

**RHETORIC AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY:
ANALYSIS OF A DOUBLE DIMENSIONAL LINK**

Betül ÖZYILMAZ*

Abstract:

It has been gaining recognition in many fields of the social sciences that discourse and meanings generated from it have particular features and create kind of power impact. Beyond its function as a mirror and instrument of representation and communication, language is used as a tool to carry out social activities and to construct or re-construct social realities. Rhetoric as the language used to persuade, confirm and justify has the same dual function. This paper is primarily concerned with the relationship between rhetoric as a form of language and public diplomacy. It is argued in the paper that there is a double dimensional link between the two. The first dimension of this link is related to the rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept. The second dimension of the link between rhetoric and public diplomacy, on the other hand, indicates how rhetoric is used in public diplomacy practices to influence the publics of the other states in international politics.

Key Words: Language, Rhetoric, Persuasion, Public Diplomacy

* Arş. Gör., Gazi Üniversitesi, İİBF, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, betulozyilmaz@gazi.edu.tr

RETORİK VE KAMU DİPLOMASİSİ: ÇİFT BOYUTLU BİR BAĞIN ANALİZİ

Öz:

Sosyal bilimlerin birçok alanında söylem ve ondan üretilen anlamların belirli sosyal vasıflar taşıdıkları ve güç etkisi yarattıkları artarak kabul gören bir yaklaşım olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Temsil ve iletişim adına bir ayna ve bir araç olma fonksiyonunun ötesinde dil, çeşitli sosyal eylemleri gerçekleştirmek ve sosyal “gerçeklikler” inşa etmek ya da yeniden inşa etmek için enstrümental olarak da kullanılmaktadır. İkna etme, onaylama ve haklı çıkarma amacına yönelik kullanılan dili ifade eden retorik de aynı çifte fonksiyona sahiptir. Bu çalışmada dilin bir formu olan retorik ve kamu diplomasisi arasındaki ilişkiyi analiz etmektedir. Çalışma boyunca retorik ile kamu diplomasisi arasında çift boyutlu bir bağ olduğu savunulmaktadır. Bu bağın birinci boyutu, bir kavram olarak kamu diplomasisinin retorik analizi ile ilişkilidir. Retorik ve kamu diplomasisi arasındaki bağın ikinci boyutu ise kamu diplomasisi uygulamalarında retorikğin nasıl kullanıldığı hususuna işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil, Retorik, İkna, Kamu Diplomasisi

INTRODUCTION

It has been gaining recognition in many fields of the social sciences that discourse and meanings generated from it have particular features and create kind of power impact. Beyond its function as a mirror and instrument of representation and communication, language is used as a tool to carry out social activities and to construct or re-construct social realities (Yongtao, 2010:86). Rhetoric as the language used to persuade, confirm and justify has the same dual function. Not only is it used as an instrument in conduct of social activities, but also it constructs social realities and generates new meanings. It is for this reason that there is a need for looking beyond apparent definition of terms and revealing to what extent they are constructed. Satisfying such need requires rhetorical analysis through which words are analyzed, interpreted and evaluated to reveal their latent meanings. In order to completely make sense of surrounding realities and activities related to them, there is a further need to focus on the role of rhetoric in the conduct of these activities.

Public diplomacy literature seems to suffer from the lack of such analysis. There are various studies directly or indirectly focus on the role of rhetoric in public diplomacy practices. However, the other part of the picture, the rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept, seems to be incomplete. Studies analyzing public diplomacy from a rhetorical perspective are rare, which prevents both those conducting public diplomacy activities and those subjected to them from making sense of what is happening around them completely. As public diplomacy is an increasingly preferred instrument of foreign policy and requires considerable amounts of both material and non-material investment, it is important to comprehend the latent meanings of public diplomacy on the one hand, and the manner its practices are carried out on the other.

Departing from such awareness, this paper is concerned with the relationship between rhetoric as a form of language and public diplomacy. First, rhetoric and public diplomacy are defined briefly and the double dimensional link between them is represented. Then, public diplomacy as a concept is tried to be analyzed from a rhetorical perspective. Finally, the role rhetoric has in the conduct of public diplomacy activities is attempted to be determined.

I) RHETORIC AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: THE CONTENT OF TWO TERMS

Although they are frequently used interchangeably in an erroneous manner, 'discourse' and 'rhetoric' refer to related but different kinds of communication. Discourse basically describes the language that is used just to express something and that is constructed and interpreted in the context of the real world

(Cameron, 2001:13). Rhetoric, on the other hand, means the art of persuasion, writing and speaking effectively, or the manner applied to persuade, write and speak effectively. In this sense, rhetoric is highly associated with persuasion (Kronman, 1999:677). Hence, discourse indicates informing, stating or expressing feelings and thoughts without the intention of persuasion whereas rhetoric diverges from discourse and similar kinds of communication by the way of seeking for persuasion, confirmation and justification.

The core of rhetorical perspective is persuasion and persuasion is a process based on dialog. Nelson and Izadi (2009:341), quote from the communication professor Heath that persuasion as rhetorical dialog creates 'zones of meaning' through which institutions and their members can discuss and reach common sight about problems. In this sense, persuasion is not equal to linear impact; rather it relies on argument and counter-argument. In the light of these, it is stated, Heath defines rhetoric as the dialog of ideas and counter-ideas, meanings and counter-meanings; as the process through which mutual interests are declared, negotiated and restricted. He refers to rhetoric as 'enactment of meanings' (Nelson and Izadi, 2009:341). In line with this argument, Burke emphasizes that attempt to persuade someone means running the risk of not being able to persuade, thereby accepting freedom of collocutor to make his/her own decision (Burke, 1982:45). Meanings cannot be imposed unilaterally or just by the use of material/physical force. Rather, they are intersubjective by nature and attempt to generate common meanings through persuasion embraces collocutors playing active role in this process (Hayden, 2012:14-15).

Moving from rhetoric to public diplomacy, it is difficult to talk about an agreed upon definition of the term. For some, public diplomacy is a communication process while for some others it is an act of informing and influencing. Public diplomacy is thought to be a foreign policy instrument by some and as a hegemonic activity by others. Tuch defines public diplomacy as a process of communication through which governments explain their national goals and policies on the one hand, and thoughts, ideals and culture of their nations on the other (Tuch, 1993:3). According to Rugh, public diplomacy is informing and influencing foreign publics with the aim of serving national interests (Rugh, 2004:1). Approaching to the issue from a critical perspective, Gunaratne considers public diplomacy to be an activity serving for hegemonic interests of states and containing a significant part of global communication (Gunaratne, 2005:759). Hence, it appears that there is no consensus among public diplomacy performers, or 'public diplomats', foreign policy experts and academicians on how to define public diplomacy. This situation derives from the fact that public diplomacy as a subject of study carries an interdisciplinary character and every discipline covers the issue from its own point of view.

Additionally, excessive list of the activities that are thought to be the parts of public diplomacy makes the term ambiguous. While discussing soft power Womack asks that '*If it includes everything from Britney Spears to world opinion of the occupation of Iraq, is it a significant and coherent concept?*' (Womack, 2010:65). It is possible to ask the same question for public diplomacy: If it includes everything from lobbying to cinema, from advertisements to national brands, is public diplomacy a coherent concept?

Such a discussion of the definition of public diplomacy is a broad one that can be the subject of another study. Not to stray off the main subject of the paper this discussion is left to another study, and through the paper public diplomacy is basically taken as the activity of addressing foreign publics to inform, influence and change them in accordance with national goals and foreign policy decisions. Considering this definition, persuasion is at the core of public diplomacy as well as rhetoric (Womack, 2010:68). It is argued in this paper that there is a double dimensional link between rhetoric and public diplomacy. The first dimension of this connection is related to the rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept. The second dimension of the connection in question points out the role of rhetoric in public diplomacy as a practice aiming at influencing foreign publics and by doing so making other countries change their behavior in the context of national interest.

II) RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AS A CONCEPT

Rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept indicates the analysis of the concept to find answers to the question of to what extent public diplomacy itself is the product of a rhetorical practice, of an attempt to construct a social reality and of an initiative to create a kind of social power. Keeping in mind that all kinds of communication between people and institutions are subject to bias, rhetorical study of public diplomacy as a concept is probable to present an alternative perspective in the way of the development of the concept (Cole, 2011:151).

A) Public Diplomacy as Rhetoric in Itself

There is no doubt that the key to studying a concept from rhetorical perspective is to comprehend how the concept in question is conceptualized, which processes it went through while taking its current meaning, and political, social and economic conditions in which these processes came about. In this regard, while studying public diplomacy from rhetorical perspective, it is required to primarily analyze the process of conceptualization of public diplomacy and the dynamics that left its mark on this process.

According to Melissen, public diplomacy is old wine offered in the new bottles (Melissen, 2005:3). Neither the importance of information and communication for state power nor the significance of persuasion in the conduct of international relations nor official communication aiming at foreign publics is something new to international relations. Some activities that are currently thought to be in the scope of public diplomacy in deed are as old as diplomacy itself.

Although its practices are that far old, the early usage of public diplomacy as a phrase is stated to date back to the 19th century. Initially, in 1856 in a criticism for the President Franklin Pierce published in *London Times* it was reminded to the American statesmen that they have to set an example for their public and it was complained that such examples of public diplomacy are very rare. Here public diplomacy was thought to be 'courtesy, civilization' and setting an example for people in this sense. On the other hand, in 1871 *New York Times* used the phrase public diplomacy in news about a dispute in the Congress. In the news it was stated that one of the congressmen had condemned furiously the secret attempts for the invasion of Dominica and declared his belief in 'open diplomacy, public diplomacy'. Public diplomacy here was used as synonymous to 'open diplomacy' that sat on the top of the political agenda in the aftermath of the First World War. During and in the aftermath of the First World War public diplomacy was referred to define the diplomatic system in which treaties and their negotiation processes are within public knowledge (Cull, 2009:19-20). In short, the early uses of public diplomacy as a phrase do not correspond to public diplomacy in the sense that it is understood currently. Early uses seem to be pronounced in place of 'courtesy, civilization' or 'open diplomacy', may be spontaneously or casually.

Public diplomacy was first conceptualized in 1965 by Edmund Gullion, the President of Edward Murrow Center of Tuft University and a diplomat. The term was defined as the following:

'Public diplomacy ... deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and execution of foreign policies. It encompasses dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; the cultivation by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with those of another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as between diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the processes of inter-cultural communications' (The Edmund R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy).

Meanings do not emerge independent from the conditions of the period in which they arose. Through their restraining or enabling impact structural

conditions give way to the need for new social realities and creation of new meanings. Thus, it is appropriate to consider that the conceptualization of public diplomacy in 1965 took its source from the need for new social realities and meanings at that time.

Communicating with foreign publics during course of war was a long since known and performed practice, and it was usually in the form of psychological war. Communicating with foreign publics during peacetime, on the other hand, has been a relatively more recent idea (Roberts, 2007:37). Reaching foreign publics without borders and customs inspection as a result of the proliferation of radio, the French government's decision to establish a cultural relations unit under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1923, and the attitudes of Bolshevik and Nazi regimes played a decisive role in the adoption of the idea of communicating with foreign publics in peacetime. Furthermore, such communication has become essential in the conduct of effective foreign policy (Roberts, 2007:37-38). Especially, Nazi propaganda and communist leaders who used propaganda as a significant power instrument appeared to be the most powerful catalyst for establishing programs for foreign publics, particularly for the US administration (Bardos, 2001:426).

The US administration tried to response to the impact of such propaganda by the way of establishing scientific and cultural programs (Roberts, 2007:39). The USA established units for the purpose of influencing foreign publics during the Second World War. Although in the post-war period these units dissolved, the programs conducted by these units proceeded as 'international information programs and cultural programs' under the auspices of the US Department of State (Roberts, 2007:40-41). However, the problems erupted between the coordinators of the cultural programs and information programs overshadowed the efficiency of these programs.

The problem the phrases 'information' and 'culture' had created put the US' efforts towards foreign publics to its trump. The issue of which program would be information and which would be cultural program caused serious controversy and occupied the agenda for a long time. Certainly, the programs explaining and expressing foreign policy would be information programs, and student exchange programs would be the cultural ones. However, radios, publications, libraries and film activities had dual function. These were information activities mostly involving cultural material. As a way out of this problem, there were attempts to rationalize the difference between two program types. In this context, cultural programs were characterized as long term and culture oriented while information programs were qualified as short term and policy oriented. In addition, target group of cultural programs were thought to

be elits whereas information programs were identified to target at masses (Roberts, 2007:41).

In deed, the basis of the problem was the 'culturalists' claim that cultural and information programs were different and their demand that cultural relations should be kept apart from foreign policy (Roberts, 2007:42). They argued that information programs evoked propaganda which was attributed a negative meaning, so they wanted to be distinguished from 'informationists'. The Department of State, on the other hand, opposed to the 'culturalists' argument and expressed that both information programs and cultural programs were foreign policy instruments (Roberts, 2007:42).

As Eisenhower became the US President in 1952, the Foreign Minister John Foster Dulles wanted the information and cultural programs to be removed from the auspices of the Department of State. According to Dulles, the Department of State was just a policy unit and had no operational responsibility to conduct such kind of programs (Roberts, 2007:43). In the light of this view, the information and cultural activities were removed from the Department of State and were transferred to newly established the United States Information Agency (USIA) in 1953. Yet, the dispute between the 'culturalists' and 'informationists' continued and the 'culturalists' constantly stated that they did not want to work under the same roof with those whose task was 'propaganda'. To appease them, cultural programs remained under the auspices of the Department of State for some more time and it was in 1978 that they were reunited with information programs under the auspices of the USIA. In this manner, the USIA was rearranged in accordance with the public diplomacy terminology (Cull, 2009:21).

In brief, information activities were perceived as propaganda and had their share from the negative qualities attributed to propaganda. For this reason, a new concept was needed to construct new, soft and helpful meanings as alternative to the terms 'information' and 'propaganda'. By this way, both information activities would be distinguished from propaganda and the dispute that overshadowed the effectiveness of the USA's programs aiming at foreign publics would soften. Last but not least, those working in this field would be more respectful to their job. In such atmosphere, Gullion's 'public diplomacy' conceptualization contained the all aspects of the USIA's activities and some aspects of the cultural activities of the Department of State. Additionally, the phrase 'public diplomacy' made USIA personnel and those conducting information activities have a more respectable occupational identity. By using the word 'diplomacy', they were promoted from the simple public relation realm to one step further (Cull, 2009:21); they now became 'public diplomats'.

The USIA that was established as a political cure, a way out was closed in 1999. In its 46 year-life, it contributed significantly to transformation of the old art of information and cultural projection as a profession in the service of foreign policy to public diplomacy. In the following periods, public diplomacy has acquired the area of usage and movement beyond a single unit or single country (Cull, 2009:21); it has gained a global dimension.

It is appropriate to conclude from what has been discussed so far that public diplomacy as a concept in deed the product of an attempt to a construct social reality. The conceptualization of public diplomacy has emerged out of the effort to persuade that information is not propaganda and both information and cultural activities serve for the foreign policy interests. Considering that it re-defines the activities already in progress more decently thanks to the hygienic power of the words, public diplomacy in itself is the product of a rhetorical initiative, a process of persuasion.

B) A Rhetorical Turn in Public Diplomacy

In addition to its being a rhetorical initiative, rhetorical study of public diplomacy as a concept also requires deeper analysis of the emphasis made on public diplomacy that it is a bilateral communication process. The attempt to diverge public diplomacy from unilateral information activities serves as the basis of such emphasis.

The meaning a word will attain is determined by its difference from other words. That is to say, meaning comes into being out of the relation of differences (Yongtao, 2010:90). Correspondingly, in an attempt to make sense of public diplomacy, it is frequently spoken of what public diplomacy is not. The meaning and content of public diplomacy is tried to be determined by turning to the relation of differences, especially between public diplomacy and propaganda. In this context, in order to differentiate public diplomacy from information activities and particularly from propaganda, it is pointed out that public diplomacy listens and pays attention to the words of foreign publics as well as trying to persuade and influence them. According to this, different from the aforementioned practices, public diplomacy involves making contact with and establishing long range relations with foreign publics beyond just selling them messages (Szondi ,2009:305).

As a matter of fact, public diplomacy practices when the term was conceptualized in 1965 were unilateral and relied on passing along information to foreign publics. In time this situation culminated in a need for distinguishing traditional public diplomacy from the public diplomacy activities in later periods. Accordingly, public diplomacy of the 20th century that is identified with unilateral communication has started to be referred as traditional public

diplomacy while the so-called 21st century public diplomacy has started to be defined in terms of bilateral communication. Likewise, the main strategy of the traditional public diplomacy is thought to be persuasion whereas the strategy of the 21st century public diplomacy is stated to be building and sustaining relations and counting publics in the process (Szondi, 2009:305).

‘Public diplomats’ have become to be seen as the representatives whose task is transforming monolog type communication process targeting at foreign publics into dialog type communication embracing attention and respect to culture and traditions of others (Cole, 2011:161). This rhetorical turn in public diplomacy has assigned diplomacy experts to meet the deficit of feedback by providing information about structure of foreign cultures and traditions as well as being supporters of foreign policy (Cole, 2011:162).

The critical point is that the primary goal of public diplomacy based on bilateral communication is to better know target groups, to better understand their perceptions and the way they make sense of transmitted messages, and eventually, to determine the further political steps accordingly. That is to say, the driving force behind the attention and respect to culture and traditions of others is the desire to sell the messages to them better rather than the desire to establish a dialog with humanistic and pure feelings. In that respect, dialog-based public diplomacy, constructing and sustaining relations and counting publics in the process all refer to a rhetorical turn in public diplomacy; an attempt to construct a new reality that public diplomacy is different from informing. Furthermore, it is possible to think that this rhetorical turn involves inculcation into the ‘public diplomats’ that their job is not a hegemonic activity and into masses addressed that they are not subjected to manipulation, adversely, they are addressed as active participants. This does not mean that the idea that public diplomacy is a dialog-based communication process is wrong or a lie. On the contrary, public diplomacy practices really include listening foreign publics and counting them in the communication process. However, this process of dialog indicates a rhetorical attempt with regard to framing and representation of the issue.

Framing means *'to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communication text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described'* (Entman, 1993:52). Framing fundamentally contains selection and salience. In this context, salience refers to making particular information more noticeable, meaningful or memorable in the mind of target group (Entman, 1993:53). Framing is so significant that even little differences in framing of a policy can create huge impact on public (Jerit, 2008:1).

As it is stated previously in this paper, the primary goal of public diplomacy based on bilateral communication is to better know target groups, to better understand their perceptions and the way they make sense of transmitted messages, hence, to determine the further political steps accordingly. However, this dimension is mostly pushed into the background whereas the idea that bilateral character of public diplomacy involves listening and understanding. Both the ignored part and the stressed part of the argument are facts. Yet, listening and understanding aspect of the process is selected, is made more salient, in such a way as to promote the consideration that public diplomacy is an activity of building and sustaining relations.

III) THE ROLE OF RHETORIC IN PUBLIC DIPLOMACY PRACTICES

Persuasion and rhetorical practices constitute vital importance for public diplomacy. The communication process through which other people, their values, attitudes, feelings, beliefs and actions are tried to be influenced is automatically defined by the attempt to persuade people into something or against something (Nelson and Izadi, 2009:337-338). In this regard, it is possible to think that no other form can better depict the role of rhetoric in present day politics and diplomacy than public diplomacy (Cole, 2011:150). On the one hand, public diplomacy as a concept is the product of a rhetorical initiative; on the other hand, public diplomacy as a practice and foreign policy instrument is fed by rhetoric. Considering that an actor's attempt to make foreign publics behave parallel to its own national interest and foreign policy, it is appropriate to argue that rhetoric is the essence of public diplomacy.

The analysis of the role of rhetoric in public diplomacy as a practice requires dealing with both the rhetoric to be used in communication with foreign publics and the significance of persuading domestic public to believe the necessity of public diplomacy practices.

A) Public Diplomacy Rhetoric Addressing Foreign Publics

What is indicated by public diplomacy rhetoric addressing foreign publics is the language and manner used to influence target group and persuade them to change their attitudes in parallel with desired foreign policy outcomes. Considering this definition, rhetoric is planned and constructed. Efficiency of rhetoric addressing foreign publics has its roots in taking credibility of words, compatibility of arguments and mindset of target group into account while planning and constructing it.

Success and influence of public diplomacy activities primarily and chiefly rely on credibility. Credibility is sort of potential to persuade (Gass and Seiter, 2009:155). Governments are not alone while trying to influence foreign publics

through public diplomacy. Rather, they are in competition with other governments, publics and organizations for increasing their own credibility and weakening others'. Especially in an environment which Nye (2004:106) refers to as 'paradox of plenty', success in such competition becomes even more important.

Technological developments results in a striking decrease in the cost of processing and transmission of information. Consequently, almost an information explosion takes place and this multiplicity of information creates a paradox. According to Nye, this abundance of information causes scarcity of interest. People are puzzled by the scale of information they encounter and have difficulty in distinguishing on which they will focus. In such a context, the one credible and whose information can be distinguished from the rest of turmoil gains strength (Nye, 2004:106). In this atmosphere, not only is information evoking propaganda despised, but also it has adverse effect (Nye, 2004:106).

B) Public Diplomacy Rhetoric Addressing Domestic Public

Through the lenses of international relations, public diplomacy is a foreign policy instrument. It is problematic for political actors to take concrete steps or determine political positions without justifying their political attitudes and behaviors. Especially in democracies, it is required to explain and justify to domestic audience the political instrument and foreign policy decision chosen from the repertoire of foreign policy alternatives (Stables and Hayden, 2005:405), to gain their approval or at least to prevent them from opposing.

Sustainable policies require struggle over meanings besides force and control (Krebs and Jackson, 2007:45). While broadening their political agenda by utilizing material opportunities, political actors are required to produce a regulatory basic idea giving meaning to political decisions and to represent links between activities (Krebs and Jackson, 2007:38). If foreign policy instrument is particularly based on material power and resources, it seems vital for sustainability and effectiveness of policy to explain for which purposes these resources are invested and to persuade domestic public into the expected advantages. In this sense, it appears nearly impossible for a political settlement that is unable to persuade its own public to influence foreign publics.

To illustrate, \$ 1,3 billion in total was allocated for the direct public diplomacy activities from the US budget in 2003. This amount was about \$ 1,6 billion in 2008 (Kalm, 2010). In the same year, the public diplomacy budget of the Department of State in total was \$ 890.889 while in 2010 the desired budget was estimated to be \$ 1.253.985 (Nakamura and Weed, 2009:26). In an environment defined by ease and predictability of to where and to what extent

state resources are transferred, the American government is required to explain these huge amounts of money devoted to public diplomacy activities to its public and make them believe that these expenses will serve for the interests of the country.

As another instance, in Turkey the Public Diplomacy Coordination Agency within the Prime Ministry was established according to the 2010/3 numbered Circular of Prime Ministry in 2010. With respect to the Circular, all public institutions and organizations are obliged to assist to the Public Diplomacy Coordination Agency in its activities with their personnel, financial resources, foreign organizations and technical and scientific capacities (T.C. Başbakanlık Kamu Diplomasisi Koordinatörlüğü, 2010). Putting all public institutions and organizations in charge of assisting to the Agency with their human and financial resources brings about the necessity to explain the logic of such decision to the personnel of these institutions and organizations. These personnel are supposed to be persuaded that public diplomacy will serve for the national interest, the investments made will bring enormous advantages and this responsibility is not a burden. Unless this is the case, it seems unrealistic to expect them to actively take part in public diplomacy activities when needed.

Shortly, although public diplomacy as a foreign policy instrument addresses and targets at influencing foreign publics, it is difficult to carrying on public diplomacy activities effectively without the knowledge and consent of domestic public. In this regard, public diplomacy embodies a persuasion process directed at domestic public. To put it another way, public diplomacy practices have to involve rhetorical practices as well. Public diplomacy rhetoric directed at domestic audience must be able to build a substantial relationship or dependency between public diplomacy activities and national interest and put forward this relationship or dependency properly and effectively, without deviating from reality.

Credibility is damaged when words and deeds do not match and when messages directed at different target groups seems contrary to each other (Gregory, 2006:5-6). Different target groups here can be both domestic public and foreign publics. In this sense, messages addressing domestic public must be consistent with the ones addressing foreign publics on the one hand, and messages addressing different foreign publics must be consistent with each other on the other hand. The content of information provided domestic public is gotten by foreign publics as well. Likewise, flow of information directed towards foreign publics is accessible to domestic audience (Wolf and Rosen, 2004:4). It should not be forgotten that deeds must support words and that same words can be successful in communication with domestic audience while they can have negative impact on foreign publics (Nye, 2008:104), or vice versa.

Considering these together, for effectiveness of public diplomacy activities, rhetoric should always rely on reality, involve consistency and be parallel to or supported by deeds.

As to compatibility of arguments, it is closely related to the issue of credibility. As it is previously mentioned one component of credibility in public diplomacy is correspondence of words and deeds. In order to manage such correspondence, arguments and rhetorical acts confessed must be parallel to available material resources. So to speak, constructed rhetoric must be composed of cautious arguments made by taking constraining impact of material resources into account. Speaking compatible with what is currently being done is important as well as doing what is said. It is unrealistic to expecting effectiveness from public diplomacy rhetoric that is contrary to the foreign policy or military activities of the country (Melissen, 2005:7).

In addition to credibility and compatibility of arguments, understanding mindset of target groups is essential for effective rhetoric. Messages transmitted to a foreign public, rhetoric used to change them in favor of desired foreign policy outcomes and national interest are filtered by their political views, perceptions, growing conditions, education level, even thoughts of their families. Formation of such detection filter and mindset is the product of political socialization. Political socialization is development of views, behaviors, attitudes and values about political system as a result of life-long direct and indirect interaction between individual and social environment (Alkan and Ergil, 1980:7). In the process of political socialization various factors can be influential in different conditions and different dimensions. Primary and secondary groups like family, circle of friends and school; environmental factors such as social classes, social events, mass media and language; and personal factors including intelligence and gender (Alkan and Ergil, 1980:113) play key roles in political socialization. In accordance with their political socialization experience, individuals or groups perceive messages that are not contradictory to their value judgment. They either do not perceive or ignore contradictory messages. That is to say, success of persuasion attempt depends on values and beliefs of target group (Burke, 1982:45-46). It is for this reason that message transmitted in public diplomacy rhetoric must correspond to the common interpretation frames of the target group. General feeling of confidence based on common goals and mutual respect is the key to strong and substantial relations with target group. Therefore, persuasive diplomacy is a matter of determining and generating common meanings in the frame of mutual respect (Womack, 2010:68).

CONCLUSION

Persuasion as the core of rhetoric is the core of diplomacy at the same time. In this sense, there seems to be a double dimensional link between rhetoric and public diplomacy. The first dimension of this link is related to the idea that public diplomacy as a concept is the outcome of a rhetorical practice and an attempt of constructing a social reality. The second dimension, on the other hand, refers to public diplomacy as a practice aiming at influencing citizens of other states and changing their behavior in parallel with foreign policy goals and national interest. Thus, the analysis of the relationship between rhetoric and public diplomacy has two dimensions as well: rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept and the role of rhetoric in public diplomacy practices.

Rhetorical study of public diplomacy as a concept show that with regard to its conceptualization process public diplomacy is the outcome of a rhetorical initiative. In addition this, it is concluded out of the rhetorical analysis of public diplomacy as a concept that the emphasis on the dialog-based character of the so-called 21th century public diplomacy different from the traditional public diplomacy indicates a rhetorical shift in public diplomacy.

Besides being the product of a rhetorical attempt, public diplomacy as a foreign policy instrument is fed by rhetoric. One part of the discussion on the role of rhetoric in public diplomacy practices is related to the public diplomacy rhetoric addressing foreign publics while the other part is concerned with the requirement of persuading domestic public into the necessity of public diplomacy investments. For this reason, while rhetoric is planned and constructed, credibility, compatibility of arguments and mindset of target group must be taking into account.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALKAN, T., ERGİL, D. (1980), *Siyaset Psikolojisi: Siyasal Toplumsallaşma ve Yabancılaşma*, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara.
- BARDOS, A. (2001), " 'Public Diplomacy': Old Art, New Profession", *Virginia Quarterly Review*, Spring, pp. 424–437.
- BURKE, R. J. (1982), "Politics as Rhetoric", *Ethics*, 93 (1), pp.45-55.
- CAMERON, D. (2001), *Working with Spoken Discourse*, SAGE, London; California; New Delhi.
- COLE, R. E. (2011), "Foreign Public Diplomacy Policy: the Rhetorical Turn", *Grove City College Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 2 (2), pp. 149-163.
- CULL, N. J. (2009), " Public Diplomacy Before Gullion: the Evolution of a Phrase", *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, , pp. 19–23.
- ENTMAN, R. M. (1993), "Framing: Towards Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm", *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4), pp. 51-58.

- GASS, R. H., SEITER, J. S. (2009), "Credibility and Public Diplomacy", *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy* (Ed.), N. Snow, P. M. Taylor, Taylor & Francis, New York, pp.154-165.
- GREGORY, B. (2006), " Discourse Norms in Public Diplomacy: Necessary and Artificial Fault Lines", George Washington University, https://www.gwu.edu/~smpa/faculty/documents/AEJMC_001.pdf (12.10.2012).
- GUNARATNE, S. A. (2005), " Public Diplomacy, Global Communication and World Order: An Analysis Based on Theory of Living Systems", *Current Sociology*, 53 (5), pp. 749-772.
- HAYDEN, C. (2012), *The Rhetoric of Soft Power: Public Diplomacy in Global Contexts*. Lexington Books, Maryland.
- JERIT, J. (2008), "Issue Framing and Engagement: Rhetorical Strategy in Public Policy Debates", *Political Behaviour*, 30, pp.1-24.
- KALIN, İ. (2010), "Türk Dış Politikası ve Kamu Diplomasisi", T.C. Başbakanlık Kamu Diplomasisi Koordinatörlüğü <http://www.kdk.gov.tr/sag/turk-dis-politikasi-ve-kamu-diplomasisi/20> (12.10.2012).
- KRONMAN, A. D. (1999), "The Art of Rhetoric", *University of Cincinnati Law Review*, 67, pp. 677-709.
- MELISSEN, J. (2005), "The New Public Policy: Between Theory and Practice", *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, (Ed.) J.Melissen, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp.3-27.
- NAKAMURA, K. H., WEED, M. C. (2009), "U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and Current Issues", Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40989.pdf> (11.10.2012).
- NELSON, R., IZADI, F. (2009). "Ethics and Social Issues in Public Diplomacy", *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, (Ed.) N. Snow, P. M. Taylor, Taylor & Francis, New York, pp. 334-351.
- NYE, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs, New York:
- NYE, J. S. (2008), "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, pp.94-109.
- ROBERTS, W. R. (2007), "What is Public Diplomacy? Past Practices, Present Conduct, Possible Future", *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 18 (4), pp.36-52.
- RUGH, W., A. (2004), " Introduction", *Engaging the Arabs and Islamic Worlds Through Public Diplomacy: A Report and Action Recommendations*, (Ed.) W. Rugh, The Public Diplomacy Council, Washington, pp.1-3.
- SZONDI, G. (2009), "Central and Eastern European Public Diplomacy", *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, (Ed.) N. Snow, P. M. Taylor, Routledge, New York, pp. 292-313.
- T.C. BAŞBAKANLIK KAMU DİPLOMASİSİ KOORDİNATÖRLÜĞÜ. (2010), "Kamu Diplomasisi Koordinatörlüğü Genelgesi", <http://kdk.gov.tr/kurumsal/kdk-genelgesi/5> (8.11.2012).

- TUCH, H. N. (1993), *Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, St Martin's Press, New York.
- WOLF, C., ROSEN, B. (2004), *Public Diplomacy: How to Think About and Improve It*. RAND Cooperation.
- WOMACK, B. (2010), *China Among Unequals: Asymmetric Foreign Relationships in Asia*, World Scientific Publishing, Singapore.
- YONGTAO, L. (2010), "Discourse, Meaning and IR Studies: Taking the Rhetoric of Axis of Evil as a Case", *CONfines*, 6 (11), pp.85-107.