



AICGS ISSUE BRIEF

MARCH 2006

05

Revitalizing Public Diplomacy: Challenges for Germany and the United States

BY KARIN L. JOHNSTON

What are the current challenges facing public diplomacy for German and American practitioners?

What tools and mechanisms can best be applied?

How can public diplomacy reach those segments of society where misperceptions are greatest?

What impact can public diplomacy have when news consumers have access to an almost unlimited array of news sources and material?

What kind of expertise can non-governmental organizations contribute?

How can success (of applying public diplomacy tools) be measured?

How can new technology be harnessed in the service of public diplomacy?

Public diplomacy has become the new buzzword in foreign policy circles, with the construction of an effective public diplomacy strategy seen as an urgent foreign policy objective for any country. Unlike traditional diplomacy—which involves official state-to-state relations with the goal of advancing a country’s national interests—public diplomacy focuses on reaching out to foreign publics. Though there is no one accepted definition, public diplomacy is generally defined as a government’s efforts to communicate with foreign audiences with the goal of informing or influencing those audiences.

In a sense, public diplomacy is nothing new. During the Cold War a wide variety of American and western European public diplomacy tools—libraries, cultural centers, and radio broadcasts—were successfully deployed throughout eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. But once the Cold War ended, interest in maintaining existing levels of public diplomacy resources waned, and budgets were cut back drastically. The terrorist attacks of September 11, the fallout from the Iraq war, and growing tensions between the West and the Muslim world, as evidenced in the uproar over the publication of the Danish cartoons depicting the prophet Muhammad, have brought the spotlight back to public diplomacy and the question of how public diplomacy strategies can be devised to meet current global challenges.

Today’s era reflects a different set of threats and challenges for governments. A greater number of non-state actors operate globally, whether they are demonstrating against environmental degradation, demanding the alleviation of world poverty, or mobilizing to protest the violation of religious or cultural norms. The process of globalization and modernization has accelerated over the past several decades, altering the environment in which states conduct their international relations. Globalization has created additional economic, social, and political pressure points for governments, and advances in communications technology have created a global media-based society where millions of people can communicate with one another instantaneously. The impact of satellite, cable, and the internet, combined with growing global interdependence, are challenging conventional public diplomacy practices in countries all over the world.

Importantly, this globalized media environment is also contributing to the development of a nascent world public opinion that transcends state borders and national distinctions. There is a growing awareness of how foreign publics can influence the formation and implementation of a country's foreign policy. It is no longer sufficient for governments to cultivate the traditional mix of diplomats and country elites; states must win the support of ordinary citizens in countries all over the world.

These developments have important implications for public diplomacy. Given the multiplicity of actors and voices, there is no single template for public diplomacy. More than ever, public

diplomacy is a two-way street. Practitioners of public diplomacy must not only craft messages that are meaningful to a particular audience; they must also analyze the ways in which those messages are interpreted to determine whether public diplomacy has been effective. Public diplomacy officials not only must persuade; they must listen and respond. In short, successful public diplomacy depends on developing tools and mechanisms that can be effectively applied to overcome the challenges of a more globalized and interdependent world. And even then, there is no certainty that the message is being heard by the intended audiences.

Challenges for U.S. and German Public Diplomacy

For Germany and the United States, public diplomacy is carried out in an increasingly fragmented and fractious world. Both countries face similar challenges posed by globalization, but there are also significant differences.

For the United States, public diplomacy challenges stem in large part from its overwhelming position of power in the international system, particularly its military power. This concentration of power, combined with the real or perceived shift in U.S. foreign policy under the Bush administration away from multilateral approaches in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, has not reassured the world of the benign character of American power.

Concern about American power and policy is reflected in public opinion surveys around the world, which have shown a precipitous decline in the prestige and reputation of the United States in the wake of the Iraq war. In a poll that asked respondents whether a country is a negative or positive influence in the world, the United States was seen as a more negative influence than Europe, or even China.¹ Opinion surveys reveal that majorities of populations all over the world do not feel the United States takes their interests into account, nor do they feel that American actions aimed at fighting terrorism have made the world a safer place.² Addressing such views is a great challenge for American public diplomacy practitioners.

The challenges are of course particularly daunting in the Middle East—the focus of much U.S. attention and activity. However, the challenges for U.S. public diplomacy in Germany and Europe are significant as well—and arguably just as worrisome, given the common challenges facing the United States and Europe. In Germany, for example, favorable opinions of the United States plummeted from 75 percent in the summer of 2002 to 38 percent in February 2004. By May 2005 the number of individuals expressing favorable views had risen to

60 percent—encouraging, but a far cry from earlier levels of support. The drop in German support for the United States is attributed in part to foreign policy differences that reflect diverging views on the efficacy of multilateral engagement and multilateral institutions, the utility of the use of force and military power, the application of international law and norms, and approaches to terrorism.

Germany faces different, but still important, public diplomacy challenges. Germany's efforts to build trust in its postwar democracy have succeeded, but its contemporary profile in the American media has declined in the years since the end of the Cold War. Reporting on current issues in Germany is infrequent, while stories of Germany's Nazi past appear with some regularity in the American press and on cable and television shows.

Distorted or insufficient media reporting may be either symptom or cause of a larger problem—and one that plagues both the United States and Germany. Foreign publics often hold significant misperceptions about the United States, its policy aims, and about American society in general. American images of Germany similarly reflect a serious lack of knowledge and understanding of contemporary German policies and society and are often outdated and static. The challenge shared by both German and American public diplomacy practitioners is at times quite similar: to overcome stereotypes, misperceptions, and monolithic views of our respective countries in order to build support for stated policies abroad.

At other times, of course, negative images and views of another country may indeed rest on rejection of policies that are accurately perceived but unpopular with foreign publics. The negative trend in German public opinion, for example, appears to be driven in good measure by Germans' objections to the particular policies of the Bush administration (e.g. on Iraq, the treat-

ment of detainees at the Guantanamo facility, the U.S. rejection of the Kyoto protocol and International Criminal Court, etc.), which have strengthened the perception that the United States is committed to pursuing a unilateralist foreign policy.

Whether rooted in informed rejection or misperceptions, the particular challenges of foreign diplomacy also must be seen within the broader context of a globalizing and modernizing world.

While many countries and societies welcome the modernizing nature of globalization, others fear that globalization's integrating nature will destroy cultural diversity, national identities, and the distinct way of life of many populations. Globalization is both a catalyst for economic and educational advancement and a source of repression, suffering, and unrest. Globalization creates winners and losers. Within the context of globalization, technological changes in the media landscape also have transformed the arena in which public diplomacy operates. Enormous strides in communications technology have increased the fragmentation of media outlets, shortened the news cycle, and intensified competition. Technological changes have also changed the news consumer. With access to cable television, internet, satellite, radio, print, and other media outlets, consumers can seek out what they want, when they want it, and can immediately compare news sources as to their content, facts, and credibility. Classic communication tools are still valuable, particularly in countries where the communications technology has not penetrated deeply, but electronic media are an increasingly indispensable tool of public diplomacy.

In short, the context of public diplomacy has changed fundamentally. During the Cold War period, public diplomacy had a significant impact in eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, because at the time there were relatively few alternative sources of information about America or western Europe available to the citizens of these countries. But those days are gone, made far less relevant because of the revolution in communications and information technology. Yet, if traditional tools of public diplomacy are outdated because the environment has changed so drastically, the question becomes whether public diplomacy officials have developed the right tools to respond to this new international environment.

Tools of Public Diplomacy

Numerous reports from government agencies, think tanks, government advisory groups, and blue-ribbon panels have addressed the problems of current public diplomacy practices. These practices traditionally have encompassed a wide range of activities and programs, including educational, cultural, and professional exchange programs, and the use of various media outlets (print, electronic, satellite, internet), and

international information programs aimed at cultivating sustained contact and dialogue with foreign publics. Re-tooling these programs to be effective in a globalized world means adapting to new technologies, building new partnerships and dialogues with citizens in host countries, and supporting public diplomacy practitioners with more resources to respond more flexibly and quickly to the accelerated pace of human relations.

Adapting Public Diplomacy Practices

U.S. government officials are actively engaged in efforts to convey a positive image of Americans and the American government to European publics. For example, the U.S. Embassy in Germany conducts exchange and speakers programs that reach targeted audiences throughout the country, particularly younger age cohorts in eastern Germany, many of whom have had little direct experience with the United States. Other exchange programs have sought to identify German Muslims to invite to the United States, where visits to schools, organizations, and Muslim communities are arranged throughout the country.

Cultural events remain an important tool of public diplomacy. The U.S. Embassy sponsored special events around the Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art's exhibit in Berlin that ended in April 2005. The exhibit drew an enormous crowd—over a million visitors from all over Europe—and was one of the most successful events the city has seen in years. Cultural public diplomacy was also front-and-center in November 2005, when the Embassy organized a concert in Berlin by a well-known New Orleans jazz quartet to thank the German people for their support for the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

The German Embassy and German Information Center in Washington, D.C. utilize similar tools to promote an up-to-date and positive image of Germany. Washington area listeners of National Public Radio know that the German Embassy is a supporter of public radio. The Embassy also sponsors various programs and exchanges with key target groups, such as journalists. One project, for example, has focused on developing a relationship with Hispanic journalists who work for the growing number of Spanish language newspapers and broadcast networks in the United States. German public diplomacy in the United States similarly promotes special events that support its public diplomacy goals. For example, the German Embassy is coordinating activities with U.S. organizations to advertise the World Cup, which will take place in Germany in summer 2006.

The media play a critical role in the efforts of public diplomacy practitioners to build a dialogue with foreign audiences. However, the globalized media environment also poses particular challenges for public diplomacy. On the one hand, the media potentially can be a powerful vehicle for public diplomacy efforts by governments and companies. Through effective

media work, practitioners may gain valuable media opportunities that provide officials a chance to deliver the message directly to the attentive public, rather than allowing others to define it for them. Media outlets, in turn, may offer government representatives access to large audiences, when the issue is topical and likely to attract significant interest.

For example, during the Iraq crisis, a popular German political talk show, *The Sabine Christiansen Show*, featured a number of American guests who appeared alongside German commentators. Some of the shows, featuring such American commentators as Richard Perle, former Chairman of the Defense Policy Board, and former President Bill Clinton, made a big impact, drawing almost a quarter of the viewing audience. German viewers respected the fact that senior American political figures had made the effort to come to Germany to explain their views, and while these American guests might not have changed many minds, they provided a first-hand account of the U.S. domestic political debate on Iraq rather than having the reportage filtered through German media frames. By the same token, German Ambassador Wolfgang Ischinger's appearance on the *Bill O'Reilly Show* during the crisis over Iraq—something many American officials are disinclined to subject themselves to—demonstrated a willingness to face tough questioning in order to explain Germany's position on Iraq to the American public.

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that the media are not neutral actors. The public receives much of its news and information from the media, which act as a receiver, translator, and transmitter of information in the political system. Story topics, format, placement, and frequency of reporting all shape the salience of an issue and the perceptions of people. Sometimes, editorial decisions about what “sells,” or what makes for “good TV,” result in unbalanced reporting. Constraints do exist, however; real-world information may moderate the media's influence or shift the focus, and the unlimited sources of news available to consumers may very well constrain the media's ability to set agendas in the future.

Non-Governmental Actors in Public Diplomacy

While German and American officials and government agencies have been particularly active in recent years, companies with significant overseas operations also increasingly are engaged in public diplomacy activities to shape positive perceptions of their companies. Additionally, many non-governmental organizations indirectly supplement public diplomacy efforts through dialogue, networking, and independent research.

Many German and American corporations conduct public diplomacy to help promote an atmosphere conducive to busi-

ness. Many set great store in supporting local communities: in-school education programs, scholarships, poverty reduction, culture and arts, or programs to build management and entrepreneurial capacities. As with a government's public diplomacy efforts, a positive image is best achieved if the intended audience sees the company taking an active interest in the host country. Additionally, corporations conduct outreach programs and contribute to public diplomacy efforts through various philanthropically-directed activities and financial support. For example, companies often underwrite or sponsor meetings or “track-two” exchanges to promote dialogue and an exchange of ideas.

As non-profit entities, foundations and many other non-governmental organizations often are more “neutral” players and as such can be very effective in promoting alternative channels of dialogue on important issues on both sides of the Atlantic. Such organizations also support leadership exchanges, which give senior analysts or legislators valuable access to information and individuals in other countries and help them to build a network of contacts. The strength of NGOs resides in their ability to build partnerships with governments, universities, and other non-governmental organizations, a multiplier effect that supplements government efforts.

New Instruments of Public Diplomacy

In addition to the activities described above, practitioners of public diplomacy are continuing to adapt traditional instruments and develop new tools to meet the challenges of communication in the global marketplace of information and ideas. This process of adaptation involves taking advantage of rapidly developing communications technology, encouraging more exchanges and creative opportunities for people-to-people contact, and committing additional financial and human resources for the tasks ahead.

New technologies offer significant opportunities to update and adapt traditional tools of public diplomacy in order to target specific audiences:

- The new electronic media—blogs, podcasts, smart video—permits practitioners to communicate more quickly while reaching a wider audience and can provide substantial quantities of information at a reasonable cost through text, images, videos, and audio files;
- Websites offer new vehicles to disseminate information to niche audiences—by sponsoring websites in other languages, or organizing specialized websites for specific audiences, such as a “one-stop” web source for students of all levels seeking information on exchange programs;
- New technologies are the key to reaching younger people, a demographic cohort that spends a great deal of time on the internet but little time reading newspapers or watching

television news. For example, German Embassy officials in Tokyo have begun offering German language lessons that are downloadable to MP3 players.

Other adaptations are being undertaken to create and sustain avenues of communication that will foster greater mutual understanding and build long-term relationships in societies that are undergoing significant changes:

- Some activities are designed to create new venues to sustain ongoing dialogue. For example, the U.S. Embassy in Berlin has helped to organize discussions about Arab literature with high school German teachers, while German Embassy officials have worked to maintain contacts with former fellows active in alumni organizations in order to harness their positive experiences and “good will.”
- Other programs are aimed at identifying new constituencies and “multipliers.” German officials now work with Hispanic journalists in the United States, and American officials offer invitations for German Muslims to participate in American exchange programs. Both activities are typical of efforts to offer new target audiences the opportunity for invaluable “person-to-person contacts.”

Measuring Effectiveness

For public diplomacy practitioners on both sides of the Atlantic, one of the most difficult questions to answer is whether such tools are effective. Part of the problem has to do with the fact that public diplomacy is a long-term, sustained process that is not easily measured against benchmarks that other political or economic programs possess.

Some observers view public opinion surveys as one of these more quantifiable benchmarks, and they call for more increased funding of public opinion surveys. The Council on Foreign Relations, for example, estimates that the U.S. government spends about \$5 million on public opinion surveys, while the private sector spends close to \$6 billion. German public diplomacy practitioners in Washington consider public opinion surveys a constituent element in their public diplomacy toolbox and in 2005 provided up to \$40,000 in their budget to conduct and present a national survey of American attitudes on Germany.

While an important tool, it must be remembered that public opinion surveys are only snap-shots of attitudes shared at a specific point in time. They are, however, extremely valuable in piecing together general attitudinal tendencies observed over time, and they are useful to practitioners in crafting messages and developing programs. For example, public opinion surveys show that although majorities in other countries are critical of U.S. foreign policy, sizeable majorities all over the world, including in the Muslim world, have very positive views of U.S. science and technology. One could leverage such positive attitudes by expanding exchange programs in science and technology.

In addition to public opinion surveys, another less quantifiable, though valuable, tool is the feedback from public diplomacy practitioners themselves. The better prepared such officials are—with strong language skills, substantive knowledge, and skill at navigating cross-cultural sensitivities—the more effective the message is likely to be.

Conclusion

In the globalized media landscape, public diplomacy is a long-term investment project, one that has no “one-size-fits-all” solution or strategy. Some broad guidelines for action are nevertheless discernible.

To counteract the misperceptions about Germany and the United States that may arise from the media or other sources of information, there is a need for more dialogue—more people-to-people contact in the form of more exchange programs at all levels: student exchanges and scholarships, journalism fellowships, corporate internships, leadership development programs, and so on. These traditional tools of diplomacy have not outlived their usefulness; rather, they become even more important in transatlantic relations particularly when mutual good will or even interest among future leaders can no longer be taken for granted.

Programs should focus on providing substance to the dialogue to address existing misperceptions and misinformation. The challenge of projecting an understanding of one’s country requires partners, and public diplomacy practitioners should seek ways of leveraging local contacts: alumni organizations, cultural institutions, businesses, universities, and non-profit organizations.

Given the continued pressure on budgetary resources, both the United States and Germany would benefit from efforts to identify ways in which countries can synchronize their public diplomacy efforts. This may be difficult to do; while the United States and Germany generally have the same toolbox at their disposal, diverging goals and objectives may lead to very different public diplomacy strategies. Some observers suggest there may be opportunities for Germany and the United States to develop

programs in the Middle East that can be mutually beneficial in terms of addressing misperceptions of the West in general. While difficult, it is worth the effort for German and American public policy practitioners to engage in discussions on how such mutually reinforcing programs might look.

What is clear is that in today's international environment, states need a strategy that places them in the middle of a global debate that, by virtue of technological advancements, has engaged an ever-expanding number of participants across the globe. It is important to have one's say in this global debate, but it is equally important to know what others are saying. For example, when global publics say that the United States does not take their interests into account, they imply the United States is not an active participant in this global dialogue. To overcome these misgivings, the United States must use the tools at its disposal to show that indeed it is listening and involved in such global discussions.

In the final analysis, however, there must also be a discussion of the limits to what public diplomacy can achieve. If real policy

differences are at the root of a country's problems, then information that is conveyed more frequently or insistently will not improve a country's foreign image. Moreover, in the complicated global public opinion landscape, German and American public diplomacy efforts are only two voices among many that can easily be drowned out by media outlets, other foreign governments, or mobilized publics.

Nevertheless, not all problems of credibility and trust are rooted in disagreements over policy but, rather, are a result of lingering and sometimes fundamental misunderstandings of a country and its culture. Foreign audiences often have superficial images of other countries gathered from popular movies, television shows, and news sources, though they do not necessarily understand the cultural context of such images. But this is what public diplomacy does best—clarifying cultural contexts, and finding ways to convey the complexity of a country's culture, social structure, and political dynamics to foreign audiences.

Public Opinion and the Media: Crafting the Message

Governments, NGOs and companies clearly expend considerable efforts to project positive images of their respective home countries. But how effective are these efforts? How do Germans view Americans, and how do Americans see Germans? What lessons might public diplomacy practitioners draw from opinion surveys in crafting more effective messages? According to Dr. Clay Ramsay, Research Director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the University of Maryland, practitioners of public diplomacy can develop an ongoing dialogue with their foreign interlocutors, if they understand where public opinion stands on various issues.³

German/European Public Opinion on the United States

Much has been said by now about America's image problem among Europeans and the public diplomacy challenges that it creates. Negative European attitudes toward U.S. policy are real, but far from immutable. In fact, European views are often convergent with the views of a majority of Americans, providing an opportunity for public diplomacy to emphasize our commonalities, rather than our differences. Among the most salient similarities in European and American views:

PROMOTING DEMOCRACY: Europeans and Americans both give majority support to long-term civilian strategies of promoting democracy in the world. They support election monitoring, upholding human rights, and aiding the development of civil societies. In the German Marshall Fund's 2005 poll, for example, 78 percent of Germans said it should be the role of the EU to help establish democracy in other countries. Eighty-three percent supported EU monitoring of elections in new democracies, and 78 percent wanted the EU to support "independent groups such as trade unions, human rights associations and religious groups."

FIGHTING TERRORISM: Half the people in major European countries support a fight against international terrorism in which the US plays a central role. The Pew Research Center's report (May 2005) found 50 percent of Germans saying "I favor the US-led efforts to fight terrorism" and 45 percent disagreeing—a much higher level of support than other poll questions would lead one to expect. Fifty-nine percent of Germans say that international terrorism is an extremely important threat to Europe; 36 percent called it "important"; only 5 percent said it was not important. (GMF 2005)

NON-PROLIFERATION: A majority in Europe recognizes the importance of the threat of nuclear proliferation. Fifty-five percent on average (53 percent of Germans) called "the global spread of nuclear weapons" an extremely important threat to Europe. (GMF)

TRANSATLANTIC COOPERATION, NOT COMPETITION: though majorities in European countries want a stronger EU, Germans and other Europeans want the EU to be a cooperative force, not a rival to the United States. While Europeans do not equate cooperation with the United States and Europe “being close”—a phrase that sounds like a blank check to Europeans and makes them prefer greater independence—these attitudes nonetheless signal a genuine positive reservoir of feeling that might be tapped. In 2004 the German Marshall Fund found that 62 percent of Germans thought “the US and the EU have enough common values to be able to cooperate on international problems.” In 2005 84 percent of Germans (74 percent in Europe on average) thought “a more powerful European Union should cooperate with the United States,” while only 13 percent of Germans thought it should compete with the United States.

SUBSTANTIVE DIFFERENCES, NOT ANTI-AMERICANISM: European public attitudes are often described as having grown more critical of the United States more generally since President Bush was elected in 2001, but the evidence does not support this assertion. Following 9/11, Germans and Europeans felt the United States was right to be concerned about international terrorism, and Germans were thus generally supportive of U.S. efforts to dislodge the Taliban in Afghanistan. Majorities still look favorably on Americans themselves, though they may continue to reject U.S. policies, particularly as they pertain to the use of force and the perceived unfettered application of American power in the world. But this uneasiness is also evident in the American public as well, which implies that the transatlantic gap is driven not by anti-Americanism but by a substantive disagreement on issues.

U.S. Public Opinion on Germany

American attitudes about Germany have rebounded more quickly than German attitudes about the United States. Favorable American attitudes toward Germany are currently at 60 percent, which falls within the average recorded over the last several decades. According to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR) surveys, Americans have rated Germany between 57 and 62 degrees (on a thermometer rating) since 1978. The CCFR data also shows the consequences of the German government’s position and handling of the Iraq issue: in February 2002, favorable American attitudes towards Germany were at 83 percent; by May 2003 they had declined to 44 percent, and reached 50 percent only in March 2004.

U.S. BASES IN GERMANY: American support for retaining U.S. bases in Germany remains significant. The most recent CCFR report shows that the American public’s support for keeping long-term bases in Germany is at 57 percent, down slightly since 2002. However, public support for U.S. bases abroad is generally down in every other country CCFR queried, such as Japan.

UN SECURITY COUNCIL SEAT: A BBC World Service poll in twenty-three countries asked about expanding the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and found that 60 percent of Americans favored Germany’s candidacy, with majorities in fourteen other countries expressing a similar view. Opposition in other countries stemmed from the view that the UNSC should not be expanded at all, rather than any perceived opposition to a German seat.

Finally, a German Information Center survey, presented in December 2005, on American attitudes towards Germany found that Americans continue to have a positive image of Germany—more positive than Germans have of the United States. Nearly half of all Americans (46 percent) see Germany as a key ally, and there are components of the German-American relationship that strike very positive chords: economic and scientific cooperation; security and cooperation, particularly in NATO; and the very much improved diplomatic relations.

However, issues surrounding the war in Iraq continue to influence American views of the bilateral relationship. Americans remain critical of Germans’ reluctance to support American efforts in Iraq, and 57 percent of respondents felt that Germany should be more involved in fighting terrorism. In fact, Germany has been very active in counter-terrorism activities in Afghanistan, deploying the largest contingent of soldiers (about 2000) in NATO’s International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). And yet, few American respondents (only 19 percent) were aware of this German contribution to the continuing war on terrorism.

For German public diplomacy practitioners, the challenge is to update Germany’s image and increase the awareness of its role in the world. As Ambassador Wolfgang Ischinger has asserted, Germany’s public diplomacy efforts will “remain focused on increasing awareness about Germany as a close and important partner of the U.S.”⁴

AICGS Public Diplomacy Initiative

For both Germany and the United States, public diplomacy is carried out in an increasingly fragmented and fractious media landscape. The public diplomacy efforts in both countries must adapt—and respond to—changes in communications technology, in the types of actors in the global arena, and in the media itself.

To be effective, public diplomacy must win over foreign publics by presenting information about a country that represents a spectrum of voices and creating more opportunities for dialogue between countries. A meeting of public diplomacy officials from the United States and Germany was organized in Fall 2005 to discuss these challenges and to accomplish several objectives: to share best practices, discuss effective public diplomacy tools and mechanisms, and explore potential areas of cooperation.

NOTES

1 A poll of 39,435 people, completed between October 2005 and January 2006, was conducted for the BBC World Service by the international polling firm GlobeScan together with the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) at the University of Maryland. The survey is available at: http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/home_page/168.php?nid=&id=&pnt=168&lb=hmpg1

2 See the Pew Global Attitudes survey 2005, available at: <http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=247>

3 Dr. Ramsay based his analysis on a review of the following surveys: Pew Global Attitudes Survey, May 2005 and February 2004; German Marshall Fund's Transatlantic Trends Survey, June 2004, and June 2005; BBC World Service Poll, conducted by PIPA and GlobeScan, December 2004.

4 Remarks in introduction to German Information Center survey:
http://germany-info.org/relaunch/politics/new/pol_German_American%20_Survey_12.html

Located in Washington, D.C., the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies is an independent, non-profit public policy organization that works in Germany and the United States to address current and emerging policy challenges. Founded in 1983, the Institute is affiliated with The Johns Hopkins University. The Institute is governed by its own Board of Trustees, which includes prominent German and American leaders from the business, policy, and academic communities.

Revitalizing Public Diplomacy: Challenges for Germany and the United States

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
AMERICAN INSTITUTE
FOR CONTEMPORARY
GERMAN STUDIES

1755 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036 – USA
T: (+1-202) 332-9312
F: (+1-202) 265-9531
E: info@aicgs.org
www.aicgs.org

AICGS