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ABSTRACT

Diplomacy, in past centuries, consisted of the mechanisms and practices adopted by states to communicate effectively and conduct meaningful relations with one another. This form of diplomacy, as standard and traditional as it needed to be, was characterized by secrecy and was mostly practiced by state officials. Public diplomacy has remained an important instrument used by states to practice diplomacy. With the arrival of the information age, the world has become more intertwined and the practice of diplomacy has had to adjust to the changing international environment. Public diplomacy, until the 9/11 attacks had little or no attention from states. Its practice has been redefined to include new actors such as non-state actors which are engaging with publics, be it local or foreign, in pursuit of a nation’s foreign policy goals. The new public diplomacy, which is a completely new field, has paved the way for new players, apart from the state, as well as the use of new communication technologies in the public diplomatic process.

This study investigates how prominent non-state actors, chief of them being think tanks, are developing capacities to address issues of national concern as well as creating the avenues for policy analysis. In doing so, the research gathers relevant data from four renowned think tanks in Ghana namely: IMANI Ghana, CDD, IEA and IDEG. These institutions revealed that the public diplomatic practice of today involves the emergence of new actors who are now being given recognition and are playing feasible roles which were hitherto performed by state actors. They are developing growing interest in how government conducts its foreign policy aims as well as building an inclusive opinion in the public diplomatic process. Again, the think tanks recommended the need to create a broader platform where both the state, non-state actors and donor states can work harmoniously to achieve common goals. It finally considered the possibility of engaging other new actors, apart from think tanks to attain an effective practice of public diplomacy.
CHAPTER ONE
RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1 Background to the Research Problem

Diplomacy comprises the countless procedures of formal and informal communication between and among states. The early practice of diplomacy emanates from the ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Roman worlds mainly through envoys. As Hamilton Keith and Richard Langhorne emphasize, the practice of diplomatic exchange was increased by the emergence of a collectivity of small city-states in ancient Greece. Although they were separated by borderlines, they managed to heighten regular intercity communication and treated each other equally due to the common language and culture they shared.1

The precursors of modern diplomacy can more properly be attributed to medieval and early modern Europe. The emerging states of Europe gradually began to institutionalize formal diplomatic customs and conventions in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, mandated as they were to engage with one another for political, geographic, economic, religious, and strategic reasons.

In the Renaissance period, traditional diplomacy had been conducted by professional diplomats who function as resident representatives of their respective governments in foreign states. Since the early nineteenth century, the leaders and foreign ministers of the major powers of the world have increasingly chosen to conduct direct diplomacy through congresses, conferences, and summits, in addition to dispatching permanent representatives to act on their behalf.
There exists various forms of practicing diplomacy and public diplomacy remains an eminent tool used in this practice. Although it gained recognition after it was coined by Edmund Gullion, the Dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, in the 1960s, it has been in practice in centuries past. In the words of Hans Tuch, public diplomacy refers to “a government’s process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas and ideals, its initiations and actions, as well as its national goals and policies.”

Contemporary public diplomacy and the quest for more of it has been heavily dominated by the experience of the United States. The tragedy of the 9/11 attacks on the United States generated a global debate on public diplomacy which has subsequently led most foreign ministries to develop their own public diplomatic policies. The United States has made attempts in making public diplomacy effective where fresh ideas are offered on how the United States can win the hearts and minds of the people abroad via strategic communication efforts. The 9/11 Commission recommended a two-pronged public diplomacy approach which required engaging with the world in three folds - define what America’s message is, what it stands for and defend its ideals abroad. Diplomatic dialogue was highly preferred to old forms of diplomatic monologue to achieve and sustain an effective US public diplomacy, ultimately facilitating in the advancement and protection of her national and international interests in a post-9/11 world. The US, therefore listened more and discerned the views of target audiences before developing programs and policies to address them.

Indeed, the efforts of the US have alerted the global community to better understand and evaluate public diplomatic policies and practices throughout the world. Old public diplomacy involves a
unidirectional process which intends to understand, inform and influence the target audience. It is viewed uniquely as a state activity and is characterized by a conventional one-way mass communication. Conversely, the new public diplomacy has evolved as a result of changes in communication technology which has subsequently increased the number of actors to include non-governmental organizations, civil societies, multinational corporations, think tanks, among others, who are engaged in public diplomatic practice. In the case of Ghana, domestic think tanks such as the Institute of Democratic Governance (IDEG), Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), Center for Democratic Development (CDD) and IMANI Center for Policy and Education have enlarged their capabilities to research and provide solutions to global and national public policy issues.

The above-listed think tanks have been carefully selected due to the increasing roles they play on governmental issues. The current terrain is such that the populace need an entity/institution to serve lead roles in national affairs on their behalf and it thus appears that think tanks, more especially IDEG, IEA, CDD and IMANI fit into this category. Their remarkable performance in their field of work and how they easily relate with the public in this regard is worth noting.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Standard or conventional diplomacy refers to the art and practice of conducting international relations by negotiating agreements, alliances and treaties through bilateral or multilateral means. This act of diplomacy is done by diplomats with the aim of fostering good relations between two countries. Public diplomacy, which is one of the main strands of this form of diplomacy, focuses
on communication between foreign societies, which is mainly intended to establish dialogue aimed at informing and influencing.

In the context of the old public diplomacy, diplomatic policies and practices were solely reserved for traditional actors (nation-states) which had the mandate of expanding international policy competences at governmental levels. Dutta-Bergman asserts as follows: “central to (old) public diplomacy is the objective of influencing the receiver countries without being open to persuasion”.³ Under this model, communication is disparate such that it is designed to influence the attitudes and behaviors of foreign publics but not necessarily those of sponsoring nations or other international actors.

The practice of public diplomacy has been heightened in the era of modern diplomacy wherefore an increase in globalization has caused it to improve drastically. People, just as much as states, now matter in an increasingly interconnected international community. A new dimension to public diplomatic practice has been deemed necessary due to the rise of public opinion in government decision-making as well as the advancement of technological strategies.

With the world becoming more diverse, complex and intertwined, there arises the need for nation-states as well as other non-traditional actors to communicate across international boundaries to attain certain objectives.⁴ Nations are therefore required to “engage with” rather than “communicate to” foreign publics in the pursuit of more collaborative relations.⁵ The current trend in public diplomacy are realities of an increasingly interdependent world in which cross-border networks of power have substituted traditional government structures and foreign
audiences have become extremely important to a nation’s ability to accomplish its foreign policy goals.⁶

Jan Melissen offers a broader explication with regards to the new public diplomacy. He affirms that “this new era has brought forth a shift in diplomatic practice driven by new actors, engagement with a progressively more interconnected foreign publics and a swing from one-way information flow to two-street communication which requires listening and dialogue.”⁷

The new public diplomacy therefore acknowledges non-state actors which include interest groups, civil societies, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, among others, who actually determine how public diplomacy should be practiced in a dynamic international environment. Undoubtedly, the old form of public diplomacy as a pure state affair is gradually fading away – that is, a move away from state-centric to an engagement of multiple actors operating in a vibrant global environment.

In the case of Ghana, notable domestic think tanks such as Institute of Democratic Governance (IDEG), Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), Center for Democratic Development (CDD) and IMANI Center for Policy and Education have emerged as prime actors in the field of public diplomatic practice due to the significant impact they have on policy making. Their quest for key national issues such as democracy and good governance, economic growth and poverty reduction, among others, have helped develop effective ways of organizing and filtering policy ideas in order to efficiently react to the changing environment. Some of the major national projects these institutions have actively engaged in include Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategies

The basis for the research is to investigate how these new actors portray their capacity to create new knowledge through collaboration with various actors, both public and private which ultimately increase the need for international communication, information gathering as well as avenues for policy analysis.

1.3 Research Questions

The research questions include the following:

- What is public diplomacy and how is it different from the new public diplomacy?
- Are non-state actors engaged in the new public diplomacy and do they collaborate with the state?
- What achievements can be attributed to the engagement of non-state actors in the new public diplomacy?
- What are the possible challenges in the activities non-state actors engaged in the new public diplomacy?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

- To understand the features and nature of the new public diplomacy;
- To highlight non-state actors who are practicing the new public diplomacy;
- To unearth any possible challenges related to the practice in Ghana;
- To examine the prospects of the new public diplomacy in enhancing the national interest.
1.5 **Rationale of the Study**

It is the aim of the study to contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the area of public diplomacy and its relevance in international relations. It is also hoped that the study will highlight the rise of non-state actors (domestic think tanks) who are engaged in the new public diplomacy and how they enhance its practice.

1.6 **Scope of Study**

The scope of this research covers the introduction of the new era of public diplomacy within the contemporary international system, the new players that is the non-state actors engaged in the new public diplomatic practice in Ghana and their relevance (and the focus is the Centre for Democratic Development (CDD), IMANI Policy Centre for Education, Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), Institute for Democratic Governance (IDEG) etc.)

It must however be noted that the rise of new actors in this new form of public diplomacy does not only include think tanks but also comprises Multinational Corporations (MNCs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), pressure groups, among a host of others, all engaged in the public diplomatic process in Ghana.

1.7 **Hypothesis**

The participation of think tanks in the practice of the new public diplomacy holds the potential for national development through effective policy execution.
1.8 Theoretical Framework

The study uses the theoretical framework of pluralism. Its major proponents include Robert Keohane, Joseph Nye, Ernst Haas, Karl Deutsch, among others. This school of thought is founded on the following assumptions:

In the works of Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, they argue that non-state actors are important entities in world politics. There exists therefore a wide variety of actors at both the state and international levels whose crucial roles within the international system cannot be downplayed. International Organizations, Multinational Corporations and other non-state agencies act as independent actors in their own rights, thus they have significant influence in certain key areas – and to a large extent they define which issues are most important politically.

Pluralists believe that the state is not a unitary actor. There exists interest groups, civil societies and bureaucracies within and outside the state, whose activities and choices frequently impact upon the decisions and policies enacted by the state. Pluralists refute the notion that the state is a rational actor. The existence of diverse groups which breeds a clash of interests will not always make the state act rationally since it needs to reach a compromise most of the time. The decision-making process therefore is heavily dominated by misperception and misrepresentation. Finally, pluralists are of the view that there exists a multiplicity of issues within the international environment. The agenda of world politics is therefore extensive. They prioritize and are more concerned about low-politics such as environmental, social and economic issues. Military-security issues, properly termed high-politics, have competing agenda in the contemporary international and national agenda and have lost significantly their former prestige.
Pluralism as an international relations theory has been criticised by other international relations theorists. Realists argue that pluralists place less importance on the role of anarchy and security dilemma in international relations. An analysis of the international system would be incomplete if its anarchical feature is not taken into consideration. As identified by Kenneth Waltz, transnationalism has not transformed the anarchic nature of the international system. States, therefore, would have different motives for their actions and diverse interests amongst each other inevitably leads to conflicts. Pluralists have been criticised for their dependence on free will which leads to cooperation and international harmony within the global system rather than competition. Realist thinkers contend that individuals are naturally aggressive and would always advance their interests at the expense of others, to the extent of springing up wars.

Finally, scholars contend that pluralists match up the world system to that of the American political system. The notion of prioritizing on non-state actors and the indispensable roles they play is merely American ethnocentrism imposed on the globe.

In spite of these criticisms, pluralism best fits this research study because the new public diplomacy looks beyond the practice of public diplomacy as a state activity. It acknowledges non-state actors which are now vibrant players in public diplomatic practice. Indeed, the practice of public diplomacy is seen as more national-oriented, wherefore the strategies and policies employed are meant to impact on a state’s foreign policy aims and objectives. Increasingly, as non-state actors find themselves engaged in diplomatic activities, they provide channels through which a state’s foreign policy approach can be shaped, as well as advancing its national interest.
1.9 Literature Review

Jan Melissen’s book titled “The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations” traces the early beginnings of public diplomacy with particular emphasis on its features and importance. He asserts that the early stages of contemporary public diplomacy began with the United States after the event of September 9th, 2001. This, however, shifted the world’s attention to public diplomacy where most European states embraced it with lots of enthusiasm. According to Melissen, the new public diplomacy refers to the interconnectedness at the civil society level which exceeds the boundaries of practicing public diplomacy as a state activity. Non-state actors, both large and small, multinational corporations and a host of other agencies now develop their own public diplomatic policies which greatly influence foreign publics. Cooperation has now been fostered between state and non-governmental organizations which hitherto saw themselves as competitors. In these present times, they both share mutual interest of mobilizing international public opinion.

Melissen further proclaims that some traits of the traditional public diplomacy are still relevant for the new public diplomacy of today. He stresses that public diplomacy must be consistent with a nation’s foreign policy and always aim at targeting the foreign public. By and large, the technological era we find ourselves in impinges on public opinion – it is no longer providing information but rather engaging with the audience. Ultimately, achieving credibility is very essential because it builds trust and stable relationship with the public. Shaun Riordan thus affirms: “public diplomacy is made more efficient with the help of non-governmental agents of the sending country’s own civil society and by employing local networks in target countries.”
Again, Melissen offers a distinction between propaganda and the new public diplomacy. He states that although they both persuade the public, the new public diplomacy is a two-way messaging such that it grants the opportunity to obtain feedback. He concludes by declaring that in today’s globalized world, diplomats need to create transnational networks and facilitating cross-border civil society links so as to operate effectively.

Additionally, Melissen seeks to highlight the main features that has precipitated a redefinition of the new public diplomacy. He states that the forces of globalization and information technology has led to an outgrowth of civil society organizations as well as an energetic media. All these features has empowered individuals and interest groups to become direct participants in the shaping of international policy either independently or otherwise. Non-state actors, who are now prime actors seek to project their own goals in order to achieve their policy decisions.

From a critical lens, Melissen’s book has largely focused on an overview of public diplomacy as well as the rise of the new public diplomacy. However, his line of arguments were not situated within the Ghanaian context. That notwithstanding, he acknowledges the rise of non-state actors in current diplomatic activities. It is prudent though to have a better understanding of the new public diplomacy to better appreciate non-state actors, particularly think tanks and how they have become the major players in the diplomatic field. Melissen does more of the former than the latter.

In Joseph Nye’s book, **Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics**, he posits that in this information age, states have become porous and they do not heavily dominate the
international scene due to the introduction of other actors – non-state actors.\textsuperscript{18} The use of the internet has increasingly helped both states and non-states alike to wield their soft power. As David Bellier notes “the internet has been a godsend to such populations because it enables large numbers of geographically isolated people with a shared history to organize into large victual communities.”\textsuperscript{19} Nye provides an example of a diaspora group in the United States, Ghana Cyber group (GCG) which effectively used the internet and other media channels to influence political outcomes back home in Ghana. GCG further seeks to maintain connections with Ghanaian expatriates so as to increase capital flow.

Nye focuses on non-state actors, specifically NGOs and their ability to represent the interests of the public. They often involve the citizenry who are well versed in local politics. Some of these NGOs have reputation and credibility that cannot be downplayed. Most of these NGOs develop soft power resources where they use their communication and organization skills to mobilize people for policy discussions and workshops in order to attract the government to reverse unfavorable foreign policy decisions. Nye however noted that in order for soft power to thrive, it needs a receptive audience.

In critical terms, Nye’s book, as opposed to that of Melissen, offers a better understanding of non-state actors within this new era of public diplomacy. Although he focuses on NGOs, the roles played by these organizations which Nye stresses are similar to those of think tanks. Nye thus does a good analysis of how these NGOs obtain soft power resources and how they utilize them for effective policy analysis.
Ellen Huijgh in her article "Changing Tunes for Public Diplomacy: Exploring the Domestic Dimension." makes the claim that public diplomacy is heavily founded on the domestic public although it is directed at foreign audiences and conducted abroad. She argues that most Ministries of Foreign Affairs cling on to the traditional practice of public diplomacy in spite of the changing environment. Although the domestic public are engaged in public diplomatic activities, they are not considered a major part of it. It is therefore not enough to satisfy the international audience, rather the domestic public must be engaged in policy debates, foreign policy formulation as well as rally support for policy ideas. Huijgh thus affirms: “investment in these domestic publics is vital for encouraging them as participants and partners in interaction with citizens of other countries around shared foreign policy concerns.”

Indeed, domestic civil society actors, however partisan they maybe, must portray interest in foreign policy decisions. In today’s globalized world, domestic security issues are increasingly linked to international issues and thus unvaryingly have a bearing on these domestically based actors.

The article further buttresses the main features of the 21st century public diplomacy. There exists multiple actors who are engaged with active domestic and international audiences with preferences on networking and relationship building. In distinguishing public affairs from the domestic dimension of public diplomacy, Huijgh thus states “some scholars consider public diplomacy to be the international face of a foreign ministry’s domestic public affairs.” Even though both terms utilize related activities and techniques, they are directed at different audiences. Domestic outreach however can be likened to domestic public diplomacy where the
former shares the long term goals of the latter that is supporting civil society programs targeted at relationship-building.

Civil society organizations such as think tanks, interest groups, among others, encourage people-to-people approach where they increase public awareness, promote an in-depth comprehension of global matters and provide connections with counterparts abroad who share similar foreign policy issues. Huijgh finally recommends that a government’s public diplomatic strategy must thus involve various actors, both home and abroad, who will provide meaningful policy initiatives. She further suggests a holistic approach for public engagement for today’s public diplomacy.

In further analysis, the article has tried to argue that public diplomacy, in this new dispensation, cannot be detached from the domestic public. It recognizes how foreign ministries are shifting away from practicing public diplomacy as a state activity and rather acknowledging these new actors who are now the prime players. The author is commended for giving civil society organizations their rightful place in governmental affairs and her suggestions for a holistic approach is highly agreeable.

Evan Potter, in his article, “Canada and the New Public Diplomacy,” points out some of the vital traits of public diplomacy, using Canada as a case study. He states that public diplomacy is handled by official bodies of one state to target publics of another state for the purpose of persuading these foreign publics to regard favorably the national policies, ideals and ideas of the targeting state. Public diplomatic programs must be in tune with a nation’s foreign policy
objectives. He further outlines some of the key features of the new public diplomacy, thus the changing context of the globalized world has led to an energetic media, rise of public opinion, robust civil society which altogether offer assistance in policy choices. Citizens now have easy access to information where they portray capacity to research and engage in policy discussions.

Potter further highlights how Canada can adopt effective strategies to advance her foreign policy goals. He recognized how public diplomacy has been placed on a high pedestal in the foreign agenda of the nation. Canada therefore adopts effective strategies to boost her image on the international plane and exercises soft power strategies in order to continually build alliances.

The article finally offers some recommendations on how Canada can better shape her public diplomatic practice being the middle power that she is. Canada needs to be more proactive, adopt strategic approaches to enhance public diplomatic practice and utilize the electronic media to build relationships with other actors who offer policy analysis which are in tune with her foreign policy goals.

From a critical perspective, the article outlines how Canada can thrive in the practice of the new public diplomacy. Regardless of the recommendations provided by the author, he refused to consider a very important factor- that is collaboration of state and non-state actors in public diplomatic activities. He however offered a solid foundation upon which the new public diplomacy thrives on.
In their working paper titled “Influencing as a Learning Process: Think Tanks and the Challenge of Improving Policies and Promoting Social Change”, Grupo Faro, a research team during the Think Tank Exchange Conference, provide insights into advanced roles of some selected think tanks as well as the strategies they adopt which helps to redefine policy analysis. In the case of Africa, particularly Ghana, the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) was the focal point and the article stresses how the Institute, through its dedicated research, helped in establishing a protocol that is the Presidential Transition Bill which has ultimately enhanced good governance in Ghana.

Grupo Faro identified some strategies employed by think tanks. They assert that during policy processes, think tanks participate at the agenda-setting stage. In the instance of the IEA, their ability to identify problems regarding political power led to initiating guidelines that would manage political transition in Ghana. The article further emphasizes that “participating in the agenda-setting stage may lead to opportunities for think tanks to partake in the policy design and decision-making processes.”

Grupo Faro alludes to the fact that aside the traditional roles of think tanks as knowledge providers, they act as political actors, facilitators of dialogue, advisors to policy makers as well as advocators for policies. Although think tanks may have preferences for certain policies, they are required to assemble stakeholders for public policy debates. They finally buttress the point that think tanks do operate in complex situations and thus require leaders who have capacities to provide technical solutions to problems within a country. At length, these solutions would
generate social change which would not only improve public policies but also expand capacities to create a formidable future.

In further analysis, the article which is largely a research paper on think tanks in the external world points out some of the roles played by these institutions. The author is able to juxtapose Ghanaian think tanks with foreign think tanks, with emphasis on the roles they play and the challenges they are confronted with. With the author focusing on just the IEA, he has been unable to provide a complete assessment of think tanks specifically in Ghana. Nonetheless, he succeeds in offering a broad perspective of think tanks, both local and foreign.

Michael Kpessa in his article, “The Politics of Public Policy in Ghana from Closed Circuit Bureaucrats to Citizenry Engagement,” focuses more on policy making in Ghana and offers a historical perspective regarding her policy making approaches. Kpessa states that the authoritarian style of rule that existed during postcolonial times did not encourage public participation in the policy process. The state, therefore, played the paternalistic role of providing services to accelerate development. Indeed, it assumed a dictatorial behaviour that shunned interest groups and other social forces in the policy making process. In the early 90s, when constitutional rule emerged, policy think tanks such as IEA, CDD began to participate in policy issues. Majority of these civil society organizations were instrumental in creating social security reforms for the country.

Kpessa further stresses that there has been a drift from bureaucratic approach to policy making to citizenry engagement. The rise of new public management theories has brought forth the idea
of mobilizing citizens to be active participants in the policy process. Consequently, this strengthens the democratic system where a fair and equitable policy environment is created to give policy participants equal opportunities to propose, analyze and criticize policy ideas.

The article also brings to the fore the significant role of civil society groups and how they effectively engage in public participation in order to generate public policies. In the words of Gail Kligman, civil society refers to “a complex web of independent associations which binds citizens together in matters of shared or common concern”. Thus, civil society groups provide platforms that engage the citizenry in the policy making process.

Finally, Kpessa affirms that the participatory approach to policy making would require a collaborative effort of both bureaucrats and the citizenry where the former act as listeners and the latter act as advocates of policy issues.

In a sense, as opposed to Grupo Faro’s article, this article provides a solid sketch of Ghana’s policy environment, focusing on how civil society groups are taking the center stage in the helm of governmental affairs. It is plausible to agree with the author that think tanks are more engaged in the policy process of Ghana than before.

In Frank Ohemeng’s article, "Civil Society and Policy Making in Developing Countries: Assessing the Impact of Think Tanks on Policy Outcomes in Ghana”, he underscores the need for the state to reform administratively in today’s world. Major actors, both domestic and foreign are engaged in advancing this new approach. Many a time, domestic actors have been
downplayed, one such is think tanks who have developed capacity financially and morally to scrutinize public policies.

Ohemeng further acknowledges the increasing growth of think tanks and the vital roles they play in modern governance which cannot be overemphasized. Think tanks have effective personnel and adopt strategic processes which help them succeed in influencing public policy. Policy makers have had to collaborate with think tanks due to the useful inputs they provide for policy implementation. Non-profit research institutions, properly termed think tanks are normally the choice of government in finding solutions to problems.

With regards to Ghana’s policy making structure, Ohemeng asserts that the policy environment was purely authoritarian, thus it was run by elites and senior bureaucrats who discouraged the participation of civil societies. However, in the subsequent years after 1992, there came the practice of democracy which brought to the fore an engagement of civil society organizations, trade unions, interest groups, among others, in the policy process. These groups served as watchdogs over government activities so as to instill transparency and accountability.

Notable think tanks which are identified as being at the forefront of governmental affairs include IEA, CDD, TWN, etc. Ohemeng states that although some of these institutions act as policy mediators and advocacy groups, they primarily seek to assist government in developing suitable policies and educating the citizenry on public policies essential for the promotion of good governance.26 Think tanks, in order to succeed in their agenda need to have effective personnel,
stay non-partisan and maintain a close relationship with international NGOs to provide enough funding.

Ohemeng finally offers some of the approaches think tanks rely on to better influence the policy process. They publicize surveys and reports for policymakers and the entire public, organize seminars, workshops, policy debates to proliferate reforms as well as collaboration with the media to promote ideas about the state.

On the whole, this article has given a vivid description of Ghanaian think tanks, the strategies they adopt and the environment within which they operate. Ohemeng provides very valid points about the rise of these think tanks and the specific roles they are playing with regards to foreign policy decisions of Ghana. The issues addressed by the author is commendable since they are in tune with the aim and objectives of the research.

1.10 Sources of Data

The study relied on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained from unstructured interviews with serving and retired ambassadors, Heads of the Center for Democratic Development (CDD), IMANI Policy Center for Education, Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA), Institute for Democratic Governance (IDEG) and officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration. The officials interviewed from the above-mentioned institutions include:

Mr. Isidore Kpotufe - Communications Manager/Project Director, IMANI Francophone
Amb. Francis Tsegah - Senior Research Fellow, CDD Ghana
Secondary data were obtained from books, journal articles, reports, newspaper publications and magazines. The LECIAD and Balme libraries as well as newsletters from the Foreign Ministry and Ghana’s Missions abroad were used. The internet was also used for relevant information.

It was considered essential to interview one official per each think tank institution because they were the representatives of their respective institutions and also, they offered the relevant information and inputs that was been sought for.

1.11 Research Methodology

The methodology for the research was based on qualitative analysis. This was necessary for the purpose of the research because the data received were described and analyzed. The interviews conducted were unstructured and thus required the use of qualitative method.

1.12 Arrangement of Chapters

The study comprises four chapters. Chapter One is the Research Design. Chapter Two examines both the old and the new public diplomacy and their relevance in the contemporary international system. Chapter Three examines how non-state actors are engaged in the practice of the new public diplomacy and the impact they have on a nation’s policies. Chapter Four summarizes the findings of the study, draws conclusions and makes some recommendations.
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CHAPTER TWO
OVERVIEW OF THE NEW PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the new public diplomacy. This section focuses on the evolution of public diplomacy, old versus new public diplomacy, characteristics of the new public diplomacy, and actors in the new public diplomacy to achieve the purpose of this study.

2.1 Evolution of Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy by tradition is defined as “a government’s process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas and ideals, its initiations and actions, as well as its national goals and policies”.¹ It can therefore be deduced from Tuch’s definition that the concept has evolved with variations to the systemic environment of governments.

Edmund Gullion was the first to use the phrase in its modern meaning although the concept existed before then. The Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy was founded by him and an early brochure of this Center provided a convenient summary of Gullion’s concept: 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 another; the reporting of foreign affairs and its
impact on policy; communication between those whose job is communication, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications.²

Paradoxically, the new use of an old term was necessary because the latter (propaganda), which Gullion preferred had attained pejorative connotations. Nicholas J. Cull, in his essay, "Public Diplomacy' Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase" asserts as follows: "The earliest use of the phrase 'public diplomacy' to surface is actually not American at all but in a leader piece from The Times in January 1856. It was used merely as a synonym for civility in a piece criticizing the posturing of President Franklin Pierce."³ Cull further reiterates that Edmund Gullion, "was the first to use the phrase in its modern meaning".⁴

Public diplomacy took a stable ground in the United States largely because the US needed a benign alternative to terms like propaganda and psychological warfare. This was to, in effect, help distinguish between its own democratic information practices and the policies pursued by the Soviet Union. Regardless of its rapid practice in the US, the term had a miniature of recognition at the international front until the post-Cold War period when the global community detected the significance of image making and foreign public opinion in international relations.

A new phase in the development of public diplomacy began after the 9/11 attacks – when countries recognized the need to engage with foreign audiences. The new challenges in public diplomacy in the post-Cold War era have been influenced by three interrelated revolutions in mass communication, politics and international relations.⁵ The revolution in communication technologies has conveyed about two major innovations- the internet and global news networks
such as CNN, BBC and Al-Jazeera which have become vital sources of information about world affairs. Following from these developments, it has become utterly important to consider and redefine the changing nature of diplomatic practice in the communication age.

As Melissen asserts, attempts have however been made by nations to incorporate public diplomacy into their foreign policy agenda so as to achieve their strategic purposes and interests. It must be noted that public diplomacy need be consistent with a country’s foreign policy objectives and goals; that is both need to be at par. Over the years, nations have carefully and consciously developed public diplomatic strategies and campaigns with the intent of achieving a particular policy objective.

In recent decades, public diplomacy has become increasingly central to the practice of diplomacy since the latter fell into the scrutiny of the media and public opinion. Public diplomacy is progressively adjusting to the new landscape of international relations.

A Canadian envoy asserts as follows: “the new diplomacy as I call it, is, to a large extent, public diplomacy and requires different skills, techniques and attitudes than those found in traditional diplomacy”. It should, however, be stated that public diplomacy has been instrumental in opening up traditionally closed domain of foreign policy framework and has made diplomats more visible and open-minded.

Bruce Gregory, in his writings affirms that “public diplomacy is an instrument used by states, associations of states and some sub-state actors to understand cultures, attitudes and behaviour,
build and manage relationships and influence thoughts and mobilize actions to advance their interests”. Reducing from Gregory’s definition, it is of no doubt that there has been a constant shift in the practice of public diplomacy, especially, at the end of the twentieth century. In this new era, it has become increasingly important to influence public opinion, domestic and international communication where the public is constantly becoming a complex challenge for foreign ministries.

As acknowledged by Rhiannon Vickers in his writings, diplomacy is adjusting to the information age which is characterized by the development and rapid expansion of information and communication technologies, the increasing ability of citizens and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to access and use these technologies, and the rise of transnational and co-operative security issues which are increasingly affecting diplomatic activities. These vagaries have given the drive for a ‘new public diplomacy’.

Signitzer and Coombs offered an innovative definition of today’s public diplomacy which recognizes new actors and their contributions to state’s public diplomatic practices. They refer to it “as the way in which both government and private individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on government’s foreign policy decisions”.

In today’s 21st century, the public dimension of diplomacy has undergone a series of changes - the strong forces of globalization has led to an information revolution- that is a rapid expansion of information technologies which has originated the internet, direct broadcast satellites, among
others. Also, the increasing ability of new actors such as pressure groups, civil society organizations, think tanks, among several others, are readily available to access these communication strategies. The new public diplomacy offers fresh opportunities for a changed diplomatic environment for state and non-state actors to communicate foreign policy issues to the foreign public.\footnote{11}

Prominent philosophers such as Leonard, Vidya and Nye have captured public diplomacy as a macro-perspective, mapping out new parameters and prescribing grand strategy for it. In their works, they elaborate how realists, liberalists and sociologists account for the evolution of public diplomacy.

\subsection*{2.1.1 Realist View of Public Diplomacy}

Realists generally define the origin and historical expansion of public diplomacy. In the works of Viotti & Kauppi, realism perceives the “state” as the principal or most important actor in the world system. Again issues such as power politics and national security are of principal concern.\footnote{12} It can be further stated that the postulation of the state as the primary actor limits the number of significant communicators and prompts realists to see foreign publics as a conduit through which they play realpolitik with states.\footnote{13}

In the antiquated realist public diplomacy, foreign publics are not themselves an end communicator with states; the final result of public diplomacy is sought in state-centered terms (i.e., changing the policy of foreign governments). Realists also assume that national security
arises from the perception of the world as an anarchic system where, with a lack of trust, states are subject to “security dilemmas”.\textsuperscript{14}

Realists try to certify security by maximizing power and find public diplomacy to be in the service of power politics and national security.\textsuperscript{15} War thus becomes the very circumstance where two antagonizing powers crudely collide the purist form of power politics. Following from this, realists see the immediate utilities of public diplomacy mainly in the form of war propaganda. In fact, modern Western countries’ public diplomacy practices originated from war propaganda in World Wars One and Two to destroy the morale of enemy soldiers and citizens.\textsuperscript{16} In this reasoning, Van Dinh thus defined public diplomacy as propaganda and psychological warfare.\textsuperscript{17}

The United States public diplomacy has been much drenched with realism. From World War II, realist U.S. public diplomacy has fluctuated in the ebb and flow of the Cold War. The weight of fighting the Cold War as the patron of “the free world” dictated much of the content and style of U.S. public diplomacy. In contending with the Soviet’s realist public diplomacy, U.S. policy communications with foreign publics inevitably became a propagandistic vehicle to “win hearts and minds of the world.” \textsuperscript{18}

Nevertheless, throughout the 1970s, the détente with the Soviet Union diluted the country’s Cold War realist public diplomacy. Its ebbing culminated in the aborted Stanton Panel Report in the middle of the era, and “the Second Mandate” of the Carter administration even proclaimed that an era of one-way persuasion would give way to two-way communication and enhanced mutual understanding on all sides, including the United States.\textsuperscript{19}
In other developing countries such as Ghana, the minds and hearts of citizens are sought by following the model of American realist public diplomacy. This has helped them to pursue their own strategic political, military, and economic aid and trade interests. In their pursuit, they yearn to follow the two-step process of public diplomacy to ultimately seek the U.S. government’s favorable foreign and trade policies, but in their own way. Although there arises the impossibility of being unable to wage a full-scale public diplomacy, in the same manner that Western countries do, most South American countries have outsourced their public diplomacy through U.S. lobbying and public relations firms.

Manheim, in his writings refers to these outsourcing practices as “strategic public diplomacy” and further emphasizes that U.S. agents’ practices of public diplomacy for foreign governments are strategically driven, guided by advanced social science theories and modus operandi.

Gilboa classifies these practices through public relations as “the reversed public relations variant of public diplomacy”. Strategic public diplomacy toward the United States has been conducted intermittently when stakes arise. Some massive media campaigns of “strategic public diplomacy” have been documented with respect to agenda-setting theory and image cultivation/image restoration discourse.

2.1.2 Liberalist View of Public Diplomacy

In the liberalists’ view, the state is considered to be one important actor among many, although its presence and behavior is still influential but on the decline. Liberalists define national security and interests from a wide perspective of transnational economic, social, and ecological issues
emanating from the growth of globalism. Thus, they view a far greater need for complex communication with foreign citizens and other non-state global entities, such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), as the state’s end partner communicators. In the eyes of liberalists, the world has entered a new era of multifaceted interdependence on a global scale, in which crude projection of military arsenal as the rule of world politics has become diluted and ineffective.

Joseph Nye thus coined the term soft power in the late-1990s and since then has developed the notion to further adapt it to the complex interconnectedness of the world. Nye indicates that, a country’s soft power is the ability to get what it wants through attraction rather than coercion. The resources of soft power, namely, attraction, include a country’s culture, ideals, and policies. From the liberalists’ perspective, the role of public diplomacy is to create attraction for a country’s culture (values), ideals (political, economic, social systems), and policies to create a conducive environment to better address issues of national interest.

Nye acknowledges that the quest of national interest through soft power is not novel to liberalism but also a staple of realist public diplomacy. However, liberalists see the working of soft power in a more complex communication environment, where government’s communication channels are only part of a myriad of multiple channels of communication among states and societies. Particularly, liberalist public diplomacy is more concerned with the conditions (credibility and legitimacy) for soft power, in which a country’s soft power resources can be translated into soft power.
Nye further stresses that the attractiveness of the United States rests on resources such as its culture (sometimes), its political values of democracy and human rights (when it lives up to them), and policies (when they are framed with some humility and awareness of others’ interests). In the mid-2000s, liberalist public diplomacy became a challenging model which sought to compete with its realist counterpart.

Rhiannon Vickers observes that British public diplomacy is more based on a symbolic and marketing approach with focus on the projection of a particular national image to an overseas passive audience. In contrast, he argues that Canadian public diplomacy is more centered on building a behavioral, cooperative partnership, in which the country enables the passive, foreign audiences to work together to address transnational challenges. Canada’s success in the Ottawa Treaty for banning landmines in 1997 has been touted as a new form of public diplomacy that embodies NGO–state partnership.

In general, liberalists under the flag of “public diplomacy in an information age,” are still preoccupied with the dimension of information globalism where the old and new communication technologies circulate information on cultures, values, and ideals. Recently, liberalists have increasingly attended to the dimension of economic globalism and thus, economic or corporate public diplomacy where the possessions and channels of soft power comprises free flows of capital and trade. These take the forms of foreign direct investment/international production and merchandises/services, along with multinational corporations’ business practices accompanying the flows.
2.1.3 Sociological View of Public Diplomacy

This perspective searches for new channels of communication and relationship building from social contacts such as transnational communities (Diasporas) and other networks of people through “network public diplomacy”. It must be indicated though that the medium of sociological globalism has not yet been fully developed to easily determine the degree of opportunities and challenges it presents for public diplomacy.

In this perspective of public diplomacy, migrants, being carriers of information, values, and cultures, have functioned in human history as a powerful agent of intercountry and intercultural communications. The nature of their intercultural communication is not a one-way transmission of people cultures through reconciled communication but rather a direct interaction and negotiation between cultures. A firsthand concern of migration for public diplomacy is increasingly felt on the nature of people contact, which can be characterized by Salter and Teger’s terms of “genuine contact”, as opposed to total experience with people, culture, ideals, and domestic governance in the destination country. In other words, a country’s soft power resources are nakedly exposed to migrants’ living experiences, which make the quality of these resources more substantial in the conduct of public diplomacy.

Migration can be either the most conducive or destructive channel of communication, more than any other channel – chiefly, interceded channels, through which the state projects messages and information abroad based on the attractiveness of its soft power resources. A risky consequence of migration for public diplomacy is that migrants’ experiences tend to be negative in the short term and have been shown to be still so even in the long term. The history of migration testifies
that increasingly, people contacts do not necessarily guarantee increasing mutual understanding. Traditionally and even contemporarily, migrants have been subjected to discrimination, xenophobia, and racism, as the case has been in South Africa. In addition, there has been increasing reports, widespread abuse and exploitation of human and labor rights of migrant workers, particularly on irregular statuses.  

Following from this background of sociological globalism, there arose the need to develop a new meaning for public diplomacy, referred to as the new public diplomacy. Sociological globalism will drive governments into more introspection, push them not to rely on image management and resources of soft power but to build the substances of soft power. Artificial resources will therefore be increasingly exposed as transparent as possible through people contacts. Although governments will still play a critical role in the success and failure of public diplomacy by pursuing quality domestic and foreign policies, the quality, namely, openness, of civil culture will ultimately define its final path.

Following from this framework, the traditional, government-sponsored exchange programs for relationship building will remain consistent with nonpolitical arenas such as arts, education, science, and language. Conversely, the programs’ potentials for building substantial relationships will remain limited in sociological globalism. They are mostly channels of arranged, partial, and superficial contacts between elites of societies, not those of natural, practical, and total contacts among the masses. In the context of sociological globalism, relationship building must not focus on showcasing and flourishing one’s own culture, values, and ideas, but rather on substantial and
practical channels and linkages among people, which would promise the greatest mutual benefit
and trust and, inevitably, the greatest challenges and risks.

As Nathan Gardels admonished, attraction of soft power resources (cultures, ideals, and policies)
is rather subjective, and thus their universal appeal can never be assumed.\(^{39}\) In this sense, the real
soft power and its real resources in sociological globalism are not what a country has as “stocks”
(something within its purview), but rather the country’s “constructivist and fluid capacity” to
create mutual trust in interaction and negotiation.

2.2 Old versus New Public Diplomacy

Robert Ivor, in his works, indicates that most theorists have separated diplomacy into two: the
“old” and “new”.\(^{40}\) The ’old’ public diplomacy played an important role for many countries in
Europe between the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. The traditional public
diplomacy was conducted by skilled wealthy people during negotiations. These diplomats were
considered as the gloomiest of all officials due to the secret nature of their diplomatic conduct
which had a great bearing on the state’s national security. The “new” diplomacy began after the
post-world war II period when the world opened up and recognized the need for international
cooperation. This new trend marked the onset of the practice of multilateral diplomacy.

Although the 'new' diplomacy became more opened to the public and accessible through the
media available at that time, the 'old' secrecy practice was very much in use by many diplomats
and was the most preferable because of its direct and self-interest outcomes.\(^{41}\)
In the works of Walter B. Wriston, he explains that ‘there was a time when diplomats were the sole interlocutors between countries. Now, unmediated dialogue and information exchange between citizens from around the world occurs 24 hours a day’.\textsuperscript{42} Diplomats, in recent times have remarked strongly and rather painfully, that advanced communications and other aspects of the information revolution are modifying the nature of diplomatic conduct— the pace of diplomacy has rather quickened and its once closed processes are forcibly being opened.\textsuperscript{43} It is plausible to note that public diplomacy has become increasingly central, that is taken its rightful place in the practice of diplomacy.

Two common conceptual frameworks recur in the literature: “old” (unidirectional government communication) and “new” (network relational multi-actor) public diplomacy. The contemporary international environment has birthed these two concepts which do not replace one another rather act as complements to each other.

From the traditionalist’s view, the practice of diplomacy is such that the roles and responsibilities of actors within the world system are clearly delineated. The requirements of today’s diplomacy has transformed, thus success in diplomacy is achieved when the world adopts openness and transnational cooperation which triggers the active pursuit of more collaborative diplomatic relations with various types of actors.\textsuperscript{44} The traditional model of diplomacy, instituted on the principles of national sovereignty and statecraft is becoming less relevant as a field of new, powerful actors have taken over the international system. Diplomats must now engage with a vast number of new players, thus the age-old ‘club model’ of diplomacy is gradually paving way for a less hierarchical ‘network model’.\textsuperscript{45}
In Shaun Riordan’s works, he explains how indispensable the concept of public diplomacy is to the new model of diplomacy. He asserts that this new dispensation has brought about non-state actors who have emerged as significant players in the global system.46

The old/traditional diplomacy includes a direct government involvement, control and support which are core to most public diplomacy programmes. It also targets well-defined publics such as political elites, opinion leaders and other key stakeholders in foreign policy making. The 21st century public diplomacy, on the other hand, views the role of the government as decreasing steadily; credible actors such as NGOs, pressure groups, think tanks, to mention but a few, are now taking the center stage.47 Today’s public diplomacy focuses on the entire populace- the easy flow of information has transformed the citizenry into independent observers as well as active participants on the international front.

It was not until the end of the twentieth century that nations acknowledged the need for the practice of public diplomacy. This kind of diplomacy now forms a core thrust in a nation’s engagement with the outside world, thus viewed as a threat to traditional diplomatic methods. The terrain of the international system was such that public opinion was given little or no attention; states which were the supreme actors were interested in persuading the foreign publics about their own policies.48 There is undoubtedly a changing international environment which has been attributed to the fast growing rate of diplomatic trends in these contemporary times. There has been an explosive growth of actors who are now playing roles which were hitherto restricted. Governments now reach out to global civil societies to better improve their diplomatic ideals and ideas.
Scholars have alluded to the fact that any good public diplomacy starts with listening. As one senior British diplomat asserted at a British Council Conference, “the world is fed up with hearing us talk: what it actually want is for us to shut up and listen”. The old public diplomacy was tilted towards one way flow of communication, thus states were only interested in convincing the foreign audience about the positive aspects of their country. The focus was on promoting national goals and interests to the wider community.

The ‘new’ public diplomacy calls for dialoguing that is a two way communication- a long-term, complex processes of interaction, in which versatile, but symmetrical relations with foreign publics are constructed. International actors have now proposed new forms of diplomatic engagement wherefore contacts with foreign audiences is targeted at building and maintaining long-term relationships with them. This new concept is no longer confined to messaging nor policy-driven campaigns; rather there lies the need to facilitate relations with non-official agents and collaborate more with them.

2.3 Characteristics of the New Public Diplomacy

With the arrival of the information age, diplomacy has been subjected to and continues to undergo a series of changes and challenges in today’s growing world. These changes have totally transformed the international environment and have alerted states to reconsider a new phase of public diplomatic practice.

The new public diplomacy is characterized by information and communication technologies and indeed, in today’s fast growing world, these techniques are developing and rapidly expanding.
The birth of the internet, social media, digitalization, among a host of others, have provided the platform for the citizenry and the entire public to engage in research and act as advocates on a wide array of issues.

Rhiannon Vickers identifies that citizens are capable to readily access these modern technologies, thus affecting the ways governments conduct diplomacy. These new technologies have distorted the rigid lines between domestic and international news spheres and have rather led to the rise of an intrusive global media which greatly influences public opinion. The one-time gap that existed between domestic policy and foreign policy has rapidly closed; the concerns of citizens are on the top hierarchy of foreign policy issues. The internet can be considered by governments as a unique diplomatic instrument; through its proper use, they can ‘advertise’ not only their positions on diverse issues, but also advocate their ideas worldwide.

In Nicholas J. Cull’s writings, he opines that the new public diplomacy shifts away from the actor-to-people Cold War-era communication to a people-to-people contact for mutual enlightenment. The actor thus acts as a facilitator and encourages relationship building with its target audiences or two audiences, remote to each other.

Another important feature of the new public diplomacy is the medium through which information is disseminated. The dissemination of information is now not restricted to policy-making elite, rather there has been a ‘power shift’ away from states to non-state actors. These new actors which include transnational pressure groups, civil society organizations, think tanks, among several others, now have the ability to access available information and share with like-minded citizens and groups. Following from this, they actively play a part in foreign as well as
global issues. Most of these new actors play lobbying roles which makes it difficult for governments to control information and its distribution. Ultimately, a ‘changed diplomatic environment’ is created in which policies are made.

Shaun Riordan further indicates that the incorporation of new actors and civil society organisations can give an aura of credibility to public diplomacy initiatives which government officials possibly would never be able to do. He asserts that the involvement of these new actors should include journalists, universities, and individual academics, businessmen and organizations, among several others in both the sending and receiving countries. This therefore creates a conducive environment to adopt a culture of openness which is a necessity for the success of today’s public diplomacy. Both government and citizens come to the realization that they both need to collaborate and duplicate efforts towards enhancing the reputation of the nation and exporting its values to the external world though attraction rather than coercion.

With the new public diplomacy on the scene, it is becoming progressively difficult for governments to keep diplomacy confined to a government activity. The public dimension of diplomacy is progressively including an active, rather than passive public as well as smaller groups and non-state actors which were once sideline players in global affairs. They now have the capacity to utilize accessible, inexpensive, and interactive communications systems to cultivate a level of effective co-ordination which were hitherto available only to states, corporations, and other large organizations. The public dimension now includes public opinion thus their consultation, involvement and action are very much considered.
Researchers such as Kunczik make the affirmation that in today’s new diplomatic era, the media is seen to be actively engaged in the processes of communication between the governments and the publics regarding domestic and foreign related issues. This is possibly so because of the expansion of global communication which has made media coverage worthwhile, and also led to the strengthening of a nation’s image and the likeability of its foreign policies. With public diplomacy modernized, the traditional diplomatic channels and work methods are importantly complemented by the use of modern media.

Contemporary diplomats now have to contend with new challenges and tasks: collaborating with the mass media and the contents transmitted by them whilst maintaining their professionalism. Again, they need preserve the support of dissimilar views that emanates from the public, with respect to the nation’s foreign policy implementation and its execution. Diplomats, in this regard, become a sort of public relations and media representatives, communication managers and coordinators.

In the midst of all these developments, they have to continue in their primary role pro-active and profound: timely and holistically recognizing and responding to the development of international relations, determining agendas, opening questions, forming coalitions, international regimes or order, catalyzing collective action among others.

Brian Hocking defines the new public diplomacy as a “network, moderator and catalyst diplomacy, which communicates in the networks of actors, comprising media, translations, mediations, filtering, analysis and interpretation of international and foreign policy matters with
an added value”. The new public diplomacy is no longer limited to messaging, promotion campaigns, or even direct governmental contacts with foreign publics serving foreign policy purposes. It is also about building relationships with civil society actors in other countries and about facilitating networks between non-governmental parties at home and abroad.

Tomorrow’s diplomats will become increasingly familiar with this kind of work, and in order to do it much better they will increasingly have to be connected with non-governmental initiatives, collaborate with non-official agents and benefit from local expertise from the outside world. Inarguably, diplomacy takes place in an international environment that can no longer be described as exclusively state-centric, thus, diplomats now have diverse roles to play in today’s transnational world. Public diplomacy practitioners of posterity will be operators in complex transnational networks, help build trust as well as facilitate cross-border civil society.

Public diplomacy seems much related with soft power; the latter however has been regarded by scholars such as Niall Ferguson as been too soft! In today’s changing diplomatic practice, foreign ministries are very much unlikely to restrict their public diplomacy ideals to traditional, policy-oriented and increasingly ineffective one-way communication with foreign publics. Regardless of the consequences, the intersection between public diplomacy and post-modern cultural relations is bound to grow, unless cultural relations’ practitioners return to a more limited conception of their work.
2.4 Actors in the New Public Diplomacy

The main actors to consider in the new public diplomacy for the purpose of this study are the state and non-state actors. Actors in general are states, individuals and organizations/institutions whose actions and inactions influence the international system in profound ways.\textsuperscript{71} They perform a host of functions which range from political, economic, social, cultural among others. Examples of actors are the leaders of countries, individuals, representatives and leaders of intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, Multinational Corporations and international non-profit organizations.

Today’s public diplomacy, which highlights non-state actors seeks to communicate and listen, rather than to convince and declare. It creates a public sphere where diverse voices can be heard regardless of their various origins, distinct values and often contradictory interests.\textsuperscript{72} The contemporary world system is fast developing and becoming interdependent, thus there arises the need to redefine the public sphere. The new public sphere is largely dependent on the global communication media systems which comprises of television, radio, print press as well as a variety of multimedia and communication systems among which the connections and horizontal networks of communication now play a decisive role.\textsuperscript{73}

The challenges of today’s globalized world has brought about a decreased ability in government responding and managing the needs, interests and values of the citizenry; thereby inducing a rise of the global civil society. Each country has recognized the need for the formation of local civil society actors who are now responsible for defending the specific values and interests of the general society.\textsuperscript{74} Chiefly among these actors include labour unions, interest and pressure groups,
think tanks, community groups, etc. Analysts such as Mary Kaldor define the global civil society as private organizations (albeit often supported and partly financed by public institutions) that act outside government channels to address global problems. He further affirms that they set values that are universally accepted but politically manipulated in their own interests.

Manuel Castells identifies some key features of global civil society actors. They have considerable popularity and legitimacy which give them a good backing in the performance of their activities. Their activities normally focus on practical matters and concrete cases that form the highlights of foreign policy issues. These new actors reach out to the public and mobilize people in support of pertinent foreign policy matters.

2.4.1 State Actors

State actors are the individuals and institutions that act on behalf of states/countries. Examples include President Obama, President Mahama, President Buhari among several others. Bossman E. Asare, in his book, affirms that former heads of states cannot be classified as state actors, because they no longer represent their countries, unless they are carrying out official duties that indeed have international bearings on their nations.

Recently, George W. Bush and Bill Clinton led a United States delegation to Haiti after the earthquake that killed many people and brought untold hardship on the Haitian people. Both former presidents became state actors because of their role in leading the delegation. When they completed the task, they ceased to be state actors.
Mr. Kofi Annan, Former UN Secretary General can be seen as a state actor when he served as Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the former Yugoslavia, overseeing the transition in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to the Multinational Implementation Force (MIFOR) led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).  

State actors promote values such as democracy, human rights and good governance, which are gradually becoming an essential part of foreign policy of a given state. State actors set aims and goals which seeks to address current policy needs to protect the well-being of future generations.

In the case of Ghana, key government agencies and sector ministries most often than not act as state actors. This is rightly so because they act as communicators of key foreign policy issues and engages with foreign publics to push forth government agenda.

2.4.2 Non-State Actors

Non-state actors are considered as individuals and organizations who act on behalf of themselves. They are comprised of multinational corporations, nonprofit organizations, terrorist and other militant groups, and intergovernmental organizations. Prominent non-state actors include Oprah Winfrey, Warren Buffet, Bill and Melinda Gates, the World Bank, Barclays Bank, World Vision International, Amnesty International, Standard Chartered Bank, African Union, European Union, domestic as well as foreign think tanks among host of others.
Non-state actors do not speak on behalf of the state; however, some of them are more influential than other countries. Individuals like Bill Gates and Carlos Slim Helu had financial fortunes exceeding the GDP of many countries in the developing world. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, for example, supports a number of programs in the world, including scholarships for graduate school education and promoting best practices in the agricultural sector in Africa.

Some non-state actors influence their governments’ policies in a manner that reflect their world views. Multinational Corporations and other International Non-governmental Organizations (INGOs) also have influence in the policies of their countries due to the employment they create and their contributions to the foreign direct investments of the country.

They are non-state organizations in the new public diplomacy who use their networks to access the foreign listeners. New public diplomacy goes beyond promotion campaigns and governmental communication with foreign publics to include creating bonds with civil society members of other countries as well as facilitating the creation of networks between domestic non-governmental parties and foreign ones. Non-state actors usually compose of heads of private companies, policy research institutions, industries and trade organisations which contribute essential ideas and aspects which features in the concept of ‘public diplomacy.’

They underline the effort to obtain ‘legitimacy’ and to show ‘effectiveness’ to the foreign public within the international front; these actors are practitioners par excellence of ‘public diplomacy.’ Their wealth of experience helps in developing practices, strategies and use of new technologies that a global society demands.
Authors such as Christopher J. Cox emphasize that non-state actors pioneer the development of new strategies for communication and influence, engagement techniques and the creation of opportunities for dialogue. They fit in and make the most of the new technologies and social networks which have become their usual means of communication with the public, both domestic and foreign.\textsuperscript{86} He further reiterates that non-state actors contribute to the redefinition of public diplomacy. They introduce and suggest aspects that may be considered for theoretical debates.\textsuperscript{87} Some of these aspects are as follows:

- they question the definition of ‘public diplomacy’ that is based on the subject that carries it out, and present a approach to the concept from the object of the action;
- they underline the growing interest in ‘legitimacy’, taken as confidence and real support from the citizenry, rather than a legality that comes from an electoral result;
- they emphasize the importance of the ‘perception of effectiveness’, taken as the effective satisfaction of the citizenry, rather than the achievement of proposed aims;
- they show the increasing power of political communication, taken in a broad sense, as part of the strategies for persuasion and influence.

The proliferation of these new actors, have over the years transformed the global system due to their consistent intervention in the international sphere. The effect of new technologies have authorized these actors to have the locus in accessing financial, political as well as technical resources. Their autonomy is increasing steadily and thus, they define new rules, act more effectively than the states (as some NGOs have demonstrated in humanitarian catastrophes), challenge strong powers (like Google in China) or radically modify security parameters (as al-Qaeda has done)\textsuperscript{88}. In a sense, non-state actors obtain ‘political authority’ from their efficacy in
advocating human rights, advancing new regulations or setting the agenda of political institutions. The source of their ‘legitimacy’, of their authority to tackle traditional actors appears to be their very ‘efficacy’.

As Calame states, there exists opportunities where non-state actors go beyond the reach and power of the states: the global vocation of some NGOs surpasses the narrow-minded national interest of some governments; the business volume of some multinationals places them ahead of many countries on the planet. Although they have greater margin for maneuver, they adapt better to new world realities, make better use of new technologies and can develop strategies for effective influence.

In fact, in certain fields, they lead change and propose formulas or models for behavior. Al-Qaeda has set out the terms for a new policy for worldwide security; the most influential NGO’s have determined cooperation policies, in defense of human rights or on environmental defence and the multinationals have established regulations for the global market.

Key non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and think tanks have proven to be adept at influencing foreign publics. Certainly not all campaigns by globally operating NGOs such as Amnesty International have become entirely successful, that notwithstanding, their effectiveness has attracted the admiration of foreign ministries that are trying to operate in increasingly fluid international networks.
It remains a hard fact that some NGOs do better than others: several countries envy the professionalism and public diplomacy muscle of some major multinational corporations. These new actors (non-state actors) have gradually gained more trust from the public; both domestic and foreign. The principal reason being that they are independent from government control.

In the works of Ataman, he contends that foreign audiences respond better to non-state actors based on the idea that they are neutral and have the capability to maintain different opinions on government’s policies. He further cautions that foreign publics need be prudent since non-state actors have tendencies to pursue their own interest just like governments.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE PRACTICE OF THE NEW PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN GHANA

3.0 Introduction

This chapter centers on the practices of the new public diplomacy in Ghana. It examines how non-state actors, particularly think tanks, are engaged in the new public diplomacy. Interview responses and information from various literatures have been obtained to help achieve the objectives, the research questions and the hypothesis of this study. The literature gathered in this study are used in a manner such that they provide enough empirical evidence with regards to non-state actors and the roles they play in the new public diplomatic practice in Ghana. These documents and information will help determine whether non-state actors are actively engaged in the practice of the new public diplomacy in Ghana or not.

For the sake of clarity and the avoidance of ambiguity, the points of reference set forth for analysis and discussion were the various literatures that directly related to the roles non-state actors play in the new public diplomacy.

In this regard, four think tanks were interviewed namely: Center for Democratic Development (CDD), IMANI Center for Policy and Education, Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA) and Institute for Democracy and Governance (IDEG).
3.1 The Concept of the New Public Diplomatic Practice

The practice of today’s public diplomacy is concerned with the various strategies and techniques used by countries and intergovernmental organizations to communicate to people of other countries rather than the politicians and the senior officials of countries. In its practice, countries and intergovernmental organizations can use people who served in both official and un-official capacities. Think tanks, civil advocacy bodies, religious groups, professional organizations, as well as individuals have all in one way or the other, practiced diplomacy in various facets such as monitoring of the electoral process and enhancing democracy in Ghana.¹ For example, the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) held televised presidential and vice-presidential debates; the Association of Ghanaian Industries (AGI) hosted meetings with all the presidential candidates to discuss economic and business policies; and the Coalition of Domestic Election Observers (CODEO), in collaboration with the Ghana Center for Democratic Development (CDD-Ghana), provided forums for parliamentary candidates to interact with their constituents in the 2008 and 2012 elections periods. In addition, the IEA, CODEO/CDD-Ghana, the Civic Forum, and religious organizations actively monitored the pre-election landscape, with special emphasis on promoting peaceful balloting. The media helped to keep the electorate well-informed about the parties and their programs and, for the most part, acts responsibly through the monitoring of the electoral process and engaging in diplomatic acts in Ghana.²

Rhiannon Vickers explains that the new public diplomacy signifies an attempt to adjust public diplomacy to the conditions of the information age. In this information age, leaders of countries
have become increasingly concerned about their country’s image and standing in the international front.³

It is important to note that communication plays a vital role in the new public diplomacy; where it serves as a driving force for the latter.⁴ In the new public diplomacy, government uses its own means of communication, such as radio stations, televisions, internet, and the newspapers to conduct public diplomacy.⁵ Jarol Manheim further asserts that the communication medium through which the new public diplomacy is practiced remains the most effective form of diplomacy than the direct government-sponsored public diplomacy.⁶ In fact, the establishment of local support groups or movements in a country, for instance, think tanks groups could help strengthen the legitimacy and authenticity of public diplomacy in a country.⁷

Eytan Gilboa presents an expanded list of the main features of the new public diplomacy as discussed extensively in the previous chapter. He highlights how “soft power” plays a key role with respect to the interactivity between states and non-state actors. The concept of soft power relates to how attractive a nation’s policies and values are to the outside world.

Scholars and practitioners have often equated public diplomacy with “soft power” and measured results solely by public opinion polls and media coverage. It is clear for almost any practitioner that public diplomacy today involves much more substance as against how it used to be practiced some centuries past. It causes people to act through cooperation rather than coercion. When strategies and policies of states or non-state actors have moral authority or are seen as legitimate in the eyes of others, their soft power is increased. Actors such as the Vatican, NGOs, and global
news organizations hold only soft power. It can therefore be concluded that the new public diplomacy calls for the use of soft power.

The practice of the new public diplomacy is as well seen as a two-way communication. Grunig and Grunig established that the two-way kind of communicating in the new public diplomacy deals with the organizations that listen to what the public has to say; thus they act on behalf of their people based on the issues of the public. They listen to the grievances of the people and address them accordingly. This two-pronged mode of communication inevitably leads to relationship building. Again, this new field of diplomacy places much emphasis on the publics’ interests as well as on their own (that is, symmetric communication). Strategic public diplomacy (new public diplomacy) will thus focus on the public interest as well as their own interest.

In James Pamment’s view, today’s public diplomacy has led to a main paradigm shift in international communication. He further stresses that the globalized nature of the world system has brought about transparency and openness, thus foreign ministries are no longer the sole actors in foreign policy implementation. Non-traditional actors are now actively involved in governmental affairs and create new channels for executing foreign policy decisions.

3.2 Actors of the New Public Diplomacy in Ghana: Emphasis on Non-State Actors (Think Tanks)

Scholars such as Gilboa have distinguished between state and non-state actors in the new public diplomacy. The new international actors such as NGOs, civil society groups, and individuals have made much input in the arena of diplomacy.
State actors are the accredited representatives of their countries who do not act on their own behalf but on behalf of the state. These actors have remained quite dormant in today’s public diplomacy, the new players (non-state actors) have now taken the center stage.

3.2.1 Non-State Actors

The practice of the new public diplomacy in Ghana have recognized the importance of engaging with various actors other than the government itself in an effort to improve Ghana’s image overseas.\textsuperscript{12} In the year 2007, the US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice launched a ‘transformational diplomacy ’initiative that called upon the private sector to take part in US public diplomacy’s endeavors around the world.\textsuperscript{13}

Non-state actors usually exploit global news networks and media events to cultivate global support for their causes. In Ghana, non-state actors such as think tanks adopt different lobbying strategies for different policy proposals but their effectiveness depends on a number of demand and supply factors that influence outcomes in the political marketplace.\textsuperscript{14}

The Mung’omba Constitutional Review Commission refers to non-state actors as organisations that seek to protect public interest whilst enjoying relative autonomy.\textsuperscript{15} This definition shields a wide range of associations and interest groups including ; National Farmers Union, Chamber of Commerce, environmental movements, civil society organizations, labor unions, professional associations, sporting clubs, cultural associations, religious groups, trade unions, media organisations, NGOs and other socio-economic orientated organisations. These groupings are perceived to act in the “public interest” and or in the interest of their respective constituencies.
Crocker Snow Jr. points out that among various private organisations involved in what used to be the government’s domain, non-profit NGOs stand out because, unlike others, they recognize the role they play in public diplomacy. Peter Simmons contends that NGOs have the potential of doing more harm than good with regards to the pursuit of their interests and agendas.

3.3 Think Tanks in the New Public Diplomacy

Andrew F. Cooper and Brian Hocking, in their work, “Governments, Non-Governmental Organizations”, refer to think tanks as NGOs and research centers that act as independent diplomatic actors in the foreign policy making. They explain that think tanks provide convenient platform for policy discussions, which helps to better inform and assist policymakers in discharging their functions.

The term “think tank” was first coined in the United States of America during the Second World War. In those days, think tanks meant a secure room or environment in which military planners and policy-makers met to discuss wartime strategy. In recent times, ‘think tank’ generally refers to a non-profit-making, tax-exempt, non-partisan (not to be confused with non-ideological) institution engaged in research and analysis on one or more issues related to public policy, whether foreign or domestic. Over the years, as think tanks expand and become more diverse, its definition becomes broader and complex.

Scholars make the attempt to differentiate between think tanks that focus primarily on policy research and those that focus primarily on political advocacy. They have tried in finding ways of determining how to assess the influence of think-tanks on domestic and foreign policy, a
subject that will be addressed in the final section of this study. The inner workings of think tanks and the various strategies they employ to gain access to the corridors of power continue to intrigue scholars, who monitor their activities closely.\textsuperscript{22}

Yehezkel Dror defines such think tanks as ‘an island of excellence applying full-time interdisciplinary scientific thinking to the in-depth improvement of policymaking, or as a bridge between power and knowledge’.\textsuperscript{23} It is difficult to accept this definition in its totality due to the fact that some think tanks do not necessarily embark on an interdisciplinary analysis of events but rather have a specific focus and are distinctively geared towards certain institutions. According to Diane Stone, independent think tanks are not interdisciplinary units of the type that are found in universities, although they have been referred to as ‘universities without students’.\textsuperscript{24} It is however acknowledged that, whereas the main purpose of independent research institutions is to undertake policy research and analysis, they are not in any way connected to the vagaries of university life.

Donald Abelson describes think tanks as ‘independent, non-profit, research oriented institutes, among whose primary objectives are to examine and comment on a wide range of public policy issues’.\textsuperscript{25} This definition falls in line with the one used by Simon James in his work on think tanks in Britain. In his view, a think tank could be conceived as ‘an independent organization engaged in multi-disciplinary research intended to influence public policy’.\textsuperscript{26}

Following from this definition, our analysis eliminates all research institutions that are directly dependent on government for research funds. Private research institutions, however maintain
their independence in whatever they do. Again, it distinguishes these institutions from management consultants who are profit oriented. Similarly, it describes such organisations as having multi-faceted objectives, thus conducting research across policy fields.

As noted by Paul Smith, working across different policy fields, with a range of interests and expertise amongst their staff, gives think tanks a distinctive perspective on policy issues. It allows them have wider outlook, and enables them to set policy ideas in a wider context. This is a characteristic shared by some of the newly emerged private research institutions in the Ghanaian policy making environment.

3.3.1 The Emergence of Think Tanks in Ghana

At the end of the year 2000, six major think tanks could be recognized in Ghana. These include: the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA), Center for Policy Analysis (CEPA), Center for Democracy and Development (CDD), African Security Dialogue and Research (ASDR), Institute of Policy Alternatives (IPA) and Third World Network (TWN).

The IEA was the first private research institution established in Ghana in 1989. It was followed by CEPA in 1993, TWN in 1994, ASDR in 1995, CDD in 1998 and IPA in 2000. Among these institutions, CEPA, IEA, CDD and TWN are concerned with the adoption and promotion of the neo-liberal agenda; that is changing the state and enhancing political openness which is devoid of state brutalities. CEPA, IEA and CDD can be classified as conservative think tanks because they focus on promoting the ‘marketization of the public service’, as well as helping other institutions that may facilitate the development of those ideas in Ghana. TWN, on the other hand,
concerns itself with social and economic policies that advance the needs and interests of
marginalized social groups in the country.\textsuperscript{31}

Other think tanks have begun as advocacy groups and have formed alliances with local and
international institutions to advocate changes in economic, political and environmental policies.\textsuperscript{32} TWN has collaborated with Integrated Social Development (ISODEC) to systematically
campaign for the involvement of civil society groups in devising policies relating to the
Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP).\textsuperscript{33} Domestic think tanks, in consultation with the Ghana
government as well as donor community churned a lot of effort in reviewing the SAP which
culminated in the Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative (SAPRI).\textsuperscript{34}

3.3.2 Characteristics of Think Tanks in Ghana

The most important feature of think tanks in Ghana as well as their counterparts across the globe
is their personnel. A close look at the staff of these institutions indicate that about 90% of them
have Ph.D. degrees and teach in leading universities. These personnel exhibit great knowledge in
their fields of speciality and thus become resource persons during policy discussions.\textsuperscript{35}

Think tanks, in both developed and developing countries are non-partisan in nature. They do not
work for political parties nor ministers of state, rather they attach a strict, non-partisan approach
to their work. According to Dr. Agyeman-Duah of the CDD, “we are not in the business of
making it look like we are for or against this party or government”.\textsuperscript{36} In view of this, think tanks
have become mindful of the need to be transparent in their work so as to maintain their integrity
and credibility in the eyes of the public.
There is, nevertheless, great deal of concern among Ghanaians on the non-partisan nature of these institutions. Most people believe that they have been controlled by political parties, especially when one examines the personalities involved in these organizations and their relationship with some political parties. For instance, Mr. Franklin Cudjoe of IMANI Ghana was accused by the governing political party, National Democratic Congress (NDC) as being a party loyalist of the New Patriotic Party (NPP) but operating under the guise of civil society group.37

Dr. Agyeman-Duah, former deputy executive director of CDD, and Henry Kwasi Prempeh, its former director of legal affairs, were card-bearing members of the NPP. Furthermore, J.B. da Rocha, a past chairman of the NPP as well as Haruna Esseku, the party’s former chairman are fellows of the IEA. Professor Adzei Bekoe, who was a member of the Council of State, a constitutional body mandated to advise the President, was also a fellow of IEA, while Dr. Charles Mensah, the former executive of the IEA, was a personal advisor to the President. Likewise, two prominent members of CEPA, Dr. Anthony Osei-Akoto and Dr. Samuel Nii Noi Ashong all served in the NPP administration.38 Dr. Abbey, the executive director of CEPA was once Ghana’s High Commissioner to Canada under the PNDC.

Further, Ghanaian think tanks may be considered as comparatively autonomous institutions, independent of government, political parties and pressure groups. Their main aim is to influence government policies so as to enhance the overall development of Ghana. Others have a much comprehensive objective, which focuses on changing the developmental contours on the African continent.39
Another notable feature of think tanks is their close relationship with governmental and non-governmental organizations. One cause for this relationship stems from the need to obtain resources necessary to carry out their work. Most of these institutions rely extensively on external sources for funding. These finds come from similar organizations based in the UK, Canada and the USA, the Bretton Woods Institutions, and other non-governmental organizations such as the USAID, Canadian Development Agency (CIDA), Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and even the OECD and the European Union (EU).

CEPA, for example, is partially funded by USAID and Africa Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF), a World Bank institution based in Zimbabwe. It also obtains funding through collaborative work with international institutions on various research issues affecting Ghana, Africa and the developing world in general.

CDD also receives funding from these organizations, as well as from the Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA), the International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTS), the Ford Foundation, IBIS, the Swiss Embassy in Ghana, Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Overseas Development Institute of UK and the British Department for International Development (DFID). IEA likewise, relies substantially on donor funding.

### 3.3.3 The Role of Think Tanks in Public Diplomacy

Think tanks have played and continue to play pivotal roles in the new public diplomacy in Ghana. They may generally be well thought-out as an integral part of non-state actors that serves
as an important catalyst for ideas and actions in emerging democracies around the world and especially in developing countries such as Ghana.\textsuperscript{44} In Africa, their emergence can be attributed to the overall political and economic liberalization, which is being promoted by African states with the support of the international community.

Scholars allude to the fact that ‘think tanks’ have had a greater influence in shaping the direction in which administrative reforms have been taking place in Ghana than other civil society groups interested in administrative reform. Their influence on the reform process is, however, contingent upon the effectiveness of their personnel, and the processes and methods they have adopted in disseminating reform ideas to policymakers and the public at large.\textsuperscript{45}

Think tanks play vital roles in the dissemination of ideas and they exhibit strong influence in the policy making environment. They have received a tremendous amount of attention in the policy studies literature due to their proliferation in both developed and developing countries.\textsuperscript{46}

Through the energies of think tanks, the larger society has begun to ‘understand’ and ‘accept’ policies being propagated to alter the state. Although it is difficult to measure the extent of their influence in this direction, there is no doubt that as a result of the methods/approaches adopted, they continue to have a significant impact on what the state should do. These methods and processes have allowed them to gain significant access to the policy making process as well as the ear of the general populace.\textsuperscript{47}
Indeed, think tanks, with the support of international donors, seem to have made more significant headway in the policy making process than other NGOs, mainly due to their capacity (personnel, finances, methods) and their ability to infiltrate the policy making arena. This dimension and ability seems to have produced an interdependent relationship between these organisations and the major policy actors, especially the legislature and executive. Thus, there is no doubt that think tanks will continue to influence policy makers regarding the need to adopt the new managerial approach to reforming the administrative state. They have been able to package this approach as the appropriate solution to the needs of the Ghanaian society.

Think tanks have developed capacity for generating research that are mostly timely and relevant for policy makers. They disseminate the outcome of such research for the benefit of the media and the general populace. These policy institutions have helped in improving the mandate of certain policy-makers, or one that more closely resembles their own, by encouraging their staff to accept positions in government.

Think tanks, in some cases, serve as local or domestic policy entrepreneurs by initiating policies, which have been adopted by government. The CDD, for instance, is dedicated to the promotion of the society and government, based on the rule of law, appropriate checks on the power of the state, and integrity in public administration. They also promote democracy, good governance and the development of liberal economic environment in Ghana.

The IEA also aims at establishing and strengthening a market economy and democratic, free and open society in Ghana, and its ultimate goal is the promotion of good governance, democracy
and a free and fair market economy in Ghana. For this reason, the IEA has become a prime policy entrepreneur for the introduction and support of the ‘mangerialist’ idea in Ghana.\textsuperscript{52}

On the other hand, some think tanks have become policy mediators for resolving policy conflicts or disagreements between government and opposition parties in issues of significant national interest.\textsuperscript{53} For instance, when the current government decided to constitute a National Reconciliation Commission to scrutinize human rights abuses under military regimes, the initial bill it introduced focused only on the era of the PNDC (1981-92).\textsuperscript{54} The result was impasse over the adoption of the bill. To help resolve the conflict, CDD conducted independent research on national reconciliation throughout Africa and other parts of the world, and used the findings to organize an international conference in Ghana with the full participation of the government, all political parties, some civil society groups and other important personalities. The results of this conference was a new bill presented by government, which had some windows of opportunity for persons who had been aggrieved under both constitutional and unconstitutional regimes since independence. The bill also granted more optional powers to the Commission to examine matters brought to its attention.\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{3.4 Data Analysis (Responses from Interviews)}

The interview was meant to elicit responses from public policy institutions with regards to the non-state actors and their engagement in the new public diplomacy. The main think tanks that were interviewed are: Center for Democratic Development (CDD), IMANI Center for Policy and Education, Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA) and Institute for Democracy and Governance (IDEG). The interview responses are presented below:
3.4.1 Definition of Public Diplomacy

When respondents were asked about the definition of public diplomacy, an official from the IMANI Center for Policy and Education responded that “there is no universally agreed definition of what public diplomacy is. They are mechanisms put in place by a foreign state to promote its interests and foreign policy in another country. They do this by mainly engaging with the voice of the people, thus there exists some actors which advance/ form the core of the people/populace which otherwise the people themselves cannot do. These actors include think tanks, faith-based organizations, the private sector and so on. The foreign country, through these organizations hopes to advance their interests and their policies.”

According to the respondent from the Center for Democratic Development (CDD), “public diplomacy deals with the mechanisms and strategies employed by nations to convey their foreign policy aims and goals to the foreign public. This kind of diplomacy normally deals with the relationship between states.”

The Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA) answered that: “diplomacy generally refers to the way states relate among themselves in a global setting using special skills and tools for negotiations to ensure that there exists cordial relations amongst each other. Public diplomacy remains an eminent tool used in this practice because states have awakened up to the fast growing nature of the world and have realized how relevant the public (be it local or foreign) is becoming to diplomatic practice.”
However, to the Institute for Democracy and Governance (IDEG), “the old public diplomacy was basically political and dealt with improving the political relations between two sovereign states (taking the Ghana-UK for instance). Public diplomacy thus becomes an important tool used in this process by states to enhance such relations and to shape their foreign policy aims and objectives.”

3.4.2 Difference between the New and the Old Public Diplomacy

Concerning the difference between the new and the old public diplomacy, IMANI Ghana replied that: “there certainly exists a difference between the old public diplomacy and the new. As the world grows older, things emerge, things change themselves. Therefore there is an attempt to involve more actors in the process. The emergence of new technologies—ie. new information and communication technologies has helped to make public diplomacy more effective and transparent as against how it was then; when it was really restricted to a number of groups. Today, we see a number of groups (the so-called informal groups) which are being actively involved in the public diplomatic process.”

With regards to a working definition for the new public diplomacy, the respondent indicated that “the new public diplomacy is a field where there exists a lot of actors which otherwise were not involved in the public diplomatic process, now being given recognition as important actors”. He further pointed out that with today's public diplomacy, there is the frequent use of information and communication technologies which have helped make public diplomatic practice more transparent and effective. The new public diplomacy, as literature names it “the people's diplomacy” includes a direct interaction with the people (ie. the public) in diplomatic practice.
This is rightly so because the new public diplomacy, invariably affects the livelihood of the populace/citizenry.  

CDD indicated that “the traditional view of public diplomacy was such that it dealt with the relationship among state actors in various spheres. However, in the last two decades, there has arisen the need for a new phase of public diplomatic practice which welcomes non-state actors and how these new actors are joining states to engage with foreign audiences with respect to the pursuit of foreign policy ideas and ideals.”

CDD further opined that “the new public diplomacy (NPD) involves the emergence of new players/actors who are now playing active roles in the diplomatic process which were hitherto performed by state actors. Some of these roles include: engaging with the public to promote foreign policy goals, creating avenues for policy analysis as well as organizing public policy debates. These roles have been made possible, very open and transparent enough thanks to the birth of new communication and information strategies such as the internet, social media etc.”

The IEA answered that “the traditional public diplomacy focuses on how states interact among themselves. Today’s public diplomacy has seen the arrival of non-state actors such as MNCs, think tanks, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) who are playing keen roles targeted at shaping a nation’s public diplomatic approach. It can therefore be concluded that the feasible roles of these new actors is what has made public diplomacy “new” in contemporary times. This clearly draws out the distinction between the “old” and the “new” public diplomacy.”
In the opinion of IDEG, “the new public diplomacy is much broad, it thus goes beyond political relations to include cultural, economic as well as social relations, granting of aid and investment opportunities among states. These elements are now taking the center stage in the diplomatic activities of a given nation.” The traditional public diplomacy, as stated earlier is narrowed down to states enhancing their political relations with little or no indulgence from other actors. “Today’s public diplomacy, however, looks at states engaging in other areas apart from the political aspect. There has been the arrival of new actors on the diplomatic scene who are seriously engaging the public in crucial foreign policy issues.”

3.4.3 Relevance of Non-State actors in the New Public Diplomacy

The respondents were asked whether non-state actors are relevant in the new public diplomacy. According to IMANI, “Non-state actors (NSAs) are extremely relevant in today's public diplomacy. State actors have their interests which are most often than not, unknown to NSAs. NSAs are normally the representation of the people, thus their role cannot be undermined. Over the years, they have succeeded in building an inclusive opinion in the PD process. NSAs stand for the people at all times, this can be opposed to state actors which normally symbolize the government of a particular state whose interests are normally driven by party colours.”

CDD, revealed that “NSAs are important in today’s public diplomacy. The views of the general public, civil society, stakeholders of foreign policy making are now very much considered in public policy debates. These new actors have thus developed a growing interest in how government conducts its foreign policy aims and decisions. They make certain that these foreign policy ideas are in tune with the national interest.”
The IEA answered that “NSAs especially think tanks are extremely relevant in today’s PD because they provide the necessary linkage between the state and those being governed (i.e. the citizenry). To this end, think tanks are able to send feedback (complaints/challenges) that confronts the ordinary people at the grassroots, and thus better articulate them for the state to provide redress”.69

IDEG stressed that “NSAs particularly think tanks are exceptionally significant in today’s PD, now more than ever before. This is so because we are in an era of transparency, accountability and good governance which presupposes that NSAs need play active roles to promote the new PD. Think tanks thus ensure that the benefits achieved thereof (having engaged in the new PD) will fulfill the needs and interests of the general populace and not for just a few section of the people. Think tanks also have the responsibility of ensuring that state actors perform their functions in a transparent and accountable manner; so as to fit the demands of the new era we find ourselves in.70

3.4.4 Collaboration of Non-State Actors (Think Tanks) with State Actors in the New Public Diplomacy

The official from IMANI responded to the question; do non-state actors (think tanks) collaborate with state actors in the new public diplomacy? He revealed that “although NSAs willingly collaborate with state actors in the pursuit of PD goals, the terrain is a tough and rough one. This is due to the fact that the latter views the former as "enemies"; wherefore the interests of state actors are not aligned with those of NSAs (ie. think tanks). Think tanks primarily work for the
improvement of humankind, that notwithstanding, governments always hold their political interests in high esteem.”\textsuperscript{71}

“In short, state and non-state actors are almost always not on the same page (hardly speak the same language). Regardless of the above-mentioned, there exists a reason for collaboration between these two entities to help in achieving efficiency. PD focuses on power, government, government-related institutions to mention but a few. It is thus important for NSAs to find the medium through which they can collaborate with state actors.”\textsuperscript{72}

CDD also confessed that, “think tanks are generally becoming more and more involved in the PD process. They therefore avail themselves and are willing to assist state actors/government to pursue its foreign policy goals. Think tanks, by virtue of the kind of work they do are directly eligible to promote pertinent foreign policy issues. Advanced nations such as the US, UK which have established institutions such as USAID, DFID in most African countries including Ghana have amicable and warm relations with domestic think tanks. These developed states are thus able to push forth and easily propagate important agenda such as democracy, good governance with the abled assistance of the local think tanks. Rightly so, these ideas conveyed by the developed nations form the main pillars of any nation’s foreign policy aims and objectives. (taking Ghana as an example in this instance).”\textsuperscript{73}

IEA indicated that: “NSAs will thus need to overlook the rivalry and competition that seemingly exist between them and government and seek partnership/collaboration with state actors to make PD practice efficient and effective.”\textsuperscript{74}
According to IDEG, “NSAs can never do away with state actors and would need to collaborate with them in this new diplomatic practice. To begin with, think tanks have certain strengths, specializations and expertise that state actors evidently lack. The need for partnering will help state actors to benefit/tap in from the experiences, skills and professionalism demonstrated by NSAs in their field of work.”

3.4.5 Engagement of Think Tanks in the New Public Diplomacy

With regards to how non-state actors (especially think tanks) are engaging in today's public diplomacy, IMANI’s response indicated that “NSAs are without doubt engaged in today's PD. In spite of the rough terrain, NSAs (think tanks) need to position themselves as NSAs and this would help them to identify their very purpose of existence. A practical example includes the negotiations of the EPA and the kind of input IMANI offered. Although the EPA is an imported policy, IMANI was able to voice out its opinion and work towards achieving the greater good, regardless of the diverse views which emanated from the public. Like IMANI and any other think tanks, it considered it prudent to conduct evidence-based work in order to clearly publicize its opinion on the policy at hand. More so, there was lot of pro-activeness on the part of IMANI which helped it to clearly withstand compromises from all angles. In a whole, IMANI was clear and solid on their opinion regarding the EPAs.”

“NSAs, are by the settings of the space, deprived of the prerogative to forcibly engage in the PD process; regardless of this, they still attain the good reputation status. To this end, IMANI has been vividly engaged with foreign businesses and international agencies on national issues. It is quite clear that with the arrival of the information age, each and every think tank need to step up,
willing accept and rapidly improve upon the use of the new information and communication strategies so as to offer credible and effective output to the populace.”

CDD noted that “NSAs are indeed engaged in today’s public diplomacy. In the case of CDD, during the election year, it collaborated with the Coalition of Domestic Election Observers (CODEO) to observe the national elections and helped achieve free, fair and transparent elections. CDD further holds programs and supports policies that are channeled towards institutionalizing good governance, economic stability among others. These programs and policies helps uplifts Ghana’s image to the outside world as a nation with good democratic values.”

According to IEA, “think tanks are increasingly playing active roles in the PD process. Taking the IEA for instance, it recognizes itself as a public policy institution and plays key roles in ensuring that public policies are shaped in a manner that serves or promotes the interest of Ghanaians. In this regard, the IEA conducts research and make their findings known to policymakers and these findings go a step further by being well documented in policy briefs for the use of posterity.”

Further, the IEA, like any domestic think tank plays the watchdog role of ensuring that governments stay committed to the cause and executes the agenda for the day (i.e. protecting and serving the interests of the populace) The IEA, in playing out these roles, develops the ability of unearthing policy challenges which most often than not, are addressed by the state. Usually, when these challenges are enormous, the state seeks assistance from other states. In the
international arena for instance, issues that are discussed by states are usually those that emanate
from the domestic think tanks and they go a long way to form the highlights of foreign policy
goals of these states.⁸⁰

“IDEG was of the view that think tanks are rapidly engaging in PD practice. For example, IDEG
in recent times has been actively engaged in the Ghana-IMF negotiations and its
recommendations were duly considered. IDEG was part of the Civil Society Platform on Ghana-
IMF Relations and has been extremely helpful in playing its advisory and supportive role to
Ghana and the IMF alike. IDEG has also offered much support to donor states and institutions
which have keen interest in our diplomatic activities. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) are
increasingly making suggestions on how to improve and deepen the benefits that will be derived
from states engaging with donor countries.”⁸¹

3.4.6 How the Activities of Think Tanks in Today’s Public Diplomacy
Enhance the National Interest

Relating to how the activities of think tanks in today’s public diplomacy enhance the national
interest, “IMANI answered that the activities of think tanks need be geared towards the national
interest, nonetheless, there exist challenges. Taking the EPA for example, IMANI fully
supported the policy in spite of the oppositions from the masses. IMANI, like any other think
tank, exists as a local based organization. Thus, its interests need be fine-tuned to suit and
properly fit into interests of the state. Think tanks normally have the penchant for overly
supporting foreign companies. The needs of the country come first, above all others, and all sorts
of compromises must be avoided. IMANI always engages with these businesses by virtue of the
activities that they conduct; where they serve as advocates and policy advisors to them. IMANI,
in a bid to pursue activities targeted at advancing the national interest, assesses the foreign policy goals and strategies of these foreign companies operating in Ghana. For instance, IMANI offers policy ideas to the USAID such that these ideas are to collectively help attain the foreign policy ideals of Ghana”.

The activities that CDD engages in certainly help to enhance the national interest. CDD, from its time of existence in 1998, has unflinchingly supported the conduct of elections in the country. Elections in Ghana have been free, fair, peaceful, and have always satisfied the national interest. In the light of this, Ghana has been considered as the pacesetter for the practice of good democracy on the continent.

IEA rightly put it that the activities engaged by think tanks advance the national interest. “Since NSAs do not work for themselves but for the public, they make sure that the interests of the latter are achieved at the end of the day. Attaining these interests are in one way or the other affiliated with the national interest”.

According to IDEG, “the activities engaged in by think tanks are promoting the national interest. The US embassy is seeking assistance from IDEG (in terms of venue, guests to invite, and provision of resource materials) with respects to the former sending a US expert to give a lecture on “Ethics in Political Reporting”. In this stead, it is IDEG that it serving as a host for this lecture and is working behind the scene to ensure its success. IDEG’s engagement and support for programs as such as these is obviously for the sake of the national interest”.
3.4.7 Achievements Accredited to Domestic Think Tanks Having Engaged in the New Public Diplomacy

With respects to the successes attributed to think tanks, IMANI had this to say: “IMANI has helped strengthen the pillars of democracy, good governance, economic growth, stable health conditions in Ghana. Foreign companies, day in day out, invest money which is targeted at fostering and improving growth and development in the country. Think tanks, have over the years, kept the government on its toes and have ensured that capital designated for developmental projects are used as such. For the perspective on democracy, transparency, probity and accountability has been very effective, thanks to the efforts of think tanks and the advisory and supportive roles they play. Other NSAs such as the media, citizens’ movement have all emanated to the scene to check the government at all times- thus instilling transparency and accountability in all spheres. Think tanks, together with foreign businesses have helped pushed forth some very pertinent and crucial national agenda, which otherwise local governments would not have done on their own.”

CDD narrated how it has helped Ghana to instill good governance as well as attain economic liberalization. It also joins hands with key stakeholders to embark on sensitization programs geared towards good election practice. Again, CDD engages with foreign corporations so as to attract foreign direct investment into the country which helps boost our growth economically.

“IEA has remained an avenue for policy ideals and ideas as well as providing a platform for its analysis. Five years ago for instance, IEA was able to popularize some of the conventions that have been ratified by government, eg. the Convention on Good Governance, Democracy and
Human Rights; the IEA held several discourses on this convention, exerted pressure on policymakers and moved it from the ratification status to implementation status.”  

Nota bene among IDEG’s achievements include improving relations between states, promoting economic and social development, organizing public debates, offering policy ideas to policymakers to mention but a few. The US awarded the Martin Luther King Award for Peace to IDEG for this year 2015 due to its promotion of peace and good relations among nations. This award indeed goes a long way to foster cordial relations between the US and Ghana.  

### 3.4.8 Challenges of Think Tanks in the New Public Diplomacy

Regarding the challenges that think tanks face through their engagement in the new public diplomacy, the respondent from IMANI recounted that “there is the possibility of being tagged as a body of promoting foreign interests. Quite unfortunately, think tanks do not have the power to change things; they rather have the influence over policy issues. They also have the trust and support of the people in doing so. Due to this, they normally are seen as suspects and tagged "pro-foreign". Again, governments views thinks tanks, research institutes, civil society organizations, among others, as partisan which makes the former shy away from engaging the latter in critical foreign policy issues and the whole PD process. The leadership of most think tanks are not naturally proactive and thus are unable to make meaningful inputs to foreign policy decisions. This however goes a long way to undermine the national interest”.  

CDD, just like any institution, is faced with challenges. Chief among them include financial constraints which restrict its volume of work, hence directly affecting its impact on key public
policy issues. CDD, however being an independent non-partisan organization, is required to carry out projects with little or no support from the state. Although external partners provide some form of financial support, there is more room for improvement as resources are most often than not insufficient to achieve quality and efficient work in the end.\textsuperscript{91}

There also exists the general perception of domestic think tanks as “being partisan”. There is also a lot of doubt that these institutions can exist independently and work towards the achievements of their own goals and strategies. These suspicions, in the end, mar the work of think tanks and discourage them to give off their best.\textsuperscript{92}

The IEA encounters some challenges. “The issue of funding is very critical, wherefore think tanks in general lack the needed resources to carry out its activities. Again, NSAs do not have enough power/ authority since they remain non-traditional actors, the state therefore has an upper hand and has more power than them (in terms of executing its functions). Most at times, the activities of think tanks are questioned and are severely challenged by the state; especially when their research findings are not favorable to them. States will therefore go to the extreme of tagging these actors as partisan and make them look less credible. Think tanks again suffer that tight loop in finding that balance between serving the interest of the populace and the interest of their donors. They may however be specific policy interventions that these donors may require think tanks to pursue. This might seem impossible and seem out of touch with realities and challenges confronting the local citizenry. In the end, it becomes problematic.”\textsuperscript{93}
IDEG certainly faces difficulties. “Increasingly Ghana is seen as a country doing relatively well on two fronts: governance and economic development. On the governance front, advanced states retract aid granted to countries such as Ghana because they gradually perceive it as a nation with lesser problems; although this may not be the case. This however becomes a great challenge. Think tanks therefore lack the little support they may derive from these donor states. On the economic development front, although Ghana has earned the middle income country status since 2010 and further exports oil, one would expect that the nation can survive with no support whatsoever. Looking at the practical side of both fronts, Ghana still derives assistance in all spheres and this would, by far, enable think tanks to play out their functions appropriately.”

The more think tanks are being seen to be doing well, the more attention is shifted away from them, thus they (both state actors and think tanks) stand not to gain any benefits. The ideal instance is when think tanks earn support from donor countries even in their bright moments. Interestingly, foreign countries who have representations (embassies) and state actors very well know the think tanks that are partisan and those that are not. It would be an over-generalization to say that all think tanks are partisan—certainly not a one size fits all situations. Governments still do have their own perception about think tanks and once they foresee that a particular think tank is inclined to some foreign state, it is seen as a competitor. Thus more attention is channeled to it (the think tank) and the state is thus been deprived of such privileges. By far, governments’ most often think that think tanks provide materials for criticism which makes the former have its own suspicions of the latter.
3.4.9 Solutions to Help Think Tanks Survive the Difficulties they Face

IMANI indicated that it mostly liaises with Tullow Oil and offers financial advice to the latter regarding the performance of its social responsibilities. There also need be transparency in the whole PD process; data must be readily accessible so as to make informed and better decisions. Again, the leadership of think tanks need be efficient and proactive. Governments as well as foreign corporations need to begin to see NSAs as partners of development and massively engage them in PD process. The support of think tanks to policy decisions inevitably helps attain success. It is also vital for think tanks to make use of technologies; both information and communication to facilitate work and create transparency.96

CDD revealed that one quick solution that easily comes to mind is the creation of endowment fund. This would help attain capital from non-projects, individuals, businesses both local and foreign just to mention but a few. Programs and policies can easily be carried out to help achieve the required output.97

According to IEA, “the state would need to partner more with NSAs and provide the necessary support (especially financial wise) to them. It would help make them work towards achieving a common goal- serving the interest of the citizenry. A broader platform would need be created and enhanced to help both the state, NSAs and donor states work hand in hand without any conflicting interests. Again, the state needs to grant NSAs more authority to carry out their functions. Once the state is able to deter itself from political ambitions and see things more constructive and practical as they are, it will be able to appreciate the good work of think tanks (taking the research they undertake for instance)”.98
IDEG proposed that donor states would need to offer attention (especially financially) to think tanks to help them work efficiently. The latter need to still remain loyal and continue seeking support from these donor states to help them keep up the good work. Once more, it is just about time that governments see think tanks as partners and not competitors, this would create a conducive (enabling) environment for discussing and pushing forth matters of mutual interest—such as executing important foreign policy decisions.99

3.4.10 Ghana’s Public Diplomacy Tomorrow Considering the Engagement of New Actors

IMANI revealed that Ghana's PD is likely to survive with the engagement of new actors (think tanks). Some NSAs are not widely known—private interests associations, faith-based organizations etc. are mostly left out of the PD process. Religious organizations are mostly sidelined and are left out to engage in humanitarian issues.

It is, however, about time for Ghana as a sovereign state to bring all these actors on-board to achieve a wholesome PD success. Social discoordination is created if all actors are not actively involved which may lead to disjointed interests. Today’s world is evolving at fast rate hence Ghana and every state as a matter of fact need to adjust to the changing environment. PD in Ghana will thrive with the arrival of new technologies. Thinks tanks will therefore need to play critical roles in pertinent national issues. An easy collaboration between state and NSAs will help foster national growth and development. Ghana still needs to learn a lot more from foreign nations; chinese think tanks are a case in point. These think tanks have the capacity of penetrating every space of the world; they have solid national strategies put in place to ease the
work of think tanks. The Chinese government and its think tanks collaborate freely and easily and are able to prepare the grounds for business opportunities in other countries.\(^{100}\)

According to CDD, “Ghana’s PD will certainly survive with the arrival of NSAs. However, more importantly, a lot of work need to be done with respects to getting oneself (i.e., the average Ghanaian) acquainted with the concept. Although the foreign ministries have the prerogative of doing so, a lot more need be done so that NSAs can better complement “the much” that will be achieved. It is indeed about time that Ghana made use of its think tanks and not see them as “rivals”. It rather needs to collaborate with institutions such as these to achieve relevant foreign policy goals.

Again, the use of cultural diplomacy to advance foreign policy objectives needs to be considered seriously in these times, as it very much was in the days of President Nkrumah. There need be a conscious effort to engage the public in PD process since the world is more opened and interconnected now and the latter are mostly found in the center stage of public diplomatic practice than they previously were. Ghana again needs to position itself and learn a lot more from the advanced nations in order to reshape her public diplomacy approach and the practice of diplomacy in entirety.\(^{101}\)

IEA made certain that Ghana’s PD will obviously thrive with the engagement of new actors. NSAs are now flourishing, their proliferation and their desire to exist without state support will make it rightly so. Ghana stands to gain a lot if it looks up to the PD practice of other advanced nations. There are a lot of skills used by these countries and can possibly inure to our benefit.\(^{102}\)
IDEG indicated that Ghana’s PD is very much likely to survive with the arrival of think tanks. The state will have to provide unflinching support to NSAs to help enhance PD practice in Ghana. This is rightly so because institutions as these better understand donor nations and what they require far more than state actors. Ghana needs to learn from the experiences of other nations’ PD practice. Ghana can always look up to the skills and expertise employed by these nations.103

3.5 Discussions

The first objective of the study sought to understand the features and nature of the new public diplomacy in Ghana. In view of this, all the four think tanks interviewed attempted to define the new public diplomacy. They all accepted that this new field involves the existence of a lot of actors who are now being given recognition as well as playing feasible roles which were hitherto performed by state actors.

The new public diplomacy involves the use of information and communication technologies which has made the process very open and transparent. This finding, however, is in agreement with Rhiannon Vickers’ definition of the new public diplomacy. He identifies that today’s diplomacy is adjusting to the information age whereby the latter is characterized by the development and rapid expansion of information and communication technologies, the increasing ability of citizens and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to access and use these technologies, and the rise of transnational and co-operative security issues which are increasingly affecting diplomatic activities.104
The study also sought to establish the relevance of non-state actors in the new public diplomatic practice. The four think tanks which were interviewed; IMANI, CDD, IEA and IDEG revealed that non-state actors are extremely significant in today’s public diplomacy because they are the representation of the people and therefore they intermediate between the state and those being governed; that is the citizenry. Their response also indicated that, non-state actors have succeeded in building an inclusive opinion in the public diplomatic process and are increasingly showing interest in how government conducts its foreign policy goals.

The second objective of the study was to highlight non-state actors who are practicing the new public diplomacy. With regards to this, IMANI revealed that, think tanks (using IMANI as an example) offer policy ideas, which takes into account foreign policy goals of the country to foreign businesses such as the USAID. CDD also affirms of their vigorous role in the new public diplomacy. The interview with them indicated that they collaborated with the Coalition of Domestic Election Observers (CODEO) to observe the national elections and helped achieve free, fair and transparent elections. It further holds programs and supports policies that are channeled towards institutionalizing good governance, economic stability among others.

With reference to IEA, it performs the watchdog role that ensures that government attends to the needs of the people. It also creates the platform for analyzing policy ideas that forms the highlights of a nation’s foreign policy goals. The evidence-based work and the research conducted by most think tanks are made known to policymakers and documented in policy briefs for the use of posterity.
These evident roles, enshrined in the activities think tanks are engaged in, is linked to what Donald E. Abelson indicated in his works. According to him, think tanks exist as ‘independent, non-profit, research oriented institutes, among whose primary objectives are to examine and comment on a wide range of public policy issues. They generate research that are timely and relevant for key stakeholders in the government machinery, again they help to authenticate and reinforce policy prescriptions recommended by policy-makers, business leaders and other opinion-leaders.¹⁰⁵

The third objective of the study was to highlight possible challenges related to the practice of today’s public diplomacy. In bringing out these challenges, the think tanks that were interviewed recounted the successes they have chalked. Think tanks have helped to strengthen democracy, good governance, economic growth and development. They provide advisory and supportive roles to government and helped instill probity, transparency and accountability. Further, think tanks have joined hands with key stakeholders to embark on sensitization programs that pushes forth pertinent foreign policy goals.

The challenges elaborated on by the think tanks are that they normally are tagged as “pro-foreign”, that is a body promoting foreign interests. IDEG explained how state actors often think that think tanks provide materials for criticism which makes the former have its own suspicions of the latter. Almost all think tanks in Ghana are financially limited thus they have insufficient resources to carry out their work.
Again, think tanks are normally perceived as partisan although they exist as independent non-partisan organizations. This, however, makes them look less credible and they shy away from engaging in critical national issues. IEA stressed that think tanks do not usually have enough authority to fully execute their functions. In this instance, when their research findings are unfavorable to state actors, they are seen as competitors and not as partners. Think tanks, in most cases, encounter clash of interests between that of the populace and donor states. It is indeed problematic when both interests are not on the same level.

The challenges above-listed are in relation to the views expressed by Frank Ohemeng and Kent Weaver in their works. Frank Louis identifies that think tanks, especially those in Ghana are criticized as been partisan and are usually seen to promoting the political interests of the government of the day or the opposition party. Kent Weaver also points out that only few think tanks in the developing countries have sufficient resources to finance their programs. Most of them have little or no funding to carry out their activities.

The final and the fourth objective of the study was to examine the prospects of the new public diplomacy in enhancing the national interest. The domestic think tanks interviewed agreed that their activities are certainly geared towards enhancing the national interest. IEA rightly puts it that think tanks do not work for themselves but for the public, they make sure that the interests of the latter are achieved at the end of the day. Attaining these interests are in one way or the other affiliated with the national interest”. IMANI admitted that since the needs of the country has a first place priority, all sorts of compromises must be avoided so as to achieve these needs in full.
Again, they shared their views and willingly conceded that Ghana’s public diplomacy will certainly survive and have a great future ahead. Non-state actors, especially think tanks are now proliferating, flourishing and are more independent than ever. Ghana stands to gain a lot if it looks up to the public diplomatic practice of other advanced nations such as China. There are a lot of skills used by these countries that can possibly inure to our benefit.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 Introduction

The final chapter of this study summarizes the research findings, gives the conclusion of the study and ends with recommendations for academia and policy makers.

4.1 Summary of Findings of the Research

The study sought to examine the engagement of non-state actors in the new public diplomacy with particular focus on domestic think tanks. Based on the interviews with four think tanks namely: the Center for Democratic Development (CDD), IMANI Center for Policy and Education, Institute for Economic Affairs (IEA) and Institute for Democracy and Governance (IDEG) the following findings were revealed:

- On the features and nature of the new public diplomacy in Ghana it was revealed that the new public diplomacy is a new field that involves the emergence of new players/actors who are now being given recognition and are playing feasible roles which were hitherto performed by state actors. This new field involves the use of information and communication technologies which has made the public diplomatic process very open and transparent.

- It was discovered from the study that non-state actors are very relevant in the new public diplomacy because they develop growing interest in how the government conducts its
foreign policy aims and decisions. Indeed, they have succeeded in building an inclusive opinion in the public diplomatic process. The responses from the interviewees also indicated that, non-state actors especially think tanks are the representation of the people, thus they provide the necessary linkage between the state and the governed. Increasingly, non-state actors are playing watchdog roles where they make certain that government satisfies the needs of the people. In this new era that we find ourselves in, these new actors ensure that state actors perform their functions in a transparent and accountable manner for the benefit of all.

- Concerning the non-state actors engaged in the new public diplomacy, the study has shown that think tanks and a lot more actors such as citizens’ movement, the media, pressure groups, faith-based organizations and other prominent civil society organizations are all actively engaged in this new diplomatic practice. The think tanks that were interviewed shared the following examples: they publicize their opinion on government’s policies, observe the national elections and helped achieve free, fair and transparent elections, hold programs and supports policies that are channeled towards institutionalizing good governance, economic stability, and democracy among others. These programs and policies help to uplift Ghana’s image to the outside world as a nation with good democratic values. These public policy institutions are playing key roles to ensure that public policies are shaped in a manner that serves or promotes the interest of Ghanaians.

Indeed, the activities of these institutions are affiliated to the national interest and the latter always has a first place priority.
Regarding the achievements of non-state actors in the new public diplomacy, it was found that these think tanks have helped strengthen democracy, good governance, economic growth and development. They also provide advisory and supportive roles to government and helped instill probity, transparency and accountability. Further, think tanks have joined hands with key stakeholders to embark on sensitization programs, policy debates that advances pertinent foreign policy goals. Think tanks have also developed the ability of unearthing policy challenges which most often than not, are addressed by the state. In the international arena for instance, issues that are discussed by states are usually those that emanate from the domestic think tanks and they go a long way to form the highlights of foreign policy goals of these states.

It was found from the study that non-state actors face some challenges in the practice of public diplomacy. They are as follows: think tanks face the possibility of being tagged as a body promoting foreign interests as well as being partisan. Think tanks lack enough funding to carry out their activities, which makes them unproductive. In fact, most of the leadership of these institutions are less pro-active and do not greatly impact on foreign policy aims and decisions in the country. State actors have always had their own suspicions about these new actors and most often, they make them seem less credible and are never willing to partner with them, especially when the findings of the research conducted by the latter are unfavorable to the former. Think tanks also encounter clash of interests between that of the populace and donor states. It becomes problematic when both interests are not on the same level.
4.2 Conclusions

In sum, the study through its methodology, literature review, analysis and discussions, have provided key issues regarding the non-state actors engaged in the practice of today’s public diplomacy using four Ghanaian think tanks as case studies. Decisively, fair analysis has been made; the research questions, objectives and hypothesis have also been duly addressed. The study has proven that the participation of think tanks in the practice of the new public diplomacy, indeed, does hold the potential for national development through effective policy execution.

It can therefore be concluded that non-state actors, particularly think tanks have played, and are still playing active roles in the new public diplomacy. They are extremely important due to the visible roles they play in this new diplomatic field and the successes they have to their credit – strengthening the pillars of democracy, good governance, and economic growth, playing watchdog roles as well as supervisory and advisory roles just to mention but a few.

The challenges faced by non-state actors include the following: possibility of being tagged as “pro-foreign” and being partisan as well. Think tanks are financially challenged which reduces their volume of work. They also battle between satisfying the interests of the public or of donor states.

It is however proposed that government as well as the donor community support them financially. These policy institutions need remain neutral to prevent them from being tagged “pro-foreign” or neutral or both.
4.3 Recommendations

Base on the analysis and discussions in chapter three, I therefore offer the following recommendations as possible solutions to rectify the challenges being faced by non-state actors in the practice of the new public diplomacy in Ghana. These recommendations are made in line with what the four domestic think tanks suggested as the possible solutions to the challenges they face as non-state actors.

4.3.1 Establishing a Fund for Non-State Actors

- Considering the responses from the think tanks interviewed, it is evident from the responses submitted that they are financially challenged, making them ineffective and unproductive. It is therefore recommended that, about 2% of the internally generated funds (IGF) obtained from governmental agencies be allocated to the policy institutions to grant them good financial standing and support their course of work. Further capital can also be attained from non-projects, individuals, businesses both local and foreign just to mention but a few to help make achievable, programs and policies carried out by think tanks. External funding from donor communities would go a long way to complement what the government will offer to these domestic think tanks.

4.3.2 Partnership with State Actors

- The interviewees admitted that although non-state actors willingly collaborate with state actors in the pursuit of public diplomatic goals, the terrain is a tough and rough one. This is due to the fact that the latter views the former as "enemies"; wherefore the interests of state actors are not aligned with those of non-state actors. Non-state actors will thus need
to overlook the rivalry and competition that seemingly exist between them and government and seek partnership/collaboration with state actors to make public diplomatic practice efficient and effective. Non-state actors need to be perceived as partners of development by state actors and other actors in the diplomatic field, since they have certain strengths, specializations and expertise that the latter may evidently lack. The need for partnering will help state actors to benefit/tap in from the experiences, skills and professionalism demonstrated by these new actors in their field of work. It will ultimately create a conducive (enabling) environment for discussing and pushing forth matters of mutual interest- such as executing important foreign policy decisions.

4.3.3 The Use of Modern Technologies

- With the fast growing nature of today’s world, think tanks would need to utilize these new information and communication technologies to enable them discharge their functions effectively. Since they represent the people, the use of these new technologies will help make information readily available to whoever may be in need, most especially for policymakers and other key stakeholders. Gradually, the public, be it local or foreign communicates with actors (both state and non-state) through these new channels. It is interesting to note that the use of these technologies would be another, and perhaps the best way to reach out to the citizenry.

4.3.4 Engagement of other Actors in the Public Diplomatic Process

- To achieve a wholesome success in public diplomacy, other key actors such as private interests associations, faith-based organizations, and citizens’ movement, among others,
need to be considered within the public diplomatic process. Again, the principal actors (state and non-state) need to be ready and willing to collaborate and work with these new actors. They should not be sidelined and left to engage in only humanitarian issues, since these actors may have some relevant contributions to make towards the public diplomatic process.
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APPENDIX

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the traditional public diplomacy?

2. Is today’s public diplomacy different from the old public diplomacy?

3. What then is the new public diplomacy? How “new” is it?

4. Are non-state actors relevant in the new public diplomacy?

5. Is there the need for non-state actors (think tanks) collaborate with state actors in the new public diplomacy?

6. What are some of the activities that demonstrate that think tanks are really engaged in the public diplomacy/helping to promote its practice?

7. Do you think the activities of think tanks are helping to enhance the national interest?

8. What are some of the major achievements that domestic think tanks have chalked due to their engagement in the new public diplomacy?

9. What are the main challenges that think tanks face through their engagement in the new public diplomacy?

10. Are there any solutions to help think tanks survive the difficulties they face?

11. Is Ghana’s public diplomacy of tomorrow willing to thrive with the engagement of new actors?

12. Does Ghana need to look up to the public diplomatic practice of other foreign nations to better improve her own?

This is the end

Thank you for your assistance and patience