionalized, and optimized in the Obama Administration remains to be seen.

So, which other agency makes it a priority to hire, or to develop professionally, experts knowledgeable in these things? If anything, an occasional expert of this type might be found in one or another of our government's foreign broadcasting stations. However, where once, during the Cold War, these stations had a culture that prized such expertise, that culture subsequently eroded. After the end of the Cold War, the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), out of a concern for budgetary savings, eliminated or decimated several language services within the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty, where such a culture was strongest. For a number of years during the 1990s and early 2000s, it implemented a policy of audience development adopting a commercial philosophy, based on the broadcasting business backgrounds of key members of the Board, rather than a political-strategic one.

For example, the BBG eliminated the Arabic Service of the Voice of America on the grounds that it was reaching only two percent of its target audience, as though commercial success rather than achieving US foreign policy objectives were at stake. It substituted that service with Radio Sawa, a station most of whose programming consisted of rock music with a minimum of news or commentary—all designed to attract the largest demographic segment of the Arab world: those under 25 years old. The net result was that the BBG

substituted a youthful audience with little current political influence for the audience of the erstwhile Arabic Service, which consisted of the political and decision making elites of the Arab world, effectively retreating from the tightly contested foreign marketplace of ideas in favor of the indiscriminate—and strategically irrelevant—pursuit of the broadcasting market share. While the use of cultural products is a highly desirable method of strategic communication, and the cultivation of the successor generation is an essential part of a long-term public diplomacy strategy, the fact that this innovation was accompanied by the elimination of the main vehicle for current political and ideological influence was not only a matter of false economies—it also amounted to a political and cultural insult to the Arab elites: as former Voice of America Director Robert Reilly has argued, restricting most communication with the Arab world to a repertoire of rock music conveyed the message that Arab elites were no longer worthy of being engaged with us in intelligent policy conversation.⁷

To be sure, the BBG did establish another vehicle for strategic communication with the Arab world: Television Alhurra. Television broadcasting, however, has never been an instrument conducive to the communication of ideas with any meaningful depth. Ideas are less susceptible to being visually exploited. Television usually requires visual action with quick changes of subject in order to maintain a significant audience. And talking heads can be given only so much time to expound on matters of political and ideological complexity before large audiences abandon them in droves. Hence programming such as “PBS NewsHour” commands only the smallest of audiences. In the case of the Arab world, Alhurra has a special challenge: it must compete with the extraordinarily well-funded and popular Al-Jazeera. The fact that it exists is nevertheless

7. See Robert R. Reilly, “Brittney vs. the Terrorists,” *Washington Post*, February 9, 2007, p A19.

a positive development, as it is never too late to enter the fray over the interpretation of news and the larger war of ideas, even if television is not the optimal instrument for addressing the latter.

The fact that budgetary constraints have been a necessary consideration in the BBG's decision-making over the past decade and a half is a symptom of the absence of integrated strategic thinking about public diplomacy. The BBG is so small an agency, with so little political influence in the foreign policy-making circles of both the Executive and Legislative Branches, that on its own, no matter how healthy a public diplomatic culture it might have, it could never introduce a policy change that would radically increase its budgets—as the Defense Department can do during wartime. For our broadcasting services to flourish, and to receive the funds necessary to produce attractive, sophisticated, and ultimately, strategically effective programming that reaches all the necessary target audiences over time, it is necessary for their budgets to have the support and strategic attention of a decisive policy-making body—such as a “Department of Foreign Policy” or the National Security Council.

To place the BBG under the aegis of a larger foreign policy agency has a corollary logic. There has long existed a philosophy within the international broadcasting community that has rivaled the commercial mentality that has been regnant in recent years. This is the philosophy that good international broadcasting is nothing more and nothing less than “good journalism.” While accurate reporting is unexceptionable, and while credibility of broadcasts is the *sine qua non* of effectiveness in broadcasting, there are reasons why the U.S. government finds it in the national interest to sponsor international broadcasting stations rather than relying on the *New York Times*, CNN, or any of the other private news and entertainment media. This is because those media have commercial inter-

ests while the government has the national security interests of the United States.

U.S. government journalists, thus, have a different mission than do ordinary journalists. The missions of both kinds of journalists overlap, but nonetheless remain distinct. Private sector journalists compete for audiences in the free market; government journalists represent the interests of the United States in the not always free, strategically rather than commercially driven, international marketplace of ideas. It is for this reason that the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) once trained those of its journalists devoted to international broadcasting by teaching them that there are twenty ways to report a story objectively and that their task was to find the one of those twenty that best supported the interests of Great Britain.⁸ Without such guidance, certain types of objective reporting can be edited and presented in ways that are harmful to the reputation and the security interests of the United States. It is for such reasons that U.S. international broadcasters must be subject to overall U.S. foreign policy, which, if properly formulated, should contain a substantial, independent, and strategically integrated public diplomacy policy.

There are two other major agencies devoted to public diplomacy: the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps. While the work of each of these agencies has a strategic impact on foreign publics, it is often conducted in a way that is not coordinated with those other instruments of statecraft that would maximize its impact. Oftentimes, foreign assistance is invisible to foreign publics—as these agencies have historically not cultivated “force multiplying” capabilities to maximize its effect on foreign

8. This observation was shared with the author by Jan Nowak Jezioranski, former journalist with the BBC and subsequently Director of the Polish Service of Radio Free Europe.

public opinion.⁹ In another strategic dimension of their work, USAID and Peace Corps personnel often have greater knowledge of the local political and cultural terrain than either U.S. diplomats or military officers, and yet this expertise is often, if not usually, untapped for strategic purposes.

Another potential locus of a culture conducive to public diplomacy—understood, as explained above, in the broadest strategic sense of the term—is the Central Intelligence Agency. During the Cold War, particularly during the first two decades following World War II, the CIA developed a public diplomacy capability based on a culture of strategic influence. It hired, and cultivated, experts in foreign political influence and wars of ideas. However, in the period between the Church and Pike Committee hearings of the 1970s and the late 1980s, its ability to conduct political influence operations or ideological warfare was considerably weakened, and since the late 1980s, what was left has been severely constrained. Experts in these fields have passed away, retired, or been purged from the clandestine service. There remains virtually no institutional memory of the methods involved in these arts.

Thus, the agency finds itself in the position of having to re-invent the wheel. Whether it can do so successfully depends on two factors: its own institutional culture and sufficient levels of national-level strategic support. The culture of the CIA has been dominated mostly by the priorities of intelligence collection. Due to the attacks on counterintelligence and covert action by the Church and Pike Committees, those two vital functions became risky career paths with disproportionately fewer career rewards in comparison with intelligence collection. Expertise in strategic psychological operations, counter-propaganda, covert political influence, or ideological

9. Exceptions to this rule can be found, but they remain exceptions. See the example cited by Pilon, *Why America Is Such a Hard Sell*. pp. 249, 250.

warfare has not been the key to promotion to the highest levels of the Agency. The Global War on Terror may be changing these priorities, but this remains to be seen.

Similarly, whether the CIA has sufficient support from the President, the National Security Council, and the Congress to be effective in the necessarily covert methods of conducting these kinds of public diplomatic activities will depend on the conceptual framework dominant in these offices as well as the level of strategic attention they are willing to give to these issues—a matter that is beyond the CIA's control. Unfortunately, the manifest lack of attention in recent years to the larger panoply of public diplomatic instruments by the White House and Congress does not give one cause for optimism.

There is evidence from anecdotal reports that the CIA has developed some very effective information operations programs in Iraq and elsewhere. There appears, however, to be little consistency in the quality (or even existence) of political influence capabilities from CIA station to station. If reports of such inconsistency are true, then it simply means that covert influence operations are being conducted without central strategic direction and that any program of quality is a function of effective leadership at what appears to be just a few stations. There is, of course, the possibility that a new, enlightened, strategically-minded leadership has emerged at the Agency, but that its human resources equipped to do such work are so limited that they are being deployed only in selected high-priority theaters.¹⁰

In the absence of any clear, systematic effort by the foreign affairs agencies of the government to develop the many necessary public diplomatic capabilities, it has been left to the Department of Defense and the Army in particular to fill the vacuum. Of all the

10. These anecdotal reports have been shared with the author by senior government officials familiar with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

foreign affairs agencies, the practices of the Defense Department come the closest to those that reflect integrated strategic thinking and long-range policy planning. Although the Department of State has a Policy Planning Staff, that bureau has historically amounted to little more than a speechwriting office. The Defense Department, in contrast, has been constrained to develop coherent policy planning as a result of the necessity of matching military means with strategic policy ends through its budget and procurement processes. Thus, of all the agencies, it has taken the most substantive steps in filling the void in many public diplomatic matters since the 9/11 attacks. The problem remains, however, that the Defense Department alone cannot create the culture of foreign political influence that is needed throughout our government's foreign affairs agencies.

Recognizing the need to fight terrorism not simply with methods of violence, but in the arenas of the mind, where terrorist extremism originates, the Defense Department attempted to establish the erstwhile Office of Strategic Influence (OSI). This office set forth, among its various goals, such projects as establishing alternatives to the radical madrassas of western Pakistan, schools which offered little more than indoctrination in an extreme, politicized interpretation of Wahhabist Islam, and thus which became breeding grounds of Islamist extremism. The alternative schools were to offer vocational education to supply their students with the training to earn a living. Because of a complete lack of understanding of the public diplomatic importance of such an office, and because of a perceived threat to its bureaucratic turf, the Defense Department's Bureau of Public Affairs leaked a story to the press that this new office proposed to use "disinformation" as a tool of strategic influence. This story, which amounted to disinformation itself, created a scandal fueled by the media,

whereby OSI became such a political liability that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld disbanded it.¹¹

The fact that this office was self-described as pursuing “strategic influence” was not helpful. It was a reflection of the inexperience of its founders with the very subject of political influence. They should have known that the lack of understanding, both inside government and in the media, of the importance of an influence capability has made any attempt to establish such a capability a political hot potato. They may as well have attempted to establish a U.S. Ministry of Propaganda. The irony of this situation is that the opponents of an influence culture—be they in the State Department, the media, or the academic/think tank community—would, in the words of J. Michael Waller, “sooner kill a man than persuade him”—or, one might add, discredit him, isolate him, separate him from his allies, or divide the ranks of his organization.¹²

In an attempt to take some account of the strategic void, the Defense Department established the Office of a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Support to Public Diplomacy. The role of this office was as limited as it was short-lived: to distance itself from “Bush Administration propaganda,” the Obama Administration abolished the office shortly after inauguration. Nevertheless, the Army’s efforts, as mentioned above, to incorporate public diplomacy in its operations via the development of its new

11. The few remnants of that office were dispersed to other regions of the Pentagon, and insofar as any of them continued any of the functions assigned to OSI, they did so under the rubric of a new “organization”: OUS (Office Under the Stairs).

12. See J. Michael Waller, “Propaganda: the American Way,” *Internationalist—A Journal of Culture and Currents*, 3, No. 4, Summer 2006. Waller has also observed that opponents of an influence capability would sooner drop a JDAM bomb on an enemy’s head rather than enter into his head to deprive him of the will to be our enemy.

Counterinsurgency Doctrine have survived the transition of Administrations.

That doctrine takes into account precisely those elements of political conflict generally neglected by U.S. foreign policy during “peacetime.” First of all, it seeks to mobilize popular support by persuasion, coercion, or exploitation of other political, religious, ideological, or psychological motivations and to identify the sources and vulnerabilities of the enemy’s popular support. There is a recognition that political rather than military factors are primary and that understanding local political and cultural conditions is imperative. Expectations are to be managed; the Army’s focus is on the concerns and needs of the population and on the grievances of both the enemy and the population—the cultivation of foreign language skills reflects that focus. The use of psychological operations is an essential factor, and civilian and military activities are being integrated. The Army pays attention to the sustenance of key cultural and social institutions, both drawing on its own resources and through the use of non-governmental organizations and private businesses. It recognizes the need for intelligence to help define the operational environment, including such things as the cultural geography, communications and economic links to other regions, media influences, enemy propaganda and deception themes, and the various pillars of support, moral or other, for the enemy. The Army is paying attention to values, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions—even to semantics and rhetorical technique. And it puts emphasis on relations with the media. Humanitarian assistance is seen as an essential part of civil-military operations. The doctrine calls for economic operations designed for popular support and political effect as well as information operations to publicize enemy violence, discredit enemy propaganda, influence foreign public perceptions favorably, foil enemy recruitment

efforts, and win support for U.S. operations and allied political forces. The Army emphasizes the importance of ethical conduct and the need to keep the moral high ground—including the recognition that official condoning of any form of torture jeopardizes American moral legitimacy and strengthens the moral legitimacy of the enemy. In short, the Army pays attention to the local as well as the global audience.¹³

As part of its rapidly evolving capabilities in political influence, the Army has developed the “Human Terrain System” which has begun the restoration of ethnographic and socio-cultural knowledge to the requirements of warfare. By applying social science and cultural anthropological expertise to the conduct of full-spectrum military operations (to remind: those operations that range from various forms of “kinetic” warfare to civil-military operations, political action, etc.), the Army succeeded in minimizing the need to use force to achieve political objectives in Iraq.

All of these positive developments are the result of the fact that in the ongoing wars, the Army identified many tasks that might ordinarily be fulfilled by civilian officials but which, as a practical matter, cannot be since a civilian “surge” capability does not exist. The Army has done so under the pressure of necessity, recognizing that the instruments of soft power are so strategic that failure to use them properly has life and death consequences. That the civilian ranks of the government have not identified these instruments as meriting an equally high priority is only more testimony to the absence of any *systematized* integrated strategic thinking within the civilian foreign policy-making community or any locus within that community supportive of a culture of foreign political influence.

The development of soft power capabilities within the Defense Department has had its limitations, however. Information opera-

13. Headquarters, Department of the Army, *Counterinsurgency FM 3-24*.

tions conducted on the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan have been hampered by two forces which are conceptually and culturally ill-equipped to make either strategic or tactical judgments about such operations. The first of these has been the cadre of “public affairs” officers, whose professional preparation has been almost solely in the realm of providing briefings and “press guidance” to the news media. Like State Department public affairs officers who conceive of public diplomacy as “spin” for policy, they conceive of their role principally as responsible for the explanation of military policy and combat operations. Information operations in support of ideological warfare or psychological operations have never been in the professional portfolio of such officers. Over the last decade, the Army has developed a cadre of information operations officers and a doctrine to support their work. However, their work has encountered impediments from genetically cautious public affairs officers who are, as a rule, unschooled in all aspects of public diplomacy. The solution to this problem is the development of proper boundaries between the public affairs function and those of information operations and psy-ops as well as better public diplomacy education for all concerned.

The second force impeding effective information operations has been some among the cadre of military lawyers. Once again, nothing in the education of these officers has prepared them for the application of legal judgment to these instruments of strategic influence. A prominent example has been the reluctance of the Special Operations Command to have anything to do with supporting politically moderate forces within the Islamic world on the basis of religious doctrine or political ideology. This reluctance is borne of legal judgments that citing religious doctrines and assisting certain factions within Islam involve violating the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, insofar as they are seen to be violating the separation of church and state. Adequate education in ideological warfare

would reveal that there exists a long tradition of U.S. use of religion as an instrument of public diplomacy and strategic influence that includes nothing less than the broadcasting to foreign audiences of religious programming and even religious services over the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty, among other examples. None of these practices was ever judged as a violation of the Constitutional prohibition of Congress to establish a state religion.

The ability of civilian ranks within the Defense Department to develop the larger panoply of political influence capabilities has also suffered from a similar conceptual and cultural handicap: the confusion about what public diplomacy is and what kind of expertise is necessary to conduct it. Once again, too much responsibility for these matters has been either delegated to, or claimed by, the Bureau of Public Affairs and its cadre of conventional public affairs officers. Once again, because achieving success in foreign influence requires different skills and a different culture than that customarily present in domestically-oriented public affairs bureaus, such officers, without the benefit of completely new professional education and training, should not be entrusted with strategic tasks of an entirely different quality than the ones to which they are professionally and culturally accustomed.

The absence of centralized strategic planning and coordination of public diplomacy

The many functions of public diplomacy, understood in its broadest sense, are undertaken by several principal agencies of the U.S. Government. They are: the Department of State; the U.S. Agency for International Development; the Department of Education; the Peace Corps; the Broadcasting Board of Governors; the Department of Defense (and the armed services); and the Central Intelligence Agency. To this list, one could also add certain proxies for the U.S. Government such as the institutions of the National Endowment

for Democracy (as federally funded private institutions) as well as various contracting institutions and companies that serve public diplomacy functions, including State Department public diplomacy contractors, USAID contractors, Defense Department information operations contractors, and others.

However, because of the way public diplomacy is understood—namely, as not including such functions as psychological operations, counter-propaganda, political action, and political/ideological warfare—the work of all the agencies that fulfill these functions—insofar as some of them are fulfilled at all—is never coordinated and strategically planned. There have been precious few times in their history that representatives of all these agencies (or their functional equivalent predecessors) have met in an interagency group or been the subject of any government-wide strategic planning. The only instances that come close were the activities of the Operations Control Board during the Eisenhower administration, and the strategic plans outlined in several Presidential directives (particularly NSDDs # 45, 75, and 77) in the Reagan administration—under the leadership of the National Security Council.

Since then, however, the cupboard has been bare. The Department of State's neglect of this entire subject has resulted in an almost complete absence of strategic interagency planning and leadership in interagency coordination. As mentioned earlier, the only exception to this pattern was the brief period of Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy James Glassman's recent leadership and the work of two relatively new interagency groups. The effectiveness of interagency practice in the Obama Administration remains an open question. Meanwhile, the National Security Council, which has been the locus of the only strategic planning and coordination of such activities in the past, has also neglected them on a systematic basis.

When looking at public diplomacy understood in its largest sense, however, one must conclude that its functions are undertaken by almost every agency of the U.S. Government. This can be explained by the fact that virtually every agency has an office or bureau of international affairs as well as other specialized offices that address international issues. This includes: obvious examples such as the Department of Education—whose office of International Education Programs funds an array of public diplomacy programs—as well as such putatively unlikely agencies as the Department of the Interior and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It most emphatically includes such major agencies as the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

The international affairs offices of these agencies conduct activities that include a very large public diplomacy portfolio. They address issues that concern international dimensions of education, public health, hunger, food shortages, malnutrition, environmental protection, housing, the welfare of indigenous peoples worldwide, many elements of commerce and economic development, safety and security issues of all sorts, labor issues, and so much more. Most of these issues involve matters of concern not just to governments but to people. In some cases, the work of these offices and the help they render people around the world becomes well known. But this is the exception rather than the rule—because their work almost never benefits from coordination with media strategies by the lead agencies or from integration, strategic planning, and national-level strategic resource allocation.

Take, as one prominent example, the issue of health. There are few issues of greater concern to people anywhere, and yet health diplomacy is a concept that is almost non-existent at the national strategic level. The armed forces think of it, and perhaps elements

of the Department of Health and Human Services, but as a matter of course, not the Department of State. President Bush's major initiative to combat AIDS in Africa, which has created much goodwill toward the United States, came from the evangelical community outside the government.

The Navy operates hospital ships. These have been involved in disaster relief, most notably in response to the tsunami in Southeast Asia in 2004. The good will generated by these relief efforts (not to mention the post-earthquake efforts in Pakistan) was enormous. Its strategic importance cannot be underestimated, particularly given that so much of it was proffered to people in the largest Moslem country in the world, Indonesia, where pro-American sentiment had plummeted and where al-Qaida cells and other radical Islamist groups had developed. However, knowing the lack of integration of such disaster relief efforts with international information programs, it would not be unreasonable to hazard a guess that greater public awareness of the Navy's tsunami response efforts was generated by the Navy's recruitment advertisements on television in the United States than was generated abroad by any systematic information programs.

Proper public diplomacy planning would have our government consider a serious investment in the expansion of such public diplomacy assets as our hospital ships. One proposal of this sort has been made by Coast Guard intelligence analyst, Jim Dolbow, who has suggested that the Navy secure thirteen more such ships, precisely for the strategic influence they win for the United States.¹⁴ Such a proposal, however, requires a strategic understanding of public diplomacy, for it is unlikely that we should expect the Navy to place a public diplomacy initiative of such magnitude on its list of institutional priorities—unless the armed forces continue even more

14. Jim Dolbow, "Let's Have a Fleet of 15 Hospital Ships," *Proceedings* U.S. Naval Institute, February 2008, p. 12.

dramatically to provide substitute services that should be expected of civilian agencies. It should be noted, however, that the Navy does realize the powerful public diplomatic effects of its hospital ships, which have been used for such purposes not only during the tsunami but also to bring medical services to collections of countries such as a recent tour of twelve Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Of course, hospital ships—or international public health projects such as the Bush Administration's AIDS initiative in Africa—are, by the standards of diplomatic budgets, very expensive. But, there are many public diplomacy initiatives in the health field that can be taken that are not costly and yet can yield substantial political benefits. One historical example is the aforementioned Ten-Year Health Plan for the Americas that was proposed by the United States through the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO) in the early 1970s. This plan, which involved little funding, established a set of public health standards for our neighbors in Latin America and demonstrated a concern for public welfare that yielded nothing but goodwill for the United States.¹⁵

Examples of this type, which almost never reach the level of State Department or National Security Council consideration, could be multiplied many times. While, individually, they may seem trivial in the larger course of national security priorities—especially those priorities which result from a hard power mindset—collectively, they have made, and can make, a strategic difference with a cost-effectiveness that is unmatched by any other set of instruments of national power.

The collective national investment in public diplomacy requires an analysis beyond the scope of this study. However, it is, on the scale of national security budget priorities, exceedingly small. Just one part of that investment—the public diplomacy budget of the

15. See PAHO Official Document 118 (1973).

Department of State—was \$796 million in 2008.¹⁶ In contrast, the advertising budget of just one American corporation, Procter & Gamble, was \$2.6 billion in 2007.¹⁷

Adding the budgets that pay for the larger set of functions that go beyond the conventional understanding of public diplomacy would, of course, dramatically increase the budgetary figure that represents just the State Department's efforts. However, in the larger scope of national strategic priorities, even that number pales in comparison with the investments made in the other elements of our national security posture. What that investment ought to be, however, is a matter that can only be determined by a government-wide strategic planning exercise of the kind that has never taken place.

The absence of systematic strategic integration of public diplomacy with other arts of statecraft

The lack of systematic strategic integration of public diplomacy with other instruments of national power is only partly a function of the lack of national-level strategic planning and coordination. In fact, such integration could take place, and has taken place, even without such a centralized apparatus and conceptual framework.

Integration with Intelligence and Counterintelligence

For example, public diplomacy of various types, as mentioned earlier, can make much greater use of intelligence to enhance its effectiveness. Most intelligence collection is “threat-based” intelligence—particularly the acquisition of information

16. Government Accountability Office, *U.S. Public Diplomacy: Strategic Planning Efforts Have Improved but Agencies Face Significant Implementation Challenges*, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07795t.pdf>.

17. Nielsen Media Research, *The Nielsen Company Issues Top Ten U.S. Lists of 2007*, <http://nielsenmedia.com/nc/portal/site/Public/menuitem.55dc65b4a7d5addff3f65936147a062a0/?vgnextoid+d5df7b5dd2ac6110VgnVCM100000ac0a260aRCRD>.

about the intentions and capabilities of powers that can pose a threat to U.S. vital interests. Because of the utter necessity of such intelligence, the default mode of the intelligence community—and the policymakers who may episodically discharge their duty to clarify the intelligence they need to meet national policy priorities—is to seek threats-based information. Such threats-based intelligence indeed shapes many of the priorities of public diplomacy. However, it is not sufficient to maximize public diplomacy potential.

There is another category of intelligence which can serve this function. This is what is called “opportunities intelligence.” This constitutes information that enables public diplomacy practitioners to exploit opportunities for political influence—opportunities that may not be sufficiently revealed by threats-based intelligence.

For example (this happens to be an authentic example from the author’s personal experience, but because of the impossibility of documenting it, it could just as well be hypothetical for the purposes of this analysis), during the Cold War, the Soviet KGB utilized the opportunities intelligence work of an emigré intellectual who worked in the world of Washington research institutions. This individual probably never stole a classified secret and passed it to the Kremlin. However, this person developed in-depth knowledge of the political sociology of the elite community of policy analysts in the major think tanks and how these people think and the policies that they recommend. Furthermore, this individual actively participated in policy discussions to influence them. When many of these people became senior officials in a new Administration’s foreign policy team, the Kremlin had the knowledge of their predilections and biases and was able to send them tailored messages (via propaganda, active measures, or through deceptive information placed in U.S. intelligence channels).

The Kremlin—whether under Soviet control or more recently under oligarchic “post-communist” control—has made major strategic investments in this kind of political influence. It is a classic form of intelligence and influence operation recommended millennia ago by Sun Tzu: what is necessary is for “dead” (i.e., “doomed” or expendable) spies to place false information on the “desk” of the enemy king, ideally authenticated as true by that king’s intelligence organization, so as to induce him to take actions against his own interests but which serve the interests of the state that sent the spy.¹⁸ A KGB defector, Anatoly Golitsyn, went so far as to testify that the Kremlin’s interest in strategic deception was as great, or even greater, than its interest in stealing American secrets. Specifically, he argued that one of the highest KGB priorities was to place an agent within our intelligence community not so much to steal intelligence secrets as to learn how U.S. intelligence was interpreting disinformation. Such a “mole” would thus serve as a “feedback mechanism” who could inform the KGB how to modulate its deceptive messages so that they would be believed.¹⁹ Although Golitsyn has been a controversial figure in U.S. intelligence circles, the larger point his testimony makes is unexceptionable: it is nothing more than the lesson that nations have long had an abiding interest in influencing the governments of other nations and have done so—and do so—using various deceptive means.

It is worth noting here that the Founding Fathers of our country—architects of our system of government—identified the special susceptibility of the republican form of government to foreign influence as arguably the greatest vulnerability of our national security posture. George Washington referred to the “insidious wiles

18. Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, pp. 231-232.

19. See, for example, Edward J. Epstein, *Deception* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1989) pp. 76-84, 95, 105-110.

of foreign influence” and the writers of the Federalist Papers made numerous references to this problem.²⁰ What they identified was nothing less than the fact that there exists a form of statecraft that the United States is naturally inclined to neglect—both as a matter of defense and offense.

Indeed, on the defensive side, there has been an almost total, systematic neglect of counter-deception, counter-propaganda, and counter-foreign-political-influence-operations. These activities are principally counterintelligence functions, yet, because of the insufficiency of integrated strategic thinking within the intelligence and counterintelligence communities, counterintelligence is understood principally as counter-espionage when it properly encompasses considerably more.²¹

Meanwhile, on the offensive side, the absence of a culture of influence in the various agencies of the government has meant that requirements for opportunities intelligence collection are almost never issued. To emphasize this point: we should ask ourselves if our intelligence community or the policymakers who set the National Intelligence Topics ever require that we place even a single case officer or agent in Moscow, Beijing, Teheran, Pyongyang or even in allied capitals, who is asked a) to collect information on the beliefs and policy predilections of individuals who are likely to affect government policy in those countries both currently and in the future, and b) perhaps even to influence those individuals.

20. George Washington, “Farewell Address,” in *American Government*, Peter Odegard, ed. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964), p. 87 and Publius, *The Federalist Papers* (New York: Mentor Publishing, 1961) #3, #5, #7, #22, #41, and # 43.

21. For further discussion of this point, see my remarks in *U.S. Counterintelligence Reform*, Proceedings of a conference at Cantigny, (Washington, DC: The Institute of World Politics Press) forthcoming.

A lesson here is that the impulse to collect opportunities intelligence cannot come from a threats-based or reactive mindset. It must come from a pro-active, offensive mindset that is the product of a forward-looking strategic culture that has political goals, a strategy to achieve them, and recognizes that many instruments of statecraft, including public diplomacy, must be incorporated into that strategy. This “offensive” mindset need not be an aggressive or an “imperial” one, nor one otherwise dedicated to bringing about revolutionary changes in the international system. It could very well be one that is dedicated to the most limited and necessary of foreign policy goals, such as merely staving off trouble by being able to anticipate it and protecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation. However, it is a mindset that can only come from a culture of influence that stems from a larger culture of integrated strategy.

Integration with Traditional Diplomacy

Public diplomacy must also be integrated with traditional diplomacy. Pressures generated by public diplomacy, for example, can serve to influence foreign governments in traditional government-to-government interactions. This requires traditional diplomats to think in terms of influencing foreign publics and opinion leaders as a prelude to negotiations with the foreign governments in question. This, in turn, requires public diplomacy taskings as well as opportunities intelligence taskings.

Public diplomacy-induced pressures may be those imposed by public opinion or elite opinion. Such pressures may also take the form of more subtle types of influence. For example, inter-religious dialogue can produce, and has produced, greater levels of mutual understanding and mutual respect in our relations with foreign leaders who possess strong religious motivations.²² Similarly, neglect of

22. See, for example, the classic work on this subject: Douglas Johnston, *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

foreign religious sensibilities—whether by our own government, or by those engaged in other cross-cultural relations such as commerce or tourism (one cannot but think here of the toxic effects of Western sexual tourism in Southeast Asia)—has contributed to foreign alienation and hostility.

Successful traditional diplomacy may depend much more upon effective public diplomacy than most diplomats realize, not only in dealing with our adversaries, but also in relations with our allies. For example, the exigencies of traditional diplomacy, particularly within the context of the NATO alliance, required that the United States maintain correct diplomatic relations with Greece, even after the seizure of power by a military junta in 1967. These relations were necessary and, for Cold War purposes, even desirable, given the regime's opposition to communist influences in the country. However, as the regime restricted and violated civil rights, alienating large numbers of Greek citizens, perceived U.S. support for the regime produced growing anti-Americanism that persisted for decades. This period of rule by the military junta was precisely a time when a strong public diplomatic effort in Greece, coordinated with correct but visibly cool bilateral relations with the regime, could have prevented much of the rise of antipathy toward the United States. Even under conditions of cool bilateral relations, cooperation on vital strategic matters could still have been conducted either secretly or with a low profile so as to avoid the aggravation of U.S. relations with Greek society. Had such a strategy of coordination of traditional and public diplomacy been undertaken at the time, U.S. bilateral relations with subsequent Greek governments would have been significantly better than they proved to be.

A final but necessary example of what cannot be but a limited menu of illustrations of strategic integration with traditional diplo-

macy is the obvious, but oft-neglected role of public diplomacy in peacemaking. In conflicts that have descended to hatred, grudges, and unrestrained revenge, where the antagonists dehumanize their enemies so as to create a psychological climate propitious for war, the human relationships developed through public diplomatic means can be the key element that restores the humanity of the enemy in the eyes of both the leadership and people of the antagonist countries.

Integration with Economic Statecraft

An influence culture, shaped by knowledge of public diplomacy and sensitivity to foreign opinion, can also play a major role in informing economic statecraft. The last two decades have witnessed the greatest use of economic sanctions against other countries in our nation's history. The use of sanctions, however, has proceeded all too often without sufficient attention to its public diplomatic effects. Sanctions leveled against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq, for example, had unintended consequences. Having been shifted by the regime away from itself and onto the people, they contributed to food shortages and malnutrition among Iraqi children. Estimates of deaths of these children from malnutrition range from 100,000 to 1,000,000.²³ The impact of these deaths has had significant adverse effects on Arab and Moslem opinion and added fuel to the grievances exploited by Osama Bin Laden and al-Qaida.

Such an experience should teach a major lesson: sanctions must be targeted against enemies of the United States and not innocent populations. And if such sanctions cannot but affect populations in some adverse way, counteracting measures that support the population, either morally, economically, medically, spiritually, or otherwise, must be taken. This means one of two things: either economists involved

23. Matt Welch, "The Truth About Sanctions Against Iraq," *Policy*, vol. 18, no. 2, Winter 2002.

in the shaping of such strategic decisions must become integrated strategic thinkers with a sensibility toward public diplomacy, or the central foreign policy makers cannot let such economic decisions be made without the necessary interagency coordination and integration. Here, one cannot help but ask: when was the last time public diplomats were consulted by anyone concerning the administration of economic sanctions? There is an even more fundamental question: where are the public diplomats who could be consulted on an issue like this?

Since poverty, joblessness, lack of economic opportunity, and other economic dislocations have all contributed historically to political extremism, civil and international wars, insurgencies, and inter-ethnic, inter-religious, and other political conflicts, positive economic measures have historically played a critical role in U.S. strategy to address these problems. Those measures have involved foreign aid policy (including the supplying of financial, technological, and managerial resources to foreign governments and businesses), stimulation of U.S. investment in foreign lands, and encouragement of international trade.

Although foreign aid policy is a form of public diplomacy, its practitioners often underestimate the degree to which it can have political influence. While it is true they recognize that some foreign aid is a direct payment to win the support of a foreign government, the culture of the U.S. Agency for International Development (or, for that matter, that of the Foreign Agricultural Service) ironically tends to see much foreign aid work as having a certain element of political neutrality—especially in its public diplomatic dimension. Some of its practitioners indeed regard their work in this field as having a fundamentally humanitarian character that is designed to serve charitable purposes more than political ones, as though they represented a non-governmental organization (NGO) and not

the U.S. government. And yet, the nature of foreign aid is such that it cannot but have political effects that are far from neutral, especially when such aid helps people in one part of a country and not another, or one ethnic or religious group and not another. Thus, while foreign assistance programs can have very positive political effects, they can also have invidious ones.²⁴ Only when foreign aid practitioners undertake their work with an eye to its full implications for political influence will it optimally serve integrated strategic purposes.

Over the years, the disproportionate amount of effort devoted to extending aid to governments has often had counterproductive effects when it comes to achieving real economic growth and thus realizing its full public diplomatic benefits. Clearly, such government-to-government aid is a necessary part of successful statecraft, insofar as cooperation of foreign states must be secured in many instances in any way possible. However, aid to governments too often has dubious results. For one, too many aid projects result in investments—usually in large public infrastructure projects—that are made by the recipient governments according to political rather than economic criteria, with a frequent consequence being projects that do not pay for themselves and only add to a nation's debt burden. Then, the channeling of contracts for such projects to cronies often involves the official theft of the donated funds and frequently reinforces a climate of corruption. It is this unintended consequence that we have been witnessing in recent years in Afghanistan, which has had disastrous public diplomatic effects.

In contrast, the most successful economic development aid policies are those that have targeted grassroots economic growth that results in a local capacity to generate wealth and create productive

24. I am indebted to John Tsagronis, formerly of the U.S. Agency for International Development and most recently of the National Security Council, for this insight.

employment. In practice, this has meant extending credit to private business, particularly small enterprises, and encouraging policies that extend private property ownership and secure its protection through the development and practical implementation of appropriate legal systems. Such aid to private enterprise can encounter a myriad of obstacles, including high taxation; stifling government regulation; government-protected monopolies; nepotism, cronyism, and corruption by government officials; established customs and value systems that militate against putting a primacy on economic efficiency; and other forms of “cultural capital” deficit. Nevertheless, this type of aid tends to be more successful in producing genuine economic growth than government-to-government aid.

Examples of successful promotion of grassroots economic growth include the financing of European businesses, both large and small, under the Marshall Plan and similar financing of businesses undertaken after the collapse of the Soviet empire in East-Central Europe by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its nationally-based “enterprise funds.”²⁵ The work of micro-finance innovator, Mohammed Yunus, has demonstrated what access to even small amounts of credit can do for people in

25. I would like to thank Francis Skrobiszewski, formerly with the Polish-American Enterprise Fund and the Hungarian-American Enterprise Fund, and currently Director of the Afghan American Chamber of Commerce, for his testimony on the effectiveness of these funds. For a brief, excellent review of their initial effectiveness, see his “Investing for Stability,” *Crisis Response Journal*, Vol. 5, Issue 4. See also John Birkelund, “Doing Good While Doing Well: The Unheralded Success of American Enterprise Funds,” *Foreign Affairs*, September-October, 2001. For a larger evaluation of the effectiveness of foreign aid policies that target the development of private enterprise, see Carol Lancaster, Kwaku Nuamah, Matthew Lieber, and Todd Johnson, *Foreign Aid and Private Sector Development*, (Providence: Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, May, 2006).

poor countries. Of course, these various financing programs could not realize their optimal potential until local economic policies were adjusted to create incentives to work, save, invest, and take entrepreneurial risks.²⁶ For example, in the case of post-war Germany, this meant the lowering of astronomical wartime tax rates to more tolerable, peacetime levels—a dramatic, but nevertheless logistically straightforward adjustment. The existing legal obstacles to economic growth in the developing countries today, however, are more fundamental. As Hernando de Soto has pointed out, most of the poor throughout the Third World do not have access to credit, because the absence of title to the property they own makes it impossible for them to offer collateral for even the smallest of loans. Thus, they must suffer extremely high interest rates for whatever uncollateralized loans they may receive—rates which necessarily reflect the risks that local bankers face when they lend with no guarantee. This, of course, is a problem of the systematic absence of legal and regulatory frameworks designed to protect private property in ways that can unlock dormant capital and put it to productive use.²⁷

Lest there be any misunderstanding of the magnitude of the amount of credit potentially available to the Third World, de Soto has calculated that the Third World poor own, and are sitting upon, \$9 trillion worth of property (homes, land, farms, businesses, etc.) which, if subject to the same legal and regulatory systems we enjoy in the West, could be used to collateralize an equal amount of credit. In Egypt alone, he estimates that the wealth that ordinary, mostly poor Egyptians have accumulated since 1945 is

26. The impact of tax policy on economic growth in the Third World is ably illustrated in the chapter on “The Third World on the Laffer Curve,” in Jude Wanniski, *The Way the World Works*, (New York, Basic Books, 1978).

27. Hernando de Soto, *The Mystery of Capital*, (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

fifty-five times the sum of all direct foreign investment recorded there, including the development of the Suez Canal and the Aswan Dam.²⁸ And that foreign investment is many times the sum of foreign aid or any conceivable micro-credit that could have been offered by Western official foreign aid “charities.” Because most foreign-supplied credit, including micro-credit, is subsidized by the charity-oriented foreign aid agencies and “banks,” there are severe limits as to how much credit can be offered—limits imposed by the amount of foreign aid dollars our Congress and other Western legislatures are willing to appropriate. As former USAID official Peter Schaefer has observed, the total amount of micro-loans provided by micro-finance organizations as of 2004 was a mere \$17 billion—a pittance compared to the credit requirements of billions of poor people worldwide.²⁹ The result of these limits on charity-based credit is that those individuals and businesses who win such subsidized loans are usually the beneficiaries of political, rather than strictly economic, decisions with all the invidious effects that such favoritism can involve.

USAID has developed a number of programs to promote self-sustaining economic growth based on the rule of law, legally-protected private property, access to capital, the enhancement of incentives to work, investment and risk-taking, and the minimization of the multitude of impediments to productive enterprise. Some of these are devoted to helping developing countries adopt systems based on the rule of law, fight corruption, and, in some countries, even establish legal protection of private property. USAID has also established micro-credit programs that have produced excellent results in the limited areas where they have been implemented.

28. *Ibid.* p. 5.

29. Peter F. Schaefer, “A \$9 Trillion Question: Did the World Get Mohammed Yunus Wrong?” *Foreign Policy*, August 18, 2009.

However, in relation to most of its activities, the effort devoted to developing land titling, private property protection, and access to capital is small.

This limited emphasis both in USAID and in other Western development aid agencies is partly the result of the bureaucratic legacy of longstanding government-to-government aid programs as well as the aforementioned attitude of many USAID officials (and, one might add, Department of Agriculture and other Western aid officials as well) that their work is principally a charitable enterprise. This attitude inclines them to develop mechanisms to favor the doling out of various forms of aid, including credit, over assistance that would result in real, self-sustaining growth and self-reliance: namely, the construction of the legal, regulatory, and banking systems within poor countries that can make the provision of credit—guaranteed and limited by the amount of collateral possessed by the poor—a profitable local business. There is a misguided and even condescending charitable inclination of many Western aid officials caused by a discomfort at the prospect that credit should become a profit-making enterprise involving no Western charitable subsidy, a discomfort that is at odds with the established legal-regulatory system of profit-making credit institutions and businesses this credit helps finance in the wealthy societies in which they live. While this sentiment is understandable given the usuriously high interest rates that prevail among lending institutions in poor countries, it does not take the positive influence of market forces into account: indeed, those prohibitive interest rates would decline precipitously with the reduction of risk afforded by collateral based on titled property.

The positive public diplomatic effects of foreign economic policies devoted to the protection of private property and the stimulation of self-sustaining economic growth cannot be underes-

timated. A major example of such a success was the land reform in immediate post-War Japan. In contrast to socialist land reforms in other countries that were characterized by the expropriation of large private land holdings, the land reform in Japan involved reimbursement of the Japanese feudal landlords for their property and its transfer to the tenant farmers. With the acquisition and legal protection of the land they had once rented, those farmers, who were formerly among the most promising targets of recruitment by communist and other extremist movements, joined the ranks of the strongest supporters of the new democratic order of post-War Japan and its close relationship with the United States.³⁰

Successful Integration: Counterinsurgency Policy

Perhaps the most prominent recent example of successful strategic integration of public diplomacy with other arts of statecraft has been the U.S. Army's consideration of the multiplicity of public diplomatic categories in its formulation of the new Counterinsurgency Doctrine. Here, as mentioned above, one sees not only the theoretical consideration of the public diplomatic issues as strategic factors affecting the entire course and success of our contemporary wars, but the actual implementation of the doctrine in practice. Fortunately at one level, and unfortunately at another, the Army has done this largely apart from national strategic leadership. In so doing, the Army has filled a void that should have been filled not only by the civilian foreign affairs agencies but by the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense, which, in its policies governing the initial conduct of the wars at hand, failed to place such priority on these factors that they should have

30. For a brief analysis of the Japanese land reform, see Toshihiko Kawagoe, *Agricultural Land Reform in Post-War Japan*, (Washington D.C.: The World Bank, Development Research Group, Rural Development, 1999).

been implemented as a matter of the highest national strategic importance.

Ultimately, the strategic integration of public diplomacy with the other instruments of statecraft—and, of course, the integration of those instruments amongst themselves—requires that public diplomats have sufficient knowledge of those other arts and of how they can be utilized to enhance public diplomatic activity; and that practitioners of other arts, such as traditional diplomats, military officers, economists, foreign aid officials, and so on, have sufficient training and knowledge of public diplomacy to enhance the effectiveness of their own missions.

This is simply a matter of education. It is a matter of knowing the force-multiplying effects of integration both from the study of the theory of integrated strategy and from the study of its history. The fact remains, however, that most education in the arts of statecraft takes place through on-the-job training. And because none of the major agencies of the government places any premium on either the study of public diplomacy or its integration with the other arts, such education must either be found in the private institutions that offer it (of which there are very few) or be created within U.S. government educational institutions.

Solutions: To Build an Influence Culture and an Integrated Strategy

Building an influence culture can be accomplished in several ways, some more optimal than others, some more achievable than others. The following options are suggested solutions that can accomplish the task. They build upon some of the critique that appears earlier, highlighting other, new problems. The exact details of these suggestions need not necessarily be followed, as there are other reasonable structural arrangements that have been, and are in the process of being, suggested in the national conversation on these matters. Nonetheless, the issues presented in the suggestions that follow must be addressed sooner or later if the United States is to develop and sustain the capability of full spectrum diplomacy.

Knowledge Solutions: Maximizing Diplomatic Versatility at the State Department

The ideal solution to creating an influence culture within the U.S. Government is to increase the versatility of the Department of State ultimately by making all political officers in the Foreign Service capable not only of traditional diplomacy but of full spectrum diplomacy. Suggestions for State Department reform have been legion over the years but, for various reasons, have met with little success. This, however, need not continue if a new Secretary of State who understands the problem in all its dimensions will make a commit-

ment to the necessary reforms. The problem in the past has been that virtually no Secretary of State in the last several decades has had such knowledge of the history, effectiveness, methods, and strategic integration of public diplomacy as could equip him or her to undertake such reforms. This is mostly a matter of inadequate professional knowledge—not only on the part of Secretaries, but also of their teams of both political appointees and Foreign Service Officers—and we must turn principally to education and professional training as a solution.

There are several main elements of reform necessary to create an influence culture and to maximize the Department's capabilities in strategic integration. First of all, there needs to be a change in career incentives that emphasizes public diplomacy. Professional education in public diplomacy should be significantly enhanced. There needs to be a deliberate effort to retain and deploy personnel with foreign affairs experience. Geographic area specialization should be improved, and foreign language and communications skills need enhancement. Emphasis is also needed: on the acquisition of thorough knowledge of the techniques and messages of foreign propaganda and overt and covert political influence operations; on acquisition of expertise in the methods and messages to counter such propaganda and political influence operations; and on acquisition of authoritative knowledge of foreign ideas, ideologies, and religious doctrines. Our diplomats' ability to be advocates for America needs to be improved, particularly by enhancing their knowledge about American history and founding principles, the "secrets" of America's success as a political economy, the formulae of the success of Western civilization in general, and the arguments in favor of many traditional American domestic and foreign policies.

The most effective method to implement an influence culture in the Department of State is to change career incentives. Profes-

sional excellence in public diplomacy has never been a criterion for promotion to the highest levels of either the Foreign Service or State Department leadership. In the past, officials serving either in the U.S. Information Agency or in public diplomacy-oriented bureaus in the Department such as those concerned with human rights, democracy, labor, refugees, etc., were not the most likely to earn the ranks of ambassador, Deputy Assistant Secretary, or Assistant Secretary. More recently, with the locus of official public diplomacy functions in the Department, the same condition pertains.

The demonstration of certain public diplomatic skills has not been rewarded or encouraged. For example, it has long been a career-threatening move for a diplomat to speak to the foreign media. To say the right thing is rarely rewarded, while to say the wrong thing risks one's entire career. It is for this reason that falsehoods that appear in the foreign media are rarely systematically countered by career diplomats stationed abroad. This phenomenon is easily explained. Traditional diplomacy requires extreme caution in the use of language. Thus, traditional diplomats are practiced in the art of discretion and not in the language of advocacy and persuasion.

Similarly, there was a large structural and cultural divide between traditional diplomats working for the State Department and public diplomats working for the former U.S. Information Agency. On the one hand, the State Department has long been concerned about very strict, centralized "message control" (which, by the way, is quite distinct from centralized strategic leadership of public diplomacy). Because of the sensitivity and enormous implications of the U.S. Government's public pronouncements, it is necessary that official statements be subject to centralized control of the precise nuances in the articulation of U.S. policy. Thus, traditional diplomats in the field are accustomed to conforming their messages to the Department's talking points or to seeking clearance from the

Department when confronted with the necessity of making a statement that is not covered by existing press guidance.

On the other hand, in its day, the central offices of the USIA would defer to its officers in the field when it came to forming its public diplomacy messages. Field officers had their finger on the pulse of foreign public opinion and were in a much better position to develop and recommend messages that would be favorably received by foreign publics and opinion makers.¹

With the demise of USIA and the absorption of public diplomacy officers into the State Department, even the minimal level of independence these officers enjoyed has been effectively eradicated by their subordination to the guidelines and priorities of the geographic and functional bureaus. Under the circumstances, it is no wonder that the State Department's cultural and structural requirements of traditional diplomatic message control trump the nation's ability not only to respond nimbly to the avalanche of messages coming from the plethora of al-Qaida websites but to develop an offensive public diplomacy strategy that could stay a step ahead of the nation's enemies in the competition for public sympathy. Thus, the challenge for U.S. public diplomacy requires that these conflicting tendencies be reconciled, coordinated, and strategically integrated.

This reconciliation, coordination, and strategic integration of diplomatic priorities in American representation abroad, like the exercise of the military art, require "full spectrum operations." Whereas the Army and the Marine Corps must possess the capability to engage, for example, in conventional battlefield operations with infantry, tanks, and artillery in coordination with close air support, they must also be capable of the various overlapping functions that comprise stability operations, peacekeeping operations, civil-military operations, special operations, and the entire spectrum of

1. I am indebted to USIA alumnus Douglas Ebner for this insight.

counterinsurgency skills—political skills in the battle for hearts and minds. To maximize effectiveness in these various politically-oriented and de facto diplomatic functions, the Army and Marine Corps have given enormous discretion to mid-level and even lower ranking officers such as majors, captains, and even lieutenants. Similarly, for the Department of State, full spectrum operations would require both greater independence and higher level of skills from its public diplomats, and this necessarily and specifically must include its mid-level and lower-level officers.

Public diplomats would need greater independence in crafting strategies and messages to foreign publics. So long as public diplomacy continues to be run by the State Department, the requirement of greater independence and discretion on the part of public diplomats of all ranks means, above all, having those diplomats report not to the geographic and functional bureaus but to the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy.² If tension arises between public diplomatic strategy and traditional diplomatic requirements, it should not be resolved by the mid-level country desk officer in a geographic bureau, but at a much higher level—even at the level of the Deputy Secretary (whose portfolio could most profitably include this vital task of strategic coordination, integration, and reconciliation).

To achieve the highest standard of professionalism in the diplomatic arts, Foreign Service Officers must develop skill not only in reporting, consultations, negotiations, and dialogue, but in the manifold arts of public diplomacy. To develop such professional skill requires knowledge and motivation. Improvement of professional knowledge must come from education. Too much professional

2. This point has been made in: Stephen Johnson, Helle Dale, and Patrick Cronin, *Strengthening U.S. Public Diplomacy Requires Organization, Coordination, and Strategy*, (Washington, D.C.: Heritage Foundation Backgrounder #1875, 2005).

knowledge in the art of traditional diplomacy comes almost exclusively from on-the-job training. Meanwhile, there is precious little professional training in public diplomacy, and, given the limited number of public diplomacy functions that continue to be fulfilled actively by the Department of State, opportunities for on-the-job training in the field have been inadequate at best. Very few diplomats have studied either traditional or public diplomacy in any professional school of international relations, as almost none of these schools teach these arts. The Foreign Service Institute's programs, while fine as far as they go, are of too limited duration and scope to cover both of the diplomatic arts adequately—not to mention their integration with other arts of statecraft.

There is another problem with State Department education and training: it suffers from too much inbreeding. Insofar as most learning comes from on-the-job training or from the Foreign Service Institute, it is done exclusively through the lens of the institutional culture of the Department, a culture that has systematically neglected public diplomacy. Meanwhile, it is very risky to one's competitive status within the State Department for a Foreign Service Officer to seek an advanced professional degree in mid-career. This is, again, a matter of career incentives. Career advancement decisions are made on the basis of the number and prestige of one's diplomatic postings in comparison with the similar postings of one's peers in one's entering class of officers. An officer with three prestigious posts will always move ahead of another officer with two prestigious postings and a Master's degree acquired in mid-career.

Thus, preparatory professional education in foreign policy-making and implementation must be radically improved in the Department. Such improvement must entail several key elements. A significant enhancement of professional education in the Foreign Service Institute is a necessary step. However, in the interests of avoiding

inbreeding, group-think, and the consequent smothering of creativity in both policy-making and implementation, other intellectual influences must have opportunity to flower. The armed forces, for example, recognize that intellectual inbreeding and the cultural clinging to an inappropriate or mistaken doctrine not only can mean the loss of thousands of lives of our military and civilian personnel (not to mention foreign military personnel and civilians), but it can also mean defeat in war. To avoid these consequences, they encourage professional education not only in their own war colleges and other professional educational institutions but in a multiplicity of civilian academic institutions with differing educational philosophies and fields of concentration. Even though conflicts in the non-military realm—wars of ideas, wars for hearts and minds, wars fought not just in the realm of armed force but in the realm of politics—can be lost and can have horrendous consequences, there is no analogous concern matched by meaningful action in the State Department to avoid the pitfalls resulting from intellectual poverty.

A related matter is the cultural problem both within the Department of State and the intelligence community that can be characterized as the “cult of classification.” This is the tendency to read principally classified cables and intelligence reports at the expense not only of open source materials but also of scholarly books and other literature that can enhance one’s understanding not only of the professional arts but also of the foreign cultures with which our diplomats must interact and which they must influence. It is another form of inbreeding.

The problem of motivation can be solved principally by changing career incentives. Promotion to the Senior Foreign Service must be made contingent not simply on “punching a public diplomacy ticket”—in other words, having a single brief public diplomatic tour—but on demonstrating a skill and having actual achievements

in winning the support of foreign publics, foreign opinion leaders, foreign cultural or religious figures, etc. Our diplomats stationed abroad must be judged not simply on their activities within the limited circles of a capital city—particularly in countries with many centers of commerce, education, and culture—but also on their ability to extend their reach to other regions that might have influence in one of many different ways. Because skill in these arts is so limited within the Foreign Service, those without such skills should not be the judges of performance in these fields. Assessments of public diplomatic performance should be made by an independent board of judges who have the necessary credentials.

Motivation can also be stimulated on the basis of professional pride. If diplomats understand that complete professionalism requires knowledge in full spectrum diplomatic operations, their natural desire to excel and to serve their country and the cause of peace and security—desires that are alive and well in our Foreign Service—will encourage an aspiration for complete professionalism.

The dearth of intellectual capital concerning public diplomacy within the ranks of the government must not be aggravated by what one might term artificially-induced shortages of intellectual capital in foreign affairs generally. These artificially-induced shortages take the form of the “up-or-out” system of Foreign Service promotions. This system forces experienced diplomats who have not attained a certain level of rank and seniority to leave the Service, ostensibly to give the opportunity for the promotion of the next class (or generation) of diplomats to the highest ranks of the Service. Many man-years of experience and knowledge of cross-cultural understanding are wasted by this system. Experienced officers who have worked for years to develop a discrete profession in traditional diplomacy must then embark on major career changes that often make little use of the knowledge they have acquired in the large part of a lifetime.

This talent must be harnessed to the national interest, and one of its most valuable uses is in the many fields of public diplomacy—both through government agencies and private sector government contractors—where professional knowledge of foreign affairs is indispensable. Proper professional education of such officers in public diplomatic arts, however, would be a prerequisite.

A similar waste of intellectual capital takes place in the periodic purges of intelligence officers and even the retirement of military officers who have significant foreign affairs experience.

A related waste of intellectual capital is the failure by both the State Department and, to a lesser extent, the CIA, to recruit people with public diplomacy skills. This failure is aggravated by the extreme difficulty that even the most highly-skilled personnel face in entering these agencies in mid- or late-career. These failures to recruit appropriate, and even rare, talent must emphatically be reversed by new personnel recruitment policies. Here, again, because of the extremely limited skill in these fields in the Foreign Service, judgments on whom to hire must be made only by those with the credentials to do so—even if they must be mobilized from outside the government in a new independent recruitment board.

Another knowledge-based reform is one that ensures that a sufficient cadre of diplomats develops and maintains an in-depth knowledge of a given major country or an individual region of the world and the relevant language or languages. The problem of language competence is a perennial one within the U.S. Government. Indeed, successive blue ribbon commissions on intelligence reform have lamented the absence of language competence in the ranks of the relevant agencies, and that includes the armed forces. There are several reasons for the stubborn inability of government agencies to improve in this area.

In the case of diplomats, the State Department has had to wrestle with criticisms that regional specialists—say, those who concentrate on the Arab world and speak Arabic—will suffer from “clientitis”: the disease of “going native,” of developing such sympathy for the people and culture of a given region that one begins to represent its interests to America rather than vice versa. Sometimes this phenomenon takes place during the course of a diplomat’s foreign posting. However, it can be argued that it may happen even more often before a diplomat is assigned to the foreign country or region. The latter case usually involves a tiny pool of linguistically competent candidates for jobs at a given posting abroad who learn the language because they were “seduced” by the country and “went native” for any number of political or cultural reasons beforehand—not after having been assigned to the post in question by the Department.

The effort to combat this clientitis has resulted in periodic efforts to create “generalists” who will serve a tour in Latin America, the next in Southeast Asia, the next in Eastern Europe, the next in the State Department, and perhaps another one in Latin America, and who possess only a dilettante’s knowledge of any of these places. True, they can avoid being isolated as “Arabists.” And they can develop sufficient familiarity with each region to enable them to serve in a senior executive role that must address all these regions. But there are only so many people who can occupy such “generalist” positions as Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Research, Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs, or Under Secretary for Political Affairs. Meanwhile, generalists often are unable to perfect their knowledge of any of the languages in which they have made a significant investment of time and effort. This, in turn, makes them less effective as potential public diplomats—particularly in speaking to the foreign media. If, however, a culture of influence were to develop in the Department, with a corresponding set of career incentives,

the two problems here—clientitis on the one hand, and insufficient communication skill on the other, could very well be reduced. But reducing these problems would demand of Foreign Service Officers a much deeper and more rigorous course of study than is currently required, study of the language and culture of a foreign land that has not already “seduced” them.

Another source of the foreign language problem—particularly in the intelligence community—is the fact that too many people in the senior ranks suffer from mediocrity in foreign languages and are disinclined to have their younger charges outshine them in this professional category. This is a variation of the well known but seldom acknowledged sin of the academic world: envy by senior professors of their younger colleagues and fear of being surpassed. This attitude may well be the main reason for the persistence of mediocrity in most organizations. The only solution to this is for those concerned with excellence and higher standards to fight to establish those standards within their respective agencies.

Finally, the lack of improvement in language capability is often explained by the need to deploy the most skillful personnel to the most pressing jobs at hand and not lose them to what is seen as an excessively long period of professional training. This is a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy that diminishes the overall effectiveness of the formulation and implementation of policy in the long term.

Improvement in communication skills requires more than better language ability: it requires skill in advocacy and persuasion. This is the art of rhetoric, an art that is not cultivated by professional diplomats. Effective rhetoric requires knowledge of the target audience, the ability to sympathize and appeal to that audience, the ability to apply reason and, where necessary, emotion in the process of persuasion. Skill in advocacy and persuasion is much more the province of domestic political debate. And here it should be

noted that many political appointees to ambassadorial positions, having come from the realm of domestic politics, possess precisely those skills that need to be better cultivated by Foreign Service Officers to maximize their professionalism in full spectrum diplomatic operations. It is ironic that these political ambassadors are compelled by the nature of the work to learn the language of diplomatic caution, while career Foreign Service Officers rarely if ever acquire skills in strategic communication.

There is, of course, a reason why such skill in persuasion and advocacy is less natural among Foreign Service Officers. These officers must develop a certain detachment from passionate advocacy for policy in order to tolerate psychologically the requirement to represent the policies of any Administration, even those with which they may privately disagree. This is an essential element of professionalism in career service. Nevertheless, recognizing the necessity of such detachment, full spectrum diplomatic operations require greater ability to advocate and persuade. The study of rhetoric and the practice of debating should therefore become part of professional diplomatic education and training.

The most effective persuasion must have a credible bedrock of political substance. Here is where one sees significant unevenness in knowledge of those subjects that must be mastered to maximize advocacy of the American cause. In addition to geographic knowledge, language capability, and skill in the art of rhetoric, expert knowledge must be acquired in three other areas.

The first of these is knowledge of the history, techniques, and messages of foreign propaganda. This is a subject that is unknown to almost everyone in the foreign policy, intelligence, and national security communities. This is deeply ironic, since there is considerable question as to how well one can perceive foreign realities correctly if one is utterly unaware of how propaganda and political

influence techniques can distort one's perceptions and understanding of those realities. Propaganda, of course, is designed to affect several audiences: foreign policy decision-making elites here in the United States and those abroad as well as our domestic public and publics abroad. The messages are used, among other things, to discredit our government, its policies, and our allies; to isolate us from our friends, allies, and potential sympathizers; to divide us within by isolating those within the United States who advocate certain foreign policies that the purveyors of foreign propaganda deem threatening; to promote various policies, ideologies, and religious doctrines; and to sow misunderstanding about the strategic intentions, purposes, goals, capabilities, policies, and tactics of the propagandist governments.

How our government can neglect this kind of influence as systematically as it does is one of the marvels of modern incompetence in statecraft. Yet it persists due to the institutional cultures and priorities of our various foreign affairs agencies.

The corollary knowledge that must also be acquired is how to counter foreign propaganda and political influence operations. This involves studying the history of intelligence collection and analysis of foreign perceptions management operations, the historic practices of successful counter-propaganda efforts, the techniques and substance of contemporary influence operations by foreign states and non-state actors, and the techniques and messages to counter and neutralize those operations.

Part of this task, as mentioned above, is a counterintelligence task, since many perceptions management, strategic deception, and covert influence operations are done by foreign intelligence services. There is a large role that once was played in counter-propaganda by the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Department of Defense, and the intelligence agencies. This role should

be revived, staffed, and institutionalized in each of the relevant agencies. This means reviving the modern equivalents of the USIA's Office to Counter Soviet Disinformation, the State Department-based interagency Soviet Active Measures Working Group, and the CIA's Office of Global Issues (which analyzed intelligence collected on Soviet propaganda and active measures), and the intelligence community's and State Department's collection efforts on foreign propaganda and political influence operations.

Given that such strategic matters as the recruitment of new cadre to terrorist organizations is done through the use not only of propaganda but of ideological and religious doctrines, successful counter-propaganda requires truly expert knowledge of these doctrines. Knowledge of these doctrines is remarkably scarce within the U.S. government. This is due not only to the lack of professional requirements for such knowledge but also to a general illiteracy about matters of religion in general and comparative religion in particular.

Pope Benedict XVI recently offered an example of public diplomacy and religious/philosophical engagement in his speech at Regensburg.³ This speech was designed not only to engage Islam in inter-religious dialogue but to issue a provocative challenge to those forces within Islam that are more capable of peaceful coexistence with, say, Judaism and Christianity to confront what Robert Reilly has called a "Nietzschean" strain within Islam that posits that Allah is pure will and that his laws are unfathomable to human reason.⁴ The pope asked, in effect: does Islam today contain the concept of

3. Benedict XVI, "Faith, Reason, and the University," Papal Address at the University of Regensburg, September 12, 2006.

4. Robert R. Reilly, *The Roots of Islamist Ideology* (London: Centre for Research into Post-Communist Economies, 2006). The Regensburg speech provoked a widespread outcry from many segments of the Moslem world. But this notwithstanding, the speech did serve to initiate a dialogue both within the Islamic and Christian communities about the use of violence to spread religion.

“Natural Law”—the Moral Law, or, as C. S. Lewis described it, the “Law of Decent Behavior” that is written on the human heart? Is Allah reasonable? The Aristotelian concept of a Natural Law was once a significant part of Islam in the Middle Ages, but was superseded by a concept of a God whose will is not discernible, and who is arbitrary if not capricious in the exercise of that will. This concept has proven to be flexible enough that Islamist extremists have been able to exploit it for violent, secular political ends. The question thus arises: will Islam retain any element of its philosophical and spiritual character, or will it continue to move in a direction that accommodates extremists who justify terrorist violence as a reflection of Allah’s will? Even to begin to appreciate the possibilities of public diplomatic engagement in this example requires some minimal literacy in philosophy and religion—literacy that one cannot reasonably expect to encounter in diplomatic circles.

This example, of course, points to one of the key ways to address the larger problem addressed earlier: the absence of integrated strategic thinking. This absence, which often reflects the corollary absence of coherent strategic goals and a commensurate strategy to achieve them, puts a large part of American traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy in a reactive frame of mind, and therefore on the defensive. Improved strategic thinking can reverse this ingrained habit and put the United States much more on the political and moral offensive, placing our adversaries in a reactive and defensive frame of mind. A large part of what is required to achieve such a posture is to engage in genuine strategic planning in all matters of strategic influence—the very process of matching ends and means and budgets that is not done in matters concerning either traditional or public diplomacy.

Structural Solutions

Creating a U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency

The intellectual gap in public diplomacy in all its dimensions continues to be as great as ever. Indeed, there has hardly been a Secretary of State in the last several decades who has understood the issues sufficiently and has placed any significant priority on the subject. Because the authorities in this field are so notably scarce among the generation appropriate for leadership of the Department, the prospects are very slim of a true champion of the art arriving at the Department and harboring the kind of passionate commitment to it that is required to reform it in the necessary ways.

The apparent structural progress that was made in the last year of the Bush Administration is not yet enough for one to conclude that the improved structure can still stand. That structure suffers from insufficient strategic coordination, severe budget shortfalls, and the continued absence of the necessary cultural change within the State Department.

Under the circumstances, in the near term, the cause of public diplomacy will require the creation of a culture that will have to find sustenance and the ability to flower outside of the State Department's influence. This will necessitate the creation of a new agency, even though such an agency will risk being considered a second-class citizen in the foreign policy-making community. The challenge, therefore, is to create an agency whose portfolio is so extensive that its strategic significance cannot be ignored and, most importantly, whose existence in the long term would spur a culture of influence within the Department and other relevant agencies of the government.

There have been several excellent suggestions for the creation of such an agency. Carnes Lord has put forth the idea of re-creating the former U.S. Information Agency, giving it a renewed independence in public diplomacy from the State Department, but formed with a

spirit more akin to the World War II-era Office of War Information than to the original USIA.⁵ Lord, however, cautions against undoing whatever progress has been made within the State Department to incorporate public diplomacy into its thinking. Thus, public diplomacy officers must be retained within each of the State Department's bureaus. The new USIA, then, would not be involved with generating and disseminating "policy information" as did the former USIA: this role would remain within State. Rather, it would have the much larger strategic responsibility of developing and implementing public diplomacy doctrine, campaigns, and programs, thus serving not simply in a "supporting role" for American diplomacy but in a larger strategic role to achieve the public diplomatic objectives of U.S. foreign and national security policy.⁶

The private Public Diplomacy Council has recommended a *de facto* re-creation of the former USIA, only now to be called the U.S. Agency for Public Diplomacy. Under the new arrangement, this agency would be within the State Department but sufficiently removed from the traditional diplomatic culture that it could operate with greater effectiveness. By remaining within State, the new agency, "would be 'in on the take offs as well as the crash landings' from the beginnings of policy formulation through to its implementation."⁷ The Council, however, recommends that the priority of public diplomacy be elevated by giving the new agency's director the equivalent rank of a Deputy Secretary of State and making the director co-chair of a major interagency group.

Juliana Pilon has suggested—but ultimately not recommended—a model which has not received adequate attention. She calls it the "American Global Outreach and Research Agency." Although she

5. Lord, *Losing Hearts and Minds?* pp. 76 ff.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 81-82.

7. Public Diplomacy Council, *A Call for Action on Public Diplomacy*, pp. 10-12.

does not go into detail about all its components and functions, she does indicate that its task would be to “promote synchronicity” between the State Department’s Bureau of Public Diplomacy, USAID, the Peace Corps and the work of some fifty other government entities. She ultimately hesitates to recommend such a structural change, because of the risks that it would provide the illusion of a cure (as did the recent reorganization of the intelligence community) when the disease that it must overcome can be cured only by a complete change of thinking—one as deep as a change in worldview.⁸

It is my recommendation that indeed a new agency of the type suggested by Pilon be created. Whereas she hesitates to find in it a true solution for what is a larger intellectual problem, I believe that form can very well help to create substance—especially if affirmative efforts are made to create a proper culture appropriate to the form. It should be recalled here that, because the State Department is antithetical to a culture of strategic influence, another home where such a culture can grow and flourish must be created.

I believe that this new home should be called the U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency (USPDA), or, if one prefers, the U.S. Agency for Public Diplomacy, as the Public Diplomacy Council suggests. The reasons for this title are as follows. To resurrect the venerable USIA has an enormous appeal that resides in tradition and in a readily accessible identity and mission derived from that tradition. However, to call it an “Information Agency” is to sequester the agency within the State Department’s misguided conceptual framework where public diplomacy is mostly and most importantly the stuff of press spokesmen and public affairs officers: “information about U.S. policy,” “spin” for policy, and “telling America’s story to the world.” As such, an ‘information agency’ would have an uphill struggle in its efforts to conduct, secure funding for, and set policy for, the many

8. Pilon, *Why America is Such a Hard Sell*, pp. 8-9.

other activities that comprise public diplomacy and that make for a culture of influence.

To have the new agency fulfill essentially the same functions as the former USIA is to risk, once again, placing it in a permanent second-class status in the foreign affairs community as it was even in its most thriving days. Instead, that agency must have an expanded role not only in information, exchanges, visitor programs, and so forth, but also in foreign assistance, political action, ideological competition, and the many other forms of public diplomacy understood in its largest sense.

To call it an agency for “strategic communications” has limitations similar to those involved with calling it an information agency. The U.S. International Communications Agency (USICA)—the incarnation of USIA that existed in the 1970s—suffered from such limitations insofar as “communications” simply seemed another, fancier way of saying “information.” Wearing that new moniker did little to enhance an influence culture and command greater respect in the larger U.S. foreign policy community, or to be properly perceived as comprehending forms of public diplomacy from cultural diplomacy to foreign assistance to ideological warfare—none of which are conventionally perceived to be elements of “communication,” be they “international” or “strategic.”

As for Pilon’s arguments for why the strategic concept at hand is one of “strategic outreach,” the term, without the explanations, would seem to be too obscure for the uninitiated, and would still appear to exclude activities such as political action and political warfare that could still plausibly appear under the public diplomacy banner.

A U.S. Public Diplomacy Agency would optimally serve as an appendage to the Department of State in a way similar to the way the U.S. Agency for International Development is currently attached to the Department, as the Public Diplomacy Council has suggested.

Under this current arrangement the Administrator of USAID holds a rank equivalent to Deputy Secretary of State and the title of Director of Foreign Assistance and Administrator of USAID. Under the new arrangement, the Director of USPDA should occupy a position of much greater prominence than the USAID Administrator. To accomplish that, this position should be bolstered in several ways.

First of all, to demonstrate that public diplomacy position occupies a place of strategic importance as a separate art of statecraft analogous to intelligence or military power, the National Security Act of 1947 should be revised to make the Director of USPDA a statutory observer within the National Security Council—a position that has been occupied only by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of Central Intelligence (and more recently by the Director of National Intelligence). Furthermore, the USPDA Director would chair a White House-based senior interagency committee whose membership would consist of the representatives of every relevant public diplomacy agency and international affairs office within the various cabinet departments and independent agencies (including the Office of Management and Budget, representatives of various relevant intelligence agencies, the international affairs offices of such agencies as the Departments of Commerce, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Labor, Treasury, etc.). Such a committee might be called the National Public Diplomacy Council. Its Deputy Chairman would be the Senior Director for Public Diplomacy in the National Security Council. Taskings assigned to various agencies by this Council would be sent to those agencies by the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, thus bearing a White House imprimatur and enforcement arm. This link with the NSC, as well as that embodied by the USPDA Director's observer status on the NSC, would give public diplomacy a greater

interagency prominence than has ever existed. The recently formed Policy Coordinating Committee on Strategic Communications would remain, albeit as a subcommittee of the larger National Public Diplomacy Council. This would reflect the fact that, as argued above, strategic communications is a subset of public diplomacy. Similarly, the interagency Global Strategic Engagement Center, which incorporates the nexus between overt public diplomacy efforts in the war of ideas with intelligence analysis and covert action, would also be a subcommittee of the larger Council.

To strengthen further USPDA's position, the new agency should be enlarged so that it incorporates most existing independent public diplomacy functions as well as those currently within the Department of State. So structured, USPDA would serve as a vehicle to integrate the public diplomatic elements of foreign affairs and national security policy. And where existing public diplomacy responsibilities would remain in other departments and government agencies, it would also provide a mechanism to help ensure strategic coherence in the work of these various agencies. With such a plethora of functions—most of which extend far beyond information policy—one essential requirement for effective public diplomacy would finally become clear: the Director of such a vast agency would have to possess a knowledge of foreign policy and integrated strategy far exceeding the usual knowledge and skills of the typical “public affairs,” journalism, or advertising specialist appointed to the leadership role in either the old USIA or as Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Moreover, the USPDA should incorporate several existing agencies responsible for various areas of strategic influence.

Thus, the Agency for International Development should become one of new USPDA's component parts, as AID's functions of foreign assistance, disaster relief, medical diplomacy, and promotion

of democracy and good government are forms of strategic influence that, as argued above, are forms of public diplomacy. In the interest of keeping its trademark acronym, AID, it could still be called the Agency for International Development, but its Director should become a new Associate Director of USPDA for Foreign Assistance.

To ensure that international broadcasting has the budgetary and political support to carry out its mission as an element of public diplomacy, the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) should be disbanded as an independent agency and its functions should be folded within the new USPDA as a new Bureau of Broadcasting under a single new Associate Director for Broadcasting. By its enabling legislation, the work of the existing BBG has been effectively independent of policy coordination, priority setting, and accountability to overall U.S. foreign policy. While its leadership has consistently protested that it in fact does conform U.S. international broadcasting to the priorities of U.S. policy, such conformity has been a matter of the BBG's voluntary will that can, as a practical matter, be selectively withheld according to its whims. This is because the Secretary of State, as an *ex-officio* member of the BBG, is for all practical purposes permanently absent from its deliberations, and the geographic bureaus of the Department have historically paid virtually no attention to the entire field of broadcasting. This institutional independence has enabled the broadcasters to avoid the aforementioned threat of State Department censorship. But there have simply been too many deleterious effects resulting from their being outside the universe of strategic priorities established by the President and refined and enforced by the policy-making agencies of the government, as well as being simultaneously outside any budgetary mechanism linked to those priorities. Only when it is under the aegis of a larger foreign policy structure will international broadcasting receive the necessary political support and funding it

needs to carry out its unique and critical mission. Just as the various broadcasting entities within the BBG structure have been able to claim independence from policies of the State Department under their current arrangement, they would still be able to do so within the USFDA.

Under this new structure, the distinction could be maintained in international broadcasting between the Voice of America—as the voice of the American government and the American people—and those radios (and television stations) that serve as a domestic surrogate free press for countries with no free press or a weak, fledgling, or threatened free press. And in the interest of ensuring that all U.S. broadcasts remain invulnerable to charges of political partisanship, a bipartisan International Broadcasting Oversight Board could be created. This board would not have any executive role as the current BBG does. Instead, it would supervise externally commissioned analyses of programming to discover: if the broadcasting was promoting political objectives antithetical to those of U.S. strategic influence policy; if its programs reflected a partisan agenda that would be offensive or objectionable to major U.S. constituencies; and if its programs were effective in their assigned mission.

Other programs, such as the Peace Corps, could profitably be placed within the new agency. This would give the Peace Corps the kind of national-level strategic attention and resources that it has rarely enjoyed—except when the National Security Council has only occasionally paid it such attention in the past. Within the USFDA, the Peace Corps's priorities of which countries to serve and the allocation of human and material resources could be coordinated with other national public diplomacy priorities in a coherent, strategic fashion. This amalgamation would require amendment of the Peace Corps legislation. It can be expected that arguments will be made that mixing the Peace Corps with other public diplomatic

activity will sully the purity of its humanitarian mission. The same arguments can be made by performing artists who could object to the harnessing of artistic talent for political purposes or by scientists who could protest that their pursuit of scientific truth through international scientific exchange is similarly polluted. But if the Peace Corps is not designed to serve the political objective of peace, then why spend taxpayer dollars on it and instead let private charities serve pure humanitarian objectives?

The current Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs within the Department of State should be transferred to the new agency as well and be renamed the Bureau of Education, Culture and Ideas, or some variant thereof. Perhaps it could simply be called a Bureau of Cultural Diplomacy, as education and matters concerning ideas, ideology, and religion all can be subsumed under cultural affairs. The reason, however, for including the word “ideas” in the title of the bureau is to stress the importance of ideas as a critical element of foreign political development, foreign propaganda, and the radicalization of terrorists, as well as a means of public diplomatic engagement and even political warfare. Unless ideas are specifically identified as a subject of strategic attention, they can easily become ignored. The function of engagement with other countries and cultures at the intellectual and ideological level thus cannot be restricted to “educational exchange” programs, for under such a rubric, this function can be incrementally neglected, shelved, and finally banished from active consideration. For these reasons, there should be a new Office of Foreign Ideological and Religious Affairs within this larger Bureau.

A constituent element of the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas should be an office to coordinate with ongoing military public diplomacy at a national strategic level and to bolster the public diplomatic impact of the presence of U.S. military person-

nel living abroad. While the armed forces have independently and effectively run numerous public diplomacy activities, they have only sporadically conducted systematic training in cross-cultural relations and communication for personnel stationed in military bases abroad. When such training has been done—often with minimal time and expense—the positive public diplomatic effects have been enormous. An office within USPDA devoted to this priority would help ensure that such training does not atrophy when other military priorities cause it to be neglected. Meanwhile, those public diplomacy activities that the armed forces have successfully run have often been conducted without sufficient knowledge on the part of civilian public diplomats and thus have rarely been part of any national-level strategic planning that has ever taken place in this realm. These include port visits and showing the flag, medical diplomacy by hospital ships, air shows, officer exchanges, the education of foreign officers, and shows of force short of gunboat diplomacy. Greater coordination of these activities with civilian public diplomacy efforts in information policy and cultural diplomacy could result in great force multiplication effects.

A similar office within the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas would work on maximizing the effectiveness of the public diplomatic effects of American students, business personnel, and other civilians living abroad who are *de facto* representatives of the United States. Such an office within USPDA charged with developing and providing materials to aid interested civilians in cross-cultural relations would ensure that the importance of this function is not neglected either in the armed forces or among civilians. The office would also be a resource for Americans living abroad, which would allow it to develop relationships with the expatriate community. The office could maintain an inventory of civilian expertise in foreign geographic ar-

ees that could be harnessed in times of special national need; it could even be the administrator of a civilian public diplomacy reserve force and work in cooperation with USAID, which could independently maintain an inventory of civilian expertise in its specialized areas of economic development, post-war reconstruction, health, and disaster relief. Such reserve forces could give the United States more of a “civilian surge capability”—a function that was filled by the Army in Iraq during its “surge” of 2006-2008 in the absence of civilian forces that could be so deployed. (As a practical matter, however, we must not be under the illusion that any institution other than the Army can fulfill the many “civilian” tasks that must be undertaken in war zones or post-war zones—tasks for which the Army once had a huge Civil Affairs Division during World War II, and lesser variants thereof since then. Nevertheless, the development of a USPDA-based civil corps could complement the Army’s efforts in selected areas and assist in the process of strategic integration of national policy.)

The private sector already plays an unacknowledged role in public diplomacy, and that role should be both recognized and organizationally accommodated. The Office of Private Sector Outreach, currently within the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, should include an information clearing-house on all public diplomacy-oriented grants for private sector organizations and individuals available from every government agency. With such an office, the government would greatly enhance its ability to think strategically about all forms of private sector cooperation and facilitate all those interested in any aspect of public diplomacy to find the proper venue within the government to seek funding and partnerships.

The current Bureau of International Information Programs should remain as currently constituted but within the USPDA. However, it should be renamed the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs. This renaming should reflect the addition—

or public recognition—of the larger political influence and political action components that public diplomacy includes. Where, if not in such a bureau, would be located an office concerned with ensuring that, for example, the Republican Party and American conservatives maintain relations with analogous parties and political forces in other countries, or that the Democratic Party and American liberals maintain similar relations with their counterparts abroad? These relationships, after all, are ways by which contacts can be maintained with opposition parties, provincial leaders who may have an effect on national policies, as well as young politicians who will become the future leaders of their countries. Although this has been a function occasionally discharged by the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute—components of the National Endowment for Democracy—it has been exercised only episodically and not strategically, to the detriment of the national interest. This is the result of an absence of strategic planning and public diplomacy doctrine within the Department of State. Thus, within this bureau should reside an office concerned with identifying other political forces and opinion leaders abroad with whom the United States must have relations and influence. This office would coordinate activities with the office concerned with ideological and religious matters within the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas.

To operate effectively in the modern media environment where fast-moving political conditions and information flows can cause both tactical and strategic political damage if left unaddressed, the new Bureau of International Political and Information Programs should contain a corps of officers both trained to recognize information of strategic importance and skilled at using the technology that has emerged in the last two decades, particularly the internet and its many applications. This requires not only the necessary technical skill frequently absent in senior ranks of the government but

also, given the unforgiving pace of information flow and the speed required to respond effectively, the granting of much more independence to younger officials.

Given the ability of propaganda and disinformation to influence foreign—and domestic—public opinion, USFDA would need yet another resource: a strong counter-propaganda and counterintelligence operation. Within the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs should be a well-funded and well-staffed Office to Counter Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation. It should contain two divisions: an office of foreign propaganda and disinformation analysis and an office to develop and conduct counter-propaganda and counter-disinformation operations. The latter office should be, in effect, a “truth squad” whose role would be to expose foreign propaganda and disinformation themes and develop messages to convey the truth to affected publics. This office should also work with the Bureau of Education, Culture and Ideas by supplying propaganda awareness information to U.S. participants in international exchanges to protect against the adverse propaganda effects that can result from foreign states using their exchange participants as propagandists.

Whereas the Office to Counter Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation would serve to counter propaganda and disinformation with corrective information, another unit within the Bureau—an Office of Public Diplomatic Security—would be in charge of ensuring that there is sufficient counterintelligence protection against foreign political influence operations and against the infiltration of U.S. public diplomacy programs by foreign agents of influence. Including counterintelligence here—doubtlessly to the surprise of many in the public diplomacy world—is based on the fact that one essential task of this art (which is usually misunderstood as solely a matter of counterespionage) is the countering of influence activities conducted by foreign intelligence services. The Office of Public

Diplomatic Security would be involved in working with the larger counterintelligence community in identifying foreign influence activities that make use of commercial operations, illicit campaign contributions, and other forms of subversion and political manipulation designed to have ultimately propagandistic, disinformative, and subversive effects. A recent—and particularly disturbing—example of an influence operation that could well be the province of the new security office is the attempt by Islamists to secure a foothold for Shariah law within the United States. This effort, which also involves the work of foreign governments, includes the attempt to use financial leverage to induce U.S. financial institutions to adopt “Shariah finance” as an initial step toward adopting a parallel legal framework that some Islamists ultimately intended to serve as a substitute for the U.S. Constitution.⁹ During the Cold War, protection against infiltration by foreign agents of influence was always weak at institutions such as the Voice of America and RFE/RL. Agents of influence who succeeded in finding positions in the services broadcasting to the countries of the Soviet Bloc concentrated on two principal tasks: fomenting political provocations among the staffs of these stations, including the incitement of inter-ethnic tensions, and developing

9. Just as the Islamic world is variegated, so has been the association of Shariah finance with political groups and agendas. There have been enough associations, however, with political groups and enough explicit Islamist statements about the ultimate political goals of Shariah that this should be a matter of serious concern for those committed to preservation of the U.S. Constitution. For an excellent review of the record of Shariah finance in various Moslem countries and the worry it has caused in some of their governments, see Ibrahim Warde, *Islamic Finance in the Global Economy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000). For an analysis of the potential subversive effects of Shariah in the United States, see McCormick Foundation and Center for Security Policy, *Shariah, Law, and “Financial Jihad”: How Should America Respond?* (Chicago: McCormick Foundation, 2008).

programs that echoed Soviet bloc propaganda to demoralize the target audiences—when hearing the echoes, the audiences would realize that no redoubt of resistance to communist oppression was invulnerable and that maybe, after all, resistance was futile. The Office of Public Diplomatic Security would be designed to detect any such attempts at infiltration.

The Bureau of International Political and Information Programs, working in cooperation with the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas, should have yet another division, devoted specifically to the study of the semantics of international political discourse and, most importantly, of foreign propaganda. This division would perform a “linguistic reality check,” which is as important as having an interpreter at international summit meetings. This kind of analysis is crucial to understanding correctly the codified language used by our adversaries, and it is almost never done systematically. For example, during the Cold War, the U.S. Government conducted its diplomacy toward the Soviet Union on the basis of complete ignorance of the Soviet definition of the expression, “peaceful coexistence,” a term which was consistently defined in Soviet literature and official political lexicons not according to the conventional American understanding of it—i.e., “we may dislike each other, but we will live and let live”—but rather as “a form of struggle against capitalism, where all forms of struggle are permissible except all-out war.”¹⁰ This term was officially incorporated into the 1972 agreement signed by President Nixon and Communist Party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev: “Basic Principles of Relations between the USSR and the USA” as well as the 1972 ABM Treaty. It was not until the 1986 Reykyavik summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail

10. See, for example, the entry on “peaceful coexistence” in M. Rummyantsev (ed.) *A Dictionary of Scientific Communism* (Nauchnyi Kommunizm Slovar’), (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984), p. 171.

Gorbachev, where Reagan rejected Gorbachev's proposal that both sides agree once again to a statement of principle that bilateral relations be based on the "principle of peaceful coexistence," that U.S. policy reflected a true understanding of the term.

Understanding of semantics and enemy code words is no less important in the current conflict than it was during the Cold War. The systematic analysis of language is necessary for the formulation of strategically optimal terminology for use in U.S. information programs. Thus, as an example, this office would analyze how—and whether—the U.S. Government should use the expression "*jihad*," conventionally understood to mean "holy war," to describe the activities of Islamist terrorists. Since one of the definitions of this word is the struggle against one's sinful tendencies, it is a word that can have positive and holy connotations in Islam. Rigorous linguistic analysis would thus address the question of whether the use of the term tends to dignify or even legitimize terrorist acts with a patina of holiness, and if it does, then it would suggest the use of other terms. An alternative argument in this example might be that the use of "*jihad*" to describe terrorist activities—used because terrorists describe their activities in such a fashion—places pressure on politically moderate Moslems to disavow extremist Islamism and excommunicate those who discredit Islam by committing terrorist acts under its banner. Reclaiming the hijacked word would both deprive the terrorists of religious legitimacy they claim to possess and help separate the religion from bloody images of terror. Such analysis can also serve as the basis for encouraging politically moderate Moslems to use other Koranic terms (something that non-Moslems cannot do with any credibility) to discredit those who kill innocents in the name of *jihad*. One such term is "*hiraba*," a word that connotes terrorist violence against innocents, and that, according to the Koran, merits the most

severe of punishments, including crucifixion.¹¹ While, in this case, both arguments have merit, the choice of terms used by U.S. officials would have to be determined also on the basis of a larger strategy in the war of ideas.

To enable broader and more effective conduct of public diplomacy under the auspices of the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs, particularly in broadcasting and information, the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948 should be amended. Changing Section 501, which restricts the use of public funds to disseminate within the United States program materials designed for foreign audiences, is an important priority. Amended by Senator J. William Fulbright in 1972 as part of his overall efforts to dismantle U.S. international broadcasting, and by Senator Edward Zorinsky in 1985, the Act has hampered U.S. public diplomacy by prohibiting access to U.S. Government-generated foreign information and broadcasts by the American public. The original intent of the relevant provisions of this legislation was to protect private U.S. media companies from competition in foreign media markets by the U.S. Government. It was also designed to protect the American public from being propagandized by U.S. Government foreign affairs agencies—a protection inspired by mistrust of the political leanings of State Department officials, who, at the time, were suspected of harboring excessive pro-Soviet sympathies.¹²

The results of the legislation as it has been interpreted have been several-fold. First, American scholars, analysts, ordinary citizens, and, as a practical matter, even members of Congress and Congressional staff members have been unable to gain meaningful

11. See an example of such analysis in J. Michael Waller, *Fighting the War of Ideas like a Real War*, (Washington D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2007).

12. For an excellent analysis of the legislative history of this legislation, see Matt Armstrong, "Rethinking Smith-Mundt," *Small Wars Journal*, www.smallwarsjournal.com, July 28, 2008

access to the products of U.S. communications activities abroad to analyze their effectiveness and congruency with U.S. foreign policy objectives. Ironically, information that is public for foreign audiences (including any Americans living abroad) is effectively classified and unavailable to Americans in the U.S. One may argue that this restriction is in itself a form of censorship, and, as such, constitutes domestic propaganda. Second, as Bryan Hill has argued, lack of access to U.S. information generated for foreign audiences has contributed to widespread public ignorance about public diplomacy, thereby limiting the possibilities of civilian outreach abroad which could contribute to the global struggle for hearts and minds.¹³ Another consequence has been the lack of public access to serious, accurate, unclassified information about foreign events as reported by U.S. Government broadcasters and the Department of State—an increasingly unfortunate situation, given the steady decrease in foreign reporting by major U.S. newspapers and other media outlets and the rise of foreign propaganda within the United States. One dimension of this problem has been the inability of American-based media to use U.S. Government-produced programming for publicly worthwhile purposes. In one exasperating example pointed out by Matt Armstrong, a local radio station in Minneapolis broadcasting to the largest Somali community in the United States was refused the use of Voice of America Somali language programming that would serve as a positive alternative to Somali terrorist propaganda that has streamed into that city and that has succeeded in recruiting numerous Somali-

13. Bryan Hill, "The Smith-Mundt Act of 1948: Comments, Critiques, and the Way Forward." Occasional Papers Series, Apr. 2007, The Center for Security Policy, Aug. 11, 2008, <http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/Modules/NewsManager/Center%20publication%20PDFs/OCC%20Smith%20Mundt.pdf>.

Americans to join the terrorist cause¹⁴—an outcome clearly at odds both with American public sentiment and with the national security interest.

Smith-Mundt's prohibitions on domestic dissemination of program material have also placed significant constraints on the use of the internet for public diplomatic purposes since the American public can easily gain access to U.S. Government-generated information and ideas developed for this medium. This has been particularly the case in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, where military lawyers, citing Smith-Mundt, have restricted information operations on the internet. Given that al-Qaida has run some hundreds of websites as part of its propaganda and recruitment efforts, the fact that most of their contents go unanswered by U.S. public diplomacy is a form of extraordinary unilateral disarmament in time of war.¹⁵

A final deleterious consequence of this legislation is that U.S. Government foreign affairs agencies—excluding the Department of Defense—have been unable to tell their stories to the American public and to generate public understanding and support for their public diplomatic work. That such a bizarre and counterproductive consequence should result from this legislation ought to spur Congress to redress this situation.

In formulating any amendments to this legislation, it should be noted that there is a difference between “propagandizing” the American people and making available to the public program materials prepared for—and available to—foreign audiences. This distinction could well be incorporated into any amendments to the legislation in ways that would not provoke fears of Government propaganda.

14. Matt Armstrong, “Censoring the Voice of America,” *Foreign Policy*, August 6, 2009.

15. See Juliana Geran Pilon, “Obsolete Restrictions on Public Diplomacy Hurt U.S. Outreach and Strategy.” Dec 3, 2007. The Heritage Foundation, Aug. 11, 2008 <<http://www.heritage.org/research/NationalSecurity/bg2089.cfm>

Thus, the obsolete and counterproductive portion of Section 501 that states that “no program material prepared by the United States Information Agency shall be distributed within the United States” could be eliminated and replaced by language permitting that such program material be “made available” to the public, a provision, as Hill has argued, that would not constitute propaganda.¹⁶ Moreover, protection against domestic propaganda could be supplied by creating a bipartisan Information Review Board, akin to the Broadcasting Board of Governors. Such a Board, *with a bipartisan professional staff and a bipartisan cohort of professional contractors*, could exercise an oversight function to ensure that information made available within the United States—including that which may be used by such media outlets as the community radio station in Minneapolis—is non-partisan, accurate, and not characterized by that disingenuous manipulation of fact and falsehood that constitutes true propaganda.

One important dimension that must be incorporated into the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs is expertise on the public diplomacy aspects of war, peace making, and peacekeeping. The presence of civilian experts in these matters might well have prompted an earlier adoption of a more effective public diplomatic dimension to U.S. military and civil-military operations in Iraq. It could be argued that such a civilian office is unnecessary, since, as mentioned above, the armed forces already identified and filled the huge gap that existed in this field. But, given the insufficiency of strategic attention to this set of instruments of statecraft, it would be optimal to have such a civilian capability. This capability could also work with the armed forces on developing a strategic dimension to psycho-

16. Bryan Hill, “The Smith-Mundt Act of 1948: Comments, Critiques, and the Way Forward.”

logical warfare, which tends to be missing from the more tactically oriented psychological operations of the armed forces.¹⁷

The Bureau should also have an Office of Research and Analysis, which would take over the Media Research and Analysis office, currently within the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The office would conduct foreign public opinion research with a unit serving as an intelligence liaison dedicated to determining the intelligence requirements for public diplomacy—principally that information which constitutes “opportunities intelligence” that would assist in the crafting of messages for foreign publics and the development of political action strategies. This office would debrief public diplomats and private sector participants in public and cultural diplomacy programs about their insights into local political conditions and attitudes of foreigners of influence, and when appropriate, convey the findings to the geographic and other relevant functional bureaus of the State Department, the Defense Department, the relevant armed forces, and the intelligence community. The unit that performs foreign public opinion analysis would coordinate with this office to help develop ways of assessing how foreign publics are interpreting our messages. But to determine both whether the messages are effective and how they could be tailored for better effect, intelligence must also be collected on how foreigners of influence in particular are receiving those messages.

This larger Bureau of International Political and Information Programs should be divided into geographic and functional bureaus, as was the case in USIA, in each of which should be stationed a representative of the State Department whose function will be to help coordinate public diplomacy with traditional diplomacy. However,

17. For an outstanding analysis and set of recommendations concerning all aspects of the Defense Department's role in strategic influence, including psychological operations, see Lord, *Losing Hearts and Minds?*, pp. 32-33, 108-109.

as mentioned above, public diplomacy policy cannot be subordinated completely to the requirements of government-to-government relations and these officials cannot serve as political commissars and censors. Instead, their role would be to assist in the coordination of traditional and public diplomacy and alert all concerned to the possibility of conflicts, which might ultimately have to be adjudicated at higher levels. This arrangement would represent one element of a larger system of checks and balances designed to restrain excessive influence of either function and to ensure integrated strategic coordination within the U.S. foreign policy apparatus as a whole. However, both the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs and the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas must have personnel stationed at home and abroad who are given enough latitude to take instantaneous action to respond to fast-moving foreign propaganda and disinformation without having to receive layers of clearances that historically have had to reach as high as the White House. The USPDA and the State Department would do well to absorb a lesson—worth reiterating here—from the armed forces, which have permitted even very low ranking officers to adopt political strategies and tactics in dealing, for example, with local village sheikhs in Iraq and village elders in Afghanistan, making decisions on the most appropriate ways to win their hearts and minds, and finding ways by which they can reconcile with other local protagonists.

To ensure that public diplomacy policy is strategically conceived at the national level, the current Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources under the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy should establish within it an office devoted specifically to the development of public diplomacy doctrine and policy. This should operate fully under the assumption that there is public diplomacy policy that is separate from policy concerning foreign governments. This of-

office would be responsible for planning and coordinating the public diplomacy budget with other full spectrum diplomatic operations.

The current Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor—one of the key bureaus under the current Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs—could properly also be placed within the new USPDA. Serious consideration should be given to moving the democracy part of this bureau's portfolio to the Bureau of International Political and Information Programs—as democracy building is a form of political action. Similarly, the labor portfolio could profitably be moved to the Bureau of Education, Culture, and Ideas—as international labor relations are an element of professional exchanges analogous to many other types of professional exchange. The remaining human rights portfolio would acquire a renewed strength by not being diluted with the other functions.

What, then, should remain of strategic influence and public diplomacy within the other geographic and functional bureaus of the Department of State? Even if most every element of public diplomacy is removed from the Department and placed in USPDA, there must remain a serious consciousness of public diplomatic priorities among the traditional diplomatic corps. For, ultimately, the purpose of creating the new agency is to spur a culture of influence within the Department and other relevant agencies of the government. Once that culture is implanted in the Foreign Service as a whole, the necessity of a separate agency may disappear. The way this consciousness could be implanted is by having a public diplomacy officer from USPDA in each of the geographic and functional bureaus of the Department, mirroring the presence of traditional diplomats in appropriate bureaus of USPDA. These officers would exercise a fully reciprocal function within State as State officers would in USPDA. Among their other functions, they would be involved in incorporating “public opinion impact analysis” into other elements of foreign and military poli-

cymaking. Their presence in the geographic and functional bureaus would represent another vital arm in a system of checks and balances—in this case, preventing the genetic tendency of the Department to diminish public diplomatic priorities in favor of traditional diplomacy.

In addition, the State Department might well include within its walls an office of strategic influence and public diplomacy that could reside either within the Office of the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, within the Policy Planning Staff, or independently (such as the proposed “Bureau of Political Affairs” mentioned earlier). Such an office would have experts in each aspect of public diplomacy, including psychological operations, political action, and political and ideological warfare. It would serve as the State Department equivalent of such offices within the Defense Department as the former Special Advisory Staff, or more recently, the Office of Public Diplomacy Support, attached to the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy. Again, such an office would be part of a system of checks and balances.

The State Department should significantly expand its network of consulates, which can house a large USPDA contingent. And finally, the Public Affairs function within the current State Department structure should remain as a separate Bureau within the Department, with the exception of a few of its functions that used to be in the former USIA, and which should be transferred to the USPDA.

In order to ensure that a culture of influence is created within the Department of State and to avoid the marginalization of USPDA, the public diplomacy “cone” of the Foreign Service should enjoy equal prestige with the “political cone.” Such prestige will easily accrue if a new rule is adopted: that, of all Foreign Service ambassadorships, a full fifty percent go to public diplomats from USPDA. Once such a reform is in place, the distinction between

the political and public diplomacy cones could well disappear and all diplomats could then cultivate skill in full spectrum diplomatic operations. Whereas today political appointee ambassadors learn, sometimes painfully, the language of diplomatic caution, and Foreign Service Officers only rarely learn the language of persuasion, a change in the allocation of ambassadorships will bring about the necessary cultural change among Foreign Service Officers faster than any other possible initiative.

Creating an enhanced foreign development aid capability

In light of the economic—and public diplomatic—success of the Marshall Plan implemented in Western Europe after World War II, the Enterprise Funds established in Central and Eastern Europe after the collapse of the Soviet empire, and those limited programs dedicated to micro-credit and the legal protection of private property in the Third World, the U.S. Government should establish a permanent organization dedicated to large-scale efforts to provide credit for private enterprise in developing countries. Its sole objective would be to help spur sustainable economic growth leading not to dependence but to prosperity—and to the eventual weaning off foreign aid. In an ideal world, such an organization should be located within USAID. The question arises, however, as to whether the existing ethos at that agency is capable of placing sufficient priority on this project in light of many aspects of its institutional culture: its ongoing legacy of government-to-government assistance; the attitude of many of its personnel that its methods must be principally charity-like in character; and its many programs that attempt—quite legitimately—to address a multitude of legal, cultural, and technical obstacles to successful private enterprise in the countries in which it operates. Because giving people genuine opportunity—particularly people in theaters of war in which the United States is engaged—is a project of such vital importance to U.S. stra-

tegic interests, and because providing access to credit—especially credit generated locally by the unleashing of human potential and capital locked up by the lack of legal protection of property—is such a critical dimension of this effort, there is a case to be made that a separate office or even agency should be established to focus entirely on the principal elements of this mission.

Thus, a permanent institution that could be called the U.S. Foreign Enterprise Fund should be created. It could alternatively serve as an independent agency within the USPDA, separate from USAID; it could be incorporated within a very private-enterprise-oriented agency like the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC); or it could become a free-standing agency. The logic of the latter two options stems from the greater likelihood that the governing board of OPIC or relative administrative independence would arm such an organization with private sector expertise: bankers, corporate executives, and entrepreneurs who have built small businesses, all of whom are more likely than most foreign aid officials to understand the challenges and realities facing business development and particularly the securing of credit. This new agency or sub-agency would be endowed by Congress with large funds to provide credit to strategically located populations and then work specifically to establish property registries, legal property protection, and the locally-based credit that would be generated by the resultant collateral.¹⁸ The endowment funds would be designed like the Central and Eastern European Enterprise Funds to be self-sustaining, insofar as a large percentage of the loans they make would be repaid and recycled to finance new business. The long-term stakes in such an undertaking are great: self-sustaining economic growth will not only improve the lives of the poor, restore their human dignity, and give them the tools to wean themselves off foreign aid, but in the current

18. See Schaefer, "A \$9 trillion Question," p. 2.

theaters of war, it will serve our national security by undermining the efforts of the terrorist networks, whose recruitment strategy feeds on the poverty and hopelessness of their future warriors and suicide bombers.

New capabilities in the intelligence, counterintelligence, and defense communities

POLITICAL ACTION AND POLITICAL WARFARE IN THE CIA AND U.S. GOVERNMENT PROXIES

The precipitous reduction in the covert political action capabilities of the United States must be quickly overcome. Since large parts of our ability to fight the war of ideas against Islamist terrorist ideology involve supporting politically moderate Moslems and their organizations, such support must be rendered mostly covertly in order to protect such moderate forces from being compromised by association with the United States, Christianity, Western secularism, Israel, Zionism, and India. (It should be noted, however, that there are private organizations that have demonstrated that the task can be accomplished in some places overtly.)

Those whose opposition to this kind of covert support is based on general opposition to covert action of any kind can argue that this is a matter for Moslems to solve within their own community, that leaks that jeopardize the secrecy of covert support to moderates would cause great damage to those moderates and strengthen the extremists, and that the U.S. can engage in political and ideological dialogue overtly through public diplomatic channels. There is some validity to these arguments. But they neglect the matter of time and the potential isolation of Islamic figures who, with support, could have a major impact. They also neglect the nature of the political dialogue within that community: Islamist terrorist organizations use terror as a weapon not only against non-Moslems but also against Moslems themselves. They do so to create a new form of totalitarian

politico-religious conformity and to isolate moderates who do not toe the “party line.” Covert support, just like that used to support dissident forces in the Soviet empire such as the Solidarity movement in Poland, is one of the only practical ways to prevent such isolation and to magnify the voices of those who dissent from the extremist line.

There are, of course, better and worse ways of extending such support, whether covertly or through proxy organizations such as the Asia Foundation or the subsidiary and grantee organizations of the National Endowment For Democracy which are known to be funded by the U.S. Government. One problem that has arisen where such U.S. organizations have attempted to support politically moderate Moslems has been an adverse reaction by Moslems in general to such American efforts. This adverse reaction—even in such a country as Indonesia which has very large, politically moderate Islamic organizations—can be explained by the fact that U.S. Government-sponsored political action was designed to support *secular* organizations and to promote women’s rights by advocating a Western radical feminist vision.¹⁹ In both cases, American political action has militated not simply against Islamist extremism but also against traditional Islamic culture. By supporting secularism, we have offended too many of those who should precisely be our allies: Moslems who want their religion to be a religion and not, in effect, a radical secular ideology that seeks political ends. And by promoting a vision of Western radical feminism, we once again have alienated politically moderate Moslems who are open to enhancing

19. For an example of a study that deserves credit for demonstrating the precedents of U.S. political action in support of pro-Western forces and for advocating that such support be applied to the current war against Islamist extremism, but which also advocates the support of liberal secularism, see Angel Rabasa, Cheryl Benard, Lowell H. Schwartz, and Peter Sickle, *Building Moderate Muslim Networks*, (Santa Monica: RAND Center for Middle East Policy, 2007).

women's rights and dignity, including equality in all sorts of matters such as compensation and education, but who object to dimensions of feminism that they perceive as signs of Western decadence such as abortion, homosexuality, and sexual license.

In the face of negative reactions to such attempts to promote political moderation in the Islamic world, U.S. government agencies and proxy organizations, feeling "burned" on the one hand, and out of their depth in religious matters on the other, appear to have concluded that any American action of this type is counterproductive and have withdrawn from such efforts. This reaction, while understandable, is due largely to ignorance of the religion, culture, and organizations of the foreign lands in question as well as to those methods, both overt and covert, which have succeeded and that can meet with success in these arenas again. One also cannot exclude a lack of will to take the necessary action as a contributory factor.

An example of success in the overt category has been the work of the LibForAll Foundation, which, instead of working against Islamic culture, has worked with it. It has helped promote Islamic popular music, such as the work of Ahmad Dhani, one of the most popular singers in Indonesia, whose song "Warriors of Love" extols a peaceful vision of Islam and rejects the violent killing of innocents. It has also promoted a book, *The Illusion of an Islamic State*, which refutes extremist Islamist ideology.²⁰ Instead of alienating politically moderate Moslems in Indonesia, such efforts have won their cooperation, precisely because they do not undermine traditional Islamic culture and beliefs. But ironically, with one minor exception for a project in Germany, the LibForAll Foundation receives no U.S. Government support. Meanwhile, at this writing, the absence of U.S. involvement in this dimension of the war of ideas has left the field open entirely to

20. See: <http://www.libforall.org/media/expose.html>.

the radicals whose ruthlessness has silenced too many of the moderates.²¹ Unilateral disarmament usually does not result in victory.

Having a covert political action and political warfare capability—even if it is not used actively for years at a time—is a necessary weapon in the arsenal of our national defense. It can be likened to certain weapons in our armed forces that are rarely, if ever, used, except for the psychological value they possess in strengthening deterrence. It is necessary, then, to have a division within the CIA’s clandestine service that possesses a covert political action and political warfare capability that can be used when it is in the national interest to so do. Just because this capability may not always be used is insufficient justification for dismantling its organizational home so much that it loses its institutional memory and knowledge of optimal professional practices.

As mentioned earlier, there are reports that individual CIA stations, such as that in Iraq, have recreated such capabilities. The question is whether the Agency is re-creating a central office that operates strategically and that can recover the knowledge of best practices that the Agency once knew and abandoned. However, for such an office to maintain an optimal effectiveness, the CIA, like the State Department, will have to implement at least one serious reform: the establishment of career incentives for its personnel to pursue professional skill in the necessary arts. And this, in addition to modifying the criteria for promotion within the Agency, will require a significant program of professional education in the relevant fields—training that is manifestly unavailable anywhere within U.S. government educational institutions and is all the more absent due to the passing away of most of those Agency alumni who were masters of these fields.

21. Bret Stephens, “Public Diplomacy for Dummies; The Bush Administration falters in the Battle of Ideas,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 7, 2007.

OPPORTUNITIES INTELLIGENCE IN THE CIA

The relative neglect within the CIA of opportunities intelligence must be reversed. While this lack of emphasis is as much, if not more, due to the failure of the policy community to require collection of such intelligence, the collection community also bears some responsibility for this situation. It is possible, of course, that there exists more raw intelligence of this type than comes to the surface in analytical reports. If this is the case, then the analysis community must include more of such information in reports that reach policy-makers' desks. Otherwise, as the first order of business, new requirements must be issued for collection on the perceptions, beliefs, policy positions, and vulnerabilities of various foreign influentials, and then on the receptivity of such individuals to American political influence of different types. With such information, U.S. policy-makers—both traditional diplomats and public diplomats—can shape their respective policies to maximize their capacity for political influence.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE IN THE FBI

Because countering the propaganda, disinformation, and strategic deception operations of foreign governments is a counterintelligence function, the lead counterintelligence agency of our government, the FBI, must develop a robust division to address these threats. Although most of these types of political influence operations are not crimes, there is nonetheless much constructive work that can be done to counter them. The Bureau, in cooperation with the proposed USFDA Office of Public Diplomatic Security, can conduct defensive counterintelligence operations in this arena that monitor these activities, analyze them, and warn policymakers of the strategic and tactical purposes that underlie them. Then, in cooperation with the USFDA's Office to Counter Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation, the Bureau can publicize them not only to govern-

ment officials but also to editorial boards, scholars, and the general public. Again, because some of these foreign influence operations are unquestionably subversive of the U.S. Constitution, such as the aforementioned attempt to implant Shariah law within the United States, the Department of Justice, as well as other relevant agencies such as, in the case of Shariah finance, the Department of the Treasury should also be kept apprised. Foreign influence operations can also be made the targets of offensive counterintelligence operations of various sorts including double agent operations, and providing feedback to foreign intelligence agencies that renders their influence operations less effective.

EXPANDED PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT AND ARMED SERVICES

While the Army has created three separate divisions—cadres of public affairs, information operations, and psychological operations personnel—the public affairs officers and the lawyers looking over everyone’s shoulders have had disproportionate and counterproductive influence over counter-propaganda, information operations, strategic psychological operations, and even ideological warfare in war zones. To avoid such counterproductive influence, none of these strategic public diplomacy functions should be conducted under the aegis of the bureaus of public affairs of any of the armed services or the Defense Department. Instead, each of the armed services should expand the professional preparation of all relevant personnel in these fields. And public affairs officers (i.e., officers who transmit news from war zones principally to the U.S. press corps—a function that necessarily has public diplomatic effects must be given “public diplomacy awareness” training to minimize their interference with the effectiveness of these other strategic public diplomacy activities.

Meanwhile, the legal departments of the armed services and the Defense Department (and, one must add, increasingly, the State De-

partment) that have all been reluctant to acknowledge the religious nature of the conflict against terrorist extremists, and which have all restricted both information and political warfare operations from addressing questions of religious doctrine, have discouraged and effectively prevented an open-minded assessment of the situation on the ground and the best and most common sense means to address it. Thus, the Department and the individual armed services must also ensure that these operations are not unreasonably constrained by lawyers unfamiliar with the history, precedents, methods, and proper techniques of these activities.

THE DESIRABILITY OF INSTITUTIONAL REDUNDANCY

Among the aforementioned institutional and structural recommendations, the reader will notice some overlapping of functions, if not redundancy among various offices, bureaus, and agencies. An example is the counterintelligence portfolio designed to thwart foreign political influence operations including propaganda and disinformation. The necessity of having two offices residing in two separate bureaus of USPDA with some overlapping responsibilities as well as distinct efforts conducted by both the FBI, CIA, and possibly other elements of the counterintelligence community, is a way of ensuring that the job is actually undertaken with no dimension neglected. An element of interagency competition may even be useful here as it is among the sixteen agencies of the intelligence community. In another example, certain ostensibly overlapping functions actually serve separate and discrete missions, as do aircraft that belong and provide support to the Marines, the Army, and the Navy—none of which are the Air Force.

CREATING AND STRENGTHENING STRUCTURES FOR IMPROVED STRATEGIC COORDINATION

The complete realization of both full spectrum diplomacy and genuine grand strategy depends on the active work of policy-makers who

think and work in grand strategic terms. It should go without saying, but it is necessary to repeat: absent coherent strategic objectives, there cannot be a coherent strategy to achieve them. Assuming that such objectives are established, some within the government must take it upon themselves to serve in the role of conductor of the orchestra. So where do we find such conductors?

With the necessary changes in knowledge, structure, and culture spurred by the creation of a new USFDA, the prospect of there being such grand strategic leadership in the State Department will improve considerably. But grand strategic thinking is not done just in the Oval Office, the NSC, and on the seventh floor of the State Department. It must be done as part of building a full spectrum diplomatic capability in each country team stationed abroad. This means elevating the rank of those conducting public diplomacy in each of our embassies. Whereas the current most senior official in this field is the embassy's Public Affairs Officer who serves in a mid-level rank, in the future, the senior public diplomacy official should be at the rank of minister, and that official should be a policy-making strategist. Furthermore, the number of public diplomacy officials in each embassy should be significantly expanded.

Government agencies face a special coordination challenge in theaters of war. Given the fact that the multiplicity of civilian tasks cannot be fully accomplished by civilian agencies in such theaters—the environment is dangerous and the civilians available for service in war zones scarce—necessity dictates that the armed forces take the lead in coordinating the various instruments of statecraft that must be used.

The mechanism provided by the Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support organization (CORDS) and its multitude of provincially-based groups that were part of U.S. counter-insurgency operations in Vietnam serves as a historical precedent

and an effective model for such integration. Until CORDS was established, the work of various agencies in the “pacification” effort in Vietnam was simultaneously uncoordinated, redundant, desultory, and inadequate. Once all the various civilian agencies involved were placed under unambiguous military command, the effectiveness of the counterinsurgency effort grew exponentially to the point that the insurgency in South Vietnam, while not eradicated completely, had nevertheless effectively lost its ability to have strategic impact.²² The provincially based CORDS teams performed all the same kinds of counterinsurgency operations that have been recently and currently required in the Iraqi and Afghan war zones, such as military operations, counter-terrorist operations, logistics, intelligence collection, local security, civil affairs, community development (including police and law enforcement), public health, education, agriculture, as well as information and psychological operations. Officials participating in those operations from USAID, USIA, the Joint Public Affairs Office, and even, to some extent, from the CIA were supervised by senior military officers. The ability of the armed forces to supply the necessary numbers of personnel to work with civilian experts in each South Vietnamese province enabled the U.S. counterinsurgency presence to work in each place that the Vietcong guerrillas had infiltrated and left them no certain safe havens.²³ A

22. It should be remembered here that the final victory of communist forces in South Vietnam came not from Vietcong insurgents/terrorists, many of whom were ultimately revealed to be communist infiltrators from the North, and who were defeated by 1972, but from two factors: a) a conventional armored invasion by North Vietnam, equipped with billions of rubles worth of Soviet military equipment; and, as cited earlier, b) the success of massive North Vietnamese and Soviet propaganda in the United States. See Lewis Sorley, *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam* (Orlando: Harcourt, Inc., 1999).

23. I am indebted to Ambassador Peter R. Rosenblatt, who formerly served

conclusion that necessarily derives from this example is that at least a certain percentage of senior military officers must have sufficient knowledge and education in the various arts of statecraft if they are to be effective “conductors” of integrated strategic operations, whether at the summit of leadership in a war theater or in a local war zone.

Even with the creation of an agency that holds the promise of establishing an institutional critical mass supportive of a culture of influence that can radiate throughout the government, interagency coordination will have to be strengthened. The establishment of the aforementioned National Public Diplomacy Council led by the Director of the USFDA will also assist this process significantly. It should have a number of component subcommittees, similar to the NSDD-77 committees of the 1980s. They could include subcommittees that cover broadcasting (which, it should be remembered, has Defense Department and CIA components); political/ideological/religious diplomacy and warfare (perhaps a continuation of the current Global Strategic Engagement Center); cultural diplomacy, exchanges, and visitor programs; and information policy and counter-propaganda.

A corollary reform would be to strengthen the structure of all policy meetings. Thus, full spectrum diplomatic capability must be represented at every council of principals. There simply must not be any briefing of such officials as the President, National Security Adviser, or Secretary of State on a given issue by, say, the Assistant Secretary of State covering the area in question or by the corresponding NSC expert, without a senior public diplomacy strategist at the same table.

as a policymaker coordinating U.S. counterinsurgency policy on the White House staff of Lyndon Johnson, for his insights into the effectiveness of the CORDS structure. For a brief recent summary of the role of CORDS, see, Dale Andrade and James H. Wilbanks, “CORDS/Phoenix: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Vietnam for the Future,” *Military Review*, March-April, 2006.

However, if none of the recommendations in this study (or those in a number of the other studies and commission reports) are ever implemented, there is only one other significant possible way to achieve an integrated, grand strategy that conducts full spectrum diplomacy alongside full spectrum military operations and other instruments of statecraft. This is through the “NSC”—not so much the formal Council itself as, specifically, the National Security Adviser to the President and the NSC staff. The likelihood of integrated strategic thinking is greater at the NSC for structural reasons: it is the only office that must address, at least by coordinating, but also by making, policy concerning every relevant function of foreign and national security affairs. If any agency of the government proposes a new policy that requires White House approval, the NSC is required to staff the issue.

The influence of an NSC staff that is truly committed to, and given the power to conduct, grand strategy can compensate enormously for the conceptual and cultural debilitations of the rest of the government. But here, it is necessary that NSC staffers who think in integrated strategic and full spectrum diplomatic terms are hired in the first place. With this prerequisite in place, they must be empowered to establish, chair, and set the agenda of interagency committees to develop and implement the necessary policies. They must also be given the power to send taskings established by those committees from the NSC’s Executive Secretary to the various implementation agencies, thus bearing the imprint of the White House. There is, as a practical matter, no other option beyond this “last resort.”

FUNDING FOR FULL SPECTRUM DIPLOMACY: CREATING A DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS BUDGET

A key element in the elevation of the instruments of soft power in national-level integrated strategy is increased funding. Historically, almost every element of the foreign affairs budget has been under-

funded and inconsistently funded. It is a scandal that the Voice of America should be cutting language services left and right at exactly the moment when America's reputation in the world has sunk to its lowest ebb arguably in the history of the Republic, when Soviet secret police alumni have been shutting down independent media voices in Russia, when the Chinese Communist Party is jamming foreign broadcasts, limiting access to the internet, and arresting dissidents, and when Islamist terrorist groups and their enablers in institutions like Al-Jazeera are flooding the Islamic world with messages that have long gone unanswered.

Some will argue that because some of VOA's language services have been reaching relatively small audiences and because substitute stations such as Radio Sawa are reaching larger ones, the substitute station is sufficient. Arguments similar to this were made during the Cold War in criticism of the alleged duplication in the case of Radio Liberty and VOA. The problem with these arguments is that each radio organization serves different purposes and different audiences. And given that the budgets for these broadcasters is minuscule (the current RFE/RL budget being the equivalent of four Apache helicopters), the economies achieved by eliminating language services at VOA are so negligible in the overall context of national security funding as to be ridiculous—especially when one keeps in mind that public diplomacy funding is arguably the most cost-effective national security investment that our government can make.

The persistently sorry spectacle of such false economies is the result of many factors. One, which is not usually visible, is the frugal attitude regnant at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). In order to avoid the penny-wise, pound-foolish trap, this most worthy impulse necessarily has to be informed by a level of knowledge and professionalism in full spectrum diplomacy that has rarely been found in this vital agency. It is essential that

among the foreign policy personnel decisions of any Administration, extremely high priority be given to placement in OMB of individuals with serious knowledge of the strategic effectiveness of the many arts subsumed within the broader understanding of public diplomacy.

Another of the most prominent factors underlying false economies in foreign affairs funding is the existence of a “small-think” mentality of the fatalistic kind one sees in political parties or factions that have relegated themselves psychologically to permanent minority status. Here, we see our foreign policy community—both traditional diplomats and public diplomats—developing new policy initiatives within the constraints of the previous year’s budget, as if external strategic conditions had not changed and did not compel our government to add new strategic requirements to the existing list of such requirements. This is the opposite of what is necessary: namely to develop policy and its requisite funding based on strategic need.

It is beyond the scope of this study to make a serious recommendation concerning the level of funding in the larger realm of strategic influence. However, it should be noted that a myriad of programs in the various fields have been operating at levels of static year-to-year funding, with priority placed heavily on programs which are hoped to produce short-term results and, needless to say, with no indexing to inflation. This goes not only for many public diplomacy programs in the State Department, the Peace Corps, and the BBG, but also in strategically important programs such as grant funding by the Department of Education for international studies and foreign language education. It is rare to see revolutionary increases in public diplomacy funding of the proportions that we see in military spending during times of crisis and war, even though international conditions would dictate such revolutionary increases, which in the larger context of national defense spending, would still

be minuscule. Thus, under current conditions of the absence of an influence culture within our foreign policy community combined with an on-going war of ideas and the nadir of America's reputation abroad, funding for the instruments of strategic influence could well be doubled, tripled, or quadrupled.

Even on a "static scoring" basis, such revolutionary increases would have a minimal effect on the national debt. But to use a static analysis model to measure the budgetary effects of such spending would be to assert that they had no positive (or, as the economists would say, "feedback") effects both strategically and, ultimately, in budget terms—an argument which is indefensible. This would be the equivalent of asserting that General David Petraeus' adoption of a new counterinsurgency strategy that expended new resources (such as school and medical supplies) to win hearts and minds in Iraq added a new increment to federal spending. In fact, a "dynamic scoring" analysis of that situation reveals that the public diplomacy spending associated with a revised political strategy resulted in an enormous reduction in expenses for "kinetic" military operations and thus major budget savings. Similarly, the potential returns on investment in the instruments of strategic influence may only be accurately assessed on a "dynamic scoring" basis.

It is ironic that the armed forces have stepped in to fill the void while the civilian foreign policy community has consistently placed a low or no priority on investing in the instruments in this field. It has been the armed forces that have exercised the larger part of diplomatic activity in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they have received commensurate funding for these activities. It is also ironic that when the Defense Department asks for funds for its larger strategic purposes, it receives them at levels that meet the strategic need. This was manifestly the case in the establishment of the ill-fated Office of Strategic Influence, which received initial funding—at Defense

Department levels—that would never have been considered if authorized for the Department of State.

There is another formidable obstacle to greater public diplomacy funding beyond that created by the failure of the diplomatic community to develop an influence culture: this is the fact that public diplomacy has always suffered the same fate as foreign affairs funding in general by being part of “discretionary” spending within the Federal Budget. Whereas entitlement spending has been completely off-limits from discretionary reductions, and defense spending has enjoyed some immunity—at least in times of war—from cuts by legislators whose concerns for deficit reduction often trump other policy concerns, the foreign affairs budget has always been an easy target for budget savings. Given that it has no powerful domestic constituencies and that it includes such anathematized functions as “foreign aid” and such putatively frivolous functions as cultural exchanges—the strategic influence value of which is never explained by the State Department—the foreign affairs budget remains the enduring object of demagoguery and false economies.

There is only one sure solution to this problem (apart, of course, from explaining much more effectively the cost-effectiveness of strategic influence in all its forms as a vital element of American national defense). This is to fold the entire foreign affairs budget of the United States into a larger “Defense and Foreign Affairs” category within the Federal Budget. Conceptually, this solution makes strategic sense. The various functions of the State Department, the BBG, USAID, the Peace Corps, and other agencies all serve as part of an overall structure designed to protect our nation’s vital interests including the task of maximizing peace and justice in our relations with other nations.

Thus, the foreign affairs budget, which currently is part of an account that also includes the “discretionary” budgets of the Justice

and Commerce Departments, should be moved out of that budgetary basket and into what is now exclusively the Defense Budget. Once so moved, it could be explained as a necessary component of a larger national strategy of both diplomatic and military defense and thus enjoy greater immunity from demagogic attacks and illusory budget savings.

One can anticipate one objection to this arrangement: the association of diplomatic means with the instruments of force, and the fear that the image of the United States in the world would be harmed by linking these two elements of statecraft. Some diplomats will doubtlessly experience an acute discomfort at having their arts of peacemaking tarnished by the presence in the same room of those who use force. Here, of course, lies an example of the rift between the cultures of hard and soft power and the failure of integrated strategic thinking. Such a reaction by elements within the diplomatic culture is ironic, especially since diplomats have long argued that their work constitutes “the first line of defense.” Given that most of the world does not pay attention to line items in the Federal Budget, this objection is not serious.

The only serious obstacle to the realization of this reform is turf consciousness among Congressional committee chairmen. And here, appeal to the larger national interest by enlightened Congressional leadership holds the key to overcoming such territorial jealousy. On a more practical level, current chairmen of the Senate Foreign Affairs and House International Relations Committees would have to negotiate compromise arrangements with the chairmen of the two houses’ Armed Services Committees. These arrangements could include various kinds of horse-trading, including offering chairmanships of influential authorizing or appropriations subcommittees. Committee rearrangements have taken place in the past. There is no good reason why it should be impossible for them to take place

again. It would be tragic if turf consciousness stood in the way of such a reform.

The advantages of such a reform would be legion. In addition to the obvious benefits of moving foreign affairs funding to a less “discretionary” (i.e., vulnerable) category, it would assist enormously in the development of a greater national capability in integrated strategic thinking. In doing so, it would bring us closer to the day when the civilian foreign affairs agencies would begin to conduct the same kind and quality of national-level strategic planning as has regularly been conducted in the Defense Department—planning that is related to the linking of strategic ends and means. It would help unite the hard power and soft power cultures. And thus, it would bring the kind of greater interagency coordination to the entire foreign policy and national security community that the armed forces have experienced under the stimulus of the Goldwater-Nichols Act. Finally, it would bring back to the strategic menu the missing rungs in the ladder of strategic options to achieve peace and security for our country. By restoring long neglected instruments of statecraft, by raising the priority attached to some of those instruments that have never enjoyed significant strategic priority, and by thereby creating a culture of influence within our larger diplomatic community, we will increase the likelihood that we can defend and advance our country’s most vital interests while minimizing the necessity of having to use force to do so.

The initiation of a successful long-term strategy to influence the world positively, to restore America’s ability to win friends, allies, and politically motivated intelligence sources, and thereby to enhance our ability to achieve greater peace and security for the United States will be a complex task. It will require change or adjustment of some bilateral and regional policies that takes into account their public diplomatic effects. It will require establishment or re-

invigoration of many programs to bring about better understanding and relationships of mutual trust between Americans and foreigners. It will require countering hostile propaganda with truth. And that truth will have to be disseminated by people who have, or can win, credibility among the target publics. It will, in short, require full spectrum diplomatic operations. And this will necessitate greater professionalism in all aspects of statecraft, particularly public diplomacy. In the war with Islamist terrorism, it will require the ability to conduct the kind of political action that can strengthen moderate forces capable of coexisting peacefully with the West. And this, in turn, will involve uniting disparate political factions and emboldening those moderate religious and political elements that have been cowed into silence by the ruthlessness of the terrorists. It will necessitate expanded efforts systematically to expose terrorist crimes, to discredit their animating ideology, and to isolate the extremists from the population support base and their pool of potential recruits—all elements of political warfare. And finally, it will require conducting policies in ways that maximize the substance—and, importantly, the appearance—of justice in our dealings with foreigners and that minimize the risk of alienating those publics whose minds are the battlefield in the war of ideas. All these elements will take time, patience, constancy, and resources that are significant in “foreign affairs budget” terms but negligible in “defense budget” terms. Above all, these things will require strategic leadership and a major change in conceptual outlook that will see not “foreign affairs” and “defense” but one integrated strategy conducted through the mechanisms of full spectrum diplomacy.

Appendix

Cultural Diplomacy, Political Influence, and Integrated Strategy

Cultural diplomacy is one of the most strategic and cost-effective means of political influence available to makers of U.S. foreign and national security policy. Because of neglect and misunderstanding, however, this powerful tool of statecraft has been vastly underutilized, its absence the source of numerous lost opportunities in our dealings with other countries.

Definition

What is cultural diplomacy? The definitions in the literature on the subject are remarkably consistent. Representative is that of Milton Cummings, Jr., of Johns Hopkins University: “the exchange of ideas, information, art, and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual understanding.”¹ Frank Ninkovich of St. Johns University speaks of cultural diplomacy as “promoting an understanding of American culture abroad.”²

1. Milton C. Cummings, Jr., *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey* (Washington: Center for Arts and Culture, 2003), p. 1.

2. Frank Ninkovich, *Arts and Minds: Cultural Diplomacy Amid Global Tensions*, a paper based on a conference by the National Arts Journalism Program, Arts International, and the Center for Arts and Culture, 2003, p. 26. Also see Ninkovich, *U.S. Information Policy and Cultural Diplomacy* (Washington: Foreign Policy Association Headline Series No. 308, 1996).

A related definition says that, “cultural diplomacy has long served to foster understanding of America and our culture around the world. . . . Cultural diplomacy, in particular, can help to bring people together and develop a greater appreciation of fundamental American values and the freedom and variety of their expression.”³ Joseph Nye of Harvard University recognizes culture as an important component of public diplomacy and what he calls “soft power.”⁴ A definition from an earlier era describes cultural diplomacy as:

the act of successfully communicating to others complete comprehension of the life and culture of a people. The objective of American cultural diplomacy is to create in the peoples of the world a perfect understanding of the life and culture of America . . . it is the requirement of mutual understanding which is the basis of successful cultural diplomacy, and it is this requirement which helps make cultural diplomacy so vitally important today.⁵

Helena Finn, a longtime senior State Department cultural affairs practitioner, states that cultural diplomacy consists of: “Efforts to improve cultural understanding” and, “winning foreigners’ voluntary allegiance to the American project. . . .”⁶

Most of these definitions stress the role of cultural diplomacy in producing greater foreign understanding or appreciation of the United States and American culture, or greater mutual understanding. While all these definitions are accurate, most of them do not reflect either the other functions of cultural diplomacy or the alternative

3. *Cultural Diplomacy: Recommendations and Research*, Center for the Arts and Culture, July 2004, p.7.

4. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), *passim*.

5. Robert H. Thayer., “Cultural Diplomacy: Seeing is Believing,” *Vital Speeches of the Day* (October 1, 1959), Vol. 25 Issue 24, p. 740-744.

6. Helena K. Finn, “The Case for Cultural Diplomacy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Nov/Dec 2003, Vol. 82 Issue 6, p.15-20.

interpretations of those who do not share the consensus cited above.

Finn, for one, does introduce one of the missing dimensions linked to mutual understanding—its link to national security, a goal rarely and only implicitly acknowledged as a purpose of cultural diplomacy:

History is a useful reminder of how seriously [the United States] once took the promotion of mutual understanding through cultural exchange. Policymakers understood the link between engagement with foreign audiences and the victory over ideological enemies and considered cultural diplomacy vital to U.S. national security.⁷

In his history of cultural diplomacy, Richard T. Arndt introduces greater complexity to the definition than is found in most other places:

Most thoughtful cultural diplomats use ‘culture’ as the anthropologists do, to denote the complex of factors of mind and values which define a country or group, especially those factors transmitted by the process of intellect, i.e., by ideas. ‘Cultural relations’ then (and its synonym—at least in the U.S.—‘cultural affairs’) means literally the relations between national cultures, those aspects of intellect and education lodged in any society that tend to cross borders and connect with foreign institutions.

Cultural relations grow naturally and organically, without government intervention—the transactions of trade and tourism, student flows, communications, book circulation, migration, media access, intermarriage—millions of daily cross-cultural encounters.

If that is correct, cultural diplomacy can only be said to take place when formal diplomats, serving national governments, try to shape and channel this natural flow to advance national interests.⁸

7. Ibid.

8. Richard T. Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century* (Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2005) p. xviii.

Arndt, a veteran public diplomacy professional at the former U.S. Information Agency, also defines cultural diplomacy from another perspective—that of the cultural diplomats themselves:

Quietly, invisibly, indirectly, my cultural colleagues and I spent our lives representing American education and intellect, art and thought, setting foreign ideas about America into deeper contexts, helping others understand the workings of the peculiar U.S. version of democracy, combating anti-Americanism at its taproots, linking Americans and foreign counterparts, helping the best Americans and foreign students study somewhere else—in short, projecting America, warts and all.⁹

British scholar David Caute, while not endeavoring to produce a definition of cultural diplomacy per se, describes the uses of cultural instruments as implements of war. The Cold War was not a traditional political-military conflict, but an “ideological and cultural contest on a global scale and without historical precedent.”¹⁰ Caute argues that for all of the Soviet Union’s failures to be economically competitive or to sustain its vast military establishment, “the mortal ‘stroke’ which finally buried Soviet Communism was arguably moral, intellectual, and cultural as well as economic and technological.”¹¹ For all their books, ballets, scientific advances, chess champions, Olympic athletes and so forth, the Soviets “were losing the wider *Kulturkampf* from the outset because they were afraid of freedom and were seen to be afraid.”¹²

In this war, then, cultural diplomacy took the form of “cultural promotion” and “cultural offensive” designed to compete with similar campaigns by the Soviets to “prove their virtue, to demonstrate their spiritual superiority, to claim the high ground of ‘progress,’ to

9. *Ibid.*, p. x.

10. David Caute, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003) p. 1.

11. *Ibid.*

12. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

win public support and admiration by gaining ascendancy in each and every event of what might be styled the Cultural Olympics.”¹³ What distinguished this conflict and its use of cultural instruments as weapons of war from religious and cultural conflicts of earlier centuries, according to Caute, was the presence of “the general public” as a theater of conflict, due to the emergence of mass media. Here, war was disguised as cultural “exchange” or “diplomacy.”¹⁴

The use of cultural instruments as implements of war is not the preferred understanding of what cultural diplomacy is or ought to be among most cultural diplomats or students of the subject. Nevertheless, given the history of their use in this way, there is no escaping this dimension of the definition.

Under the circumstances, cultural diplomacy may be defined as the use of various elements of culture to influence foreign publics, opinion makers, and even foreign leaders. These elements comprehend the entire range of characteristics within a culture: including the arts, education, ideas, history, science, medicine, technology, religion, customs, manners, commerce, philanthropy, sports, language, professional vocations, hobbies, etc., and the various media by which these elements may be communicated.

Cultural diplomacy seeks to harness these elements to influence foreigners in several ways: to have a positive view of the United States, its people, its culture, and its policies; to induce greater cooperation with the United States; to change the policies of foreign governments; to bring about political or cultural change in foreign lands; and to prevent, manage, mitigate, and prevail in conflicts with foreign adversaries. It is designed to encourage Americans to improve their understanding of foreign cultures so as to lubricate international relations (including such activities as commercial rela-

13. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

tions), enhance cross-cultural communication, improve one's intelligence capabilities, and understand foreign friends and adversaries, their intentions, and their capabilities. Cultural diplomacy may also involve efforts to counter hostile foreign cultural diplomacy at home and abroad.

In short, cultural diplomacy, being designed not only for mutual understanding but for these other purposes as well, has as its proper end the enhancement of national security and the protection and advancement of other vital national interests.

Note that the this definition, in addition to those cited earlier, contains enough references to foreign publics, foreign opinion makers, foreign cultures, and "Americans" in general, that cultural diplomacy fits principally within the sphere of public diplomacy, which involves relations with, and influence over, foreign publics, with a result being greater understanding by Americans of foreign cultures and policies as well. While it does comprehend influence and relations with governments, the primacy of its public diplomatic effects is worth stressing because some cultural diplomats, as discussed below, have been known to subordinate cultural diplomacy to the exigencies of traditional government-to-government diplomacy.

Integration with other arts of statecraft

Properly speaking, cultural diplomacy is an element of national security policy in general and public diplomacy in particular. Cultural diplomacy can be integrated with other elements of these activities whether they are in the realm of information policy, ideological competition, countering hostile propaganda, foreign aid policy, religious diplomacy, or establishing relationships of trust. In these capacities, cultural diplomacy can have positive effects on foreign cooperation with U.S. policy.

Foreigners who trust the United States, Americans in general, or even merely certain individual Americans, and who feel that

Americans respect them and are willing to listen to their point of view, are more likely to help those whom they trust with sustenance, safe haven, information, and communications in wartime. They are more likely to help establish relations with others within their societies, build coalitions, collaborate with U.S.-sponsored political arrangements, and so forth during times of peace making and peace keeping. They are also more likely to do business with Americans.

Cultural diplomacy is an important ingredient in the collection of secret intelligence and open-source information of a political, diplomatic, or other national security-oriented nature. This is not to say that participants in cultural diplomatic activities are, or should be, intelligence collectors. In fact, as in the case with Peace Corps volunteers, it is more effective that such participants should stay clear of intelligence activities precisely in order to maximize the beneficial effects of their activity. Nevertheless, cultural diplomatic participants also establish and develop relationships with individuals who are not likely to be sources of intelligence or other information, but whose networks of personal relationships can lead to such sources. The best human intelligence collection and operations are accomplished through the broadening of personal relationships. Collection is also successful when there are significant numbers of foreigners who sympathize with American ideas and ideals. Insofar as cultural diplomacy involves the effective promulgation of those ideas and ideals, it increases the pool of potential sources.

In addition, cultural diplomats and participants in cultural diplomatic activities often have insights into foreign political conditions and foreign public attitudes that embassy political officers do not. Yet, rare is the occasion when they are debriefed by our traditional diplomats or policymakers for these insights.

Cultural diplomacy can also be integrated with political action, political warfare, and subversion. It can be an integral part of strategic psychological operations.

It can be integrated with these other arts and dimensions of statecraft by being overtly political or, in most cases—and most effectively—by avoiding association with politics altogether. Its effectiveness in the latter case results from the fact that many forms of cultural activities do not have political or strategic strings attached. And yet, paradoxically, they have tremendous positive political effect. Thus, cultural diplomacy, like other forms of public diplomatic outreach such as Peace Corps volunteerism, foreign medical assistance, disaster relief, and the like, can be undertaken effectively by various governmental and non-governmental participants in many cases without their being aware of strategic integration or the political/psychological methods and effects associated with it.

Why cultural diplomacy is neglected

With all these possibilities, why is cultural diplomacy ignored or relegated to tertiary status in U.S. foreign and national security policy? Part of the explanation derives from the nature of the two principal perspectives in policy making: that of the defense community and that of the traditional diplomatic community—the communities representing “hard” and “soft” power respectively.

The defense community is that which conceives of its role in “national security” terms more so than the diplomatic community (notwithstanding the latter’s oft-articulated role as the “first line of defense”). Similarly the defense community tends to think in “strategic” terms more than the diplomatic community does. However, it sees strategy as a matter involving armed forces, physical battlespace, geo-strategic opportunities and constraints, intelligence concerning these matters, and sometimes even a limited view of the psychological element of strategy, insofar as it involves

such things as deterrence and depriving the enemy of his will to resist.

This community, which can be said to be concerned with “hard power,” historically has tended not to think of the other psychological elements of strategy, such as public diplomacy, which, after all, is not its principal professional focus. Occasionally, this community does consider such activities as aid programs and their role in winning hearts and minds in the context of counterinsurgency warfare. The U.S. military has a substantial soft power dimension of its own, and since 9/11 arguably has taken a lead in public diplomacy innovations which, out of deference to the State Department, it calls “public diplomacy support.” However, the potential fruits of cultural diplomacy almost never enter into the military community’s strategic calculus.

The traditional diplomatic community, exemplified by the Department of State, has traditionally treated cultural diplomacy as an afterthought. This has been aggravated by the fact that it does not conceive of diplomacy in grand strategic terms that incorporate a variety of instruments of statecraft. During the early years of the Cold War, this was less the case, as the Department included its own Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Subsequently, however, this bureau was shifted to the U.S. Information Agency which became the main public diplomacy agency of the government.

Meanwhile, primacy in the Department was placed on traditional, government-to-government diplomacy, including consultations, dialogue, demarches, negotiations, peace processes, agreements, and reporting on political conditions affecting the foreign governments in question. This diplomatic culture has traditionally placed its emphasis on negotiations and reporting and rarely on influence in the largest sense of the term. These emphases derive principally from a longstanding bureaucratic culture that has placed no career

incentives on influencing non-governmental figures and larger publics. One can even say that it is a culture that discourages such influence insofar as it has become risky and certainly profitless to one's career for an American diplomat to speak, for example, to the foreign media or to endeavor in other ways to shift foreign public attitudes.

When American career diplomats speak publicly, they use a language of caution and rarely a language of persuasion and advocacy—the art of rhetoric that can be used to sway large numbers of people. The diplomatic culture in this sense cannot be called an influence culture, and thus it does not think of all the ways influence can be exercised.

After years of separation of public (and cultural) diplomacy from the Department's direct purview, these functions became not simply subjects of neglect, but even irritants to the smooth running of the diplomatic process. Some public diplomacy initiatives—particularly targeted toward publics living under tyrannical regimes—would irritate those regimes and thus produce mild disruptions to traditional (i.e., government-to-government) relations. Telling the truth to truth-starved populations denied a free press cannot easily be reconciled with withholding such truth in the interest of harmonious relations with censorious regimes. The genetic impulse among State Department policy makers was to attempt to suppress those initiatives that risked “rocking the boat.”

Because of the primacy of the State Department in policy making (whereby country desk officers would often overrule public diplomacy policy that might be attempted at USIA or other public diplomacy agencies), more than a few public diplomats acceded to smooth relations with tyrannies instead of improved relations with oppressed publics.¹⁵

15. This author personally witnessed examples of this phenomenon while in

One of the most breathtaking examples was the opposition by the leading staff members of the Board for International Broadcasting to a major modernization plan and budget increase (totaling \$2.5 billion) proposed in 1982 for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (as well as the Voice of America). This program, part of President Reagan's strategy to dismantle the Soviet Union, had been initiated in response to the deterioration and obsolescence of the radios' equipment, to the extreme scarcity of programming funds, to the KGB's proxy operation to bomb RFE/RL's Munich headquarters, and to the communist imposition of martial law in response to the rise of the Solidarity movement in Poland. That it should have been opposed by the very agency responsible for funding and overseeing these radios' work is contrary to every law of nature and bureaucratic behavior.

Similarly, a coalition of USIA cultural affairs officials and State Department officials who fashioned the first draft of an exchanges agreement (including cultural exchanges) with the USSR in 1985 was so bent on avoiding any disagreement with the Kremlin that this initial bargaining position contained 21 violations of a Presidential directive (NSDD 75) requiring full reciprocity in exchanges.¹⁶ The spirit of this draft agreement was to make preemptive concessions to Moscow on every matter of sensitivity to the Kremlin, the net effect of which would have been to minimize the extent of cultural outreach to the Soviet public.

It should not be surprising, then, that the nation's message-making will suffer when public diplomacy and cultural affairs officials are co-opted by the government-to-government diplomatic priorities of a and out of government. He served in the Department of State and the National Security Council from 1981 to 1987, working on U.S.-Soviet relations and public diplomacy.

16. This is the judgment of this author, whose 1985 memorandum on this issue to the National Security Advisor to the President documents each violation.

State Department that has long since shed any inclination toward adopting a culture of influence towards foreign publics.

Another reason why cultural diplomacy is neglected is because it is a long-term endeavor requiring a long-term strategic vision. As Winston Churchill noted in *The Gathering Storm*, democracies have congenital difficulty in pursuing a consistent policy for more than five years at a time. Changes in administrations, and in cabinet and sub-cabinet positions, all make for short-term thinking in foreign policy.

Finally, cultural diplomacy is neglected because it, along with other arts of statecraft, is not studied by aspiring or current diplomats and strategists in their academic preparation or mid-career training. Where there is little understanding gained through on-the-job training of the integration of cultural diplomacy with other arts of statecraft, there has been little or no education on this integration in existing professional schools in or out of government. This includes, not remarkably, the State Department's Foreign Service Institute, whose training in public and cultural diplomacy has been historically superficial and management-oriented.¹⁷ While the defense and intelligence communities depend and ought to depend on the success of cultural diplomacy undertaken by other agencies, there is sufficiently little comprehension of this dimension of statecraft in those communities that they fail to demand its inclusion in national strategy.

The Tools of Cultural Diplomacy

While every element of what can be considered part of the culture of a nation is and has been used in cultural diplomacy, some have been used more regularly and intensively than others. The literature

17. There is some evidence, at this writing, of greater sensitivity to public and cultural diplomacy within the Department in response to the extraordinary harvest of anti-Americanism around the world resulting from to the U.S. occupation of Iraq.

in this field is replete with examples of these instruments. It may be useful to summarize them as briefly as possible here, before showing how they work.

The arts

Both the United States and other powers have made significant use of the various arts to great effect in cultural diplomacy. These include the performing arts such as theater, film, ballet, and music; the fine arts such as painting and sculpture; and an art that can be considered *sui generis*: architecture.

Exhibitions

While exhibitions can be considered an art unto themselves, they harness a variety of other elements of culture, such as science, technology, folk and ethnic culture, hobbies, commercial products, and the activities of various professions, including charitable work. They can convey American customs, manners, and the enthusiasms of popular culture. They can be used to teach and convey interpretations of American, regional, and world history as well as ideas.

Exhibitions can be huge, World's Fair-type displays. They can be as small as a poster outside the U.S. embassy in Moscow, portraying Rev. Martin Luther King's struggle for civil rights. In this one example, our cultural diplomats conveyed: the history of King's struggle and the success of that struggle; the fact that there was sufficient freedom in America for him to conduct that struggle in the first place (implicitly in contrast with political conditions in the USSR); that America celebrates that struggle as a reflection for its concern about human rights and the dignity of the human person both at home and abroad (including implicitly the USSR); and American honesty about the adverse conditions of American blacks ceaselessly highlighted by Soviet propaganda (this honesty being implicitly in contrast with Soviet official mendacity about political and human rights conditions both in the U.S. and the USSR). None of these

points was conveyed in a way that directly attacked the Soviet government or its policies.

Exchanges

Exchanges with foreign countries have included every imaginable field. The most common have been educational, scientific, and artistic. However, there are many other fields that have also been covered including professional, labor, sports, youth, and religious exchanges.

Educational programs

Educational programs abroad can incorporate: the establishment of American universities abroad (e.g., the American University in Beirut, the American University in Cairo, Robert College in Turkey, etc.); sponsorship of American studies programs at universities around the world; the dispatching of American authorities (professors, teachers, experts working in private industry and government abroad to teach or conduct lecture tours; the sponsorship of conferences; scholarships, both for Americans studying abroad and foreigners studying in America (such as the Fulbright Scholarships); etc.

Literature

While the distribution of some kinds of literature can properly be considered to be in the realm of information policy, the distribution of books and other periodicals that do not relate specifically to official information policy is a form of cultural diplomacy. The establishment of libraries abroad for use by foreign populations is one of the most effective means of conveying ideas, history, and other elements of culture, whether to generate understanding or to persuade.

Language teaching

Teaching foreigners English is the key to giving them access to American literature, film, broadcasts, and other media and the informa-

tion, ideas, and other messages they carry. Similarly, the American study of foreign languages is the key to opening up understanding of foreign cultures. Foreigners' knowledge of English and Americans' knowledge of foreign languages opens the door to greater tourism, commercial relations, cultural relations, and ultimately political relations.

Broadcasting

American broadcasts abroad by radio and television, and related multimedia, are among the most important media of cultural diplomacy. These are the only means by which unfiltered information and ideas can be conveyed to foreign audiences that live in countries where media access is restricted either by market realities or official censorship. The Voice of America has traditionally served not only as an instrument of U.S. information policy (as the voice of the U.S. government), but also as the voice of the American people and their culture. Other radios, such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have broadcast respectively to the countries of East-Central Europe and the former Soviet Union acting as "surrogate domestic free presses" for those countries, especially when they were under communist rule and had no free press. Other U.S.-sponsored radio and television media have undertaken similar roles in recent years, including Radio Marti, Radio Free Asia, Radio Free Afghanistan, Radio Sawa, Radio Farda, and Alhurra satellite television.

These various media have broadcast, among other things, news, music, literature, and poetry, whether American or native to the audience's country, programs on alternative ideas, historical programs, and religious programs—all concerning subjects that may be unknown or forbidden in the target countries.

Gifts

The giving of gifts has been a perennial staple of cultural diplomacy. It is a sign of thoughtfulness, of respect, of care about others. Its psychological and political effects can be long lasting.

Listening and according respect

The simple tools of dialogue, listening to others, expressing interest in and solicitude toward others, and according them respect are such obvious instruments of any kind of diplomacy that it would seem unnecessary to mention them. Yet, given the lack of integrated strategic thinking within the larger foreign policy and national security communities, and, one may add, the lack of contact with foreigners among too many foreign and defense policy makers, it is clear that these most elementary tools are often neglected, and their power misunderstood or not appreciated. According foreigners respect merely by listening and endeavoring to understand their perspectives breeds such good will that it is amazing that these instruments are not emphasized in every dimension of security policy.

Promotion of ideas

While most of the previous instruments can be described as vehicles or media for the transmission of cultural products and influences, the role of certain elements of culture should be included in this list for purposes of emphasis, despite the risk of violating a consistency of categories. The promotion of ideas is arguably the most important of these cultural elements. In the American case, this has meant the explanation of such American ideas as: the inalienable rights of the individual and the source of those rights; the rule of law; political and economic liberty; our Founders' view that since men are not angels there is a need for government and also for limits on government, including checks and balances; the dignity of the human person, no matter what his or her background or condition; democracy and representative government; the freedoms of speech, press,

assembly, association, and religion; and other ideas central to our political culture.

The use of ideas as an instrument of cultural diplomacy may involve the gentle explanation of unknown or misunderstood ideas or the attempt to undermine hostile ideological currents abroad.

The question arises as to who in the U.S. government should be involved in the promotion and articulation of ideas. Given that developing and maintaining literacy in the realm of ideas is virtually a full-time occupation, it is questionable whether the vast majority of those whose profession is traditional diplomacy, strategy, or information policy will ever have the time to cultivate the necessary intellectual skills to double as competent professionals in this field. The only practical answer as to who should undertake the job of promoting and articulating ideas or arrange that this task be done by non-governmental organizations or individuals with maximum competence to do so, is: cultural diplomats.¹⁸

Promotion of social policy

Among the ideas American cultural diplomacy has promoted in recent years are those whose cultural effects are so notable that they merit individual attention. The United States has promoted contraception and abortion as part of both a policy of population control and “reproductive rights,” sexual abstinence and marital fidelity (as part of a campaign against HIV/AIDS), and women’s rights. Some of these policy positions are controversial not only in the United States but also in many of the countries to which they are targeted.

The controversial—and, in some countries, even offensive—character of these positions raises questions central to cultural diplomacy: to what degree should such diplomacy respect the customs and mores of often fragile foreign cultures, and to what extent should

18. There is a role here as well, under certain unavoidable circumstances, for intelligence personnel charged with covert influence operations.

it attempt to disrupt these cultural patterns? The answers to these questions must be informed by prudential judgments that balance the need to build good will toward America and support for U.S. interests on the one hand, and a desire to promote social agendas worldwide in spite of the effects such promotion may have on other U.S. foreign policy interests. Such judgments cannot be made by those whose sole interest is in an ideological or social agenda. It must be made with the perspective of the entire array of U.S. interests.

History

The writing and interpretation of history has long been the object of political controversy and struggle, not only domestically but internationally. The distortion of history (marked principally by the deliberate neglect or suppression of significant facts and evidence) has been a staple of the proponents of political ideologies whose extreme political ends justify the use of any means, including dishonesty in historical interpretation. Typical examples were communist movements and regimes which used historical revisionism to re-shape national memory and national identity in an effort to create a “new communist (or Soviet) man.”

It is the province of cultural diplomacy to enter into historical controversy in ways that advance U.S. national interests. This may mean disseminating historical facts that have been flushed down what George Orwell called the “memory hole.” Or it may mean correcting historical distortions that have captured the minds of foreign populations or leaders, and which serve to inspire hatred, resentment, and desires for justice that are not merited by the true historical evidence.

In the case of communist historical revisionism during the Cold War, U.S. cultural diplomacy consistently and faithfully endeavored to supply accurate history to populations subjected to intellectual oppression and denied access to a free press and historical archives.

The good will toward the United States engendered among millions of people behind the Iron Curtain by this cultural diplomatic effort alone was of strategic proportions. When Vaclav Havel, as the first president of post-communist Czechoslovakia (and later the Czech Republic) visited the United States, he made a special visit to the Voice of America to thank its personnel for keeping his national flame alive for half a century.

Religious diplomacy

Religion has long been, and continues ever more visibly to be, a central element of international relations and foreign policy. Yet, in the U.S. foreign policy culture over the past few decades, policy makers and governmental structures continue to pretend it does not exist. This is partly the result of cultural illiteracy due not only to secularization but to a precipitous decline in the study of history, philosophy, and religion in American colleges. It is also the result, in more recent times, of an ill-informed attitude that any use of religion by U.S. officialdom represents a violation of the First Amendment.

Religion, however, has for years been both the medium and the subject of cultural diplomacy not only by foreign powers but by the United States as well, albeit in less visible corners of the U.S. foreign policy community. For example, U.S. international broadcasting has regularly included religious programming, including actual religious services, for populations where freedom of religion has been suppressed. For years such programming was conducted with no hesitation, and completely in conformity with Constitutional law, since it had nothing to do with the First Amendment proscriptions against Congress establishing an official religion in the United States. Such programs involved different religions, depending on the target audience.

A key element of religious diplomacy has involved inter-religious dialogue. Such dialogue has been used in recent years to over-

come hostility and mistrust between Moslems on the one hand, and Christians and Jews on the other, by stressing their common Abrahamic tradition, monotheism, and subscription to the idea of a transcendent, universal, objective moral order, in contrast to modern relativism and materialism and their contemporary cultural fruits.

Knowledge of religion and its attendant philosophical categories of thought is a necessary professional skill for at least some cultural diplomats. In the contemporary period, we have been witnessing a struggle between traditional Islam and “Islamism”—which is arguably one of two things: either 1) not a pure religion, but rather a political ideology that attempts to harness religion to serve its worldly ends; or 2) a version of religion that has a strong political-ideological agenda. Is it the business of traditional government-to-government diplomacy to affect this struggle? Are traditional diplomats equipped to do so? Is this the province of information diplomacy and “public affairs officers”? We hear constantly about how the United States is in a “battle of ideas” with extremist, terrorism-prone Islamism. So, once again, who within the U.S. government is to affect or conduct this battle of ideas? The main answer is cultural diplomats. It is they who must either be actively involved or who must have at least the adequate intellectual preparation to identify private sector individuals or non-governmental organizations who are equipped intellectually to conduct these affairs with some level of competence. They must be accompanied by people with the same skills in our intelligence community who are capable of conducting political action and political and ideological warfare.

How cultural diplomacy works: political and psychological effects

The ways by which cultural diplomacy achieves its desired objectives are little studied and little known in the larger foreign policy

community. They include the palpable political and psychological dynamics and effects as well as less obvious ones.

Enhancement of international relations

The most widely acknowledged way by which the larger number of cultural diplomatic tools work is by promoting cross-cultural communication and mutual understanding. Cultural diplomatic tools are methods of having relations with influential groups in foreign countries outside the purview of normal diplomatic or commercial channels (although commerce can be considered a “cultural” activity in the broader understanding of the term). They can significantly ameliorate relations with foreign publics, opinion makers, influential groups, and even governments by bringing to light and strengthening cultural affinities and thereby inspiring relationships of trust. This happens, for example, when, through artistic performances or exhibitions, our cultural representatives speak to foreigners in a “universal language” of art or music. This language serves as a vehicle of cross-cultural communication that highlights commonalities of aesthetic sensibility—particularly a common appreciation of beauty, which contains an element spiritually related to truth. The discovery of such aesthetic commonality can, in turn, inspire respect and trust.

Cultural diplomacy, when conducted with respect for foreign cultures and in ways that minimize disruption of those cultures, can inspire first the obvious mutual understanding but also ever greater relations of trust. It is a way of conducting international relations without a *quid pro quo*, without a direct political agenda, without specific diplomatic, commercial, or military goals. This breeds such good will that it can, over time, translate into better relations on a political level. The establishment of this good will and trust, however, is a long-term endeavor the beneficial effects of which cannot be realized overnight. The oft-entertained idea of public diplomacy as

the equivalent of "crisis public relations" whereby a poor corporate public image can be reversed through a skillful short-term public relations campaign could not be more inapplicable here.

It is difficult to overemphasize the strategic value of respect for foreign cultures. In recent years, much of the world has perceived the United States as having a unilateralist foreign policy that is disdainful of the views of the international community and even culturally imperialist. Attendant to this is the feeling that American policies are based on an underlying lack of respect for other cultures and a lack of willingness to listen to other points of view. As cultural diplomacy can initiate and broaden cross-cultural communication, two worthwhile results can emerge: 1) such diplomacy can mitigate the adverse effects of any extant American lack of respect for foreign cultures and sensibilities; and 2) insofar as Americans do respect foreign cultures yet are perceived by foreigners as not doing so, cultural diplomacy can disabuse such perceptions or at least lessen their intensity.

Finally, cultural diplomacy produces those levels of mutual understanding, trust, and comfort by contact with foreign cultures that promotes better international relations in other fields, such as commercial, diplomatic and military.

Immunization against, and cure for, the effects of hostile propaganda

Cultural diplomatic tools, particularly those in the realm of the arts, exhibitions, and sports, can have the effect of immunizing foreign audiences from hostile propaganda, and even reversing the effects of that propaganda. Exposure to inspiring cultural products, displays, and performances have the effect of creating curiosity about, and appreciation for, the United States that may not have been there before. Indeed, the witnessing of even a single artistic performance can have instantaneously positive effects on foreign attitudes.

For example, during the Cold War, the Indian subcontinent was the target of the greatest investment of Soviet anti-American propaganda. In spite of the affinities that India and the United States might be thought to have had as the world's largest and oldest democracies respectively, relations between the two countries were considerably strained for various reasons, not least of which was the adverse effect of Soviet propaganda, which portrayed America as materialistic, imperialistic, rapacious, militaristic, aggressive, and unjust in its policies. When audiences in New Delhi witnessed performances of an American college choir, many of these images were erased. As with G.K. Chesterton's description of art as a reflection of the soul,¹⁹ the Americans' performing art revealed the existence of a spiritual component to the American character that many in the audience had never seen. This spiritual element had the effect of melting hearts hardened by the distortions of hostile propaganda.

The very establishment of personal relations of trust, developed as a result of any number of different types of cultural relations, can have an immunizing effect. Foreigners who know, like, and trust individual Americans are less likely to believe hostile portrayals of America simply because they could not imagine their American friend being guilty of the opprobrious behavior or attitudes alleged of Americans in general.

Conditioning for subsequent political messages

Baruch Hazan has dissected a related dimension of the dynamics of cultural diplomacy. He describes it as a form of conditioning propaganda: whereby cultural diplomatic tools induce sufficient curiosity or appreciation for their users that they have the effect of breaking down the barriers that foreigners erect to prevent themselves from receiving messages from sources they do not trust. The

19. G. K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man* (Fort Collins: Ignatius Press, 1993).

cultural influences “impregnate” those barriers, poking holes in them, increasing the likelihood that the audience will listen to political messages that follow.²⁰ Thus, cultural diplomacy can set the stage for political communications and even serve as a cover for them.

Psychological disarmament

A related effect of cultural diplomacy is psychological disarmament. This is a tool used principally by powers posing a political or strategic threat to others and which use cultural diplomacy as a means of disguising the threat.

Again, recent history provides us with insights. The USSR was a master at this form of psychological disarmament. During the latter stages of the Cold War, Moscow launched a multi-faceted campaign directed toward the psychological disarmament of the United States so as to remove the competitive military pressure that had contributed to the crisis in the Soviet military economy and the larger crisis of the legitimacy of the regime.²¹ The key objective of this campaign was revealed publicly by Kremlin representatives as an endeavor to “deprive you [the United States] of an enemy image.”²² A salient part of this effort was the launching of a huge cultural offensive targeted against the United States and the West in general.²³

20. Baruch Hazan, *Soviet Impregnational Propaganda* (Woodstock, NY: Ardis Publishers, 1982) p.17.

21. John Lenczowski, *The Sources of Soviet Perestroika* (Ashland University: John M. Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs, 1990).

22. _____, “Military Glasnost’ and Soviet Strategic Deception,” *International Freedom Review* Winter 1990, Volume 3 Number 2, p. 6-7; as quoted in “Increasing Realism in U.S.-Soviet Relations,” *Nepszabadsag*, June 4, 1988, *Foreign Broadcast Information Service Daily Report-Eastern Europe*, June 8, 1988.

23. _____, *Soviet Cultural Diplomacy: A Multi-faceted Strategic Instrument of Soviet Power* (Unpublished paper, 1991). URL: http://www.iwp.edu/docLib/20060710_cultural_diplomacy.pdf

This campaign was accompanied by propaganda efforts to demonstrate that the Soviet Union had changed its political genetic code, that it had in effect ceased to be Marxist-Leninist in character, and therefore, ceased to have, by definition, unlimited global political-strategic goals. The larger propaganda campaign also included a campaign of military *glasnost*' (a term designed to be understood as "openness" but really meaning "publicity," or perhaps "controlled openness with manipulated truth")—a campaign of partially opening up formerly secret military facilities to show that military secrecy was no longer a strategic priority.²⁴

The cultural component of the campaign involved dispatching every imaginable cultural product, from ballet companies and jolly balalaika-playing sailors on naval port visits to films and Olympic gymnasts. They were specifically designed to have a psychologically disarming effect. When the Red Army Chorus gave a concert at Washington, D.C.'s Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and included a stirring rendition of the American National Anthem, it received an enthusiastic standing ovation.²⁵ Only a few years before, the Chorus' parent institution had been involved in creating and disseminating butterfly toy bombs, designed to be picked up by small children in Afghan villages so that their hands and arms would be blown off, thus inducing their parents and neighbors to flee the villages, depriving the anti-Soviet *mujahideen* warriors of safe haven in the countryside. Contemporaneous with that concert, Soviet armed units invaded Azerbaijan ostensibly to create inter-ethnic peace after the KGB had inspired Azeri communist pogroms against Armenian citizens in Baku. In reality, as the Soviet defense minister publicly admitted, the invasion was designed to prevent political power from slipping from the hands of Moscow's local communist authorities.

24. _____, "Military *Glasnost*' and Soviet Strategic Deception."

25. Lenczowski, *Soviet Cultural Diplomacy*.

When regaled with the inspiring choral strains thundered by the Soviet army's basses, who could be reminded of such events? Well into Moscow's cultural and psychological disarmament offensive, it became clear that Mikhail Gorbachev's military buildup considerably exceeded that of President Reagan in eighteen of twenty categories of armament.²⁶

Political power projection

Cultural diplomacy is a form of demonstrating national power—by exposing foreign audiences to every aspect of culture that reflects such power, including the advancement of science and technology, a nation's quality of life, a nation's wealth (as reflected in the development of those elements of a civilization that can only come from wealth), its competitiveness in everything from sports and industry to military power, and its self-image of cultural and civilizational confidence. Some tools, such as a scientific and technological exhibition, accomplish this purpose directly; others, such as architecture, do so symbolically. The skillful use of these cultural tools can thus project a nation's power politically and have strategic effects ranging from inspiring confidence among allies to enhancing the deterrence of adversaries.

Inspiration for political change

Cultural diplomacy is a method of inspiring political change in foreign countries. When targeted toward states representing a political, strategic, or cultural threat, it can serve as a form of warfare. In this connection, the use of cultural vehicles and the seizure of cultural institutions by one's political allies is a well-known form of subversion.²⁷

26. Lenczowski, *Sources of Soviet Perestroika*, p.27, based on a chart compiled by Jim Guirard, *West Watch*, January-February 1990 (data based on U.S. Department of Defense, *Soviet Military Power*, 1989).

27. See, notably, the works of Antonio Gramsci, as compiled in David For-

By creating a climate where certain thoughts and ideas become reinforced by cultural tools, whether through artistic or intellectual fashion or even in the realm of etiquette, cultural instruments can shape political attitudes and conditions. Typical targets of such cultural influence are film, literature, theater, popular music, educational institutions, the mass media, religious organizations, and even charitable organizations.

Counteracting atomization

One noteworthy effect of cultural diplomacy when utilized by the United States against the Soviet Union during the Cold War was the undermining of the Soviet regime's atomization of society. Atomization was the attempt to separate people from one another, to make each individual isolated from others so as to prevent people from organizing in groups beyond the control of the regime. The principal technique was to prevent people from trusting each other. This was done mainly by recruiting and co-opting even unwilling individuals into the internal security apparatus. People were thus pressed against their will into this service by being required to inform on their neighbors, co-workers, and even family members. Failures to report and denounce infractions of Soviet laws resulted in punishment of the coerced "informer." The climate of mistrust thus engendered became pervasive.

Radio broadcasts by stations acting as a surrogate free press were the most important method of bringing people back together again and assisting them to establish relations of trust. Secret listeners, who tuned in to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—often at risk of punishment by the authorities—would gain knowledge which could form a common bond with other secret listeners. One illustration of this phenomenon involved a man who boarded a bus in Warsaw

gacs, ed., *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*, (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

in the 1950s and began whistling a song that could be heard only on Radio Free Europe and not on any of the local communist stations. A few seconds after he started, another person on the bus joined him in the whistling, and then another, and another, until most of the passengers were whistling together, and in the process, discovering that they were all secret listeners and that there were more of them than there were of the authorities. This, in a certain sense, was the beginning of the “people power” principle underlying the establishment of the Solidarity movement which would later contribute mightily to the collapse of the Soviet empire.

Contributing to political and ideological warfare

When cultural instruments, notably ideas, are used as weapons in political and ideological warfare, they can be critical to achieving several of the classic goals of these forms of war. They can serve to persuade or co-opt publics, opinion makers, or leaders in allied, neutral, or adversary countries. They can be used to isolate extremist and adversary forces within their own countries by exposing and discrediting them or their ideas, polarizing and splitting contending factions within an adversary’s camp, or even isolating our adversaries from their allies.

Cultural diplomacy includes political and ideological argument. It uses the language of persuasion and advocacy. This is not the kind of language that is associated with traditional diplomacy, which, as mentioned earlier, stresses diplomatic caution and endeavors to smooth rough edges rather than accentuate them in political debate.

Traditional diplomats rarely learn the language of persuasion and advocacy and almost never use it in public fora, as there is no career incentive to do so. In fact, it is a career-threatening move to use such language when speaking to foreign media. Who, then, should use

such tools in service of U.S. strategic interests? The answer, again, is: principally cultural diplomats.²⁸

Cultural instruments as double-edged swords

Cultural products and instruments are not uniformly effective in achieving the many beneficent political, psychological, and strategic effects our foreign policy seeks. Some of these products can be offensive to foreigners. U.S. popular culture, for example, contains numerous attractive products that have captured the imaginations of people around the world, whether it be music, film, technology, or many other examples. However, there are dimensions of this popular culture, such as the pornographization of American cinema, dress, and music and the treatment of women (and men) as objects rather than persons, that many traditional foreign cultures find offensive and subversive of national cultural mores. Ordinary American television programs broadcast on American Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) to American armed forces stationed abroad have been seen as sufficiently offensive by allies as close to the United States as South Korea that the governments of such countries have endeavored to prevent these shows from being viewed by their own populations.

Similarly, American and other Western attempts to export various social policies have been viewed in other countries as culturally imperialist and lacking in respect for the moral and cultural arrangements painstakingly worked out over centuries in their lands. The perception of such lack of respect has alienating effects among foreigners as great as the beneficent effects that derive from those occasions where they feel that Americans treat them with respect.

The question thus arises as to how U.S. cultural diplomacy should be involved in tempering the adverse effects of those ele-

28. Once again, there is an important role to be played here by similarly qualified covert intelligence personnel responsible for influence operations.

ments of American popular culture that are widely perceived in foreign lands as toxic and subversive. There may not be consistency, of course, in how American cultural products are perceived in a given country. Religious and political leaders in a given Moslem country, for example, may view such products (or policies, such as promoting women's rights) one way, while the youth of their country may view them otherwise.

Even in such cases, cultural diplomacy can find ways of mitigating the adverse effects of American culture among the members of one group while enjoying their benefits among the members of another. In the case of foreigners being offended by the pornographic character and sexually libertine values portrayed in American films, cultural diplomacy can educate the concerned foreign audience about the existence of American constituencies that find such fare equally offensive and explain the existence of cultural conflict in America and how it is a feature of a free society.

Cultural diplomacy with adversary states can have a multiplicity of effects. The usual desired effects are to appeal to the people of such states over the heads of their (usually tyrannical) governments, to neutralize adversary governments, or to persuade them to change their attitudes and policies. Cultural interactions and exchanges arranged with adversary governments pose certain risks, however. Insofar as they principally involve U.S. exchanges with representatives of that government, they can have various adverse consequences.

For example, they can legitimize illegitimate institutions thus serving the adversary government's efforts to achieve political-strategic deception. For example, during the Cold War, exchanges were arranged between the American Bar Association (ABA) and the Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL). An exchange of this type gives Americans the impression that an organization like the ASL is the functional and moral equivalent of the ABA: in other words, a pro-

fessional association representing the interests of a membership of independent lawyers who work in an analogous legal system.

Such an exchange would have been more accurately portrayed if it were described as being between American lawyers and official prosecuting agents of the Communist Party's system of arbitrary legal repression who double as official propagandists.

Similarly, "inter-parliamentary" exchanges between members of the U.S. Congress and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet gave similar legitimacy to the latter, by portraying them as having been legitimately democratically elected by citizen constituents whom they represent. Again, truth in advertising would describe such an exchange as being between U.S. elected representatives and Communist propagandists disguised as elected representatives.

By portraying the Supreme Soviet as a putatively legitimate parliament, an exchange of this type serves to send the message that the Soviet state is a state like any other (particularly like other democracies) with a parliament like any other. By portraying a system of government that is familiar and non-threatening, such an exchange reinforces illusions about the systemic requirements and, therefore, strategic intentions of a state with a radically different genetic code.²⁹

Exchanges with foreign adversary governments can present the (usually oppressed) population of their country with an image of cozy relations between their oppressive government and the United States. Few things can be more demoralizing to a suffering people, yet it is the objective of tyrannical government precisely to produce such demoralization so as to prevent internal political resistance to its rule.

29. For an elaboration of how Soviet institutions served purposes of strategic deception, see my "Themes of Soviet Strategic Deception and Disinformation," in Brian Dailey and Patrick Parker (eds.), *Soviet Strategic Deception* (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1987), p.55-75.

Yet another risk of exchanges with adversary states is that such exchanges can be used by them to serve strategic purposes such as psychological disarmament, intelligence collection, and technology acquisition. Under such circumstances, it should occur to U.S. policy makers to erect defenses against such purposes. Insofar as the threat may be intelligence collection or technology theft, the relevant counterintelligence and defense agencies must be involved. But in cases where psychological disarmament is the purpose, who exercises responsibility for defense against this? In one sense, this is a function of strategic counterintelligence. However, since most counterintelligence in the United States is conceived of principally as an exercise in tactical counterespionage and almost never a task of countering foreign political influence operations, cultural diplomats must be involved.

Here such involvement must include, at minimum, briefing participants in cultural exchanges about the potential threats and strategic purposes of their exchange counterparts and their official sponsors. The construction of such exchanges must also avoid political symbolism that reinforces the strategic purposes of those governments. The days of exchanges between uninformed, naive Americans and well-briefed official propagandists from adversary countries must end.

A final consideration relating to the double-edged nature of cultural diplomacy is in order: the role of American participants who do not share a given administration's policy positions. Americans who dissent from administration policy can most assuredly undermine national policy objectives when speaking abroad in the context of whatever cultural activity they may be pursuing. However, it is also true that dissident voices can nonetheless serve longer-term American interests especially if their foreign audience also disagrees with the current administration policy in question. Under such circum-

stances, the portrayal of an America where there is free debate and where dissident voices are not suppressed can mitigate hostile attitudes of foreign audiences who oppose U.S. policy by giving those audiences hope that U.S. policy can change or at least be informed by views that seem more respectful of their own.

Conclusion

Given the vast array of activities included in cultural diplomacy, it is obvious that the U.S. government has ignored the many possibilities they offer to influence the world in ways that promote U.S. national interests and higher moral purposes. There is no genuine career track leading to positions of high influence in the Department of State for experts in these matters. Nor are there career incentives for foreign affairs personnel to apply their talents to this field. There is no serious professional education for cultural diplomats within the government. Nor are cultural diplomats sent to outside educational institutions to develop the knowledge and intellectual skills necessary to succeed in this most sophisticated of political influence activities.

Meanwhile, despite the utterly strategic nature of this form of influence, no resources—neither human nor financial—commensurate with this strategic character are devoted to cultural diplomacy.

For all the specific policy recommendations one might make in concluding this analysis, and for all the recommendations that have been made in a slew of worthy reports on the subject, as a realistic matter none will be seriously considered by either the executive or legislative branches until two prerequisites are realized:

First, there must be a conceptual revolution in the character of American statecraft. This must involve the adoption within the broader diplomatic and national security communities of an influence culture, to complement the culture of government-to-government dialogue, consultations, and negotiations on the one hand, and

the culture of material power, be it military or economic, on the other. A culture of influence can only come about with the merging of both these cultures so that the ministers of “hard power” recognize the value of “soft power” and that the diplomatic culture recognizes the existence of one of its critical dimensions that make “soft” instruments powerful. What this means is that there must emerge a new culture of integrated strategy that refuses to abandon instruments critical to a successful foreign policy and grand strategy.

Second, determined leadership is necessary if existing patterns of bureaucratic practice and budgeting are to be overcome and cultural diplomacy is to secure its place at the strategic table. The existing advocacy by proponents of cultural diplomacy is weak. This is so because it is almost always divorced from integrated strategy. Its strategic value and its indispensable character have remained unsatisfactorily explained.

Ironically, those whose business ought to be the arts of capturing attention and of persuasion have failed both to capture national strategic attention and to persuade. Existing national leadership in both political parties remains oblivious to the enormous gap that must be filled. And given how difficult it is for existing leaders to acquire intellectual capital while in office, it seems quixotic to hope that they will undergo the necessary conceptual revolution, become enthusiasts and advocates for a necessary structural and bureaucratic revolution within the government, and then go about implementing such change with strategic and tactical determination.

The realistic conclusion to be drawn from this is that the fruits of this extraordinary instrument of national influence will have to be picked up by a new generation. But time flies and a new generation is in formation.

Works Cited

- Amr, Hady. "The Need to Communicate: How to Improve U.S. Public Diplomacy with the Islamic World," The Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Towards the Islamic World, Analysis Paper Number 6, Washington, D.C., January 2004.
- Andrade, Dale, and James H. Wilbanks. "CORDS/Phoenix: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Vietnam for the Future." *Military Review*. March-April, 2006.
- Armstrong, Matt. "Rethinking Smith-Mundt." *Small Wars Journal* (July 28, 2008) www.smallwarsjournal.com
- Arndt, Richard T. *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2005.
- . "Censoring the Voice of America." *Foreign Policy*, August 6, 2009.
- Benedict XVI. "Faith, Reason, and the University." Papal Address at the University of Regensburg, September 12, 2006.
- Birkelund, John. "Doing Good While Doing Well: The Unheralded Success of American Enterprise Funds." *Foreign Affairs*, September-October, 2001.
- Caute, David. *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy During the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Chesterton, G.K. *The Everlasting Man*. Fort Collins: Ignatius Press, 1993.
- Cultural Diplomacy: Recommendations and Research*, n.p., Center for the Arts and Culture, July 2004.
- Cummings Jr., Milton C. *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Arts and Culture, 2003.
- Dailey, Brian, and Patrick Parker., eds. *Soviet Strategic Deception*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1987.

- Dolbow, Jim. "Let's have a Fleet of 15 Hospital Ships." *Proceedings*, U.S. Naval Institute, February, 2008.
- Epstein, Edward J. *Deception*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1989.
- Ferris, Elizabeth. "Iraqi Internal Displacement and International Law." 9th Annual Conference on Public Service & the Law, University of Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, Virginia, February 9, 2008.
- Finn, Helena K. "The Case for Cultural Diplomacy." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82 Issue 6, November-December 2003.
- Foreign Broadcast Information Service Daily Report-Eastern Europe*, June 8, 1988.
- Forgacs, David., ed. *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- Glassman, James. "Briefing on U.S. Public Diplomacy and the War of Ideas." (October 28, 2008) <http://www.state.gov/r/us/2008/111372.htm>.
- Government Accountability Office. *U.S. Public Diplomacy: Strategic Planning Efforts Have Improved but Agencies Face Significant Implementation Challenges*. <http://www.gao.gov/new .items/d07795t.pdf>.
- Guirard, Jim. *West Watch*. January-February n.p. 1990.
- Hazan, Baruch. *Soviet Impregnational Propaganda*. Woodstock, New York: Ardis Publishers, 1982.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. *Counterinsurgency*. FM 2-24, MCWP 3-33.5, n.p.
- Heritage Foundation. *How to Reinvigorate U.S. Public Diplomacy*. Washington, D.C., April 23, 2003.
- Hill, Bryan. "The Smith-Mundt Act of 1948: Comments, Critiques, and the Way Forward." Occasional Papers Series, Apr. 2007, The Center for Security Policy (August 11, 2008). <http://www.centerforsecuritypolicy.org/Modules/NewsManager/Center%20publication%20PDFs/OCC%20Smith%20Mundt.pdf>.
- "Increasing Realism in U.S.- Soviet Relations," *Nepszabadsag*, June 4, 1988.
- Intercollegiate Studies Institute and the University of Connecticut's Department of Public Policy. *The Coming Crisis in Citizenship: Higher Education's Failure to Teach America's History and Institutions*. 2006.
- Johnson, Stephen, Helle Dale, and Patrick Cronin. *Strengthening U.S. Public Diplomacy Requires Organization, Coordination, and Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: Heritage Foundation Backgrounder # 1875, 2005.

- Johnston, Douglas. *Religion the Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Kawagoe, Toshihiko. *Agricultural Land Reform in Post-War Japan*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, Development Research Group, Rural Development, 1999.
- Lancaster, Carol., Kwaku Nuamah, Matthew Lieber, and Todd Johnson. *Foreign Aid and Private Sector Development*. Providence: Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, 2006.
- Lenczowski, John. *Cultural Diplomacy, Political Influence, and Integrated Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008.
- . "Military Glasnost' and Soviet Strategic Deception." *International Freedom Review* Winter 1990, Volume 3 Number 2.
- . *The Sources of Soviet Perestroika*. Ashland, OH: Ashland University Ashbrook Center, 2009.
- . *Soviet Cultural Diplomacy: A Multi-facted Strategic Instrument of Soviet Power*. 1991. http://www.iwp.edu/docLib/200607710_cultural_diplomacy.pdf
- Libforall, Home page, <http://www.libforall.org/media/expose.html>.
- Lord, Carnes. *Losing Hearts and Minds? Public Diplomacy and Strategic Influence in an Age of Terror*. Westport, CT and London: Praeger Security International, 2006.
- . "What 'Strategic' Public Diplomacy Is," in J. Michael Waller., ed. *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counterpropaganda, and Political Warfare*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009.
- Marx, Karl. "Theses on Feuerbach." in Robert C. Tucker., ed. *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York: WW Norton & Company, 1972.
- McCormick Foundation and Center for Security Policy. *Shariah, Law, and "Financial Jihad": How Should America Respond?* Chicago: McCormick Foundation, 2008.
- Nielsen Media Research. *The Nielsen Company Issues Top Ten U.S. Lists of 2007*. <http://nielsenmedia.com/nc/portal/site/Public/menuitem.55dc65b4a7d5addff3f65936147a062a0/ygnextoid+d5df7b5dd2ac6110VgnVCM100000ac0a260aRCRD>.
- Ninkovich, Frank. *Arts and Minds: Cultural Diplomacy Amid Global Tensions*, National Arts Journalism Program, Arts International, and the Center for Arts and Culture, 2003.

- . *U.S. Information Policy and Cultural Diplomacy*. Washington, D.C.: Foreign Policy Association Headline Series No. 308, 1996.
- Nye Jr., Joseph S. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
- Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. *Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication*, Washington, D.C., September 2004.
- Pan-American Health Organization Official Document 118. Washington, D.C.: n.p. 1973.
- Peterson, Peter G. et al, "Finding America's Voice for Reinvigorating U.S. Public Diplomacy." Report of an Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 2003.
- Pilon, Juliana Geran, ed. *Cultural intelligence for Winning the Peace*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009.
- . "Obsolete Restrictions on Public Diplomacy Hurt U.S. Outreach and Strategy." The Heritage Foundation. August 11, 2008. <http://www.heritage.org/research/NationalSecurity/bg2089.cfm>
- . *Why America is Such a Hard Sell*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.
- Pincus, Walter. "Iraq's Slow Refugee Funding Has Ripple Effects," *Washington Post*, May 17, 2008, A12.
- Publius. *The Federalist Papers*. #3, #5, #7, #22, #41, and #43. New York: Mentor Publishing, 1961.
- Rabasa, Angel., Cheryl Benard, Lowell H. Schwartz, and Peter Sickle. *Building Moderate Muslim Networks*. Santa Monica: RAND Center for Middle East Policy, 2007.
- Reilly, Robert R. "Brittney vs. the Terrorists." *Washington Post*, February 9, 2007. A19.
- . *The Roots of Islamist Ideology*. London: Centre for Research into Post-Communist Economies, 2006.
- Report of the Public Diplomacy Council. "A Call for Action on Public Diplomacy." Washington, D.C., January 2005
- Rumyantsev, M., ed. *A Dictionary of Scientific Communism* (Nauchnyi Kommunizm Slovar'). Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1984.
- Schaefer, Peter F. "A \$9 Trillion Question: Did the World Get Mohammed Yunus Wrong?" *Foreign Policy*, August 18, 2009.

- Skrobiszewski, Francis. "Investing for Stability." *Crisis Response Journal*, Vol. 5, Issue. 4, 2009
- Smith, Kelly Adams. "Embassy Outreach Targets Estonian Grass Roots." *State* magazine, May 2005.
- Sorely, Lewis. *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam*. Orlando: Harcourt, Inc., 1999.
- Soto, Hernando de. *The Mystery of Capital*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Stephens, Bret. "Public Diplomacy for Dummies: The Bush Administration falters in the Battle of Ideas." *Wall Street Journal*, July 7, 2007.
- Thayer, Robert H. "Cultural Diplomacy: Seeing is Believing." *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Vol. 25 Issue 24, October 1, 1959.
- Tierney Jr., John. *Chasing Ghosts*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books. Inc. 2006.
- Tzu, Sun. *The Art of War*. Trans., by Ralph D. Sawyer. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1994.
- U.S. Counterintelligence Reform*, Proceedings of a Cantigny. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, forthcoming.
- U.S. Department of Defense, *Soviet Military Power*. n.p. 1989.
- U.S. Department of Justice. *Soviet Active Measures in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, June 1987.
- U.S. Department of State. *Active Measures: A Report on the Substance and Process of Anti-U.S. Disinformation and Propaganda Campaigns*. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Publication 9630. August 1986.
- . Bureau of Resource Management. *FY 2008 Budget in Brief*, February 5, 2007. In J. Michael Waller. *The Public Diplomacy Reader*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009.
- . "Changing Minds, Winning Peace." Report of the Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, 2003.
- . *Dictionary of International Relations Terms*, n.p. 1987
- . *Soviet Influence Activities: A Report on Active Measures and Propaganda, 1986-87*. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, Publication 9627, August 1987.
- . U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. 2004, 2005, and 2008 Reports.
- . 1985 Report. in J. Michael Waller. *The Public Diplomacy Reader*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2009.

- Waller, J. Michael. "The American Way of Propaganda: Lessons from the Founding Fathers." in *Strategic Influence: Public Diplomacy, Counterpropaganda, and Political Warfare*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008.
- . *Fighting the War of Ideas Like a Real War*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008.
- . *Founding Political Warfare Documents of the United States*. n.p., Crossbow Press, 2009.
- . "Propaganda: the American Way." *Internationalist – A Journal of Culture and Currents*, 3, No. 4, n.p. 2006.
- . ed., *The Public Diplomacy Reader*. Washington, D.C.: The Institute of World Politics Press, 2008.
- Wanniski, Jude. *The Way the World Works*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Warde, Ibrahim. *Islamic Finance in the Global Economy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- Washington, George. "Farewell Address." in *American Government*. Peter Odegard., ed. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1964.
- Welch, Matt. "The Truth About Sanctions Against Iraq." *Policy*, vol. 18, no. 2. Winter 2002.
- Young, Stephen. "How North Vietnam Won the War." *Wall Street Journal*, August 3, 1995, A8.

Index

- ABM Treaty (1972), 128
abortion, 142, 175
active measures, 4; definition of 33-34; countering of, 85
Adams, Samuel, 26
advertising (in foreign policy), 23, 84, 119, 189
Afghanistan, Soviet War, 5, 34; U.S. War, 41, 46, 52, 78, 92, 132, 135, 153
AFL-CIO, 30, 65
Africa, combating AIDS, 33, 38, 82-83; support of anti-communists 33, 38
agriculture, Department of, 81; in foreign policy, 81, 96
Aguirre, Maria Sophia, xiv
Al-Hurra, 69, 173
Al-Jazeera, 69, 151
Allah, 5, 7, 82, 90, 102, 131
al-Qaida, 5, 7, 82, 90, 102, 132
al-Qaida-in-Iraq, 7
America Houses, 39
American Bar Association (ABA), 188
American Forces Radio and Television Service, 187
American Global Outreach and Research Agency (AGORA), 115
American University in Cairo, 172
American University of Beirut, 27, 172
Amr, Hady, 8
anthropology (in foreign policy), 39
anti-Americanism, 5-7, 11, 19, 40, 89, 162, 170
Arab world, 42, 68-69, 108
Arabic, 42, 68-69, 108
architecture. *See* arts
Armenia, 183
arms control, 33, 47
Armstrong, Matt, 131-132
Arndt, Richard T., 161-162
arts, 19-20, 159-160, 163, 166, 171, 180, 183; architecture, 20, 171, 184; ballet, 162, 171, 183; books, 29, 33, 162, 172; film, 28, 171, 183, 185, 187-

- 188; literature, 20, 105, 128, 172-173, 185; music, 20, 36, 42, 68-69, 142, 171, 173, 179, 185, 187; painting, 20, 171
- Asia Foundation, 141
- Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Research (U.S. Department of State office), 108
- Assistant Secretary for Politico-Military Affairs (U.S. Department of State office), 108
- Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL), 188
- Aswan Dam, 95
- atomization, 36, 185
- Ayatollah Khomeini, 5
- Azerbaijan, 183
- ballet. *See* arts
- Barrett, Barbara, xiv
- belles lettres, 20
- Benard, Cheryl, 141
- Benedict XVI (pope), 112
- Bin Laden, Osama, 90
- books. *See* arts
- Brezhnev, Leonid, 128
- British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 61, 71
- broadcasting, in public diplomacy, 2, 16, 20, 31, 33, 36, 42, 82, 134-135, 154-155, 173, 184-186; international, 33, 35, 38, 73-74, 136-137; under the BBG, 41-43, 70-71, 125-126
- Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), xv, 39, 42, 68, 79, 120, 133
- Bukovsky, Vladimir, xiv
- Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, 136
- Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 122, 124, 167
- Bureau of International Political and Information Programs, 124-126, 130, 133-136
- Bureau of Public Affairs, 74, 79
- Bureau of Public Diplomacy, 116
- Bush Administration, 5, 9, 40, 42-43, 65, 67, 75, 82-83, 114
- Bush, George W., 42, 65
- Butler, Nicholas Murray, 27
- campaign contributions, 127
- Carter Administration, 32
- Caspian Basin, 64
- casus belli*, 6
- Caucasus, 64
- Caute, David, 162
- copyright, 32, 61, 120, 131, 135, 168, 173
- Central America, 33-34, 38
- Central Asia, 6
- Central Europe, 28, 173
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Cold War, 30-32; intelligence, 76, 118, 145, 150, 152; political action and warfare, 146-150; public diplomacy, 2, 43, 63, 83, 155-156; purging of, 34, 42
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 118
- Chesterton, G.K., 181

- China, 6, 64
- Christianity, 26, 66, 112, 140, 178
- Church Committee, 32, 72
- Churchill, Winston, 56, 170
- civic action, 65
- Civil Affairs Division (U.S. Army), 124
- Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS), 147
- civil rights, 171
- civil-military operations, 76-77, 102, 133
- clientitis, 53, 108-109
- CNN, 70
- Coalition of the Willing, 5
- Cold War, 32, 89, 171, 188, 190; broadcasting, 71, 134, 159; policies, 39, 52; post-Cold War era, 1, 41; public diplomacy, 30-31, 37, 40, 64-65, 75, 92-93, 134-135, 175, 185
- Columbia University, 27
- Committee on Public Information, 27
- Congress for Cultural Freedom, 29
- Constitution of the United States of America, 127, 145; separation of church and state, 67, 78-79, 177
- Continental Army, x
- Continental Congress, 25
- Counterinsurgency Doctrine, 9, 76, 97, 153
- counterinsurgency warfare, 30-32, 39, 41, 55, 103, 147-149, 167
- counterintelligence, 34, 75, 118, 133, 144; instrument of state-craft, xi, 25; integration with intelligence, 88-94, 99; new capabilities, 144, 146, 150-151
- counter-propaganda, 68-69, 90-91, 116-117, 152; public diplomacy, 20, 24, 53, 60, 83, 156; public opinion, 28, 131-132; War on Terror, 6, 8, 75; within Department of State, 4, 118
- covert action, 22, 72, 119, 140
- credit, 93-96, 138-139
- Cuba, 33
- cultural diplomacy, 166-174; elements of, 18, 21-24, 53, 170-178; neglect of, xii, 4, 52, 130, 174-178; political influence, 10, 33, 122, 140; within USIA, 30
- cultural exchanges, 16, 172, 176
- culture, xiii, 1-3, 10, 18, 21, 53, 71, 73, 119, 166, 169; American, 6, 15, 22-23, 27, 30, 36, 69, 168, 172; elements of, 170-178; Foreign, 6, 8, 22, 111-112, 114, 128-129, 147-148; hard/soft power, 6, 15, 22-23, 27, 30, 36, 69, 168, 170; of influence, xii, 4, 11, 13, 62, 77-78, 80, 82, 92, 94, 104-107, 114, 121, 123, 142-144, 154, 160, 164; within agencies, xi, 14, 64-66, 68, 75, 95, 109, 117, 121, 144, 153, 176
- Cummings, Milton, Jr., 159
- Czech Republic, 39, 177
- Czechoslovakia, 47

- Dale, Helle, 103
- DCI. *See* Director of Central Intelligence
- de Soto, Hernando, 94
- debt, 92, 153
- deception, 76, 86-87, 111, 144, 182, 188-189
- Declaration of Independence, 25
- Defense Science Board, 8, 15
- democracy building, 16, 136
- Democratic Party, 65, 125
- demoralization, 22, 30, 128, 189
- Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Support to Public Diplomacy, 75
- Deputy Secretary of State, 115, 118
- détente*, 31-32
- deterrence, 1, 143, 167, 184
- Deutsch, John, 40
- Dhani, Ahmad, 142
- Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), 118
- Director of National Intelligence (DNI), 118
- disaster relief, 28, 82, 119, 124, 166
- disinformation, 1, 4, 21, 34, 37, 74, 86, 112, 126-127, 135, 144, 146, 189
- DNI. *See* Director of National Intelligence
- Dolbow, Jim, 82-83
- Dujarric, Robert, 17
- Eagleburger, Lawrence, 4, 33
- East Central Europe, 28, 93, 173
- Eastern Europe, 108, 138, 139, 182, 194
- Ebner, Douglas, 102
- economic statecraft, 90
- education, 43, 45, 51, 79, 100, 103, 104, 106-107, 110, 142, 143, 149, 152, 161, 162, 170, 191; exchanges, 16, 20, 29, 122, 148, 172; higher education, 17, 66, 74, 98, 105; public diplomacy, 19, 20-23, 26, 28, 36, 78, 79, 81, 98, 100, 103, 122-123, 148, 163, 185
- Egypt, 94
- elite opinion, 1, 2n1, 18, 88
- elites, 2, 21, 69, 111
- Encounter* (journal), 29
- enterprise funds, 93, 138-139
- entrepreneurship, 94, 139
- environmental issues, 81
- Epstein, Edward J., 86
- Estonia, 63
- ethnography, 45, 171; ethnic conflict, 91, 127; ethnic policy, 13
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 93
- exchanges, cultural, 14, 20, 154, 169, 188, 190; educational, 16, 20, 172; public diplomacy, 18, 20, 117, 123, 126, 136, 149, 154, 188-190. *See also* culture
- Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, 118
- exhibitions, 20, 28, 171, 179-180
- falsehoods, 101

- FBI. *See* Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Federal Bureau of Investigation
(FBI), 34, 144, 146
- Federalist Papers, 87
- feminism, 141
- Ferris, Elizabeth, 7
- Field Manual FM 3-24. *See* Counterinsurgency Doctrine
- film. *See* arts
- Finn, Helena, 160-161
- First Amendment. *See* Constitution of the U.S.
- First World War, 27
- food, 81, 90
- Foreign Agricultural Service, 3, 91
- foreign aid, 16, 18, 28, 53, 91-93, 95, 138-139, 154, 164
- Foreign Commercial Service, 3
- foreign influence, 16, 19, 79, 86-87, 127, 145
- foreign investment, 95
- foreign languages, 20, 109, 173
- foreign opinion, ix, 4, 13, 19, 21, 29, 30, 53, 55, 90, 106, 164
- Foreign Service, xiv, 63, 66, 99-101, 103-111, 136-138, 170
- Foreign Service Institute, 104, 170
- Founding Fathers, x, 25, 86
- Franklin, Benjamin, x, 26
- Fulbright Program, 28. *See also* exchanges
- Fulbright, Sen. J. William, 130
- GAO. *See* Government Accountability Office
- Georgetown University, xiv, 199
- Germany, 28, 39, 94, 142; Nazi Germany, 2, 38
- gifts, 20, 174
- glasnost, 183
- Glassman, James, 40, 67-68, 80
- Global Strategic Engagement Center, 68, 119, 149
- Global War on Terror, 6, 8, 43, 73
- Goldwater-Nichols, 9, 52, 156
- Golitsyn, Anatoly, 86
- Gorbachev, Mikhail, 46, 129, 184
- Government Accountability Office (GAO), 42
- grand strategy, xi, xii, 10, 23, 49-57, 146, 150, 192
- Greece, U.S. relations with, 89
- Green Berets, 30, 55
- Guirard, Jim, 184
- Gulf War (1991), 7
- gunboat diplomacy, 123
- hard power, xii, 17, 52-58, 83, 156, 167, 192
- hard power culture, xii, 53-57
- Havel, Vaclav, 47, 177
- Hazan, Baruch, 181
- health diplomacy, 81
- hearts and minds, ix-xi, 8, 11, 22, 30, 103, 105, 131, 135, 151, 153, 167
- Heritage Foundation, 8, 103, 132
- Hill, Bryan, 131-133
- hiraba*, 129
- history, xii, 2, 10, 19-21, 23-25, 28, 45, 47, 67, 80, 90, 98, 100-101, 110-111, 146, 151, 171,

- 161, 163, 176-178, 182
- Hitler, Adolph, 56
- HIV/AIDS, 75
- homosexuality, 6, 142
- hospital ships, 82-83
- House International Relations Committee, 155
- human rights, xiv, 22, 61, 101, 136, 171, 199
- Human Terrain System, 41, 77
- humanitarian aid, 28
- Hussein, Saddam, 6, 52, 90
- ideas, 1,4,8, 180-182; cultural diplomacy, 21, 23, 45, 82, 127-128, 167-178, 180, 184; foreign marketplace, 71, 74, 106; historically, 28-40; ideological warfare, 10, 19, 42, 57, 75, 83, 143,187; in the State Department, 68, 81; soft power, xii, 9-10, 11, 17, 52, 54, 56-58, 77, 150, 155-156, 160, 166-167, 192; strategic outreach, 20, 123, 151; war of, 15, 24, 45, 49, 51, 68-70, 73-75, 110, 136, 146, 148, 160, 165, 186
- The Illusion of an Islamic State* (book), 142
- imperialism, 6
- Indonesia, 82, 141-142
- influence. *See* influence culture, political influence
- influence culture, 1, 4, 62, 66, 78, 94, 105-107, 122-123, 160-161, 176
- information, American society and culture, 15, 30; Department of State, 4, 132, 137; operations, 23, 68, 76, 79, 81, 83, 135, 151-152; policy, ix, 8, 20, 22-23, 29, 35, 120, 125, 128-129, 150, 155, 167, 171, 180-181, 183; public diplomacy, 1, 17, 19-21, 24, 38, 43, 88, 122, 129, 167, 186
- infrastructure, 92
- Institute of International Education, 27
- The Institute of World Politics, xiii-xiv, 51n7
- intelligence xi, 88-91, 187; capabilities/collection, 23, 32, 34, 72, 84-85, 87-88, 111-112, 134, 144, 148, 165, 190; Intelligence Community, xv, 40, 68, 85-87, 105, 109, 112, 116, 127, 134, 144, 146, 178, 180; officers/sources, ix, 53, 139, 164; public diplomacy 21, 25, 34, 38, 43, 79, 140, 173
- interagency groups, 3, 33, 39, 40, 63-65, 67-68, 80, 91, 112, 115, 118-119, 146, 149-150, 156
- Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 66n4
- international law, 7
- International Republican Institute, 65n3, 125
- International Visitor Program, 27
- international visitors, 23. *See also*

- cultural exchanges; exchanges;
education exchanges; Fulbright
Program
- internet, 125, 132, 151
- Iran, 5, 7, 38, 42
- Iran-Contra, 38
- Iraq, 5-9, 15, 41, 52, 55-56, 63, 73,
77-78, 90, 124, 132-133, 135,
143, 148, 153, 170
- irregular warfare. *See* counterinsur-
gency warfare
- Islam, 6, 74, 112, 127n9, 129, 178
- Islamic world, 6, 78, 141-142, 151
- Islamism, 127, 129, 178
- Islamist extremism, 67, 74, 82,
112-113, 127, 129, 140-142,
151, 157
- Italy, political action in, 30
- ius ad bellum*, 6n5
- Jajko, Walter, xiv
- Japan, 28, 38, 97
- Jeziorski, Jan Nowak, 71n8
- jihad, 127-129
- John Paul II (pope), 46
- Johns Hopkins University, 159
- Johnson, Stephen, 103n2
- Johnston, Douglas, 88n9
- joint operations, 52
- Joint Public Affairs Office, 148
- journalists, 23, 30, 47, 71
- journals, 29
- Judaism, 112
- just war, 6
- Kawagoe, Toshihiko, 97n30
- Kennedy Center for the Performing
Arts, 183
- KGB, 4n4, 85-86, 169, 183
- King, Rev. Martin Luther, 171
- Koran, 129
- Kriebler, Robert, 35n4
- labor, 30, 65n3, 81, 101, 136, 172
- language, advocacy and persuasion,
101, 110, 128, 129, 138, 168,
186; cultural diplomacy, 19,
152, 163; services, 31, 39, 42,
68, 151; skills/competence,
20, 76, 100, 107-109, 152,
172-173
- Latin America, 83, 108
- law, 7n, 22, 78, 95, 112, 113, 127,
132, 145, 146, 148, 169, 174,
177, 185, 188, 189
- Lebanon, 27
- Lewis, C.S., 113
- LibForAll Foundation, 142
- libraries, 20, 28, 33, 39, 62, 172
- literature. *See* arts
- Loctite Corporation, 35n4
- Lord, Carnes, xiv, 12, 14, 17, 42n6,
114, 115, 134n
- malnutrition, 81, 90
- Marshall Plan, 93, 138
- Marx, Karl, 48
- Marxism-Leninism, 48, 183
- materialism, 6, 178
- McCormick Foundation, 127n9
- media, 2, 27, 70, 74, 75, 130, 163,
184; diplomacy, 20, 21, 33, 74,

- 174-175; foreign, 101, 108-110, 130, 150-151, 168, 186; newspapers, 30, 62-63, 131
- Media Research and Analysis Office, 134
- medical assistance, 15, 166
- medical diplomacy, 119, 123
- medicine, 19, 163
- micro-credit (micro-finance), 93, 95, 138
- Middle Ages, 113
- Middle East, 5-6, 27, 42
- military education, 21
- military power, 118, 184
- Minneapolis, 131, 133
- moral battlespace, 22
- moral legitimacy, 77
- mujahideen, 183
- music. *See* arts
- National Democratic Institute, 65, 125
- National Endowment for Democracy, 2, 35, 65, 79-80, 125, 141
- National Intelligence Topics (NITs), 34, 87
- National Security Act of 1947, 2, 118
- National Security Advisor to the President, 169
- National Security Council, xiv, 2-4, 38, 40, 64, 70, 73, 80, 83, 118, 121, 169
- National Security Decision Directive 45 (NSDD 45), 80
- National Security Decision Directive 75 (NSDD-75), 47, 80, 169
- National Security Decision Directive 77 (NSDD-77), 3-4, 33, 39, 80, 149
- National Security Professional Development Integration Office, 9
- national strategy, 10, 27, 51, 55, 170
- NATO. *See* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
- natural law, 113, 169
- New York Times*, 70
- newspapers. *See* media
- NGOs. *See* non-governmental organizations
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 112
- Ninkovich, Frank, 159
- NITs. *See* National Intelligence Topics
- Nixon, Richard, 128
- non-governmental organizations (NGOs), 35, 76, 175, 178
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 37, 89
- North Vietnam, 31, 148
- nuclear deterrence. *See* deterrence
- Nye, Joseph, 17, 160
- Obama Administration, 43, 68, 77, 80
- Obama, Barack, 43
- Odierno, Gen. Raymond, 41
- Odom, William, 17
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 118, 151
- Office of Private Sector Outreach (U.S. Department of State), 124
- Office of Public Diplomacy Sup-

- port, 137
- Office of Public Diplomatic Security, 126, 144
- Office of Strategic Influence, 17, 74, 137
- Office of War Information, 28, 115
- Office Under the Stairs, 75n11
- oil, 6, 46
- Olympics, 163
- OMB. *See* Office of Management and Budget
- Operations Control Board, 29, 80
- opinion leaders, 2, 19, 27, 88, 106, 125
- opportunities intelligence, 41, 85, 87, 88, 134, 144
- Orwell, George, 176
- Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), 139

- painting. *See* arts
- Pakistan, 74, 82
- Palmer, Mark, xiv
- Pan-American Health Organization, 29, 83
- PAOs. *See* Public Affairs Officers
- Parker, Patrick, 189
- PBS NewsHour, 69
- Peace Corps, 2, 28, 40, 65, 72, 79, 116, 121, 152, 154, 166
- peace movements, 30
- peaceful coexistence, 112, 128-129
- peacekeeping, 1, 102, 133
- perceptions management, 17, 21, 57, 111
- Peterson, Peter G., 8
- Petraeus, Gen. David, 41, 153
- philanthropy, 20, 163
- Pike Committee, 32, 72
- Pilon, Juliana Geran, xiv, 12, 16, 41, 72, 115, 116, 117, 132
- Pincus, Walter, 7
- Poland, 5, 30, 34, 37, 46, 141, 169
- Policy Coordinating Committee on Strategic Communications, 67, 119
- Policy Planning Staff (U.S. Department of State), 74, 137
- political action, 2, 4, 8, 31, 40, 41, 60, 134, 137, 166; capability/strategy, 26, 29, 57, 140-141, 143, 178; and influence operations, 10, 26, 29, 77, 157; and public diplomacy, 18, 22, 30, 39, 80, 117, 125, 136
- political influence, campaigns, x, 25-26; capabilities, xii, 25, 43, 73, 75, 77, 79; covert, 4, 32, 35, 72, 100; foreign, 4, 72, 74, 77, 86, 87, 92, 111-112, 126, 144, 146, 190; international, 25, 33; policy, 18, 31, 144; and public diplomacy, 23, 45, 58, 69-70, 85, 91, 125, 159, 191; strategy, 10, 16, 86
- political symbolism, 190
- political warfare, campaign, x; capabilities, 32, 34, 39, 41, 140, 143, 146, 157; and influence operations, 10, 166; neglect of, 4, 8, 31, 39; and public diplomacy, 18, 22, 29, 35, 37,

- 56-57, 117, 122
- pornography, 6
- port visits, 123, 183
- Post-Cold War. *See* Cold War
- poverty, 91, 140
- Problems of Communism* (journal), 28
- Proceedings* (journal), 82n14
- Procter & Gamble, 84
- professional education, 23, 42n8, 45, 79, 100, 104-105, 107, 143, 191
- propaganda, 4, 25-26, 62, 75, 85, 126, 131, 133; anti-American, 4-5, 131-132, 146, 181; challenges, 6, 8, 18; foreign, 31, 100, 110-112, 122, 128, 135, 183; hostile, 2, 21, 27, 37, 50, 76, 157, 164, 180-181; Soviet, 4, 28, 31, 33-34, 112, 127-128, 148n22, 171, 181, 182n20
- propaganda of the deed, 15, 18, 22
- proxies, 79, 140
- psychological strategy, 8, 10, 18, 41, 54, 57, 65
- Psychological Strategy Board, 29
- psycho-political operations, 55
- public affairs officers (PAOs), 60, 78, 79, 116, 145, 178
- public diplomacy, ix-xiii, 2-4, 11, 47, 112, 170-176; budget, 83-84, 151; counterinsurgency, 97-98; cultural diplomacy, 19, 21, 169-177, 187; definition of, 11-16, 18-19; education, 21, 69, 100-101, 104-107; historical use/examples of, 23-33, 35, 37-40, 45-46, 53, 60, 62, 75; integration with economic statecraft, 90-91; integration with intelligence/counterintelligence, 35, 72, 84-85; integration with policy/strategy, 9, 23, 31, 35, 40-45, 71, 79, 81-84, 88, 97-98; integration with traditional diplomacy, 63, 67-68; instruments of, 19, 21-23, 79, 81-83; misconceptions of, 9-11, 23, 45, 56, 58-60, 70, 79, 105; solutions, 106-126; 128-144, 155-159; structure, 62-69, 74-78, 102
- Public Diplomacy Council, 8n, 115-119, 149
- public health, 81, 83, 148
- public opinion, 2, 8, 13-14, 19, 26, 31, 41, 43, 58, 72, 88, 102, 126, 134, 136, 148
- public relations, 15, 23, 148, 180
- publications, 14
- Publius, 87
- Qods Force, 7
- Quadrant* (journal), 29
- Rabasa, Angel, 141
- radio, 2, 14, 28, 30-33, 36, 121, 131, 133, 151, 169, 173, 185
- Radio Farda, 173
- Radio Free Afghanistan, 33, 173
- Radio Free Asia, 173
- Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty

- (RFE/RL), 2, 28, 39, 47, 68,
71n8, 79, 169, 173, 185-186
- Radio Marti, 33, 173
- Radio Sawa, 68, 151, 173
- Reagan Administration, 3, 80
- Reagan, Ronald, 32, 33-35, 37,
47n3, 128-129, 169, 184
- Red Army Chorus, 183
- Refugees, 7, 101
- Regensburg address, 112
- Reilly, Robert R., xiv, 69, 112
- Rejkyavik Summit (1986), 128
- religion, 1, 4, 8, 19, 66-67, 79, 88,
112-113, 122, 129, 141-142,
163, 175, 177-178
- religious diplomacy, 21, 149, 164,
177
- religious-ideological influence, 65
- republican form of government, 86
- Republican Party, 65, 125
- Resistance International, 34
- respect, 20, 21, 25, 50, 53-54, 56,
88, 117, 165, 174-175 179-
180, 187
- rhetoric, xiii, 46n, 76, 109-110, 168
- Rice, Condoleezza, 63
- Robert College, 27, 172
- rock music, 68-69
- Romerstein, Herbert, xiv
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 27
- Root, Elihu, 27
- rule of law, 22, 95, 174
- Rumsfeld, Donald, 75
- Rumyantsev, M., 128
- Russia, 6, 151
- Schaefer, Peter, 95, 139n
- Schwartz, Lowell H., 141n19
- science, 17, 19, 20, 163, 171, 184
- Second World War, 10, 27, 28,
30, 72, 115, 124, 138
- Secretary of State, 3, 4n2, 27,
63, 99-100, 114, 120, 149
- secularism, 6, 66, 113, 140, 141, 177
- Senate Foreign Affairs Committee,
155
- September 11 terrorist attacks, xiii, 5
- sexual tourism, 89
- Shariah law, 127, 145
- Shia, 7
- Sickle, Peter, 141
- Small Wars Journal*, 130
- smart power, xiii
- Smith Richardson Foundation, xiv
- Smith, Kelly Adams, 63
- Smith-Mundt Act (1948), 130, 133
- soft power, xii, 9, 10, 11, 17, 52,
54, 56-58, 77, 150, 155-156,
160, 166-167
- soft power culture, 52, 54, 57-58, 156
- Solidarity, 30, 34, 37, 46, 65, 141,
169, 186
- Somali language, 131
- Sorley, Lewis, 148
- South Korea, 187
- South Vietnam, 148
- Southeast Asia tsunami (2004), 82-83
- Soviet Union, 2, 5, 28, 37, 56, 128,
162, 169, 173, 183, 185
- Special Operations Command, 78
- spin, ix, 12, 14, 78, 116
- sports, 19, 21, 163, 172, 180, 184

- Stephens, Bret, 143
- strategic communications, 6, 10, 11, 15-16, 117, 119
- Policy Coordinating Committee, 67, 119
- strategic deception, 86, 111, 144, 182, 183, 188, 189
- Strategic Defense Initiative, 37, 46
- strategic influence, xii, 12, 14, 17, 18, 26, 37, 65, 72, 74-75, 78, 79, 82, 113, 116, 119, 120-121, 134, 136, 137, 152-154
- strategic outreach, 11, 16, 18, 117
- Strmecki, Marin, xiv
- Suez Canal, 95
- suicide bombers, 144
- Sun Tzu, 56, 86
- Sunni, 7
- Supreme Soviet, 189
- surge, 9, 77, 124
- surrogate free press, 121, 185
- Taliban, 5, 52
- taxation, 93
- technology, 8, 15, 17, 19, 20, 38, 46, 51, 125, 163, 171, 184, 187, 190
- television, 2, 14, 28, 33, 42, 69, 70, 82, 121, 173, 187
- Television Alhurra, 69
- terrorism, 5, 74, 157, 178
- Thayer, Robert H., 160n5
- Third World, 94, 138
- threat-based intelligence, 84
- Tierney, John, Jr., 55n9
- trade unions (in foreign policy), 30, 35
- traditional diplomacy, xi, xii, 10, 11, 12, 18, 23, 57, 62-63, 65, 88-89, 99, 101, 104, 106, 113, 134, 137, 171, 186
- Tsagronis, John, 92n24
- Tucker, Robert C., 48n4
- Turkey, 27, 172
- Turner, Stansfield, 32
- unconventional warfare, 8. *See also* counterinsurgency warfare
- Under Secretary for Political Affairs, 4, 108, 137
- Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, 42, 62, 67, 80, 103, 135
- Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, 136
- United Nations, 7
- United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, xiv, 8, 13, 40, 66, 197
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID), 2, 40, 72, 80, 95-96, 116, 118, 124, 138-139, 154
- United States Agency for Public Diplomacy, 115-116
- United States Air Force, 52, 146
- United States Armed Forces, xv, 1, 9, 30, 53, 105 143, 147, 152, 159; diplomacy, 21-22, 55, 81, 84-85, 123, 133-135, 147, 161, 172; education, 43n8, 105, 107; neglect, 32, 39, 58, 82, 112, 128

- United States Army, 9, 30, 41, 56, 73-78, 97, 102-103, 124, 145-146
- United States Coast Guard, 82
- United States Congress, 31-32, 48, 62, 73, 79, 95, 130, 132, 139, 189, 199
- United States Department of Agriculture, 81, 96
- United States Department of Commerce, 81
- United States Department of Defense, 17, 73, 79, 97, 111, 132, 184
- United States Department of Education, 79-81, 152
- United States Department of Health and Human Services, 81-82
- United States Department of Homeland Security, 118
- United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 81, 118
- United States Department of State, xi, xii, 3, 13n3, 14n4, 34n3, 39, 47, 48, 99, 111, 131, 154, 167, 169n15, 191; bureaus, 122, 136; neglect for diplomacy, 4, 80; policy, 60, 64, 65, 74; programs, 8, 27, 34; public diplomacy, 12, 14, 47, 79, 82, 84, 100, 103-104, 117, 119, 125, 137; weaknesses, 1, 40, 61, 105
- United States Department of the Interior, 81
- United States Department of the Treasury, 145
- United States Foreign Enterprise Fund, 139
- United States Information Agency (USIA), 2, 12, 28, 33, 39, 60, 101, 111, 114, 133
- United States Information Service, 28
- United States International Communications Agency, 117
- United States Marine Corps, 41, 56, 102-103, 146
- United States Navy, 52, 82-83, 146
- USAID. *See* United States Agency for International Development
- USIA. *See* United States Information Agency
- Vietnam War, 30-32, 39
- VOA. *See* Voice of America
- Voice of America (VOA), xiv, 27-28, 39, 42, 47, 61, 68-69, 79, 121, 127, 131, 132n14, 151, 169, 173, 177
- Wahhabi, 5, 74
- Wall Street Journal*, 31, 143n
- Waller, J. Michael, xiv, 12n1, 13n2, 26n1, 43n7, 75, 130n11
- war of ideas, 14-15, 44, 46, 48, 65, 67, 70, 119, 130, 140, 142, 153, 157
- War of Independence (American), x
- Warde, Ibrahim, 127n9
- "Warriors of Love" (song), 142

- Washington Post*, 7, 69
Washington, George, x, 26, 86
websites, 102, 132
White House, 3, 32, 38-40, 64, 73,
 118, 135, 149n-150
Wick, Charles Z., 33
Wilson, Woodrow, 27
Wireless File, 27
Wisner, Frank, 30
women's rights, 141-142, 175
Worldnet Television, 33
Wos, Aldona, 63
Young, Stephen, 31n
Yunus, Mohammed, 93. *See also*
 microcredit.
Zorinsky, Edward, 130

About the Author

John Lenczowski is founder, president, and professor at The Institute of World Politics, an independent graduate school of national security and international affairs founded in 1990 in Washington, D.C. He received his BA from the University of California, Berkeley and his MA and PhD from Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies. He has served as a Congressional staff member, as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Special Adviser to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, consultant to the Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Bureau at the Department of State. He is former National Security Council Director of European and Soviet Affairs under President Reagan for whom he served as White House principal adviser on Soviet affairs. He has taught at the University of Maryland, Georgetown University, and The Institute of World Politics. He is the author of *Soviet Perceptions of U.S. Foreign Policy*, and *The Sources of Soviet Perestroika*.

