

Subscribe to our newsletter. Peter Lang on Facebook. Powered by PubFactory. User Account Sign In Not registered? The model of integrated public diplomacy should continue to call for U. The credibility of news is crucial to keep the trust of international audiences. The Need for Additional Support for the Field. One third of PD assets are vested in the field posts and Foreign Service and Foreign National employees around the world.

They have been shortchanged for years, and should gain restored support. In the current period of austerity this will be difficult to achieve, but every effort is needed to add staff abroad, including to administer the many exchange programs of a beefed-up ECA. Greater flexibility should be allowed in moving civil servants to posts for extended tours. At some point as the nation works through the looming budget deficit, a major campaign should begin to convince the Administration and the Congress to increase, not cut, field personnel. Looking Ahead. Looking ahead, several cross-cutting concerns or opportunities merit ongoing consideration: Green vs. Red Lines in the Whole of Government Approach. There is a compelling need for inter-Agency and Congressional agreement on how the Department of Defense and State Department will engage with publics abroad. Neither the Department of Defense nor its Congressional oversight committees are likely to accept a permanent reduction of funds authorized to DoD in favor of the Department of State.

Cooperation remains. In the future, one major challenge for the Department will be the degree to which ECA and USAID are able to maintain long-term institutional linkages, collaboration and capacity building programs rather than see resources siphoned off to meet urgent crises or immediate demands of U. Few, for example, would dispute the potential value of hosting newly minted Tunisian parliamentarians here for brief visits, or helping a significant number of Syrian students caught in the diaspora study in the U. But from which pot of money will any new or expanded initiative come? Who should pay, and who decides? With no significant cushion for emergencies, the Department has faced difficulties in balancing current demands with long-term needs.

It has not been able to afford being strategic. Conversely, when ECA is challenged to respond creatively to unusual opportunities or needs, a modest revolving contingency fund might help deal with an immediate crisis of unforeseen opportunity. Educational Exchange: A Benefit or a Necessity? Although the Strategic Framework highlighted the importance of higher education in U. The sector is not only a valued partner in international affairs, it is a vital component of the American economy, a major export earner, a conduit for recruiting talent and the construction of new enterprise, for filling gaps in our own talent base.

International students in American community colleges, colleges and universities enrich our culture and add depth to every phase of our national life. The new ECA strategic plan might help fill a much-needed gap in thinking about higher education, and make routine partnerships with higher education and related organizations more strategic. What are the level and extent of their communication and exchange activities? Where are there gaps and needs? How can the Department and USAID, and other USG agencies, in partnership with university professional councils and national associations, facilitate or help catalyze activities that could draw on support available from the private sector, American philanthropy and citizenship? Is there need for the strategic plan involving higher education to examine long-term national needs in various sectors and how public and private institutions, through international exchanges and other collaboration, promote long-term national needs?

Strategic planning and consultation with others can also help State deal with one of the important unmet needs of U. America is ever more a nation of nations and relates more comprehensively to multiple global trends. Our economy depends on a globally knowledgeable public and institutions that can compete effectively in the world arena. Our society and culture are enriched by such interaction, and we find answers to some of our domestic concerns in learning from others. In the decades to come our society will rely all the more on international talent, on young men and women who study and stay here or go back to their home countries with a network of American links. Beyond national-level consideration, almost every metropolitan region and state actively pursues commercial, cultural and ethnic contacts with counterparts abroad.

These should be enhanced. Perhaps ahead of its time, the concept became a left-right political hot potato, and suffered a rapid demise when the conservative Reagan team replaced the liberal Carter team in Pro-active public affairs and rapid response will always be vital in the ever more contentious global public arena. Even with the most modern technologies and up-to-date staffs, the USG will not be able to control the larger flow of messages, information or communication. The digital revolution has made this abundantly clear. The challenge will be to step back, better analyze and understand the multiple transnational forces, and shape public strategies that help better position the U. This applies most importantly to the global quest for economic opportunity, fair play, social justice and human dignity.

These struggles underlie conflict around the world. Public Diplomacy is best suited to help Americans, from policy makers to citizens, understand and adapt to global challenges. The next generation of State employees is already filling the void in communications technology, and is prepared to seek out the important long-term concerns of young people around the world. Even if they ruffle some feathers in taking policy risks, younger State Department employees should be empowered to recommend new modalities for State. There needs to be even more latitude for experimentation in overseas missions and in Washington. The prospects for integration of public diplomacy with other elements of statecraft are better today than a decade ago, in part because the public dimension of world affairs is so clearly more significant, and in part because leadership through the QDDR and the Public Diplomacy Strategic Framework has recognized the need for reform.
As State becomes more public in its orientation it will be challenged to provide more support and greater flexibility for its communicators abroad. A stronger public diplomacy advisory function at every step in the policy process, would help political leadership develop wise and effective policies, and help Americans better understand international concerns. Likewise sustained focus on building relations pertains not just to the conduct and mission of exchanges. In all phases of U. World Public Opinion has studies throughout the past decade that document the decline in support for the U. There is need for more research into the recent evolution of strategic communication doctrine and practices. As Cary points out, Gates, Admiral Muller, and several Congressional leaders and staff expressed concern at the excessive and unclear spending in this field.

Senior Department leaders chaired four task forces with 11 working groups and additional sub-groups. For additional details see pp. The PD Strategic Framework is essentially an extended PowerPoint presentation, a clever way to encapsulate complex ideas and focus attention on key initiatives. See also critique in Seib Mountain Runner. ECA has begun to integrate use of social media with regular exchange programs. Ex-change Connect, its website, has spawned a number of interactive outreach activities. Some of the best examples of field post creativity are described in the annual awards of the Public Diplomacy Alumni Association, available online. The ODDR mention of an overseas contingency budget, modeled on the approach to unusual and unforeseen costs by DoD, merits consideration. Open to question are the number and mix of students, and the degree to which American universities should focus on in-country training and institutional develop-ment vs.


General Accountability Office, July. Engaging foreign audiences: Assessment of public diplomacy platforms could help improve state department plans to expand engagement. House of Representatives. Foreign affairs reform and reconstructing act. Report, to accompany HR Venhaus, J. Army, May. Why youth join al-Qaeda U. Institute of Peace. Special Report Weisman, S. However, such integration does not necessarily call for bureaucratization or government oversight of global outreach. Drawing on the findings from a research study that explains why U. NGOs have a stake in the U. Non-state actors are entities other than governments e. Increasingly, non-state actors such as NGOs affect political outcomes within one or more states or within international institutions Atack, Josselin and Wallace, ; Taylor, R. Ripinsky and Van den Bosche, For instance, develop-ment NGOs seek to influence national and multilateral development policies Atack, ; McCleary, I. Inevitably, non-state actors also engage with their counterparts and other publics in other countries.

Such interactions are sometimes described as people-to-people engage-ment or citizen diplomacy, but more often than not, as public diplomacy. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, ; Zatepilina, Historically, the human and monetary resources devoted to public di-plomacy by the U. Government have lagged behind what non-state actors such as multinational corporations, media and private foundations brought to the table Arndt, ; Lord, Nye, ; Richmond, U.

Government Accountability Office, May. Non-state actors such as NGOs have tended to enjoy greater credibility among international stake-holders than state actors Leonard et al. For instance, representatives of the U. As the case studies described in this chapter demonstrate, the public diplomacy efforts of U. Government, it has its own voice —commonly, a dissenting one—and its own way of engaging with global publics, on behalf of its stakeholders and on behalf of its country of origin. Conceptual and Operational Definitions of a U. Although the term NGO may be used interchangeably with the terms civil society organizations and non-state actors, the latter two are broader con- cepts, both inclusive of NGOs Atack, ; Edwards, ; Florini, ;

The literature defines NGOs as all the formally registered entities except governments, political parties, and businesses that are a self-governing: b producing public goods; c raising revenues from voluntary donations; d employing both paid staff and volunteers; e exempt from paying income taxes; and f not distributing profits to members Lewis, ; Ripinsky and Van den Bosche, ; Salamon, ; United Nations. In addition, NGOs in the United States are collectively referred to as the independent sector, the third sector, or the nonprofit sector.

Other typologies identify nongovernmental organiza-tions by geographical reach e. In this chapter, different types of NGOs such as operational or advocacy, and faith-based or secular are compared and contrasted in the context of their engagement in public diplomacy. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the literature does not offer a clear-cut distinction between international NGOs and transnational NGOs McCleary, In this chapter, the term international describes NGOs that are based in their country of origin but operate globally, whereas the term transnational refers to NGOs that have more than one national headquarters in countries other than the country of their origin.

The organizations examined in this chapter are conceptually and operationally defined as U. Overview of the Case Studies. Internal Revenue Code. At the time the executive interviews and textual analysis of corporate documentation were conducted. Three NGOs. The other two NGOs define their connection to faith as a shared Jewish worldview. In addition to describing their organizations as faith-based, the interviewed
executives of both AJC and AJWS referred to their groups as ethnicity based, and emphasized that their fundraising efforts reach out to donors from both the religious and ethnic Jewish communities around the United States.

Although all four NGOs engage in international programs and interact with various foreign publics, only two do. Although AJWS has no offices abroad, it has no offices abroad. With regard to hiring policies for their overseas offices, both AJC and DKT look for individuals who possess cultural sensitivity and are immersed in the countries where they work, but are not necessarily U.S. nationals. In-depth interviews with two or three executives from each NGO, as well as an analysis of corporate texts such as websites, blogs, annual reports and newsletters, provided a comprehensive picture of how these four NGOs interact with global publics and generate goodwill among their domestic and international stakeholders.

Although each case offered insights into the organizational practices and discourses of an individual nonprofit organization, the theoretical replication across cases revealed several parallels. These four NGOs consciously engage in both symbolic and substantive organizational identities. As their top executives explained, each of these NGOs positions itself as foremost American, although with various degrees of emphasis on the country of origin. In addition, for the two Jewish organizations i.e. AJC and AJWS, the name of ERD also alludes to its country of origin, albeit somewhat more subtly. Although the Episcopal Church has members in several countries, it is best known as a part of the Anglican Church in the United States.

As mentioned earlier, DKT relies on marketing principles to address social problems and achieve a humanitarian impact. NGOs see themselves as voices of both their domestic and international stakeholders before the U.S. NGOs aspire to bring accessibility and affordability of family planning and HIV prevention to the developing world. ERD seeks to spotlight the role of indigenous religious and civil society organizations in providing disaster response and strengthening communities around the world.

Regardless of whether an NGO operates through its own overseas offices or through counterpart civil society groups in host countries, and whether an NGO is represented in a host country by a U.S. office or by a third party, it is essential that the NGO does not control the message on the ground, it expects the implementing partner to speak on its own behalf. According to most interviewed executives, while both sides are free to make public their differing positions, the U.S. NGOs often speak for their implementing partners.

Moreover, these NGOs believe that their corporate selves each add a facet to projecting outward the multifaceted U.S. NGOs. These NGOs see themselves as having the ability to speak for the U.S. NGOs. Both the faith-based nature i.e. Quality, Stakeholder Empowerment, and Issues Management. Nearly all interviewed executives agreed that, although corporate reputation is in the eyes of the beholder, the four NGOs take a strategic approach to building their reputational capital both in the United States and abroad. As mentioned earlier, some of the reputational strategies NGOs employ include: a commitment to quality of the services they provide directly to stakeholders and projects they fund through implementing partners; b) relationship-building grounded in the empowerment of host-country stakeholders; and c) thought-out management of issues concerning stakeholders at home and abroad.

NGOs believe that the quality of what they do is one of the building blocks of a good reputation—from lobbying the government on human rights issues to promoting family planning and reproductive health products and services rather than the organization. The NGO delegates responsibility. Although the establishment in some host countries may not approve of family planning programs, DKT seeks to comply with local customs and foster long-term partnerships with national governments and civil societies.

Such autonomy and flexibility of operations in each country allows DKT to be accepted as a natural part of the commercial landscape and become a key player in the area of family planning. As a result of a growing demand for its brands, DKT generates most of its revenues from sales, thus reducing its dependency on grants or donations. Another reputational strategy by NGOs involves building and maintaining relationships both domestically and internationally with such stakeholder groups as members and donors in the United States, host-country civil society organizations, and governments. Most NGOs earn the trust of their counterparts in host countries by strengthening local capacities and encouraging local initiative. In its relationships with grassroots organizations in poor countries, AJWS...

The grant-making NGO wants its grant-seekers and project partners to have a say in how to use the funding for effective community development. AJWS is also aware that its volunteers i.e. AJC executive underscored humility in interactions and respect for. Nevertheless, the NGO monitors how its relief and development funds are spent. And it is why we establish rigorous monitoring and evaluation standards. The NGO engages in opinion research to identify the issues of concern for the Jewish minorities. Furthermore, AJC generates intangible reputational capital by nurturing connections with the U.S. When AJC disagrees with U.S. NGOs, it engages in advocacy to promote its positions. According to an interviewed executive, Americans ought to know more about the hope that U.S. NGOs-sponsored development projects bring to small communities in developing countries, but the U.S.

Therefore, AJWS encourages its volunteers returning to the United States to speak and write about their experiences in the developing countries and advocate for global justice at home. An ERD executive mentioned that a controversy in the church, such as the debate within the Anglican Community on the ordination of gay bish-ops, would be one of those issues that might affect the organization and its relationships with stakeholders. In those instances, ERD finds a common ground with host-country counterparts and diplomatically shifts the focus from ideology to disaster relief or development projects. At the same time, the NGO seeks to demonstrate its commitment to its donor base in the United States its ability to work out disagreements with host-country partners and direct its support to those in need regardless of their beliefs.
Reputational Assets. Government are based on equality and autonomy. Inspired by the U. However, as another executive pointed out, being an advocacy organization requires that the NGO challenge the official U. When the U. Congress and Administration have different positions on the issues of importance for AJC e. Most interviewed executives argued that U. An executive explained that, because of such disagreement, AJC is not only reluctant to pursue government funding, but also actively advocates for a policy reform. According to a DKT executive, disagreement with official U. Like-wise, being a recipient of government funding, does not deter ERD from expressing its opposing views.

In those instances when U. NGOs might be perceived by some publics as agents of the U. By and large, however, in the international arena these NGOs tend to be perceived as agents of U. By virtue of representing specific segments of U. The four NGOs recognize that the U. Likewise, these NGOs are cognizant of how their corporate behav-iors in host countries affect the overall perception about the United States and, in turn, impact the operating environments in those countries for all.

As a result, while U. NGOs may not be engag-ing in strategic reputation management on behalf of the United States, the outcomes of their own reputation management go beyond their corporate in- terests. In addition, because of their explicit country-of-origin identities, the four NGOs have an intrinsic interest in improving the U. Therefore, U. NGOs share responsibility for the U. Finally, although the examples reviewed in this chapter ostensibly em- phasize the American identity of U. The top executives interviewed for the study in gave permission for the names of their organizations to be disclosed. American Jewish Committee a. New York: AJC. American Jewish World Service a. Who we are. Arndt, R. The first resort of kings: American cultural diplomacy in the twentieth century. Washington, DC: Potomac Books. Atack, I. Four criteria of development NGO legitimacy. Login Register. Advanced search Search history. Browse titles authors subjects uniform titles series callnumbers dewey numbers starting from optional.
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