

THE ROLE OF NON-STATE ACTORS IN 21ST CENTURY PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

I Kadek Andre Nuaba

Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Science

Universitas Sriwijaya

Email*: ikadekandrenuaba@fisip.unsri.ac.id

Abstract. Public diplomacy is a form of communication between actors (both government actors and non-state actors) carried out by peaceful methods and aims to form a positive image of the country abroad. Globalization has created many changes in the practice of public diplomacy, especially on media and the involvement of actors in diplomacy. Those bring openness and connectivity between actors regardless of geographical location (borderless). Thus, this article tries to analyze how the role of non-state actors in public diplomacy in the midst of globalization era. Constructivist approach of this article is to see the practice of public diplomacy not merely to achieve national interests, but how to create inter-state awareness in peaceful ways. The conclusion of this article is that non-state actors have equal power as government actors in the practice of public diplomacy, the existence of non-state actors is not to weaken the role of government actors, but to strengthen each other to achieve peace and diplomatic mission.

Keywords: Public Diplomacy; Non-State Actors; Globalization; and Constructivist

Abstrak. Diplomasi publik adalah bentuk komunikasi antara aktor (baik aktor pemerintah dan aktor non-negara) yang dilakukan dengan cara damai dan bertujuan untuk membentuk citra positif negara di luar negeri. Globalisasi telah memunculkan banyak perubahan dalam praktik diplomasi publik, terutama pada media dan keterlibatan para aktor dalam diplomasi. Perubahan tersebut membawa keterbukaan dan konektivitas antar aktor tanpa memandang geografisnya (borderless). Artikel ini mencoba menganalisis bagaimana peran aktor non-negara dalam diplomasi publik di tengah era globalisasi. Pendekatan konstruktivis pada artikel ini bertujuan untuk memandang praktik diplomasi publik tidak hanya untuk mencapai kepentingan nasional saja, melainkan bagaimana menciptakan kesadaran antar negara dengan cara damai. Kesimpulan dari artikel ini adalah bahwa aktor non-negara memiliki kekuatan yang sama pentingnya dengan aktor pemerintah dalam praktik diplomasi publik, keberadaan aktor non-negara bukan untuk melemahkan peran aktor pemerintah, tetapi untuk memperkuat satu sama lain untuk mencapai misi diplomasi dan perdamaian dunia.

Kata kunci: Diplomasi Publik; Aktor Non Pemerintahan; Globalisasi; Konstruktivis

Copyright©2025. I Kadek Andre Nuaba

This is an open access article under the CC-BY NC-SA license

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1234/ssrj.v2i3.40>

PENDAHULUAN

The emergence of the public diplomacy phrase in 1856 through the *London Times* newspaper was intended as a synonym of politeness to criticize the attitude of US President Franklin Pierce regarding the development of impressions that began to come from other countries and encouraged him to set an example in the diplomatic process (Gurgu & Cociuban, 2016). Although at the time of the cold war that occurred between the United States and the Soviet Union the phrase public diplomacy was often interpreted as propaganda because they both sought to achieve national interests abroad. Public diplomacy is still seen as a finer terminology than manipulation or propaganda in an effort to communicate between countries (Rachmawati, 2016).

Correspondence I Kadek Andre Nuaba  Email: ikadekandrenuaba@fisip.unsri.ac.id

The Role of Non-State Actors in 21ST Century Public Diplomacy

Globalization in 21st century has brought many changes in the practice of public diplomacy today. Digitalization presents various facilities in the exchange of information and communication between nations without being limited by geographical factors (borderless) causing non state actors to have a crucial influence in the process of constructing the image of a nation. International relations are no longer seen as relations between countries but also include relations between the international community. Therefore, traditional public diplomacy, which only involves the role of the government in carrying out diplomatic missions, is no longer optimal in conveying diplomatic messages to a country. Public diplomacy activities involving the participation of non-state actors (public) will be needed in order to complement traditional public diplomacy activities.

Today, social media technology has become a daily part of human life. This then had an impact on diplomatic practices and government efforts in gaining international public attention. The capabilities offered by social media, especially in providing ease of connectivity, not only contribute to international politics and social activities, but also include international efforts to resolve global and interstate government issues, linking individuals, countries and non-state actors. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, etc. become big platform for all public generation to share any information, idea, and even practicing diplomacy. Public's opinion through internet could bring same power as power of official diplomats or government's actors in practicing of diplomacy.

As a result of the digitalization, diplomacy which used to involve the majority of government actors alone now opens space for the public to participate in the negotiation process. However, it cannot yet be ascertained whether the connectivity and openness of the media and information bring goodness to every nation in establishing relations between countries, because this means that the state which is the main actor in the government bureaucracy cannot control every view and opinion from the public. Of-course this carries a greater risk of miscommunication between actors. Based on the dynamics of public diplomacy in 21st century, this paper would like to analyze how the nowadays condition of public diplomacy and how the role of non-state actor in constructing world interaction

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy has evolved from being a state instrument aimed merely at influencing foreign public opinion into a broader academic and practical field within international relations. According to Melissen (2005) the theory of public diplomacy reflects a transformation from traditional diplomacy toward a more dialogical form that actively involves non-state actors. In the 21st century, characterized by globalization and digitalization, public diplomacy is no longer confined to *state-to-state* communication but instead engages global publics and actors beyond governmental structures.

Gregory (2008) further explains that public diplomacy functions as a political instrument with specific characteristics that include engagement with non-state actors to understand culture, attitudes, and behavior in order to build relationships and influence opinion. Therefore, this research defines public diplomacy as a practice of peaceful communication among international actors, both state and non-state, aimed at constructing a positive national image and fostering mutual understanding in the era of globalization.

Non-State Actor

In international relations, non-state actors refer to individuals, groups, or organizations that operate independently of formal state authority but possess the capacity to influence diplomatic processes. Ayhan (2019) includes non-state actors within the framework of public diplomacy and highlights the conceptual ambiguity between both, arguing that non-state actors have become essential agents within the practice of public diplomacy. Similarly, Lee and Ayhan (2015) emphasize that in the context of networked and collaborative public diplomacy, non-state actors function not only as consumers but also as active drivers of diplomacy.

From a constructivist perspective, non-state actors play a strategic role equivalent to that of states because identity, norms, and interaction, rather than military or economic power, constitute the core of international engagement. Hence, this study employs a theoretical framework of non-state actors to explore how they contribute to shaping awareness and diplomatic practices in 21st-century public diplomacy.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design to explore the role of non-state actors in 21st-century public diplomacy. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative research is an approach used to explore and understand the meanings that individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem through inductive processes emphasizing interpretation rather than quantification. This method enables researchers to analyze phenomena within their real-life contexts, making it particularly suitable for understanding the dynamics and interactions that occur in public diplomacy involving multiple actors and complex communication networks.

In this research, data were collected through documentary and literature analysis, drawing on academic journals, books, and institutional reports related to public diplomacy and global governance. The data were analyzed descriptively and interpretively to identify patterns and meanings that explain how non-state actors contribute to shaping public diplomacy practices. The qualitative approach was chosen to provide a deeper understanding of the transformation from state-centered diplomacy to a more participatory and networked form of international engagement that reflects the changing structure of global communication.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Concept of Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy is aimed at influencing the public's opinion of others country, especially to introduce its culture and self-esteem (Issundari, 2016). Jan Melissen (2005) distinguishes public diplomacy into two namely "traditional public diplomacy" and "new public diplomacy". Traditional public diplomacy leads to the old form of diplomacy characterized by its asymmetrical and bureaucratic communication system and does not recognize the existence of a domestic dimension, the state is known as the main actor in the process of public diplomacy. Whereas in the new public diplomacy state becomes not the only actor in public diplomacy, but rather recognizes the role of non-state actors, the nature of its communication is dialogic and recognizes the existence of a domestic dimension (Issundari, 2016).

Public diplomacy is also defined as the business of a country to influence the opinions of the public and leaders in other countries (Melissen, 2005). This is done with

the aim of achieving foreign policy goals. The practice of public diplomacy is also related to the communication process of the government of a country to the public in other countries by sending a message about the country's thoughts or policies.

In the practicing public diplomacy, actor could use any powers as a tool to achieve the mission of practicing public diplomacy in public. Nye (2009) divides power in two instruments, namely soft power and hard power. Then, Nye coined the concept of soft power. He is of the view that other than military and economy, there is soft power which helps the government to achieve its foreign policy aims. According to Joseph S. Nye Jr (2009):

“...One can affect others’ behavior in three ways: threats of coercion (“sticks”),. Inducements and payments (“carrots”), and attraction that makes others want what you want”

Nye believes that soft power rests on, culture, political values, institutions and foreign policies (Nye, J.S., 2008). Thus art, culture, education, politic, and many more will be a contribution for the country. Nye also argued that soft power is not only about entertainment and popular culture but the universal values that a country culture have and shared by the others also like rule of law, democracy, market's labors, and democracy. There are soft power that could be a weapon for an actor or state to raising up the successor of public diplomacy.

One of the goals of public diplomacy is to form a positive country's image. Although as an intangible force, negative images cause real material losses, as a result of inappropriate policies, misallocation of resources and evaluation of underperforming and excessive performance. As a result, the country's image becomes a valuable commodity in international relations.

The difference between traditional diplomacy and public diplomacy lies in the actor (communicator) and the objective component to be achieved. Judging from the communicator component, traditional diplomacy is carried out by one country against the government of another (government-to-government contact), public diplomacy is carried out by the government to the people or the community (people-to -people contact) (Kissinger, 1994).

Public diplomacy in traditional way believes that state is the main actor in practicing public diplomacy, it makes diplomacy being rigid and bureaucratic, but in the new public diplomacy believes that non-state actor has equal power to state in increasing the positive image of a country in the global vibes.

Public diplomacy can be a mechanism for the use of soft power by promoting the cultural values of certain countries, with the influence of the international community on other actors about the attraction of cultural values. So that this approach with strength can not only create better relations between countries, but it is also known as the establishment of peaceful communication.

Public Diplomacy on Constructivist Perspective

The view of constructivism is the most recent approach after realism and liberalism. In the view of constructivism, the international system is better known as an international society. In accordance with its basic assumptions related to image, constructivists view all international actors as equal, both state and non-state. Because,

what distinguishes the significance of their role is the discourse it carries, how well it is considered by all.

In studies of public diplomacy, rationalists are still the dominant approach used, consequently public diplomacy is emphasized as a tool to achieve national interests only (Rachmawati, 2016). Whereas in a constructivist approach, the mission of public diplomacy does not only lie in national interests, because national interests will always be able to change to adjust to changes in state identity that occur due to interactions between countries (Rachmawati, 2016).

Constructivist approaches pay more attention to the awareness of the state or actor to build good relations between countries, so that for constructivists non-state actors have the same strategic role as state actors in the practice of diplomacy. Although it has acknowledged the existence of non-state actors, the rationalist approach still blocks the country as the main actor in the practice of diplomacy (government driven), so that this approach model tends to be more liberal. Analysis of differences between constructivist and rationalist approaches can be seen in table 1 below:

Table 1. Analysis of differences in constructivist and rationalist approaches in the study of public diplomacy

Approachment	Intention	Actor	Strategy
Rationalist	<i>Image building for national interest</i>	State actors and non-state actors and domestic dimensions that are subordinate in nature	Dissemination of foreign policy information to domestic public, the media, and non-governmental organizations in order to support the country's foreign policy
Constructivist	Relation building	State actors and non-state actors and domestic dimensions that are independent	Creating awareness of citizens and relations between citizens

Source: (Rachmawati, 2016)

The analysis of this article will use a constructivist approach because public diplomacy is seen as an interaction between actors who have the same power and not solely to achieve national interests, but also view the importance of the actor's awareness to jointly create peace. In addition, this article places non-state actors as subjects in the practice of public diplomacy. The constructivist approach also has relevance to openness and connectivity resulting from globalization. Constructivism views identity and actor as important in political reality, constructivists also reject logic of consequences and emphasize logic of appropriateness, it is believed that actions chosen by actors are always based on logical consequences that emphasize mathematical calculations for material interests.

Constructivism also believes that identity forms interests and actions (whereas identity is formed based on collective or intersubjective understanding), because ideas are those that determine identity or actor and identity which then interpret the material capabilities or behavior of a country. So that in the practice of public diplomacy constructivism views that national interests are not the only main goal, because state identity will affect the national interest of the country when it is confronted with the interests of other countries or domestic conditions of the country. In addition, constructivism also believes that the international structure is not only understood as a

process, it is also understood as a result of social interactions between actors which will then construct structures or norms in the social environment.

Non-State Actor in Public Diplomacy

The definition of international relations indicates the expansion of international relations actors. Actors refer to actors in international interactions. International relations actors are grouped into two parts, namely state actors and non-state actors. Non-state actors consist of multi-national companies-MNCs, international government organizations-IGOs, international non-governmental organizations -INGOs, transnational organized crime-TOC, international terrorist networks, including individuals who have the ability to provide new perspectives on the views of the state (Baylis dkk., 2023). Globalization triggers the emergence of two new conditions in the study of public diplomacy, namely the emergence of non-state actors and the widespread variety of issues, this condition causes the role of non-state actors to be important and cannot be separated from the practice of public diplomacy.

C. Hill said that non state actors are individuals or groups involved in the interaction of international relations, whether using state facilities or not (Hill, 2003). The existence of non-state actors in the practice of public diplomacy lacks strong legitimacy, because non state actors usually do not formally represent their country, however the presence of non-state actors who are able to influence the policies of a particular country or group will form a new image or reputation for the international community. There are many non-state actors in public diplomacy that have big power as a state has, it is as the explanation bellow (Hill, 2003):

1. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which are non-profit groups with voluntary membership that operate at the local, national and international levels with the aim of gaining civil society support on certain issues.
2. Multinational cooperation (MNCs) are business organizations that move to benefit three or more countries at once.
3. The international diaspora community, which is a group of people who know certain ethnicities spread throughout the world and move to influence policy towards their home countries.
4. Separatist or terrorist groups.
5. University that have the task of teaching and conducting research and providing policy choices.
6. Epistemic community, namely groups of experts from various backgrounds with various views on certain phenomena and seek solutions together on existing problems.
7. Trade union organizations, namely groups managed at national and international levels to serve the interests of workers.
8. Individuals whose actions have national or even international implications.

Brian Hocking (2005) in *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* argues that in the practice of public diplomacy, non-state actors not only participate as consumers but also act as drivers of diplomacy who can influence those around them. The involvement of non-state actors does not weaken the function of the state or government actors, but instead becomes a collaboration between the

government and the public in achieving diplomatic missions to shape the country's positive image abroad.

Based on the relationship between actors, James (1987) in his book *On Diplomacy: A Genealogy of Western Estrangement* divides diplomacy into three things, which are diplomacy carried out between countries, anti-diplomacy that refers to hierarchical relations between state and society, and neo diplomacy refers to alternative forms of mediation carried out by non-official agents. While Diane Stone classifies it in T1, T2, and T3. T1 is diplomacy carried out between governments, T2 is diplomacy carried out between government and civil society, and T3 is people-to-people diplomacy (James, 1987).

The Role of Non-State Actor Public Diplomacy

Before the strengthening of the flow of technology and information until the 21st century, the practice of public diplomacy was mostly done in traditional ways, through the role of government (government-to-government diplomacy). But public diplomacy through traditional methods is no longer an effective method. Traditional public diplomacy requires superior diplomat specifications and truly understands the national goals of the country. Furthermore, conventional change into digitalization in the 21st century also brings benefits to every country in establishing international relations. Policies decided by the state are no longer fully determined by government actors, because the public can directly assess each policy issued. Borderless which is a result of this condition also accelerates the process of exchanging information across the globe.

Those changes raise a new phrase namely digital diplomacy. This diplomacy has the same significance as a negotiation process between countries to achieve peaceful cooperation, but it is done through different ways, which is through internet-platform. Digitalization brings the role of non-state actors to be more strategic in each case of policy making. Not only makes it easy for non-state actors to convey their aspirations, digitalization is also used by government actors in conveying messages from programs and state missions to the public. So that state institutions and state actors currently seem obliged to have social media accounts to publish every activity and programs implemented. This openness provides space for the public to criticize and support every performance of both the government and the policies of other countries.

The country that is considered the best in using digital instruments to support public diplomacy activities is the United Kingdom (Adesina, 2017). There is a special institution established by the UK to handle digital public diplomacy (e-diplomacy), namely the Digital Diplomacy Division, which is one of the divisions of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). In addition, the UK also actively supports its diplomats to use social media facilities to interact with citizens and foreign communities. The @ForeignOffice twitter account is the biggest diplomacy account of a country, which consists of 237 ambassadors, embassy representatives and diplomatic missions on Twitter (Dwikardana dkk., 2017). The UK also uses more than 20 digital platforms to support its diplomatic activities

In addition to UK, the United States of America is also one of the countries that utilizes digital in conducting diplomacy, confrontation between the President of the USA Donald Trump and North Korean President Kim Jong Un through social twitter media and electronic media has attracted so much public attention. Donald Trump's follow-up on Twitter was 109.6 million people with a total following of 53. the use of

social media to interact with the public is also often carried out by the USA's State Department by holding question and answer sessions via the Facebook page of the USA's Department of Foreign Affairs (Adesina, 2017).

In addition to the above state actors, the phenomenon that shows the significant role of non-state actors in the process of forming a positive image of a country is the 2017 World Festival of Youth and Student Forum (WFYS) conducted by Russia. This activity presents 20,000 young people from 150 countries with a mission to form a welcome and open country image to the world community (Umesi & Bamidele, 2017). Interaction between participants domestic Russia and the global community are expected to change the perspective of a closed Russian image. In addition, Indonesia also has several public diplomacy programs with the aim of forming a positive image of the nation abroad, namely through the Indonesian Arts and Culture Scholarship program (IACS), Bali Democracy Forum (BDF), and Dharmasiswa (Issundari & Rachmawati, 2016). These soft diplomacy programs financially certainly spend the state budget and do not show authentic and direct benefits. However, public diplomacy involving massive non-state actors can construct a good and comprehensive image of the country.

Non-state actors have increased roles that make the state less relevant. It does not only occur in transnationalism activities, but in all other international activities. Although the state has the legitimacy of its citizens, including the legitimacy of non-state actors related to its origin, which means that political power is much greater, in reality the state also has restrictions on its legitimacy in the form of attachment to international law. Meanwhile non-state actors are hard to reach the law especially to be tried. So that the state actually uses the services of non-state actors who are not bound by international law to bring the interests of the state in the international sphere but in its implementation do not act on behalf of the state

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above the conclusion of this article that the changes resulting from the 21st century statecraft in this digitalization era, non-state actors have the same strategic strength and role with government actors. This is evidenced by various state activities and programs involving non-state actors to participate in carrying out diplomatic missions. In addition, openness and connectivity through the internet provide equal opportunities for every actor to be involved in the negotiation process, diplomacy is not only constructed from government efforts to the government, but also to government-to-people and people-to-people contact.

The existence of non-state actors in the practice of diplomacy is not to negate the duties and functions of the state or state actors, but to complement each other and support the opinions of the state built by forming a positive state image. In the end the changes in the 21st century actually provide space and opportunity for each individual to oversee and carry out important tasks as part of the world community.

In an increasingly integrated international system, while remaining the primary actors in diplomacy, state must adopt a more inclusive approach by creating space for public participation and engaging non-state actors to advance national interests. At the same time, it is essential for states to safeguard their foundational values and domestic stability, given that national societies are now deeply intertwined with global communities. The same principle applies to non-state actors. As opportunities for

involvement in diplomatic processes continue to expand, their participation has become a significant determinant of the effectiveness and overall success of diplomatic missions.

REFERENCES

- Adesina, O. S. (2017). Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1297175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175>
- Ayhan, E. W., & Lee, G. (2015). Why Do We Need Non-state Actors in Public Diplomacy?: Theoretical Discussion of Relational, Networked and Collaborative Public Diplomacy. *International Journal of Area Studies*, 22(1), 57–77.
- Ayhan, K. J. (2019). The Boundaries of Public Diplomacy and Nonstate Actors: A Taxonomy of Perspectives. *International Studies Perspectives*, 20(1), 63–83. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/eky010>
- Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (2023). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations* (9th edition). Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Dwikardana, K., Djelantik, S., & dkk. (2017). *Transformasi Diplomasi di Era Digital: Identifikasi Postur Diplomasi Digital di Indonesia* [Penelitian Hibah Mondisiplin]. LPPM Universitas Katolik Parahyangan. https://repository.unpar.ac.id/bitstream/handle/123456789/4719/lpdsc189_Sapta%20Dwikardana_Transformasi%20strategi%20diplomasi-p.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=n
- Gregory, B. (2008). Public Diplomacy: Sunrise of an Academic Field. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 274–290.
- Gurgu, E., & Cociuban, A. D. (2016). The Role Of Public Diplomacy In International Relations In Full Process Of Globalization. *Annals of “Spiru Haret”. Economic Series*, 16(2), 125. <https://doi.org/10.26458/16210>
- Hill, C. J. (2003). *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hocking, B. (2005). *Rethinking the “New” Public Diplomacy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Issundari, S. (2016). The Role of Citizen in Indonesian Public Diplomacy Through IACS (Indonesian Arts and Cultural Scholarship) Program. *International Journal of Political Science, Law and International Relations*, 6(3), 1–12.
- Issundari, S., & Rachmawati, I. (2016). *Constructing Indonesian Soft Power through IACS (Indonesian Art and Culture Scholarship) Program*. International Conference on Contemporary Social and Political Affairs, Surabaya.
- Jemes, D. D. (1987). *On Diplomacy: A Genealogy of Western Estrangement*. Basil Blackwell.
- Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. Simon & Schuster.
- Melissen, Jan. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nye, J. S. (2009). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
- Nye, J.S. (2008). Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 94–109.
- Rachmawati, I. (2016). Pendekatan Konstruktivis dalam Kajian Diplomasi Publik Indonesia. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.5290>
- Umesi, L., & Bamidele, O. (2017). 19 th World Festival of Youth and Students. *HSE University*. <https://www.hse.ru/en/ma/pd/news/211438349.html>