Soft Power and Public Diplomacy: New Frontiers in Foreign Policy and Global Engagement

[1]**Bariledum Kia,**

[2]**Shammah Mahakwe Anyalebechi, &**

[3]**Ubokulom J. Banigo**

[1]*Department of History and International Diplomacy,*
[2&3]*Department of Political Science Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwu, Port Harcourt.*

Keywords:
Soft Power, Public Diplomacy, National Interest, Foreign policy

Abstract

In the contemporary global landscape, Soft Power and Public Diplomacy have emerged as critical instrument used by nations to enhance their global engagement to achieve their foreign policy objectives. This paper explores the concept of soft power and public diplomacy. The study further examines their application in foreign policy implementation. The paper used descriptive research method and obtained data from secondary sources through review of existing literature on the emerging trends in soft power and public diplomacy. The paper used Social Exchange theory as its framework of analysis. This theory provides how countries engage in reciprocal exchanges of benefits and costs to achieve their goals. From the analysis of data gathered, the study results show that soft power and public diplomacy promote national interests and enhance global engagement. China uses soft power to promote its Belt and Road Initiative, United States use public diplomacy to promote its values of democracy India and Brazil use soft power to promote its cultural heritage and identity. Nigeria used soft power to enhanced its regional influence. Based on the study findings, the study recommends among others that African States should leverage soft power and public diplomacy to achieve their foreign Policy goals.

Corresponding Author:
Bariledum Kia

Background to the Study

In the current global context, soft power and public diplomacy have become increasingly significant as countries navigate the complexities of international relations and seek to achieve their objectives not just through economic and military strength but also by winning hearts and minds. The effectiveness of soft power and public diplomacy hinges on credibility and the ability to maintain a positive image; hence, it requires consistent and strategic cultivation of cultural and ideological exports. As the world becomes more interconnected and the international arena more competitive, the soft power and public diplomacy of nations serves as a critical tool in shaping global dynamics, fostering international cooperation, and advancing national interests in a manner that is both subtle and profound (Nye, 2008).

Diplomacy, at its core, represents the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of states or groups, acting as a fundamental instrument for maintaining international order and security. This intricate process involves a series of strategic communications and engagements aimed at fostering peaceful relations and addressing global challenges through dialogue and consensus-building. The multifaceted nature of diplomacy allows it to adapt to the changing dynamics of international relations, reflecting the diverse interests and cultures of the global community. In this context, diplomacy serves not only as a mechanism for preventing conflicts but also as a platform for promoting international cooperation on a wide array of issues ranging from environmental protection to global health and economic development. The effectiveness of diplomacy lies in its ability to bring together various stakeholders, including nations, international organizations, and civil society, to work towards common goals and solutions that respect the interests and sovereignty of all parties involved.

This modern approach has expanded the reach of diplomatic initiatives, allowing for real-time communication and fostering a greater understanding among peoples across borders. Additionally, diplomacy today encompasses not just the resolution of disputes but also the building of long-term partnerships and collaborations that address the root causes of conflict and underdevelopment. Through initiatives such as cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy, states strive to build mutual respect and understanding, laying the groundwork for enduring peace and cooperation. In this ever-connected world, the role of diplomacy in bridging divides and building a more cooperative international system has never been more critical, highlighting its continued relevance in promoting global peace and prosperity (Cooper, Heine, & Thakur, 2013).

In the contemporary global landscape, diplomacy has evolved to include not just traditional state actors but also non-state actors, reflecting the growing complexity of international relations. This expansion has introduced new forms of diplomacy, such as public and cultural diplomacy, which seek to engage directly with foreign publics and promote cultural understanding. Despite these changes, the essence of diplomacy remains the art of navigating international relations with tact, discretion, and strategic foresight, underscoring its enduring significance in fostering peace and cooperation on the global stage. State and global diplomacy embody the strategic interactions and negotiations between sovereign states and global actors

to navigate the complexities of international relations and address challenges that transcend national borders. This facet of diplomacy underscores the interconnectedness of the global community, where the actions of one state can have far-reaching implications on the international stage. Through state diplomacy, countries seek to advance their national interests, secure peace, and foster bilateral or multilateral relationships through direct communication and formal agreements. Global diplomacy, on the other hand, extends beyond the confines of state-to-state interactions, encompassing efforts by international organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and transnational entities to address global issues such as climate change, human rights, and international security.

The synergy between state and global diplomacy is crucial for creating cohesive international policies and frameworks that reflect the collective interests and responsibilities of the global community (Bjola & Kornprobst, 2018). The dynamic landscape of state and global diplomacy is marked by the increasing significance of soft power, digital diplomacy, and public diplomacy in shaping international perceptions and relations. States leverage cultural diplomacy, exchange programs, and digital platforms to influence global audiences and build cultural and ideological affinities that complement traditional diplomatic efforts. Similarly, global diplomacy thrives on the collaboration between states and international actors to formulate solutions that no single country can achieve alone. The United Nations, for example, serves as a central platform for global diplomacy, facilitating dialogue and cooperation on issues affecting humanity as a whole. This evolution reflects a shift towards a more inclusive and participatory approach to diplomacy, where multiple voices contribute to constructing a more stable and equitable international order (Hocking & Melissen, 2015). Against this background, the study examined the growing trend in the use of soft power and public diplomacy in achieving foreign objectives of states with focus on China, United States of America, and Nigeria among others.

Method of Study
The study employed a qualitative research design, a methodology chosen for its strength in providing in-depth insights into complex phenomena, which in this case is the influence of soft power and public diplomacy on international relations. This design was pivotal in enabling the researcher to delve into the nuances and intricacies of how nation states leverage its soft power and public diplomacy to affect and shape global diplomatic relations. By adopting a qualitative approach, the study was uniquely positioned to explore the multifaceted ways in which China, United States and Brazil projects its soft power abroad

The study obtained data from primary and secondary data, including academic journals, government reports, news articles, and books, providing a comprehensive view of strategic use of soft power and public diplomacy and its implications for global diplomacy. The qualitative design enabled the researcher to interpret the data within the broader context of international relations and the shifting dynamics of global power structures, thereby offering a detailed exploration of the soft power concept and its practical application by the study on the world stage. The study is divided into three sections in order to achieve the enduring significance of the paper. The first section is the introduction above. The second section deals

with conceptual clarifications and theoretical framework and the last section with focus on the discussion of findings.

Theoretical Framework
The study employed used Social Exchange theory as the framework of analysis. This theory was developed by several researchers and theorists in the field of Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology such as George Homans (1910- 1989), Peter Blau (1918-2002), Emerson (1939 and cook and Emerson (1978) among others. This theory explains how nation or people form and maintain relationships by exchanging resources, such as emotional support, information, and materials goods. The theory posits that nations or individuals engage in social interactions because they expect to receive benefits or rewards in return. The adoption of this theoretical frame was informed by the advantages associated with it application. The theory provides a useful frame work for understanding the dynamics of soft power and public diplomacy. Through the theory, the study gains insights into how nations and governments build relations, exchange resources, and weigh costs and benefits in their efforts to achieve their goals. While Social Exchange Theory has its limitations, it remains a valuable tool for analysing the complex interactions involved in soft power and public diplomacy.

Conceptual Clarifications
Soft Power
Soft power, a term coined by Joseph Nye in the late 20th century, encapsulates the ability of a nation or entity to shape the preferences and behaviours of others not through coercion or tangible payments, but through the attractive pull of its culture, political values, and foreign policies. Unlike hard power, which compels actions through military might or economic sanctions, soft power co-opts rather than coerces, offering a subtler form of influence that has become increasingly relevant in today's interconnected global landscape. This concept highlights the importance of attraction and persuasion in international relations, suggesting that the resources that produce soft power, such as cultural exports and diplomatic efforts, can be crucial tools for achieving national objectives on the world stage.

Nye (2004), introduces a transformative perspective on the nature of power within the international political arena through the concept of "soft power", which he defines as the capacity to influence others' preferences and behaviors through attraction and persuasion, rather than coercion or monetary incentives. This form of power emanates from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies, marking a shift from traditional, hard power strategies that rely on military and economic might. Nye's framework posits that the ability to shape the preferences of others through cultural appeal and ideological compatibility provides a subtler, yet profoundly impactful, means of exerting global influence. By embedding soft power within the cultural, political, and policy outputs of a state, Nye argues for a nuanced understanding of influence, one that underscores the importance of the values and norms exported by a country in determining its international standing and effectiveness in achieving its foreign policy objectives.

Parmar (2010) extends the discourse on soft power by emphasizing the structural and ideational underpinnings that facilitate its operation. According to Parmar, the generation of soft power transcends mere cultural exportation, involving the strategic utilization of elite networks, educational institutions, and the dissemination of a nation's ideology. This perspective highlights the institutional mechanisms that countries employ to cultivate a favorable international image and influence global norms and values. Parmar's analysis suggests that soft power is not merely a passive consequence of cultural attractiveness but a strategic asset cultivated through long-term investment in ideational and cultural resources. The emphasis on the role of institutions in propagating soft power points to a broader strategy of international engagement, one that involves the deliberate shaping of global intellectual landscapes and the fostering of international partnerships that reflect and reinforce a nation's soft power assets.

Melissen (2005) focuses on the relational dimensions of soft power, arguing that the essence of this form of influence lies in a country's ability to connect with global audiences through effective public diplomacy and cultural initiatives. By leveraging communication strategies, international broadcasting, and cultural exchanges, states can enhance their soft power by building positive perceptions and establishing emotional and intellectual ties with people around the world. Meissen's approach underscores the importance of active engagement and dialogue in the exercise of soft power, suggesting that the ability to appeal to and resonate with international publics is a critical component of a country's global influence. This perspective highlights the dynamic and interactive nature of soft power, emphasizing the role of communication and cultural diplomacy in crafting a national image that attracts and persuades on the global stage.

Hayden (2012) investigates the nature of soft power through the prism of media and international communication, presenting a thesis that the extensive reach and ready availability of a nation's cultural and information output serve to significantly bolster its soft power. This perspective highlights the transformative role of digital media and technological advancements in magnifying a nation's cultural allure and the narratives it opts to disseminate globally. Hayden posits that in the digital age, the efficacy of soft power is closely linked to a nation's ability to effectively harness and deploy its cultural and informational resources across the global digital landscape. The implication here is that soft power is not merely a function of the content itself but also of the strategic use of digital platforms to engage, influence, and shape international perceptions and attitudes, thereby extending a nation's influence well beyond its borders.

Wang (2011) offers a comprehensive examination of soft power from the vantage point of global governance, arguing that a nation's capacity to make positive contributions to global challenges and adhere to international norms significantly amplifies its soft power. This conceptualization of soft power is broad, encompassing moral leadership and collaborative efforts on global issues as integral components. Wang underscores the importance of a country's international conduct and its ability to act as a moral and cooperative leader in the global arena. The emphasis here is on the persuasive power of ethical leadership and proactive

engagement in global governance as means to enhance a nation's appeal and credibility on the world stage. This approach suggests that the foundations of soft power lie not only in cultural or informational outputs but also in tangible contributions to the global community and the adherence to principles that resonate universally.

Wiseman (2015), articulates a vision of soft power that includes the instruments of diplomacy and global cultural influence that a state can employ to shape international outcomes favorably without resorting to coercion. In this framework, the emphasis is placed on the role of diplomatic practices, adherence to international norms, and cultural appeal in the construction of a state's soft power. Wiseman highlights the critical importance of international institutions and governance frameworks as arenas for the exercise of soft power, suggesting that states can exert influence more effectively through example and persuasion rather than force. This perspective reinforces the idea that soft power is a multi-faceted concept, rooted not only in the ability to attract and co-opt through cultural and informational means but also through the strategic use of diplomacy, engagement in international norms, and leadership in global governance to achieve international influence and outcomes.

Jentleson (2010), introduces the concept of "smart power" as a sophisticated strategy that harmonizes the strengths of both soft and hard power within the realm of international relations. He explicates soft power as a critical component of this amalgamated approach, emphasizing its foundation on the allure and persuasive capacity of a nation's cultural resources, diplomatic initiatives, and the narratives it propagates globally. For Jentleson, the quintessence of soft power resides in its ability to subtly influence the international arena through attraction rather than coercion, suggesting that its potency is significantly augmented when employed in conjunction with the more direct measures of hard power. This synthesis, according to Jentleson, furnishes a more adaptable and effective methodology for navigating the complex web of global politics, highlighting the strategic advantage of blending persuasive cultural and ideological appeals with the tangible assertiveness of military and economic might.

Slaughter (2009) researches into the nuanced mechanics of soft power in the contemporary digital era, positing that its essence lies in the intricate network of global relationships and the seamless exchange of ideas, information, and cultural values. She champions the notion that soft power extends beyond mere governmental action, permeating the digital sphere through social media, international partnerships, and the activities of non-state actors. This perspective foregrounds the pivotal role of connectivity and the dynamic interplay of global civil society in amplifying a country's influence. By focusing on the collaborative and ideational aspects of international engagement, Slaughter elucidates how soft power is intricately woven into the fabric of global diplomacy, underscoring the significance of a nation's ability to foster and leverage these transnational networks and connections as a means of cultivating influence and advancing its interests on the world stage.

Nye (2008), further refining his seminal concept of soft power, underscores the importance of credibility and moral authority as central pillars of a nation's ability to exert influence without

resorting to force. He argues that the efficacy of soft power is inherently tied to the global perception of a nation's integrity and its adherence to universal norms and values. Nye's analysis suggests that the true measure of soft power is not merely in the attractiveness of a country's culture or the appeal of its political ideals, but in the international community's recognition of its genuine commitment to ethical conduct and the collective good. This enhanced understanding of soft power highlights the critical role of perceived legitimacy and moral leadership in shaping the preferences and actions of other states, thereby offering a more nuanced and ethically grounded framework for assessing a nation's influence in the international domain.

Van Ham (2012) explores the transformative impact of the digital revolution on the concept of soft power within the political domain, offering a nuanced understanding that integrates digital diplomacy and cyber influence as core components. He posits that in the age of information technology, soft power extends beyond traditional cultural and diplomatic endeavors to encompass the strategic use of digital platforms, social media, and online content creation. This approach to soft power underscores the importance of engaging international audiences through digital channels, where narratives and ideologies are contested and spread across global networks. Van Ham's definition emphasizes the capability of states to leverage digital technology not only to disseminate their cultural and political values but also to influence public opinion and international relations in a more direct and immediate manner. In this context, soft power is seen as a dynamic and adaptive force, capable of shaping global perceptions and attitudes through the adept manipulation of digital communications and media. The expansion of soft power into the digital realm reflects a broadening of the means through which countries can assert their influence on the international stage, highlighting the critical role of information and communication technologies in contemporary global politics.

Public Diplomacy

This is any of various government-sponsored efforts aimed at communicating directly with foreign publics. It includes all official efforts to convince targeted sectors of foreign opinion to support or tolerate a government's strategic objectives. Methods include statements by decision makers, purposeful campaigns conducted by government organizations dedicated to public diplomacy, and efforts to persuade international media to portray official policies favourably to foreign audiences. There are two basic kinds of public diplomacy. The first is branding, or cultural communication, in which the government tries to improve its image without seeking support for any immediate policy objective. States use branding strategies to foster a better image of themselves in the world. Ideally, branding creates general goodwill and facilitates cooperation across a variety of issues. It also helps to maintain long-term alliance relationships and undermine enemy propaganda.

The second type of public diplomacy includes various strategies designed to facilitate more rapid results—a category sometimes called political advocacy. Whereas branding is meant to affect long-term perceptions, political advocacy campaigns use public diplomacy to build foreign support for immediate policy objectives. Foreign publics may be encouraged to

support or oppose the leaders of other states. Sometimes states need to quickly convince foreign audiences to support costly military alliance strategies. Foreign leaders may want to cooperate with alliance plans but fear domestic reprisal for agreeing to unpopular actions. Under these conditions, public diplomacy may help those leaders cooperate by reducing the threat of backlash at home.

From the above clarifications, it is obvious that both concepts are tools in modern diplomacy, deployed by actors, especially state actors to achieving desire objectives. As explained by Nye (2008). Public diplomacy is a key instrument of soft power, use to promote a country's soft power by showcasing its cultural, idea logical institutional attributes, and by engaging with foreign publics to shape their preferences and opinions. In other words, public diplomacy is a means of exercising soft power, as it allows countries to influence others through attraction and persuasion, rather than coercion and achieve their goals in international relations.

Foreign Policy.
Different scholars have, over the years, offered different definitions of the concept; each focusing on different aspects of foreign policy's constitutive processes, some more pessimistic than others. Ota and Ecoma (2015) offer one such pessimistic understanding of foreign policy as 'a coordinated and articulated strategy' through which a state's decision makers intend to 'manipulate the international environment' so as to achieve their foreign policy objectives. Such an understanding stands in contrast with more neutral definitions of foreign policy such as that offered by Oni and Taiwo who define foreign policy as 'a body of decisions formulated to serve as the guiding principles of a nation-state in its interaction with other nation-states.' (Oni & Taiwo, 2016). One of the foremost authorities on foreign policy, James Rosenau, defined foreign policy as 'adaptive behaviour' and the nation as an 'adaptive organism'. (Rosenau, 1969).

Despite their differences, the three definitions of foreign policy offered above, when taken together, highlight four salient elements of foreign policy: it is a coordinated activity, it is externally oriented in that it is directed towards the international environment, it aims to achieve certain objectives of the constitutive state, and it is adaptive. These four elements lead to a comprehensive definition of the foreign policy of a state as its externally oriented activities aimed at the attainment of certain foreign policy goals vis-à-vis other states in the international system of states that are adapted to fit changing realities. Such an understanding of foreign policy is hardly definitive because, as has been pointed out by Holsti (1970), Foreign Policy behaviour is a 'patterned or recurring decisions' by state governments. (Keohane, 1986).

Discussion of Findings
Regardless, the study of foreign policy, under the auspices of the sub-field, Foreign Policy Analysis" (FPA), has become increasingly important in the field of International Relations in recent years, least of all because foreign policy (with its focus on relations between states) is concerned with issues so important that they have implications for mankind as a whole. (Wivel, 2019). The importance of the foreign policies of states, is that state policies towards

other states play a deterministic role for the stability of the international system, and welfare of the citizens of the affected states (Hudson, 2005). It is this direction that the use of soft power and public diplomacy as a new trend, is analyzed. Using these as foreign policy tools, the study identified the following countries that engage in global interaction with soft power and public diplomacy. Here are some logical examples of countries that have used soft power and public diplomacy to achieve their goals in international relations:

United States

The United States has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote democracy and human rights around the world. For example:

i. The US has funded democracy promotion programs in countries like Egypt, Tunisia, and Libya.

ii. The US has used public diplomacy to promote human rights, particularly through the State Department's annual Human Rights Report.

iii. The US has also used cultural diplomacy to promote American values, such as through the Fulbright Program, which sends American scholars and students to study abroad.

iv. During the Cold War, for example, the United States used public diplomacy to persuade European audiences that the foundations of democratic government and capitalist enterprise were superior to Soviet alternatives. The Voice of America broadcast directly into the Warsaw Pact nations of eastern Europe to dispel myths about the West. At the same time, the U.S. State Department built and maintained reading rooms in Allied countries, replete with books about American history and culture. The department hoped that exposure to American principles and ideas would reinforce broad support for U.S. policies.

v. Public diplomacy in the form of political advocacy is illustrated by Kuwait's efforts in 1990 to gain U.S. popular support for an attack against Iraq. In late 1990, Kuwait hired an American public relations firm to convince U.S. voters that liberation from the dictator Saddam Hussein was worthwhile and morally correct. Americans had mixed feelings about intervention, and most voters knew little about Kuwait. U.S. Pres. George H.W. Bush worried that he lacked the public mandate to act firmly against Iraq. Kuwait therefore undertook a carefully orchestrated political advocacy campaign to demonstrate the scope of Saddam's cruelty and gain American sympathy.

vi. In other cases, states use public diplomacy to discredit adversaries. Countries tacitly or explicitly urge foreign publics to oppose leaders who do not share the sender's strategic interests. This strategy has two goals. First, it attempts to encourage cooperation by pressuring recalcitrant foreign leaders who rely on popular support. Second, when prospects for a change in policy are minimal, it encourages foreign audiences to revolt against their leaders. Neither strategy has a long history of success, probably because public diplomacy campaigns are often received with skepticism. In addition, leaders who are the targets of such campaigns can limit and distort outside information before it reaches the public. (Rugh, 2017).

China

China has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), a massive infrastructure development project that aims to connect China with other parts of Asia, Europe, and Africa. For example:

i. China has used public diplomacy to promote the BRI, through events like the Belt and Road Forum.

ii. China has also used cultural diplomacy to promote Chinese culture, such as through the establishment of Confucius Institutes around the world.

iii. China has funded infrastructure development projects in countries along the BRI route, which has helped to build goodwill and promote Chinese influence. (Bush, 2021).

Japan

Japan has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote Japanese culture and technology around the world. For example:

i. Japan has used public diplomacy to promote Japanese culture, such as through the Japan Foundation, which promotes Japanese arts and culture abroad.

ii. Japan has also used cultural diplomacy to promote Japanese technology, such as through the establishment of Japanese technology centers and innovation hubs around the world.

iii. Japan has funded development projects in countries like Indonesia and the Philippines, which has helped to build goodwill and promote Japanese influence. (Otmazgin, 2012).

India

India has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote Indian culture and influence around the world. For example:

i. India has used public diplomacy to promote Indian culture, such as through the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, which promotes Indian arts and culture abroad.

ii. India has also used cultural diplomacy to promote Indian yoga and wellness, such as through the establishment of yoga centers and wellness retreats around the world.

iii. India has funded development projects in countries like Nepal and Bhutan, which has helped to build goodwill and promote Indian influence. (Mahapatra, 2016).

South Korea

South Korea has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote Korean pop culture (K-Pop) around the world. For example:

i. South Korea has used public diplomacy to promote K-Pop, such as through the Korean Wave (Hallyu) initiative.

ii. South Korea has also used cultural diplomacy to promote K-Pop, such as through the establishment of K-Pop centers and festivals around the world.

iii. South Korea has funded cultural exchange programs, which has helped to build goodwill and promote Korean influence. (Kim, 2016).

South Africa

South Africa has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote the concept of African Renaissance, which aims to revitalize and reposition Africa as a major player in global affairs. For example:

i.   South Africa has hosted several international conferences and summits, such as the African Union Summit, to promote African unity and cooperation.

ii. South Africa has used public diplomacy to promote African culture, such as through the African Cultural Festival.

iii. South Africa has also established several cultural exchange programs with other African countries to promote people-to-people exchanges and cooperation. (Madise & Isike, 2020).

Nigeria

Nigeria has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote economic development and attract foreign investment. For example:

i.   Nigeria has established several economic diplomacy initiatives, such as the Nigerian Investment Promotion Commission, to promote Nigerian business and investment opportunities abroad.

ii. Nigeria has used public diplomacy to promote Nigerian culture, such as through the Nigerian Cultural Festival.

iii. Nigeria has also established several cultural exchange programs with other African countries to promote people-to-people exchanges and cooperation. (Idowu & Igunnubi, 2018).

Ethiopia

Ethiopia has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote African integration and cooperation. For example:

i.   Ethiopia has hosted several international conferences and summits, such as the African Union Summit, to promote African unity and cooperation.

ii. Ethiopia has used public diplomacy to promote African culture, such as through the Ethiopian Cultural Festival.

iii. Ethiopia has also established several cultural exchange programs with other African countries to promote people-to-people exchanges and cooperation. (Hassen, 2023).

Ghana

Ghana has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote Pan-Africanism and African unity. For example:

i.   Ghana has hosted several international conferences and summits, such as the African Union Summit, to promote African unity and cooperation.

ii. Ghana has used public diplomacy to promote African culture, such as through the Ghanaian Cultural Festival.

iii. Ghana has also established several cultural exchange programs with other African countries to promote people-to-people exchanges and cooperation. (Amoah-Darkwah, & Kipo-Sunyehzi, 2023).

Morocco

Morocco has used soft power and public diplomacy to promote economic cooperation and attract foreign investment. For example:

i. Morocco has established several economic diplomacy initiatives, such as the Moroccan Investment Development Agency, to promote Moroccan business and investment opportunities abroad.

ii. Morocco has used public diplomacy to promote Moroccan culture, such as through the Moroccan Cultural Festival.

iii. Morocco has also established several cultural exchange programs with other African countries to promote people-to-people exchanges and cooperation. (Wüst, & Nicolai, 2023).

Brazil

Brazil has used its vibrant cultural heritage, particularly music and dance, to promote its soft power and attract foreign audiences. For example:

i. Samba and bossa nova music have become iconic symbols of Brazilian culture, with many international artists incorporating these styles into their work.

ii. Brazilian dance, such as capoeira and forró, has gained popularity worldwide, with many schools and cultural centers teaching these styles.

i. Brazil has provided technical assistance and training to farmers in countries like Mozambique and Ghana, helping to increase their agricultural productivity and exports.

ii. Brazil has also invested in agricultural research and development, partnering with international organizations like the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to promote sustainable agriculture practices.

i. The Brazilian Government has established several Brazilian studies centers at universities in the United States, Europe, and Asia.

ii. These centers offer courses, research opportunities, and cultural events that promote Brazilian culture and foster exchange between Brazilian and international students.

i. Brazilian soap operas, known as telenovelas, have gained immense popularity worldwide, with many countries broadcasting dubbed or subtitled versions.

ii. Brazilian films, such as "City of God" and "The Elite Squad," have received international critical acclaim and have helped to promote Brazilian culture and values.

Brazil has used its membership in international organizations like BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) to promote regional integration and cooperation. For example:

i. Brazil has worked closely with other BRICS countries to promote economic cooperation, infrastructure development, and social welfare programs.

ii. Brazil has also played a key role in regional integration initiatives, such as the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) and the Mercosur trading bloc. (Straubhaar, 2020).

While traditional diplomacy revolves around negotiations and agreements, soft power, as described by Joseph Nye Jr., operates on a different plane, leveraging attraction and persuasion instead of coercion. It serves as a vital complement to traditional diplomacy, acting as a potent tool for achieving economic goals on the international stage. The key mechanisms through which soft power fuels economic development include:

Cultivation of a positive national image stands at the heart of soft power's economic impact. Through cultural exchange programs, educational initiatives, and humanitarian aid efforts, nations can foster trust and goodwill among international audiences. This positive perception translates into increased attractiveness for trade and investment. Consider South Korea's "Korean Wave" phenomenon, where the global popularity of K-pop and K-dramas has spurred tourism and boosted demand for Korean products, contributing significantly to their economic growth. (Wang, 2011). This demonstrates how soft power cultivates a favorable image, drawing international attention and economic opportunities.

Diplomacy extends beyond bilateral interactions, encompassing participation in international forums and institutions. By actively engaging in these platforms and promoting shared values, nations can influence the norms and agendas that shape global trade and economic cooperation. For example, the European Union's emphasis on environmental sustainability through soft power diplomacy has influenced global standards and trade regulations, creating new markets for European green technologies. (Tkah & Tkah, 2018). This highlight how soft power can shape the international economic landscape, opening doors for specific industries and sectors within a nation.

Soft power doesn't just build bridges with individual nations; it cultivates valuable partnerships and alliances. Collaborative research, joint ventures, and knowledge exchange facilitated by strong diplomatic relationships built on soft power initiatives can significantly contribute to economic development. Take India's "Look East" policy, which emphasizes cultural and economic engagement with Southeast Asian nations. This soft power approach has led to increased trade ties and joint ventures in areas like infrastructure development, mutually benefiting both regions. (Sadeghi & Hajimineh, 2019). Such partnerships not only generate economic gains but also foster innovation and knowledge sharing, driving further development.

Misconceptions and negative stereotypes can act as barriers to economic opportunities. Here, soft power plays a crucial role in addressing these perceptions and presenting a more nuanced image of a nation. Initiatives promoting cultural understanding, educational exchanges, and media engagement can combat negative stereotypes and attract trade, tourism, and talent. For example, Rwanda's post-genocide reconciliation efforts and focus on sustainable development, widely publicized through media and international partnerships, have helped attract tourists and investors, contributing to their economic recovery. (Mann, 1984). This demonstrates how effectively deploying soft power can overcome negative perceptions and unlock economic potential.

Soft power acts as a powerful driver of economic development, complementing traditional diplomacy by fostering trust, shaping norms, building partnerships, and countering negative perceptions. By harnessing the persuasive power of soft power, nations can enhance their global image, access new markets, and cultivate valuable partnerships, ultimately paving the way for sustainable and inclusive economic growth in an interconnected world. Soft power and public diplomacy are complementary forces working together to unlock economic opportunities and drive national development in a complex and interconnected world. By understanding these linkages, nations can leverage diplomacy strategically and harness the power of soft power to build a more prosperous future. Soft power and public diplomacy represent a new frontier in foreign policy and global engagement. By harnessing the power of attraction, persuasion, and cooperation, countries can achieve their objectives, build stronger relationships, and promote peace, stability, and prosperity in an increasingly interconnected world.

Conclusion

In the increasingly complex and interconnected world of the 21st century, soft power and public diplomacy have emerged as essential tools of foreign policy and global engagement. By leveraging cultural, ideological, and institutional attractions, countries exert influence, build relationships, and achieve their objectives without resorting to coercion or hard power. As the study revealed, soft power and public diplomacy offer a range of benefits, from promoting cultural exchange and understanding to fostering economic cooperation and development. Effective public diplomacy can also help to build trust, credibility, and reputation, which are essential for achieving foreign policy goals.

However, as with any tool of foreign policy, soft power and public diplomacy require careful planning, execution, and evaluation. Governments must invest in building their soft power capabilities, including cultural diplomacy, international broadcasting, and people-to-people exchanges. Moreover, in the digital age, public diplomacy must adapt to new technologies and platforms, from social media to virtual reality. This requires governments to develop innovative strategies for engaging with foreign publics, building online communities, and promoting their narratives.

References

Amoah-Darkwah, E., & Kipo-Sunyehzi, D. D. (2023). Harnessing Ghana's soft power for global Influence: The strategies, policies, and programmes, *Africa Insight*, *53*(1), 20-31.

Bjola, C., & Kornprobst, M. (Eds.). (2018). Understanding international diplomacy: Theory, practice, and ethics, Routledge. 2018.

Bush, J. W., (2021). *China's soft power in the context of the Belt and road initiative: Three case Studies" (2021)*, UVM Honors College Senior Theses. 393.

Cooper, A. F., Heine, J., & Thakur, R. (Eds.). (2013). *The oxford handbook of modern diplomacy,* Oxford University Press.

Hassen, D. (2023). *China's soft power in Africa: A qualitative content analysis on China's strategic narrative projection in Ethiopia and South Africa.*

Hayden, C., (2012). *The rhetoric of soft power: Public Diplomacy in global contexts*, Lexington Books.

Hocking, B., & Melissen, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Diplomacy in the digital age*, Clingendael Institute.

Holsti, K. J., (1970). 'The concept of foreign policy, *Journal of Peace Research*, 7(4), 315-328.

Hudson, K. R., (2005). 'Introduction to the special issue: Advances in foreign policy analysis, *Interfering policy Studies Perspectives*, 6(2), 1-7.

Idowu, A. O., & Ogunnubi, O. (2018). Nigeria's soft power and economic diplomacy in Africa. *Journal of African Foreign Affairs*, 5(2), 189-206.

Jentleson, B., (2010). 'The power of persuasion: Towards a theory of soft power and international relations', *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(1), 123-147.

Keohane, R. O., (1986*). After Hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy,* Princeton, NJ., Princeton University Press.

Kim, H. S. (2016). The Korean Wave as soft power public diplomacy. In *the Routledge handbook of soft power* (434-444). Routledge.

Madise, D., & Isike, C. (2020). Ubuntu diplomacy: Broadening soft power in an African context. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 20(3), 2097.

Mahapatra, D. A. (2016). From a latent to a 'strong 'soft power? The evolution of India's cultural diplomacy, *Palgrave Communications*, 2(1), 1-11.

Mann, M., (1984). The autonomous power of the state: Its Origins, Mechanisms, and Results. *European Journal of Sociology,* 25(2), 185-213.

Melissen, J. (2005). *The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Nye, J. S., Jr., (2004). *Soft power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Public Affairs.

Nye, J. S., Jr., (2008). *The powers to lead*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 2008.

Oni, A. B. & Taiwo, A. S., (2016). 'Nigeria's foreign policy challenges: A reflection', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 51(3), 374-391.

Ota, E. S., & Ecoma, C. J., (2015). 'An analysis of the determinants of Nigeria's foreign policy', *American Journal of Inter-Foreign Policy Research*, 4(2), 22-33.

Otmazgin, N. K. (2012). Geopolitics and soft power: Japan's cultural policy and cultural diplomacy in Asia, *Asia-Pacific Review*, 19(1), 37-61.

Parmar, I. (2010). Think tanks and power in Foreign policy: A comparative study of the role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939–1945. Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosenau, J. N., (1969). *The Logic of Inter-foreign policy Politics*, New York, NY., Free Press.

Rugh, W., (2017). 'American soft power and public diplomacy in the Arab world', *Palgrave Commun* 3, 16104 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.104

Sadeghi, S., & Hajimineh, R. (2019). 'Soft power vs. Iranophobia: A constructivist approach to Iran's public diplomacy', *Iranian Journal of International and Security Studies*, 11(4), 194-218.

Slaughter, A. M., (2009). 'America's edge: Power in the networked century, *Foreign Affairs*, 88(1), 94-113.

Straubhaar, J. (2020). *Brazil and corporatist soft power. In BRICS Media* (159-176). Routledge.

Tkach, O., & Tkach, A. (2018). Soft power within the framework of smart power: Case study of US relations with Latin America and the Caribbean in the Obama administration', *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 11(3), 85-95.

Van Ham, P., (2010*). Social power in international politics*, Routledge. 2010.

Wang, Y., (2011). Public diplomacy and the rise of Chinese Soft Power', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 257-273.

Wiseman, G., (2015). *Diplomacy in a globalizing world: Theories and practices,* Oxford University Press.

Wivel, A., (2019). *Foreign policy analysis*, SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Wüst, A., & Nicolai, K. (2023). Cultural diplomacy and the reconfiguration of soft power: Evidence from Morocco, *Mediterranean Politics*, 28(4), 554-579.