

THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE WASHINGTON, DC 20319-5078



ELECTIVE COURSE

Public Diplomacy and National Security

NWC 6075

ACADEMIC YEAR 2020-2021 (FALL)

Room TBD

This document contains educational material designed to promote discussion by students of the National War College/National Defense University. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the National Defense University or the Department of Defense. The contents of this document are the property of the U.S. Government and are intended for the exclusive use of the faculty and students of the National War College (NWC) and the National Defense University (NDU). No further dissemination is authorized without the express consent of the NWC Commandant.

Sonya Finley

Dr. Sonya L. Finley
Course Director
Department of Strategy & Policy

Captain Corey Ray, USN
Chair
Department of Strategy & Policy

COURSE SCHEDULE, ACADEMIC YEAR 2020-2021
Public Diplomacy and National Security

Dr. Sonya Finley
TUESDAYS, tbd

Week	Subject	Date
Topic 1	Introduction to Public Diplomacy	September time
Topic 2	Understanding Public Opinion	September time
Topic 3	Social Network Theory & Influence	October
Topic 4	Information Environment Trends and Dynamics	October
Topic 5	U.S. PD Toolkit: Educational and Cultural Diplomacy	October
Topic 6	U.S. PD Toolkit: International Broadcasting/Global Media	October
Topic 7	U.S. PD Toolkit: Advocacy/ Daily Communications	November
Topic 8	“Nation” Branding	November
Topic 9	Public Diplomacy of Peer Competitors	November
Topic 10	Public Diplomacy of International Terrorist Organizations	November
Topic 11	<i>Presentations of Individual PD Strategy Projects</i>	December
Topic 12	<i>Presentations of Individual PD Strategy Projects</i>	December
	<i>PD Strategy Paper Due – ALL</i>	1 day after Topic 12

Overview: This course examines the role of public diplomacy/strategic communication as an instrument of state power designed to understand, inform, and influence external audiences in the service of national security / foreign policy objectives. We will examine public diplomacy concepts, institutions, toolkits, and practices.

Designed for national security practitioners, the course will focus on understanding a strategic instrument that is relevant to and employed by multiple departments and agencies within the U.S. Government (USG). The course also will examine how other state and non-state actors use public diplomacy to understand cultures, attitudes and behavior; build and manage relationships; and influence attitudes and actions to advance their interests and values.

Focus: We will seek to understand these themes by focusing on three areas of inquiry:

- What is public diplomacy?
 - Concepts and theory underpinning public diplomacy, including soft power and public opinion, public affairs, strategic communications, and propaganda;
- What is the environment in which actors conduct public diplomacy?
 - An evolving context shaped by global trends and technological advances, social networks and public spheres, and changing international and regional dynamics;
- Who conducts public diplomacy and how?
 - U.S., large/middle/small-power states, and non-state actors' public diplomacy "toolkits"—advocacy & daily communications, international broadcasting & digital media, exchanges & cultural diplomacy, and "nation" branding.

Objectives: By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- evaluate the role of public diplomacy (understand, inform, influence) in advancing national security objectives;
- analyze audiences, including formal and informal information sources that influence public opinion;
- develop a focused and realistic public diplomacy strategy to advance a national security policy/issue;
- consider ways to measure impact.

Academic Requirements: The course consists of twelve weekly sessions.

- 1) **Seminar Performance/Contribution:** All students are expected to read posted assignments as the basis for seminar discussions and activities. In-class activities may include nation-branding proposals and engagements with guest participants & each other.
- 2) **Public Diplomacy Strategy:** Students will develop a ~2,500 word public diplomacy strategy using a range of PD tools to advance a specific policy/issue. Students will submit selected topics by topic 7 for approval. Students will present individual strategies during topics 11 and 12 during which the seminar will engage and offer feedback. The public diplomacy strategy is *due one day after topic 12* (to incorporate peer reviews). See pages 23-24 for amplifying guidance on content and structure. In general, PD strategies employ a Framework of "ABCDEF": **Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Effectiveness Assessment/Follow-Up.**

In coordination with the course director, students have the option of writing a research paper about critical issues affecting U.S./DoD public diplomacy/strategic communications in accordance with various essay competition guidelines. See <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/About/Essay-Competitions/> for information about the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Strategic Essay Competitions. Students may also write papers for the Women, Peace & Security Essay Competition; see https://ndu.libguides.com/wps_writing_award and https://ndu.libguides.com/ld.php?content_id=50290019 (Note: students may also tighten their PD strategy and then submit for the SecDef/CJCS strategy paper competition.)

FORMAT. In scope and format, strategy papers are not academic research papers in the usual sense. PD strategies are designed to understand, inform, and influence the attitudes and behavior of selected, relevant audience(s) relating to a significant issue. Students may choose to write a PD strategy on behalf of the U.S. government as a whole or a specific department/agency, a foreign government, a regional organization, or a non-state actor/organization such as an NGO.

- Prepare papers double-spaced with 12-point font, preferably in a standard font like Times New Roman or Arial.
- Prepare the paper to the directed word count target or page length; list word count when appropriate at the footer of the last page. Footnotes or endnotes are not included in the textual word count. In-text quotes and epigraphs are included in the word counts.
- Use one-inch margins, all around.
- Use footnotes or endnotes in the Chicago “note-bibliography” Style, as detailed in Kate Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, 8th edition, Chapters 15-17.
- Prepare a cover sheet that shows the paper title, student’s name, course and seminar, Course Director, Faculty Advisor, and date.
- Include page numbers at the bottom of the page.

Student Assessment: Students must meet all stated course objectives to pass this course. The course director will use performance on the following assessments to determine each student’s final grade:

- 60%: Seminar performance, as evident by preparation, active and relevant contributions to discussions and activities including nation branding, and group interaction
- 40%: Public diplomacy strategy (written and oral presentation; content, composition)

Source Materials are posted on Blackboard in addition to three books:

- Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Dover Publications, 2004).
- Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009).
- Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019).

Useful public diplomacy websites also include [USC's Center for Public Diplomacy](#), GW's [Institute for Public Diplomacy and Global Communication](#) (IPDGC), John Brown's [Public Diplomacy Press and Blog Review](#), Robin Brown's [Public Diplomacy, Networks and Influence](#) website, Steve Corman's [Center for Strategic Communication](#), and Matt Armstrong's [MountainRunner.us](#), Bruce Gregory's PD Reading List at [publicdiplomacy.wikia.com](#), and the [Public Diplomacy Council and the Association of Public Diplomacy Professionals'](#) website.

See Student Catalogue for university/college policies regarding grade scale, grade appeals, attendance, original work etc.

Topic 1 (September) **Introduction to Public Diplomacy**

States [have] sought to engage foreign publics for centuries. The core practices of public diplomacy: listening, advocacy, cultural and exchange diplomacy and even international broadcasting all [have] deep roots in ... statecraft ...

Nicholas Cull

At the risk of sounding tautological, strategic communications is communicating strategically: it's the thoughtful integration of issues of stakeholder perception and response into policy-making, planning and operations at every level...and the orchestration of actions, images and words in support of our policy objectives.

Rosa Brooks, Former Senior Advisor, DoD

Soft power is the ability to affect others to obtain the outcomes one wants through attraction rather than coercion or payment. A country's soft power rests on its resources of culture, values, and policies.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Harvard University

Throughout history people in groups have sought to comprehend, engage in discourse with, and influence the thoughts and actions of people. International relations depends upon communication, many forms of which depend upon a state's soft power. Whatever it is called – rhetoric, propaganda, public diplomacy, or strategic communication – actions, language, and images have been used as instruments of political power. A framework for effective public diplomacy/communication strategy is “**ABCDEF**”: **Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Follow-Up.**

Objectives:

- Understand the concepts and components of soft power and public diplomacy.
- Consider why and how actors conduct public diplomacy (understand, inform, influence) in support of national security.

Questions for Discussion:

- What is the relationship between soft power and a state's ability to communicate? Why is soft power more “complicated” for strategists?
- Why is listening critical for public diplomacy/strategic communication? What are other tools in a public diplomacy/strategic communication toolkit?
- Why and how are government-civil society connections relevant to national security/foreign policy?

Readings: 45 pages

Nicholas J. Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (New York: Polity, 2019), 1-18.

Joseph S. Nye Jr. "Soft Power and Public Diplomacy Revisited," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 14 (2019), 7-20. (14 pages) https://brill.com/view/journals/hjd/14/1-2/article-p7_2.xml and BLACKBOARD

Defense Science Board, "Task Force on Strategic Communication," (January 2008), 10-20. (11 pages) <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dsb/reports/2000s/ADA476331.pdf> and BLACKBOARD

"The Spectrum of Listening," USC Center on Public Diplomacy Blog
<https://www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/spectrum-listening>

Topic 2 (January 21) Understanding Public Opinion

*The only feeling that anyone can have about an event he does not experience is the **feeling** aroused by his mental image of that event. That is why until we know what others think they know, we cannot truly understand their acts.*

Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*

In 1922, Walter Lippmann pioneered the theory of public opinion, including the abstract and underlying forces that shape its formation and manipulation. Considering public opinion is essential for public diplomacy practitioners' quest to understand, inform, and influence foreign audiences' attitudes and behavior. In developing a public diplomacy strategy, it is an essential starting point when considering "ABCDEF" elements: **Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Follow-Up.**

Objective:

- Understand the concept of public opinion, why and how it is formed.
- Consider how to analyze foreign public opinion in order to understand audiences.

Questions for Discussion:

- What is the nature of public opinion, how is it formed, and what forces does it reflect?
- How might you diagnose your own and others' "stereotypes"? Others'? Why would this be important to the practice of public diplomacy?
- Why is public opinion hard to measure?

Readings: 67 pages, plus video

Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Dover Publications, 2004).

- Chapter 1 "The World Outside and the Pictures in our Heads," 1-17.
- Chapter 6 "Stereotypes," 43-52.
- Chapter 7 "Stereotypes as Defense," 52-57.
- Chapter 8 "Blind Spots and their Value," 57-63.
- Chapter 9 "Codes and their Enemies," 63-71.
- Chapter 10 "Detection of Stereotypes," 71-86.
- Chapter 11 "The Enlisting of Interest," 87-93.

Jason Robert Jaffe, "Pros and cons of public opinion polls," TED-Ed (May 17, 2013).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ubR8rEgSZSU> (4 minutes)

Visit for Situational Awareness.

Pew Research Center, Global Attitudes & Trends. <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/>

The Chicago Council on Global Affairs Public Opinion Polling.

<https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/issue/public-opinion>

University of Chicago General Social Survey (GSS) Data Explorer

<https://gssdataexplorer.norc.org/trends>

Topic 3 (September) Social Network Theory & Influence

Social connections have value precisely because they can help us to achieve what we could not achieve on our own.

Nicholas Christakis and James H. Fowler, 2009

With a basic understanding of public opinion as a foundation for attitudes and behaviors, this week we consider the logic of social network theory. Specifically, we investigate the intricate patterns of social connections/networks that affect our opinions, actions, choices, and experiences. In order to effectively communicate and affect public opinion and behavior, strategists must consider the range of social networks in which their audiences are immersed. This foundational context informs your analysis of many of the “**ABCDEF**” elements:

**Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Effectiveness
Assessment/Follow-Up.**

Objective:

- Understand the basic logic of social network theory
- Appreciate how various network structures may influence behavior

Questions for Discussion:

- How do configurations of social networks affect the “contagion” of ideas/narratives?
- How do “weak ties” open groups to new norms, new ideas, and new behaviors?
- Walter Lippmann highlighted the importance of ascertaining “the feeling aroused by [people’s] mental image[s]...” What is more powerful: emotions or facts? Why?

Readings: 50 pages and podcast

Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, Chapter 1 “In the Thick of It” in *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009), 3-32, xx (chapter 2 (emotions) or 6 (politics)). (xx pages)

Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019), 29-38. (10 pages)

Shankar Vedantam, et al. “Facts Aren’t Enough: the Psychology of False Beliefs,” Hidden Brain Podcast (22 July 2019). <https://www.npr.org/2019/07/18/743195213/facts-arent-enough-the-psychology-of-false-beliefs> (Hidden Brain episode that looks at how we rely on the people we trust to shape our beliefs, and why facts aren’t always enough to change our minds.)

Topic 4 (tbd)
Information Environment Trends and Dynamics

We live in the midst of a tempest, by which I refer to the turbulent nature of the electronic media environment as it has evolved via digital technologies. Wave after wave of changes to our modes of communication and interaction, our tools for thought and social action have altered and continue to alter our societies and our cultures, as well as our psyches and ourselves.

Lance Strate

International relations depends upon communication and public diplomacy focuses on engaging with populations abroad in support of national interests and goals. This week we consider the contemporary context in which public opinion is shaped. The readings highlight multiple dimensions of change and global trends impacting the information environment and your analysis of “ABCDEF” elements: **Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Effectiveness Assessment/Follow-Up.**

Objective:

- Consider the public diplomacy implications of contemporary contexts and trends in the information environment/media space.

Questions for Discussion:

- What factors have contributed to the evolution of news/information content and delivery?
- As new information technologies have emerged over time, how have they impacted societies?
- What aspects of the changing world do you find may be most impactful for public diplomacy practitioners and why?

Readings: 45 pages, plus podcast

Richard Fletcher, “The Rise of Populism and the Consequences for News and Media Use,” in *Digital News Report 2019*, Reuters Institute and University of Oxford, 42-48. (6 pages) <http://www.digitalnewsreport.org/survey/2019/the-rise-of-populism-and-the-consequencesfor-news-and-media-use/>

Jen Patja Howell, “The Lawfare Podcast: Renee DiResta on Disinformation and Misinformation From Vaccines to the GRU,” Arbiters of Truth Series, The Lawfare Podcast #499 (January 23, 2020). (40 minutes) <https://www.lawfareblog.com/lawfare-podcast-renee-direstadisinformation-and-misinformation-vaccines-gru>

Jennifer Kavanagh and Michael D. Rich, “Truth Decay: An Initial Exploration of the Diminishing Role of Facts and Analysis in American Public Life,” (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2018), ix-xvii. (9 pages). https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2314.html

Tom Nichols, “How America Lost Faith in Expertise: And Why That’s a Giant Problem,” *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2017). (12 pages) <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/usa/2017-02-13/how-america-lost-faith-expertise>

Lance Strate, “Amazing Ourselves to Death: Contemplating the Technological Tempest of Our Times,” ETC: A Review of General Semantics, Vol. 75, Issue 1/2 (Jan-Apr 2018), 26-42. (16 pages) BLACKBOARD

David Streitfield, “Tech Giants, Once Seen as Saviors, Are Now Viewed as Threats,” New York Times (October 15, 2017). (3 pages) <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/12/technology/tech-giantsthreats.html>

GLANCE. Shawn Langlois, “How biased is your news source? You probably won’t agree with this chart,” MarketWatch (10 March 2018). <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/how-biased-is-your-news-source-you-probably-wont-agree-with-this-chart-2018-02-28>

Topic 5 (tbd)
PD Toolkit: Educational and Cultural Diplomacy

Prevailing in the struggle will require far more than military force. It will require the use of all elements of our national power: public diplomacy; development assistance; law enforcement training; expansion of economic opportunity; and robust intelligence capabilities... In this struggle, scholarships will be far more important than smart bombs.

John McCain, 26 March 2008

Culture awareness is a two-sided equation in that it involves both the self and other. Without cultural self-awareness it is difficult to accurately perceive and understand the behavior of others.

R. S. Zaharna, 2012

Cultural diplomacy is a tricky business in a democracy.

Louis Menand, 2005

There are many players in educational and cultural diplomacy from U.S. government-sponsored programs to a plethora of civil-society organizations such as Sister Cities International, Rotary Club International, and Athletes for Hope. Today, U.S. exchange programs involve nearly 55,000 American and foreign participants per year. In fact, one in three world leaders has participated in a U.S. Government exchange program. Abroad the U.S. has nearly 700 American Space cultural centers in 169 countries that were visited by nearly 40 million last year.¹ Yet, as Frank Ninkovich observes, “the desire to break down cultural barriers is hardly innocuous or innocent. It is hard to imagine a foreign policy activity that is more serious, even subversive in intent” (Ninkovich 1996, 44).²

Objectives:

- Understand how educational and cultural diplomacy supports national security objectives.
- Appreciate the strengths and limitations of educational and cultural diplomacy.
- Consider how to employ educational and cultural diplomacy tools.

Questions for Discussion:

- How can educational and cultural activities contribute to the advancement of national security interests?
- How might you consider Walter Lippmann’s discussion of stereotypes when analyzing audiences and planning and conducting educational and cultural diplomacy activities?
- Why might American cultural diplomacy be contentious, both at home and abroad? How would you represent American culture? What would you exclude? How would you choose?
- How could you measure the impact of such activities?

Readings: ~34-39 pages, plus exploration of websites

¹ Figures drawn from unclassified U.S. State Department documents. The 2017 Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting also offers detailed looks at current programs.

² Frank Ninkovich, “US information policy and cultural diplomacy,” *Foreign Policy Association Headline Series 38* (Ithaca, N: Foreign Policy Association, 1996).

Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019), 73-79, 91-100. (17 pages)

Louis Menand, "Unpopular Front: American Art and the Cold War," *The New Yorker* (17 October 2005), 174-179. (6 pages)

http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2005/10/17/051017crat_atlarge and BLACKBOARD

GLANCE (for PD strategy ideas).

- United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. "Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs" (list of all active programs) in *2017 Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting*, (6 October 2017), 47-104.
https://www.bbg.gov/wp-content/media/2017/09/2017_Comprehensive_Annual_Report_on_Publ.pdf
- DoS Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs "22.33" audio podcasts featuring first person narratives/anecdotes from those who have engaged in educational and cultural exchanges <https://eca.state.gov/2233>
- Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, the leading Washington-based advocacy organization for NGOs and universities engaged in cultural diplomacy www.alliance-exchange.org
- Defense Security Cooperation Agency's International Military Education & Training www.dsca.mil/programs/international-military-education-training-imet

Pick One:

Atkinson, Carol. "Does Soft Power Matter? A Comparative Analysis of Student Exchange Programs 1980–2006," *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Vol. 6 Issue 1 (January 2010), 1-8, 16-19 (12 pages). BLACKBOARD and NDU Library

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.24909875&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Karadag, Haluk. "Forcing the Common Good: The Significance of Public Diplomacy in Military Affairs," *Armed Forces & Society* Vol. 43 Issue 1 (January 2017), 72-87. (16 pages)

BLACKBOARD and NDU Library

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=120606665&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Pigman, Geoffrey Allen. "International Sport and Diplomacy's Public Dimension: Governments, Sporting Federations and the Global Audience," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, Vol (2014), 94-114. (11 pages)

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mth&AN=94831404&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Topic 6 (tbd)
PD Toolkit: International Broadcasting / Global Media

...to inform, engage, and connect people around the world in support of freedom and democracy.
U.S. Agency for Global Media, Mission Statement

To understand the effect of free information on power, one must first understand the paradox of plenty. A plenitude of information leads to a poverty of attention . . . Attention rather than information becomes the scarce resource, and those who can distinguish valuable information from background clutter gain power.

Joseph Nye, Harvard University

This week we examine international broadcasting / global media as part of the public diplomacy toolkit. U.S. public diplomacy practitioners continue to imagine how to best employ tools and methods promoting monologue, dialogue, and collaboration across electronic technologies to be effective in the 21st century global information environment. According to UNESCO, at least 75% of households in developing countries have access to radio. Along with radio, nearly 70% of the world's population are unique mobile subscribers. Over half of the world's population has access to the Internet. The State and Defense Departments increasingly are appreciating the power of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and social media platforms to understand, communicate, and engage with civil societies and networks to accomplish national security goals and objectives. Additionally, U.S. Global Media offers news and program content for digital, television, and radio platforms. And yet, Freedom House finds that the freedom of the media has been deteriorating around the world for the last decade.

Objectives:

- Understand how international broadcasting / global media supports national security objectives.
- Appreciate the strengths and limitations of U.S. international broadcasting / global media.
- Consider how to use international broadcasting / global media to reach and connect with audiences.

Questions for Discussion:

- How do states employ digital communication tools, specifically international broadcasting / global media, to further strategic interests? What specific programming does U.S. global media offer in the regions/countries you will visit?
- What are key challenges facing international broadcasting / global media?
- If you compared various state-funded outlet headlines for a current news story, what framing might you notice?
- How can we measure the impact of international broadcasting / global media?

Readings: 39 pages, plus 22 minute podcast and exploration of USAGM website/programs

Dana Ballout, "Good Morning, Kafranbel," *This American Life* Podcast "Episode 667: Wartime Radio, Act Two" (1 February 2019). <https://www.thisamericanlife.org/667/wartime-radio/act->

[two-5](#) (a story about a formerly-DoS funded local radio station in Syria and the potential within broadcasting in trying to change mindsets)

Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019), 101-119. (19 pages)

Faizullah Jan, “International Broadcasting as a Component of U.S. Public Diplomacy (A Case Study of Voice of America’s DEEWA Radio),” *The Dialogue* Vol X, No. 2 (30 June 2015), 152-163. (12 pages)

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=109263098&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Sarah Repucci, “Freedom and the Media 2019: A Downward Spiral,” Freedom House (June 2019), 1-7. (8 pages) <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-media/freedom-media-2019>

SKIM. Reuters Institute and the University of Oxford, “Digital News Report 2019.” <http://www.digitalnewsreport.org/> (highlights digital news consumption in 38 countries that may be useful for PD projects)

United States Agency for Global Media website <https://www.usagm.gov/>

- Explore: “Who We Are”, “Our Work”, and “Networks”
 - Voice of America <https://www.voanews.com/>
 - VOA Learning English Program, including Video Programs (English in a Minute etc) at bottom of website <https://learningenglish.voanews.com/youtube.com/voalearningenglish> facebook.com/voalearningenglish twitter.com/voalearnenglish
 - Radio Free Asia <https://www.rfa.org/english/> <https://www.facebook.com/RadioFreeAsia.English/> <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCirnBv9qGKCJYZSaWmYGFaQ>
 - Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty <https://www.rferl.org/> @RFERL <https://www.facebook.com/rferl/>
 - Middle East Broadcasting Networks
 - Radio Sawa <https://www.radiosawa.com/> <https://www.liveonlineradio.net/arabic/radio-sawa.htm>
 - Alhurra TV <https://www.alhurra.com/> <https://www.youtube.com/user/alhurra>

GLANCE for AWARENESS. Various state-funded (and for some, state-run), English language channels designed to reach and influence Anglophone audiences (albeit not all according to the same journalistic standards).

- British Broadcasting Company <https://www.bbc.com/>
- Voice of America <http://www.voanews.com/>
- Iran’s Press TV <https://www.presstv.com/>
- Russia RT <https://www.rt.com/>
- China CNTV <http://english.cntv.cn/01/index.shtml>

Topic 7 (tbd)
PD Toolkit: Advocacy & Daily Communications

In *The Future of Power*, Joseph Nye argues that one of the stages of public diplomacy is daily communications “which involves explaining the context of domestic and foreign policy decisions... [as well as] crises” (Nye 2011, 105). Daily transparent communications actively symbolize commitment to our political, democratic values and thus also may enhance U.S. credibility in the long run. In today’s information ecology, both professional and citizen media are active players. Media decisions regarding what stories to highlight and *how* can shape political agendas and public opinion. For U.S. practitioners, engaging with global media provides an opportunity to advocate, set agendas, and frame situations in support of national interests and specific policy objectives. Yet, the effectiveness (in terms of resonating with audiences) often rests upon the political cultural congruency between the U.S. and the recipient nation(s)/audiences(s).

Objectives:

- Understand the logic of how government officials may influence public opinion via media engagements.
- Appreciate the strengths and limitations of U.S. advocacy & daily communications.
- Consider how to conduct daily communications in support of national security objectives.

Questions for Discussion:

- Gilboa argues that global communication plays various roles in its relation to foreign policy officials, and may serve as “a sophisticated tool in the hands of government officials.” How?
- Public perception of issues is a function of framing which itself involves multiple steps and actors. How can you conceptualize Entman’s basic model to account for the plethora of media sources in today’s environment?

Readings: 45 pages

Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019), 40-51. (11 pages)

Eytan Gilboa, “Global Communication and Foreign Policy,” *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 52, Issue 4 (December 2002), 731-748. (18 pages)

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02571.x>

Robert M. Entman, “Theorizing Mediated Public Diplomacy: The U.S. Case,” *Press/Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2008), 87-102. (16 pages) BLACKBOARD

Visit for Awareness.

Department of State. @StateDept @statedeptspox @ForeignPressCtr <https://blogs.state.gov/>

Department of Defense. @DeptofDefense @USNationalGuard www.dodlive.mil

USAID. @USAID

Topic 8 (March 3) “Nation Branding”

Many countries have wasted enormous sums of public money on communication campaigns based on the assumption that people don't respect their country simply because they don't know enough about it. In most cases, they are deluding themselves, and the real reason why their country has a negative reputation is that it doesn't deserve a positive one.

Simon Anholt, *Nation Branding: Propaganda or Statecraft*

This week we consider “nation branding” and national image as a public diplomacy tool supporting foreign policy and national security goals. Most states engage in public diplomacy; however, public diplomacy strategies of great powers often differ in important ways from those of small and medium states. This lesson considers how “middle powers” may develop an effective, attractive brand/image, represented via a strategic narrative designed to underpin the inherent attractiveness of a state and its policies; and enhance state legitimacy in terms that persuade, attract and ultimately, positively influence audience attitudes and behaviors. In other words, nation branding may provide a “middle power” “with ample opportunities to gain influence in world affairs far beyond their limited material capabilities” (Gilboa 2009, 24).

Objectives:

- Understand the concept of nation branding.
- Appreciate how states may develop and promote a national brand to support the advancement of national interests and objectives.

Questions for Discussion:

- What's the relationship between soft power and nation branding?
- How do external audience perceptions and values influence brand reception?
 - What is the country's reputation? Is it deserved? What can you do about it?
 - How well do various rankings reflect what you know/have learned about that country? Do these reflect national culture? Historical context? Geographic considerations? Economics? Social or political realities?
 - In developing a national brand, how should you think about a public's emotional appreciation—and which publics should you consider?
- What are the limitations of nation branding in today's complex information environment?

Readings: 28 pages, plus Indices

Nicholas Cull, *Public Diplomacy: Foundations for Global Engagement in the Digital Age* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2019), 127-134. (8 pages)

Eytan Gilboa, “The Public Diplomacy of Middle Powers,” *Public Diplomacy Magazine* (USC, Summer 2009), 22-28. (7 pages) http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/summer_2009.pdf

Andrew F. Cooper, “Middle Powers: Squeezed Out or Adaptive?” *Public Diplomacy Magazine* (USC, Summer 2009), 29-34. (6 pages) http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/summer_2009.pdf

Simon Anholt, "Nation 'Branding:' Propaganda or Statecraft?" *Public Diplomacy Magazine*, (University of Southern California, Summer 2009), 88-90. (3 pages)
http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/summer_2009.pdf

Danielle Kost, "Branding Sells Cereal, Handbags, and Vacations. Can It Sell a Country?" HBS Working Knowledge (11 March 2019). (3 pages) <https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/branding-sells-cereal-handbags-and-vacations-can-it-sell-a-country>

Jian (Jay) Wang, "Does Brand Nationality Still Matter?" (30 January 2017). (1 page)
<https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/does-brand-nationality-still-matter>

Seminar Individual Activity:

- Acting as a PD practitioner working on behalf of the state you will visit during your field studies, craft a nation branding campaign/narrative using attributes identified within various indices and your own academic research to date. Presentations of 3-5 minutes.
 - FutureBrand's Country Brand Index <https://www.futurebrand.com/country-brand-index>
 - McClory, Jonathan ed. "The Soft Power 30" (USC Center on Public Diplomacy, 2017). <https://softpower30.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/The-Soft-Power-30-Report-2017-Web-1.pdf>
 - BBC World Service Country Ratings Poll <https://www.globescan.com/news-and-analysis/press-releases/press-releases-2017/104-press-releases-2017/420-sharp-drop-in-world-views-of-us-uk-global-poll.html>
 - Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2017
 - Simon Anholt's *Good Country Index*, <https://goodcountry.org>
 - Pew Research Center, Global Attitudes & Trends, <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/>

Topic 9 (tbd)
Public Diplomacy of Peer Competitors

Whichever nation's communications capacity is strongest, it is that nation whose culture will spread far and wide... with the most power to influence the world.

Li Chang-Chun, Chinese Communist Party Propaganda Chief

Russia will continue to pursue an active and constructive line in international affairs. Its weight and influence in the world will increase... The basic principles of Russian foreign policy remain the same... The concept focuses on modern foreign policy tools, including economic diplomacy, elements of so-called soft power, and careful integration into the global information space.

Vladimir Putin, address to members of the Russian Security Council, 2013

Question More.

Motto of RT (formerly Russia Today)

Much depends on the health and vigor of our own society... Every courageous and incisive measure to solve internal problems of our own society, to improve self-confidence, discipline, morale and community spirit of our own people, is a diplomatic victory over Moscow...

George Kennan in the "Long Telegram," 22 February 1946

China and Russia have institutionally organized in order to compete within the broad public diplomacy space. In December 2016, Russian President Putin enacted Presidential Decree 646--a new doctrine in information security that revealed "Moscow's interpretation of existential threats to its national interests and its priorities in countering them ... [including] "information-psychological influence" and political destabilization" (Jones in Jane's Defence Weekly, 8 December 2016).³ Chinese leaders have created a unique model emphasizing cultural elements under the Communist Party of China's leadership. Understanding why and how peer competitors conduct such activities is a necessary step in developing how the U.S. may address and/or counter such activities within the information space.

Objectives:

- Appreciate the evolution of peer competitor public diplomacy activities designed to advance national interests.
- Consider relative prioritization peer competitors place on public diplomacy as an instrument of statecraft compared to the U.S.

Questions for Discussion:

- What guides Russian and Chinese public diplomacy activities and what types of institutional and instrumental initiatives have they undertaken? Does such prioritization matter?
- What might be some of the West's "dominant narratives" and structures that both China and Russia seek to challenge?

³ See The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation for an unofficial translation of the doctrine: http://www.mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/official_documents/-/asset_publisher/CptlCk6BZ29/content/id/2563163

- How would you assess the effectiveness of Chinese and Russian investments in public diplomacy initiatives? What metrics would you consider and why?
- What are the implications of peer competitor public diplomacy efforts for the United States?

Readings: ~55 pages

Dale, Helle C., Ariel Cohen, Janice A. Smith. “Challenging America: How Russia, China, and Other Countries Use Public Diplomacy to Compete with the U.S.” Heritage Foundation Backgrounder, No 2698 (21 June 2012), 1-15. (15 pages) <http://www.heritage.org/global-politics/report/challenging-america-how-russia-china-and-other-countries-use-public>

Simons, Greg. “Taking the new public diplomacy online: Russia and China,” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 11, Issue 2 (May 2015), 111-124. (14 pages) <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1685862709/fulltextPDF/5016AE256D2A4975PQ/3?accountid=12686>

AND, CHINA

Lim, Louisa and Julia Bergin. “Inside China’s audacious global propaganda campaign,” *The Guardian* (7 December 2018). (15 pages) <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/dec/07/china-plan-for-global-media-dominance-propaganda-xi-jinping>

Hak, Yin Li and Seanon Wong. “The evolution of Chinese public diplomacy and the rise of think tanks,” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 14, Issue 1 (February 2018), 36-46. (10 pages) <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2003242792/fulltextPDF/DB6AD6C170C74CCBPQ/5?accountid=12686>

OR, RUSSIA

Bowley, Graham. “Oligarchs, as U.S. Arts Patrons, Present a Softer Image of Russia,” *New York Times* (6 October 2019). (15 pages) <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/06/arts/russia-oligarchs-arts.htm> and BLACKBOARD

MacFarquhar, Neil. “A Powerful Russian Weapon: The Spread of False Stories,” *New York Times* (28 August 2016). (6 pages) <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/29/world/europe/russia-sweden-disinformation.html>

Ratner, Paul. “The Primer on Russia’s “Active Measures,” Its Information Warfare Strategy,” *big think* (7 April 2017). <https://bigthink.com/paul-ratner/the-primer-on-russias-active-measures>

Topic 10 (tbd)
Public Diplomacy of International Terrorist Organizations

Bin Laden's war, of course, is all about propaganda.

Tony Koran, *Time*, 6 November 2001

[The Islamic State has] its agile and robust propaganda machine that has helped to inspire as many as 31,000 people from across the globe to leave their homes and join the cause."

Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and Nathaniel Barr, 2016

We will integrate our strategic communications capability across our efforts to send a clear message... this message will aim to discredit terrorist narratives, dissuade potential terrorist supporters, and demonstrate the effects of our counterterrorism operations are not limited solely to direct action.

United States National Strategy for Counterterrorism, October 2018

In April 2016, the U.S. established the Global Engagement Center within the State Department. The GEC is charged with leading U.S. efforts to counter propaganda and disinformation from international terrorist organizations and foreign countries. More specifically, the 2017 NDAA defined its mission as being to “lead, synchronize, and coordinate efforts of the Federal Government to recognize, understand, expose, and counter foreign state and non-state propaganda and disinformation efforts aimed at undermining United States national security interests.”⁴

Using the “**ABCDEF**” construct of “**Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Effectiveness Assessment/Follow-Up,**” how might national security professionals / public diplomacy practitioners address / counter such activities? Building on what we have learned about public diplomacy concepts and toolkits in prior topics, how might we think of audiences and the attitudes and behaviors we want to affect?

Objectives:

- Consider public diplomacy / propaganda / information warfare conducted by other actors.
- Consider how to use your public diplomacy toolkit (cultural and educational diplomacy, international broadcasting, digital media etc) to address / counter / inoculate against the public diplomacy / information warfare of other actors in the international environment.
- Consider broader science and technology-based actions that may support U.S. efforts.

Questions for Discussion:

- How do pre-existing beliefs/prejudices influence audience response to targeted messaging?
- How could you use public diplomacy tools as part of a public diplomacy strategy to “inoculate” publics against such disinformation? What else can we do?

Readings: 45 pages

⁴ <https://www.state.gov/r/gec/>

Buril, Fernanda. "Changing God's Expectations and Women's Consequent Behaviors – How ISIS Manipulates "Divine Commandments" to Influence Women's Role in Jihad," *Journalism of Terrorism Research*, Vol 8, Issue 3 (October 2017). (9 pages)

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=126213746&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Al-Tabaa, Esther Solis. "Targeting a Female Audience: American Muslim Women's Perceptions of al-Qaida Propaganda," *Journal of Strategic Security* 6, no 3 Suppl. (2013), 10-21. (11 pages)

<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol6/iss5/4/>

Marcia, Forest Rain. "A Marketer's Perspective: ISIS Propaganda and Why it Works," *The Counter Terrorist* (Apr/May 2016), 48-56. (5 pages)

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=114744693&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Alexander, Audrey. "How to Fight ISIS Online: Why the Islamic State is Winning on Social Media," *Foreign Affairs* (7 April 2017). (3 pages) <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/print/1119786>

Gartenstein-Ross, Daveed and Nathaniel Barr, "Fixing how we fight the Islamic State's Narrative," *War on the Rocks* (4 January 2016). (11 pages)

<https://warontherocks.com/2016/01/fixing-how-we-fight-the-islamic-states-narrative/>

Warrick, Joby. "How a U.S. team uses Facebook, guerrilla marketing to peel off potential ISIS recruits," *The Washington Post* (6 February 2017).

https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/bait-and-flip-us-team-uses-facebook-guerrilla-marketing-to-peel-off-potential-isis-recruits/2017/02/03/431e19ba-e4e4-11e6-a547-5fb9411d332c_story.html

Ahmad Salkida, "ISWAP Launches Bi-weekly Hausa Newspaper," *HumAngle* (26 March 2020).

<https://humangle.ng/iswap-launches-bi-weekly-hausa-newspaper/>

SKIM. Benigi, Matthew C., Kenneth Joseph, and Kathleen M. Carley. "Online extremism and the communities that sustain it: Detecting the ISIS supporting community on Twitter," *PLOS ONE* 12(12), (1 December 2017).

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0181405>

Topics 11 & 12 (tbd)

Presentations of Individual PD Strategies

Having developed a public diplomacy strategy (see final pages) to address/advance a selected, specific policy issue/objective, each student will have ~10 minutes to present key elements of his/her public diplomacy strategy to the seminar and respond to seminar critical questioning and feedback. See following pages for guiding structure.

Objectives:

- Demonstrate foundational understanding of the role of public diplomacy in supporting national interests and objectives.
- Enhance public speaking and communication skills through a concise synopsis of an overall public diplomacy strategy.
- Learn from one another.

Questions for Discussion:

- What is the specific policy issue/objective at hand?
- How do the proposed public diplomacy strategies support/advance interests/goals/objectives?
- Does the proposed strategy incorporate “**ABCDEF**” elements: **Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement, and Effectiveness Assessment/Follow-Up?**
- Do the audience analyses logically inform selected public diplomacy toolkit recommendations?
- Does the public diplomacy strategy incorporate multiple public diplomacy tools and do the tools reinforce one another?

Resources on Bb:

In addition to your individual research, see the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy’s *Comprehensive Annual Report on Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting* for an overview of contemporary public diplomacy tools and activities that may provide ideas for the written project. Specifically the 2017, 2018, and 2019 versions which provide basic overviews of information landscapes and media usage in many locations, as well as overviews of existing programs.

Also, U.S. government employees can create an account with Open Source Enterprise at <https://www.opensource.gov> to access sources of information for foreign audiences.

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY STRATEGY/PLANNING
A General Structure for Public Diplomacy Strategies/Plans
“ABCDEF”: Audiences, Behaviors, Content, Delivery, Engagement,
And Effectiveness Assessment/Follow-Up
AY21

PURPOSE AND STRATEGY OVERVIEW

- What is your overarching policy issue aim/goal/objective?
- What are your supporting public diplomacy objectives and how do these tie to your overarching aims/goals/objectives?

AUDIENCE ANALYSIS

Key Audiences and Demographics

- Who do you need to influence in order to accomplish your goals? How can you disaggregate broad(er) audiences into key segments?
- Why are these specific audiences important to achieving your overarching goals?

Audience Concerns, Attitudes and Opinions

- What do the specific audiences care about?
- What are each specific audiences’ views toward us? Towards the issue(s) at stake?
- Are there trends in public opinion worth noting?

Information Sources and channels

- In what formal or informal social networks might they be immersed?
- How do key, specific audiences get their information?
- Whom do they trust? Find authoritative? Where are the information sources located?
- What information sources are growing/declining?
- Are certain information sources more/less popular with certain demographic groups?
- Who has access to your specific audiences?

Allies and Adversaries

- What other governments, private sector entities, multilateral organizations, and non-governmental groups are working on this or similar issues (or competing/distracting issues) within the country/region?
- What are the agenda, programs, and resources of each?
- Who might be potential (informal) partners/ “allies”?
- Who might be opposed to, or what conditions/actions might adversarial to our efforts? Why?
- What are key trends/dates you should be aware of? (environmental changes, domestic or international votes/decision dates, international conferences, political events)?

BEHAVIORS (OVER TIME)

- What attitudes or behaviors/actions do you want each segmented audience to adopt as a result of your public diplomacy efforts? (What do you want them to think? To do?)
- What is the time frame for each attitude / behavior? Do you need to think incrementally? (i.e. become aware/understand an issue; materially/politically/emotionally support/cooperate on an issue etc)
- What “SMART” objectives can you create? (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound)

CONTENT, DELIVERY, ENGAGEMENT: PUBLIC DIPLOMACY TOOLKIT

Tools for Content, Delivery, & Engagement

- Based on the information developed above, what activities and public diplomacy tools will you use to achieve your objectives?
- How might PD tools be sequenced over time to achieve SMART objectives in support of goals?
- What messages/narratives/activities resonate with each specific audience? Why?
- What communications channels will you utilize to reach/engage each specific audience?

Building Alliances and Networks

- Within the USG, what departments and agencies are already engaged or could be engaged as “allies” in this issue and how?
- How might you encourage expansion of alliances/ formal and informal partnerships, and coordination among the various entities that are allied around the issue?

Local Capacity Building

- Do you need to build local capacity within the government or civil society to help garner support for the issue? If so, in what areas and how might you do this?

Countering the Opposition

- Do you need to monitor media to track information trends/narratives in the public sphere? If so, how?
- How will you respond to disinformation and/or opposition arguments/situations? Who are the voices/circumstances? What are the channels?

EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT /FOLLOW-UP:

- How can you measure current attitudes/behaviors of key, segmented audiences? What indicators may be helpful?
- How can you assess attitudinal / behavioral change after PD events? Activities? Over time?
- How will the attitudinal / behavioral changes support your overall aims/goals/objectives?

Topic 1 “Introduction” Additional Resources:

Matt Armstrong, “The Past, Present, and Future of the War for Public Opinion,” War on the Rocks (19 January 2017). <https://warontherocks.com/2017/01/the-past-present-and-future-of-the-war-for-public-opinion/>

Katherine A. Brown, Shannon N. Green, and Jian “Jay” Wang, “Public Diplomacy and National Security in 2017,” CSIS (January 2017). <https://www.csis.org/analysis/public-diplomacy-and-national-security-2017>

Video Conference on “Public Diplomacy & National Security” with Katherine Brown, Jay Wang; Ben Rhodes and James Glassman, moderated by Michael Crowley (17 January 2017). <https://www.c-span.org/video/?422062-1/csis-hosts-discussion-public-diplomacy>

Nicholas J. Cull, “Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616, no. 1 (1 March 2008), 31–54. [Permalink: <http://ann.sagepub.com.ezproxy6.ndu.edu/content/616/1/31> and Blackboard]

Bruce Gregory, “Public Diplomacy and National Security: Lessons from the U.S. Experience,” *Small Wars Journal* (2008). <https://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/82-gregory.pdf>

Mel Levin, Rockwell Schnabel and Jay Wang, “American public diplomacy is our country’s best foreign policy tool,” *The Hill* (19 September 2017). <https://thehill.com/opinion/international/351311-american-public-diplomacy-is-our-countrys-best-foreign-policy-tool>

Joint Force Quarterly, Issue 56, 1st Quarter 2010.
<https://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a515164.pdf>

- Robert D. Deutsch, “Ambassadors to the World: A New Paradigm for Public Diplomacy and Strategic Communication.”
- Kristin M. Lord, “Public Engagement 101: What Strategic Communication Is, Isn’t, and Should Be.”
- Christopher Paul, “Strategic Communication is Vague: Say What You Mean.”

Joint Publication 3-13. *Information Operations* (20 November 2014).
https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Doctrine/pubs/jp3_13.pdf

Kennon H. Nakamura and Matthew C. Weed, “U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and Current Issues,” CRS (December 18, 2009).

“Issue Brief: Distinguishing Disinformation from Propaganda, Misinformation, and “Fake News”” National Endowment for Democracy (17 October 2017). <https://www.ned.org/issue-brief-distinguishing-disinformation-from-propaganda-misinformation-and-fake-news/>

Joseph S. Nye Jr., *The Future of Power* (New York: Public Affairs, 2011), 81-109.

Catherine A. Theohary, “Defense Primer: Information Operations,” Congressional Research Service (18 December 2018). <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IF10771.pdf>

U.S. Government Accountability Office, *DOD Strategic Communication: Integrating Foreign Audience Perceptions into Policy Making, Plans, and Operations*, GAO-12-612R (May 2012). <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/591123.pdf>

Charles Wolf Jr. and Brian Rosen, “Public Diplomacy: How to Think About and Improve It.” RAND OP-134, (2004). https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2004/RAND_OP134.pdf

Topic 2 “Public Opinion” Additional Resources:

“How to change emotions with a word,” *The Economist* (3 May 2018). <https://www.economist.com/science-and-technology/2018/05/03/how-to-change-emotions-with-a-word>

Adam Curtis, Writer/Director. *The Century of the Self*, BBC 4 Documentary on Sigmund Freud’s theories on desire and how they are applied in consumerism, advertising, and politics (4 segments) <http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/the-century-of-the-self/>

Charles A. Dorison, Julia A. Minson, and Todd Rogers, “Selective exposure partly relies on faulty affective forecasts” *Cognition* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.02.010>

Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2013).

Darren Linvill and Patrick Warren, “That Uplifting Tweet You Just Shared? A Russian Troll Sent It,” *Rolling Stone* (25 November 2019). <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/russia-troll-2020-election-interference-twitter-916482/> (example of the potential to expand and mobilize social networks)

Malcolm Gladwell, *Blink* (NY: Back Bay Books, 2007).

Anya Schiffrin, ed., “In the Service of Power: Media Capture and the Threat to Democracy,” Center for International Media Assistance (August 16, 2017). <https://www.cima.ned.org/publication/media-capture-in-the-service-of-power/>

James Surowiecki, *The Wisdom of Crowds* (NY: Anchor, 2005).

Topic 3 “Social Network Theory” Additional Resources:

Ori Brafman and Rod A. Beckstrom, *The Starfish and the Spider: The Unstoppable Power of Leaderless Organizations* (NY: Penguin Group, 2006).

Susan Cain, *Quiet: The Power of Introverts in a World that Can't Stop Talking* (NY: Broadway Books, 2013).

Malcolm Gladwell, *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference* (NY: Back Bay Books, 2002).

Malcolm Gladwell, *Talking To Strangers* (NY: Little, Brown and Company, 2019).

Maria Ressa, *From bin Laden to Facebook* (NY: World Scientific Publishing Company Inc, 2013).

Clay Shirky, "How telephones, Twitter, Facebook can make history," TED Talk (16 June 2009). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_iN_QubRs0

Anne-Marie Slaughter, "DIY Foreign Policy," Personal Democracy Forum 2011 (7 June 2011). <http://personaldemocracy.com/media/diy-foreign-policy> (19:30 minutes)

Topic 4 "Information Environment" Additional Resources:

Phillip C. Arceneaux, "Information Intervention: the Mending of a Fractured Paradigm," USC Center on Public Diplomacy blog (22 July 2019). <https://www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/information-intervention-mending-fractured-paradigm>

Janna Anderson and Lee Rainie, "The Future of Truth and Misinformation Online," Pew Research Center (Internet and Technology) (19 October 2017). <http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/10/19/the-future-of-truth-and-misinformation-online/>

Wynne Davis, "Fake or Real? How to Self-Check the News and Get the Facts," All Tech Considered, National Public Radio (5 December 2016). <https://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2016/12/05/503581220/fake-or-real-how-to-self-check-the-news-and-get-the-facts>

Matthew Hindman and Vlad Barash, "Disinformation, 'Fake News' and Influence Campaigns on Twitter," Knight Foundation (October 2018). https://kf-site-production.s3.amazonaws.com/media_elements/files/000/000/238/original/KF-DisinformationReport-final2.pdf

Aldous Huxley, *Brave new world* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1932).

Robinson Meyer, "The Grim Conclusions of the Largest-Ever Study of Fake News," *The Atlantic* (8 March 2018). <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/03/largest-study-ever-fake-news-mit-twitter/555104/>

Alina Polyakova and Daniel Fried, "How Democracies Can Defend Against Disinformation,"

War on the Rocks (30 May 2018). <https://warontherocks.com/2018/05/how-democracies-can-defend-against-disinformation/>

Neil Postman, *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business* (New York: Viking, 1985).

Shawn Powers and Markos Kounalakis, eds., *Can Public Diplomacy Survive the Internet? Bots, Echo Chambers, and Disinformation* (Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, May 2017). <https://www.hsdl.org/?abstract&did=800873>

Katy Steinmetz, "How Your Brain Tricks You Into Believing Fake News," *TIME* (9 August 2018). <http://time.com/5362183/the-real-fake-news-crisis/>

Lance Strate, *Amazing Ourselves to Death: Neil Postman's Brave New World Revisited* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014).

Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral, "The spread of true and false news online," *Science*, Vol 359, Issue 6380 (9 March 2018), 1146-1151. <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/359/6380/1146>

Topic 5 "Cultural & Educational Diplomacy" Additional Resources:

Matt Armstrong, "UN Peacekeeping as Public Diplomacy," *World Politics Review* (19 May 2010). <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/5561/u-n-peacekeeping-as-public-diplomacy>

Canadian Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade "Cultural Diplomacy at the Front Stage of Canada's Foreign Policy," (June 2019). https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/committee/421/AEFA/Reports/Report_CulturalDiplomacy_e.pdf

Andrew F. Cooper, "U.S. public diplomacy and sports stars: mobilizing African-American athletes as goodwill ambassadors from the cold war to an uncertain future," *Place Brand Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 15 (July 2019), 165-172.

James E. Dillard, "All that Jazz: CIA, Voice of America, and Jazz Diplomacy in the Early Cold War Years, 1955-1965," *American Intelligence Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (2012), 39-50).

Eureka Facts, "Summer Work Travel (SWT) Program Review," (22 August 2017). <https://www.eurekafacts.com/phocadownload/SWT%20Impact%20Evaluation%20Final%20Report.pdf>

Kathy Fitzpatrick, Candace L. White, and Lindsey M. Bier. "C-Suite Perspectives on Corporate Diplomacy as a Component of Public Diplomacy," *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* (May 2019).

Charles Paul Freund, “The DJ who helped win the Cold War: the Voice of America’s Willis Conover got the Soviet Bloc jazzed up,” *Reason Magazine*, Vol. 47, Issue 7 (December 2015), 60.

<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsgbc&AN=edsgcl.435048560&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Christopher Paul, Jessica Yeats, Colin P. Clarke, Miriam Matthews, Lauren Skrabala. “Assessing and Evaluating Department of Defense Efforts to Inform, Influence, and Persuade: Handbook for Practitioners,” RAND (2015). https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR809z2.html

Katarzyna Pisarska, “The role of domestic public engagement in the formulation and implementation of US government-sponsored educational exchanges: An insider’s account,” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* Vol. 11, Issue. 1 (Feb 2015), 5-15. (11 pages)
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/1658613421/A4F446D4046A4A8DPQ/2?accountid=12686>

William Rugh, “American Soft Power and Public Diplomacy in the Arab World,” *Palgrave Communications* 3 (10 January 2017). <https://www.nature.com/articles/palcomms2016104>

Evan Salbego, “Beyond the Operational Environment: Reflections on Information Warfare,” *Small Wars Journal* Blog Post (8 April 2017). <http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/beyond-the-operational-environment-reflections-on-information-warfare>

ES Wim, RD Macy, and G. Ciottone, “Medical and psychosocial needs of Olympic and Pan American athletes after the 2010 earthquake in Haiti: an opportunity to promote resilience through sports medicine and public diplomacy,” *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, Vol 29 (2) (2014), 195-199.

R. S. Zaharna, *The Cultural Awakening in Public Diplomacy*, CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, Paper 4, (2012).
<http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/sites/uscpublicdiplomacy.org/files/useruploads/u35361/2012%20Paper%204.pdf>

Topic 6 “International Broadcasting / Global Media” Additional Resources:

Barbara Rosen Jacobson, Katharina E. Hone, and Jovan Kurbalija. *Data Diplomacy: Updating diplomacy to the big data era* (February 2018).
<https://www.diplomacy.edu/datadiplomacy/policyresearch>

Ilan Manor, “The Digitalization of Diplomacy: Toward a Clarification of a Fractured Terminology,” Working Paper (August 2017).
<https://digdipblog.files.wordpress.com/2017/08/the-digitalization-of-diplomacy-working-paper-number-1.pdf>

Paul Mozur, “A Genocide Incited on Facebook, with Posts from Myanmar’s Military,” *The New York Times* (15 October 2018). <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/15/technology/myanmar-facebook-genocide.html?nl=top-stories&nlid=15434438ries&ref=cta>

Shaun Riordan, “Digital Diplomacy in 2016: The Need for Strategy,” (27 March 2017). <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/digital-diplomacy-2016-need-strategy>

Mick Ryan and Marcus Thompson. “Social Media in the Military: Opportunities, Perils and a Safe Middle Path,” *groundedcuriosity.com* (21 August 2016). <http://groundedcuriosity.com/social-media-in-the-military-opportunities-perils-and-a-safe-middle-path/>

Mick Ryan, Mick Cook, Felicity Hamblin and Sharon Mascall-Dare. “Exercise Hamel 2016: A Case Study in the Military Use of Social Media,” *The Strategy Bridge* (11 October 2016). <https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2016/10/11/exercise-hamel-2016-a-case-study-in-the-military-use-of-social-media>

Eduard Saakashvili, “Don’t Call US Information Warriors,” *Coda* (11 July 2018). <https://codastory.com/disinformation-crisis/information-war/dont-call-us-information-warriors> (US’s “Current Time” programming versus RT)

Clay Shirky, “The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere, and Political Change,” *Foreign Affairs* (Jan/Feb 2011). <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2010-12-20/political-power-social-media>

Clay Shirky, “How social media can make history,” TEDTalks Video (16 June 2009). (15:40 minutes) https://www.ted.com/talks/clay_shirky_how_cellphones_twitter_facebook_can_make_history/discussion

U.S. Government Accountability Office, *DOD Strategic Communication: Integrating Foreign Audience Perceptions into Policy Making, Plans, and Operations*, GAO-12-612R (May 2012). <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/591123.pdf>

Matthew Wallin and Jed Willard, “Asking the Right Questions About U.S. International Broadcasting,” *The Diplomat* (3 June 2014). <https://thediplomat.com/2014/06/asking-the-right-questions-about-u-s-international-broadcasting/>

Mathew Wallin, “The Challenges of the Internet and Social Media in Public Diplomacy,” *Perspective* (American Security Project, February 2013). <http://www.americansecurityproject.org/ASP%20Reports/Ref%2000112%20-%20Challenges%20of%20the%20Internet%20and%20Social%20Media%20in%20PD.pdf>

Matthew C. Weed, *U.S. International Broadcasting: Background and Issues for Reform*, Congressional Research Service, R43521 (15 December 2016). <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43521.pdf>

Topic 7 “Advocacy & Daily Communications” Additional Resources:

Robert M. Entman and Nikki Usher, “Framing in a Fractured Democracy: Impacts of Digital Technology on Ideology, Power and Cascading Network Activation,” *Journal of Communications*, Vol. 68 (2018), 298-308.

Robert T. Hastings, “There can be no substitute for maximum disclosure with minimum delay,” Army Public Affairs Association Blog (11 July 2016).
<http://www.armypaa.org/blog/2016/7/1/there-can-be-no-substitute-for-maximum-disclosure-with-minimum-delay>

Mark Hertsgaard and Kyle Pope, “Transforming the media’s coverage of the climate crisis,” *Columbia Journalism Review* (22 May 2019). <https://www.cjr.org/watchdog/climate-crisis-media.php> (an example of media’s role in agenda setting, accuracy, and accountability)

Jehane Noujaim and Julia Bacha, *Control Room*, Film, Directed by Jehane Noujaim. (United States: Magnolia Pictures, 2004). <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f3rMo5cgaXQ>

Joint Publication 3-61 *Public Affairs* (17 November 2015).
https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Doctrine/pubs/jp3_61.pdf

Topic 8 “Nation Branding” Additional Resources:

Simon Anholt, “Which Country Does the Most Good for the World?” *Ted Talk*, (June 2014).
http://www.ted.com/talks/simon_anholt_which_country_does_the_most_good_for_the_world?language=en

The Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index <http://nation-brands.gfk.com/>

Michael Cecire, “Russia’s Art of War: State Branding by Other Means,” *Foreign Affairs* (7 February 2017). <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/print/1119346>

Chung-shing Chan and Marafa, Lawal. A review of place branding methodologies in the new millennium,” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 9, Issue 4 (Nov 2013), 236-253.

“India’s Soft Power: From Potential to Reality?” in *India: The Next Superpower? LSE IDEAS Special Report* (March 2012), 28-33. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/ideas/Assets/Documents/reports/LSE-IDEAS-India-Superpower.pdf>

Ilan Manor, “Framing, Tweeting and Branding: A Study in the Practice of Public Diplomacy,” USC, Center for Public Diplomacy Blog (9 January 2015).
<http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/framing-tweeting-and-branding-study-practice-digital-diplomacy>

Topic 9 “PD of Peer Competitors” Additional Resources:

Holly Kathleen Hall, “The new voice of America: Countering Foreign Propaganda and Disinformation Act,” *First Amendment Studies*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (2017), 49-61.

Peter Mattis, “Contrasting China’s and Russia’s Influence Operations,” *War on the Rocks* (16 January 2018). <https://warontherocks.com/2018/01/contrasting-chinas-russias-influence-operations/>

Gary D. Rawnsley, “To Know Us is to Love Us: Public Diplomacy and International Broadcasting in Contemporary Russia and China,” *Politics*, Vol. 35, Issue 3/4 (November 2015), 273-284. (12 pages) BLACKBOARD and NDU Library
<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=110259769&site=eds-live&scope=site>

U.K. Government Communication Service. “RESIST: Counter-disinformation toolkit” (10 April 2019). <https://gcs.civilservice.gov.uk/guidance/resist-counter-disinformation-toolkit/>
<https://gcs.civilservice.gov.uk/news/resist-counter-disinformation-toolkit-launched-today/>

China:

Dan Bauman, “Amid Fear of Foreign Influence, Colleges’ Confucius Institutes Face Renewed Skepticism,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol 65, Issue 26 (9 March 2018).
<https://www.chronicle.com/article/Amid-Fear-of-Foreign/242687>

Caitlin Byrne, “Political Leaders and Public Diplomacy in the Contested Indo-Pacific,” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 14 (2019), pp. 182-197.

Sarah Cook, “The Implications for Democracy of China’s Globalizing Media Influence” chapter II in “Freedom and the Media 2019,” Freedom House (June 2019).
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-media/freedom-media-2019>

Samantha Custer et al., “Ties that Bind: Quantifying China’s public diplomacy and its “good neighbor” effect,” AidData at William and Mary (June 2018).
<https://www.aiddata.org/publications/ties-that-bind>

Bill Gertz, “Congress to Crack Down on Chinese Influence in U.S.: Legislation targets Beijing spying, Confucius Institutes,” *The Free Beacon* (4 June 2018). <https://freebeacon.com/national-security/congress-crack-chinese-influence-u-s/>

Craig Hayden, “China: Cultivating a Global Soft Power” in *The Rhetoric of Soft Power: Public Diplomacy in Global Contexts* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012).
<https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=433576&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Elsa Kania, "PLA Strategic Support Force: The 'Information Umbrella' for China's Military," *The Diplomat* (1 April 2017). <https://thediplomat.com/2017/04/pla-strategic-support-force-the-information-umbrella-for-chinas-military/>

Michael Leslie, "The Dragon Shapes Its Image: A Study of Chinese Media Influence Strategies in Africa," *African Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 16 Issue 3 / 4 (December 2016), 161-174. <https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ofs&AN=120788799&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Eric X. Li, "The Rise and Fall of Soft Power. Joseph Nye's concept lost relevance, but China could bring it back," *Foreign Policy* (20 August 2018). https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/08/20/the-rise-and-fall-of-soft-power/?utm_source=PostUp&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Editors%20Picks%20%208/20/2018%20-%20Brand%20South%20Africa&utm_keyword=Editor#

Zhang Qingmin, "Sports Diplomacy: The Chinese Experience and Perspective," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 8, Issue 3-4 (2013), 211-233. <https://brill.com/view/journals/hjd/8/3-4/hjd.8.issue-3-4.xml>

David Scott, "China's Public Diplomacy Rhetoric, 1990-2012: Pragmatic Image Crafting," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, Vol. 26, Issue 2 (June 2015), 249-261.

Darren E. Tromblay, "No More Fun and Games: How China's Acquisition of U.S. Media Entities Threatens America's National Security," *smallwarsjournal* (22 May 2017). <http://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/no-more-fun-and-games-how-china%E2%80%99s-acquisition-of-us-media-entities-threatens-america%E2%80%99s-nati>

Wu Ying, "Review of the Confucius Institutes' Strategy for the Dissemination of Chinese Culture," *Chinese Education & Society* 49 (2016), 391-401. <https://nduezproxy.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=121963987&site=eds-live&scope=site>

Russia:

Matthew Armstrong, "A Revealing Fight with Russia's RT at the State Department," *War on the Rocks* (21 November 2016). <https://warontherocks.com/2016/11/a-revealing-fight-with-russias-rt-at-the-state-department/>

FactBar Edu "Fact-checking for educators and future voters," https://www.faktabaari.fi/assets/FactBar_EDU_Fact-checking_for_educators_and_future_voters_13112018.pdf

Edward Lucas and Ben Nimmo. "Information Warfare: What is it and How to Win it?" CEPA InfoWar Paper No. 1 (DC: Center for European Policy Analysis, November 2015), 1-13. <http://cepa.org/sites/default/files/Infowar%20Report.pdf>

Neil MacFarquhar & Andrew Rossback. "How Russian Propaganda Spread from a Parody

Website to Fox News,” *New York Times* (7 June 2017).

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/06/07/world/europe/anatomy-of-fake-news-russian-propaganda.html>

Eliza Mackintosh, “Finland is winning the war on fake news. What it’s learned may be crucial to Western Democracy,” CNN Special Report (May 2019).

<https://www.cnn.com/interactive/2019/05/europe/finland-fake-news-intl/?fbclid=IwAR1foBQbxbmer4VpJz9mt-PRlyqy6yvdkh9leQCMfQzd8JPIrOk5WT2TdxY>

Ben Nimmo, “Anatomy of an Information War: How Russia’s Propaganda Machine Works and How to Counter it,” StopFake.org (May 2015). <https://www.stopfake.org/en/anatomy-of-an-info-war-how-russia-s-propaganda-machine-works-and-how-to-counter-it/>

Christopher Paul and Miriam Matthews. “The Russian “Firehose of Falsehood” Propaganda Model: Why it Might Work and Options to Counter It,” *RAND Perspective* (2016).

https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE198/RAND_PE198.pdf

Jim Rutenberg, “RT, Sputnik and Russia’s New Theory of War,” *New York Times* (13 September 2017). <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/13/magazine/rt-sputnik-and-russias-new-theory-of-war.html>

Greg Simons, “Russian public diplomacy in the 21st century: Structure, means and message,” *Public Relations Review*, Vol 40, Issue 3 (2014), 440-449.

“Hamilton 68” <https://dashboard.securingdemocracy.org/> (a website that tracks Russian propaganda in near-real time; see the following for the story

<http://www.businessinsider.com/russian-propaganda-website-tracker-2017-8>)

Office of the Director of National Intelligence. “Background to “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections”: The Analytic Process and Cyber Incident Attribution.” Intelligence Community Assessment (January 6, 2017).

https://www.intelligence.senate.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ICA_2017_01.pdf

Grand Jury for the District of Columbia. Internet Research Agency Indictment (Russian organization engaged in operations to interfere with elections and political processes) (February 2018). <https://www.justice.gov/file/1035477/download>

Topic 10 “PD of International Terrorist Organizations” Additional Resources:

Matthew Armstrong, Michael Lumpkin, and Timothy Thomas. “Crafting an Information Warfare and Counter-Propaganda Strategy for the Emerging Security Environment,” Testimonies to the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, 115th Congress (15 March 2017). <https://armedservices.house.gov/legislation/hearings/crafting-information-warfare-and-counter-propaganda-strategy-emerging-security> (video link as well as transcripts)

Ryan Basford, “U.S. Counter-Ideological Campaign,” *Small Wars Journal* (16 April 2017). <http://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/us-counter-ideological-campaign>

Colin Clark and Charlie Winter. “The Islamic State may be failing, but its strategic communications legacy is here to stay,” *War on the Rocks* (17 August 2017). <https://warontherocks.com/2017/08/the-islamic-state-may-be-failing-but-its-strategic-communications-legacy-is-here-to-stay/>

Joshua Goldstein and Gabriel Koehler-Derrick. “Using Google Insights to Assess Egypt’s Jasmine Revolution,” *CTC Sentinel*, Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, Vol 4, Issue 3 (March 2011), 4-8. <https://ctc.usma.edu/using-google-insights-to-assess-egypts-jasmine-revolution/>

Patrick Tucker, “A Quick Guide to the Jihadist Communications Toolkit,” *Defense One* (22 July 2016). <https://www.defenseone.com/technology/2016/07/quick-guide-jihadist-communications-toolkit/130159/>

Fredrick Vincenzo, “An Information Based Strategy to Reduce North Korea’s Increasing Threat” (CNAS, US-Korea Institute at SAIS, NDU, and Georgetown University, October 2016). <http://georgetownsecuritystudiesreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/An-Information-Based-Strategy-to-Reduce-North-Koreas-Increasing-Threat.pdf>

The White House. National Strategy for Counterterrorism (October 2018). <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/NSCT.pdf>