



Karina Paulina Marczuk

University of Warsaw
ORCID: 0000-0003-1870-7728

Human Security and Public Diplomacy

Introduction

In 2001, Roland Paris published a paper entitled ‘Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air’, in which he pointed to the ambiguity of the notion of human security.¹ Encompassing the international dimension of security, the term is seen as something more than pure military power, as it includes a human component too. Similarly, public diplomacy – a term that embraces a set of activities undertaken within foreign policy, i.e. “diplomacy” – is addressed not only to the authorities abroad, but also to a wider spectrum of foreign audiences, i.e. the “public”. Public diplomacy and human security belong to the area of external relations of states, i.e. their foreign policies. Also, they are both frequently criticised for their lack of theoretical framework (human security), and abusing of the concept of diplomacy (public diplomacy).

This paper looks at the interplay between public diplomacy and human security within the field of foreign policy. First, the author explains what human security means by providing three main groups of definitions of the term. Second, the concept of public diplomacy is explained by emphasising the evolution of “classic” diplomacy and its functions. Finally, an attempt has been made to research the issue of how public diplomacy can be used to promote human security. To do so, the paper provides several case studies of the policies of the two main supporters of human security: Japan, and Canada.

The main question posed in this paper is whether public diplomacy – alongside its modern tools, such as digital technologies – is indeed used to promote human

¹ R. Paris, ‘Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air’, *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2001, pp. 87–102.

security. It is argued that due to the fact that both public diplomacy and human security belong to the domain of foreign policy, human security – as an official policy in the states that affirm it – is promoted abroad through a variety of means of public diplomacy. To verify this claim, an attempt has been made to look into the positions of Japan and Canada in this respect.

The notion of human security

For many years, the idea of human security has been around in the academic debate. Until now, a huge number of monographs, papers and chapters have been published in various countries and in numerous languages, and scholars have coined a multitude of definitions of human security. Human security has been criticised due to the lack of a rigorous methodological framework, which can be noticed when one compares it with, for example, (inter-)national security. Numerous states and their political leaders, however, have decided to incorporate the human security doctrine into their policies, and follow its principles and values. Similarly, such international organisations as the United Nations (UN) or the European Union (EU) have been putting into practice the assumptions underlying human security. Taking this into consideration, the mainstream definitions on human security have been reviewed in order to identify the most relevant explanation that can be used for the purposes of this paper.

There are two main dimensions of human security: the Japanese school, which rests on the so-called “freedom from want” doctrine; and the Canadian school, which hinges upon the idea of “freedom from fear”. In general, the Japanese school concerns human dignity in daily life in a very broad meaning of the term (social affairs), while the second one is chiefly related to safeguarding political rights and ensuring safety to everyone. Reviewing the subject literature on human security, one can single out three main approaches taken to determine human security: 1) the definitions proposed by the UN; 2) the definitions coined by scholars; 3) the definitions given by the governments of Japan and Canada.² As the term human security was originally promoted by the UN, let us begin with the explanation of the point of view put forward by the UN on what human security is supposed to be.

Within the UN, the idea of human security gained popularity after the demise of the Cold War order. It was in 1994, when a new Human Development Report, titled *New Dimensions of Human Security*, was presented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The document emphasised a new global political and economic situation, and the need for a security transition, which implied a shift from the classical understanding of security in military terms, conflicts between states, protection of borders, or weaponry to a broader, human-centred approach focused on the eradication of the threats posed to people and their

² In this part of the paper, the research on the numerous definitions of human security has been based on the book by K.P. Marczuk, *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej: od bezpieczeństwa państwa do bezpieczeństwa ludzi*, Warszawa 2012, pp. 55–66.

environment, and human development in general. A key part of the report is the fourth chapter, titled *New Dimensions of Human Security*, where an explanation of human security can be found:

Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity. [...] A consideration of the basic concept of human security must focus on four of its essential characteristics: human security is a universal concern. [...] The components of human security are interdependent. [...] Human security is easier to ensure through early prevention than later intervention. [...] Human security is people-centred. [...] human security is more easily identified through its absence than its presence.³

This is the reason why security threats are understood broadly, including the authors of the report, which goes down to economic security, food insecurity, health insecurity, ecological security, as well as personal, societal and political security.

The UN's point of view on human security was further developed by numerous UN officials and experts, such as the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees Sadako Ogata. In their public addresses, they stressed the fact that human security had to be advanced in both its dimensions, that is "freedom from fear", and "freedom from want", and through human development. In particular, Annan marked that in some cases, even the states could become a source of insecurity for their citizens (for instance genocide), so he emphasised the importance of the narrow dimension of human security, i.e. the core of the Canadian school. Ogata was rather focused on the promotion of its broader dimension, i.e. the foundations of the Japanese school.⁴ In short, in the UN's view, human security is understood extensively, and as such it encompasses both military and non-military threats, as well as natural and man-made risks posed to the security and safety of people. The key elements of the concept are human dignity,

³ United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*, New York–Oxford 1994, pp. 3, 22–23, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019].

⁴ For further information, see: *Secretary-General [Kofi Annan] salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia*. Press Release SG/SM/7382, Ulaanbaatar, 8–10th May 2000, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2000/20000508.sgsm7382.doc.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019]; K.A. Annan, *We the Peoples: The role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*, New York, United Nations, Department of Public Information, 2000, p. 43, https://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/pdfs/We_The_Peoples.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019]; idem, *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization: General Assembly Official Records Fifty-fifth Session*. Supplement No. 1 (A/55/1), New York, United Nations, 2000, p. 4, http://legal.un.org/ola/media/info_from_lc/A_55_1E.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019]; S. Ogata, *Statement of Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Asian Development Bank Seminar "Inclusion or Exclusion: Social Development Challenges For Asia and Europe"*, Geneva, 27 April 1998, <https://www.unhcr.org/en-ik/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fcd54/statement-mrs-sadako-ogata-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees-asian.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019]; eadem, "Human Security: A Refugee Perspective". *Keynote Speech by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Ministerial Meeting on Human Security Issues of the "Lysoen Process" Group of Governments*, Bergen, 19 May 1999, <https://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fc00/human-security-refugee-perspective-keynote-speech-mrs-sadako-ogata-united.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019].

and human development. In this case, human security is also perceived as an alternative to national security.

With regard to the definitions coined by the scholars, one needs to admit that the number of works said about human security has been growing over the recent years. For instance, a critical study of these concepts was proposed by Taylor Owen, who has made an attempt to review a set of definitions of human security offered by the academic community.⁵ In general, all these concepts can be divided into two main groups. The first group encompasses the definitions that highlight the broad dimension of human security (i.e. “freedom from want”), while the second group rests on the narrow dimension (i.e. “freedom from fear”). According to Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh and Anuradha M. Chenoy, however, the academic community looks at human security in three ways. First, it is regarded as a fancy concept without a robust methodological framework. Second, human security is mainly about “freedom from fear”; and, third, it is predominantly about “freedom from want”. In this way, the academic debate on human security is taking place on the two dimensions mentioned above: on the hand, there is an ongoing discussion between the advocates of human security and its opponents; on the other hand, there is a debate going on between the advocates and opponents of the narrow and broad approaches to human security.⁶ Others, such as Malcolm McIntosh and Alan Hunter, claim that human security is a handy term in the sense that it covers the *Realpolitik* and the rule of law (security), and the rules of humanitarianism and anthropocentrism (human dimension) too. The authors also emphasise that human security consists of three key elements. First, it is human-centred; second, it is aimed at the examination of the relations occurring between the human being and society, and, third, it postulates to protect people from national, international and global threats.⁷ For the purposes of this paper, a broad approach to human security has been adopted, which postulates that human security encompasses sustainable human development.⁸

The third approach to defining human security is based on the positions of the governments of Japan and Canada, i.e. the two countries that have been staunch supporters of human security. Both have been managing their foreign policy by implementing the principles of human security and incorporating them into their agenda: Japan has focused on social and economic issues, while Canada has put more emphasis on “freedom from fear” issues. Their human security policies will be analysed in the final part of the paper.

⁵ T. Owen, ‘Human security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition’, *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2004, pp. 373–387.

⁶ S. Tadjbakhsh, A.M. Chenoy, *Human security: Concepts and implications*, Abingdon, Oxon, New York 2007, p. 40.

⁷ M. McIntosh, A. Hunter, ‘Perspectives on human security: The emergent construct’, [in:] M. McIntosh, A. Hunter (eds.), *New perspectives on human security*, Sheffield 2010, pp. 3–4.

⁸ G. King, Ch.J.L. Murray, ‘Rethinking human security’, *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 116, no. 4, 2001–2002, p. 585.

The notion of public diplomacy

Diplomacy and its functions, as traditionally understood, has evolved from focusing on dialogue and negotiation to advance the foreign policy goals of a state, secrecy, diplomatic protocol, ceremonial, and gradual professionalization⁹ towards a variety of new diplomatic activities, one of them being of key interest – public diplomacy. Public diplomacy, the concept that gained popularity in the US a few decades ago, has been more popular in other states, including Western and non-Western countries. For instance, in Poland the term “public diplomacy” came into use only when Radosław Sikorski became the minister of foreign affairs serving from 2007 to 2014. For the first time, Sikorski mentioned the term in his exposé on Polish foreign policy in 2009, in which he stated that the “[...] task [of public diplomacy] is not only to promote Poland as broadly understood, but also to convince public opinion abroad of our assessment and our understanding of international problems.”¹⁰

What exactly is “classic” diplomacy? Traditionally, diplomacy was about establishing and conducting official relations between states in various areas. To advance this goal, states have developed the art of negotiation (mainly bilateral treaties), which has since then been the major field of interest for ‘classic’ diplomacy. Of the numerous diplomatic law provisions, the key ones are those included in the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, which describes diplomatic functions as follows: information gathering, communication, representation, negotiation, and the promotion of friendly relations. Article 3 of the 1961 Vienna Convention includes the term *inter alia*, too, what allows diplomacy to be exercised in new ways and forms: “The functions of a diplomatic mission consist *inter alia* [...]”¹¹ More importantly, diplomacy as classically understood has remained in the sphere of activity of sovereign states while public diplomacy involves various international actors.¹²

Public diplomacy, i.e. the art of influencing and attracting foreign audiences, is associated with the concept of soft power. Soft power, the term propagated by American scholar Joseph S. Nye, is about ability to achieve aims through attractiveness rather than coercion or payment¹³. Brian Hocking has noticed that “it is not the case that public diplomacy is itself uniquely the expression of soft power”¹⁴ while Beata Ociepka notes that public diplomacy integrates all states’ soft power activities in their foreign policy.¹⁵ As such, nowadays it is called “new public diplomacy”.

⁹ C. Jönsson, M. Hall (eds.), *Essence of Diplomacy*, Houndmills, Basingstoke and New York 2005, p. 11.

¹⁰ *Exposé 2009: Informacja Ministra Spraw Zagranicznych Radosława Sikorskiego na temat polskiej polityki zagranicznej w 2009 roku*, 2009, http://www.msz.gov.pl/pl/polityka_zagraniczna/priorytety_polityki_zagr_2017_2021/expose2/expose_2009 [accessed: 25.10.2019].

¹¹ *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations*, 18 April 1961, https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1964/06/19640624%2002-10%20AM/Ch_III_3p.pdf [accessed: 29.10.2019].

¹² B. Ociepka, *Miękka siła i dyplomacja publiczna Polski*, Warszawa 2013, p. 77.

¹³ J.S. Nye, *Soft power: jak osiągnąć sukces w polityce światowej*, Warszawa 2007, p. 25.

¹⁴ B. Hocking, ‘Rethinking the ‘New’ Public Diplomacy’, [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke, New York 2005, p. 34.

¹⁵ B. Ociepka, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

Other concepts that link with public diplomacy are, as Jan Melissen suggests, propaganda, nation-branding, and foreign cultural relations. He also emphasises the fact that: “[t]he new public diplomacy will be an increasingly standard component of overall diplomatic practice and is more than a form of propaganda conducted by diplomats.”¹⁶

To date, diplomacy has developed and expanded and, thereby, it covers various dimensions of international relations. This is the way one can talk, for instance on conference diplomacy, international cooperation between parliaments (parliamentary diplomacy), mitigation of hostile relations between states through exchange of nationals (people-to-people diplomacy, P2P), or various other ways of enhancing the influence and position of a state on the international forum, which explains the idea of “new diplomacies”. Among them, the crucial role goes to public diplomacy, although one has to keep in mind cultural diplomacy too, which is focused on enhancing inter-state mutual relations through art, performances, concerts, movies festivals, and other forms. This type of diplomacy is therefore often included into bi- or multilateral agreements that states conclude.¹⁷ Moreover, states promote themselves in international relations using digital tools, such as social media (digital or cyber-diplomacy and its particular types as Facebook diplomacy, Twitter diplomacy – Tweeplomacy, Instagram diplomacy – Instaplomacy or Instadiplomacy, or LinkedIn diplomacy).¹⁸ Other ways of increasing the impact of states abroad can be, for instance, through the promotion of cooperation in science (science diplomacy),¹⁹ or in economics (economic diplomacy).²⁰ Numerous states also boost their international influence through so-called gastrodiplomacy or culinary diplomacy,²¹ not to mention sports (sports diplomacy).²² The list of “diplomacies” is long and, what is more, there is extensive literature on the subject of diplomacy and its evolution.²³

¹⁶ For further information, see: J. Melissen, ‘The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice’, [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke, New York 2005, pp. 11; 16–23.

¹⁷ In the case of Poland, see: K.P. Marczuk, ‘Evolution of Poland’s Cultural Diplomacy: Case Study of Spain, 1977–2017’, [in:] M. Mizerska-Wrotkowska, J.L. Orella Martínez (eds.), *Poland and Spain in Late Modern and Contemporary Civilisation and Culture*, Madrid 2018, pp. 129–138; K.P. Marczuk, ‘Good Neighbourhood Treaties and Public Diplomacy: Polish Activities in Neighbouring States (2007–2014)’, [in:] K.P. Marczuk (ed.), *Good Neighbourhood Treaties of Poland: Political, Security and Social Relations*, Cham 2019, pp. 25–40.

¹⁸ For example, see: S. Riordan, *Cyberdiplomacy: Managing Security and Governance Online*, Cambridge, Medford 2019.

¹⁹ O. Krasnyak, *National Styles in Science, Diplomacy, and Science Diplomacy: A Case Study of the United Nations Security Council P5 Countries*, Leiden 2018.

²⁰ P.A.G. van Bergeijk, M. Okano-Heijmans, J. Melissen (eds.), *Economic Diplomacy: Economic and Political Perspectives*, Leiden–Boston 2011.

²¹ P.S. Rockower, ‘Recipes for Gastrodiplomacy’, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2012, pp. 235–246.

²² J.S. Rofo (ed.), *Sport and Diplomacy: Games within Games*, Manchester 2018.

²³ For instance see: P.M. Seib, *The Future of Diplomacy*, Cambridge, Malden 2016; P. Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*, Cambridge, New York 2009; B. Surmacz, *Ewolucja współczesnej dyplomacji: aktorzy, struktury, funkcje*, Lublin 2015.

In contrast to “classic” diplomacy, public diplomacy is aimed at enhancing the position of states in international relations, increasing the value of their brands, and building up their soft power. This is also the ability to influence other international players to further one’s own national interest. As such, public diplomacy is a tool for foreign policy used to support the advancement of its goals and, as such, it is complimentary to traditional diplomatic activity, which Manuel Castells sums up as follows: “[p]ublic diplomacy is the diplomacy of the public, that is, the projection in the international arena of the values and ideas of the public.”²⁴ Paul Sharp offers a concise definition of public diplomacy, which he understands as a very timely concept and as “[t]he process by which direct relations are pursued with a country’s people to advance the interests and extend the values of those being represented, appears to be an idea whose time has come.”²⁵ Sharp’s definition has been applied for the purposes of this paper.²⁶

Finally, public diplomacy is different from the notion of “classic” diplomacy mainly by its means and methods. For example, it involves political marketing, and it is geared towards different target groups, as it is focused not only on governments, but also on societies and individuals. Therefore, as suggested by Beata Ociepka, we should not in fact be talking about the recipients of public diplomacy, but rather its stakeholders.²⁷

How can public diplomacy be used to promote human security?

Public diplomacy, as Efe Sevin notices, is a combination of two terms which, on the one hand, demonstrate their strong links with international relations (“diplomacy”). On the other hand, the “public” component is about broadening the scope and the recipients of traditional diplomacy – from states to nationals.²⁸ Therefore, public diplomacy remains a tool of foreign policy, while human security is a concept which is applied to and furthered by foreign policy. This is the plane where they both intersect, and this process is discernible when one looks at the approach to human security of the key states that support it, that is Japan and Canada.

To begin with Japan, this country’s government perceives human security as of the key pillars of its diplomacy, the other pillar being, *inter alia*, economic diplomacy, science and technology diplomacy, or public diplomacy. Human security is

²⁴ M. Castells, ‘The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance’, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 616, no. 1, 2008, p. 91.

²⁵ P. Sharp, ‘Revolutionary States, Outlaw Regimes and the Techniques of Public Diplomacy’, [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke, New York 2005, p. 106.

²⁶ Efe Sevin, Emily T. Metzgar and Craig Hayden reviewed the key literature on public diplomacy: E. Sevin, E.T. Metzgar, C. Hayden, ‘The Scholarship of Public Diplomacy: Analysis of a Growing Field’, *International Journal of Communication*, vol. 13, 2019, pp. 4814–4837.

²⁷ B. Ociepka, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

²⁸ E. Sevin, *Public diplomacy and the implementation of foreign policy in the US, Sweden and Turkey*, London 2017, p. 3.

understood as “[...] a concept aimed at creating a community in which people can fully develop their potential through protecting all individuals, and at the same time empowering them to solve their own problems.”²⁹ As such, human security is the leading rule of the overall Japanese development cooperation. Therefore, one can conclude that Japan has adopted a wide approach to human security, which brings us back the already mentioned Japanese school of human security. Also, although public diplomacy has not been defined explicitly in the latest government *Diplomatic Bluebook 2019*, it is safe to say that public diplomacy is not only an essential tool of Japan’s foreign policy, but also the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) of Japan strongly emphasises its digital dimension (digital diplomacy). In particular, it is about active dissemination of information through the Ministry’s website – available both in Japanese and English – and social media, such as Facebook,³⁰ Twitter,³¹ Instagram,³² and YouTube.³³ The key objective is to stay in touch with the public (for instance, the third section of the Diplomatic Bluebook 2019 is entitled “Diplomacy with the Support of the Public”), that is both Japanese nationals (so-called domestic public diplomacy³⁴) and the recipients abroad. This is the way the government promotes and informs on the vision of its Japanese foreign policy, as well as any advancements of human security issues. The authors of the Diplomatic Bluebook 2019 have stressed the fact that the Ministry “[...] considers its English website an important tool of public diplomacy, and has been enhancing the distribution of information in English on *Japan’s foreign policy* (including maintaining territorial integrity, historical issues and *security*), Japan’s position on international affairs, and Japan’s rich and varied attractiveness.”³⁵

If one accesses the Ministry’s English version of its website, which is – according to the government’s position – the main source of communication with the foreign audience, they can easily find some information on the human security activities taken by the government. For instance, the Ministry has emphasised the assistance provided by the Trust Fund for Human Security, founded by Japan and operating within the United Nations. What is more, the promotion of human security is one

²⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, *Diplomatic Bluebook 2019: Japanese Diplomacy and International Situation in 2018*, 17 October 2019, pp. 246–247, https://www.mofa.go.jp/fp/pp/page22e_000929.html [accessed: 5.11.2019].

³⁰ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/MofaJapan.en> [accessed: 5.11.2019].

³¹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Twitter, https://twitter.com/MofaJapan_en [accessed: 5.11.2019].

³² Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Instagram, <https://www.instagram.com/mofajapan> [accessed: 5.11.2019].

³³ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/user/mofachannel> [accessed: 5.11.2019].

³⁴ Ellen Huijgh, who has researched domestic dimension of public diplomacy, argues that “[p]ublic diplomacy remains a cipher for the domestic public. It is predominantly associated with its international aspect: directed towards foreign publics and conducted abroad. Nevertheless social media and the increasing mobility of global citizens have blurred distinctions between domestic and international audiences” – E. Huijgh, ‘Changing Tunes for Public Diplomacy: Exploring the Domestic Dimension’, *The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, vol. 2, no 1, 2011, p. 63.

³⁵ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, *op. cit.*, p. 295. Italics marked by the author.

of the priorities of Japan's foreign policy, and the government has committed itself to organise a set of actions aimed at the dissemination of information on Japan's engagement in human security. In particular, these actions are: "[...] (1) making policy speeches and organising symposia, (2) engaging other countries on human security in bilateral and multilateral meetings and referring to human security in the outcome documents of such meetings, (3) establishing groups aiming to mainstream human security and cooperating actively with them."³⁶

Human security is strongly related to the official development assistance (ODA), provided by Japan, in that sense that development cooperation is perceived as a key tool of Japanese diplomacy. Looking at the issue in more detail, the major priorities of the Japanese ODA are "addressing global challenges and promoting human security toward achieving the SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals]."³⁷ In particular, it is about covering such fields as "[...] health, food, women (gender), education, disaster risk reduction and tsunami countermeasures, water and hygiene, and climate change and global environmental issues."³⁸ One should also note that all these areas concern the broad dimension of human security.

Canada is perceived as a state that puts forward a narrow approach to human security. It means that, besides the development agenda, the government is focused on such issues as active involvement in international peace and security campaigns, promotion of human rights or inclusive governance and democracy. "Revitalising the rules-based international order" is one of the four pivotal areas of concern for Canada's diplomacy in the years 2019–2020.³⁹ To approach this aim, Justin Trudeau, Canada's Prime Minister, in his Minister of Foreign Affairs Mandate Letter of 1 February 2017, pointed to the various foreign policy priorities. Among them is the priority of "[e]xpanding Canadian diplomacy and leadership on global issues and in international institutions," which, *inter alia*, means "to champion the values of inclusive and accountable governance, including by promoting human rights, women's empowerment and gender equality, and peaceful pluralism, inclusion and respect for diversity."⁴⁰ What is significant is that in 2017, Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland claimed that "[t]o put it plainly, Canadian diplomacy and development sometimes require the backing of *hard power*."⁴¹ This statement proves a clear links with Canada's approach to human security.

³⁶ Global Issues Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, *The Trust Fund for Human Security: For the "Human-centred" 21st Century*, August 2009, p. 4, https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/t_fund21.pdf [accessed: 7.11.2019].

³⁷ Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

³⁹ Government of Canada, Global Affairs Canada, *Plans at a glance and operating context*, 6 June 2019, <https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/priorities-priorites.aspx?lang=eng> [accessed: 7.11.2019].

⁴⁰ J. Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, *Minister of Foreign Affairs Mandate Letter*, 1 February 2017, <https://pm.gc.ca/en/mandate-letters/minister-foreign-affairs-mandate-letter> [accessed: 7.11.2019].

⁴¹ Ch. Freeland, Minister of Foreign Affairs, *Address by Minister Freeland on Canada's foreign policy priorities*, 6 June 2017, Ottawa, https://www.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/news/2017/06/address_by_ministerfreelandoncanadasforeignpolicypriorities.html [accessed: 7.11.2019]. Italics marked by the author.

The commitment to develop public diplomacy was clearly pointed out in the 2017 Minister of Foreign Affairs Mandate Letter too. Since 1995, Canada has developed its public diplomacy, understood as the promotion of Canadian ideals and culture abroad, with a particular emphasis on human security, which it treats as the third pillar of its foreign policy.⁴² The others two pillars are the promotion of economic growth, and the pursuit of international peace and security. The crucial time was the period when Lloyd Axworthy became minister of foreign affairs, serving from 1996 to 2000. Axworthy was a staunch advocate of human security, and it was he who brought human security to Canada's foreign policy.⁴³

Nowadays, Global Affairs Canada – i.e. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs – develops its public diplomacy activities mainly on the Internet, applying digital diplomacy tools. In particular, it goes down to extensive presence in the social media – the Canadian government uses a variety of channels to reach out to a broadest possible audience worldwide⁴⁴. Global Affairs Canada has developed various social media channels, and other types of communication tools, such as podcasts. Table 1 below illustrates the social media and other digital media used.

Table 1. Global Affairs Canada social media and digital tools

Type of communication	Sorts of medium
Social media	Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Flickr, Weibo, WeChat, LinkedIn
Podcasts	–
RSS feeds	
Mobile apps and mobile websites	
Email subscriptions	

Source: author's own compilation based on Government of Canada, Global Affairs Canada, *Stay connected*, 16 October 2019, https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/contact-contactez/social-media_medias-sociaux.aspx?lang=eng [accessed: 8.11.2019].

All these channels are used to communicate Canada's vision of human security. To do so, numerous posts on several issues are published, like e.g. the activity of Canadian functionaries and humanitarian personnel abroad.

Conclusions

Not only diplomacy but also security has evolved over the last years – from a diplomacy and security of and by the states to a diplomacy and security by and for the

⁴² E. H. Potter, *Canada and the new public diplomacy*, The Hague, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael, 2002, p. 8.

⁴³ L. Axworthy, 'Introduction', [in:] R. McRae, D. Hubert (eds.), *Human security and the new diplomacy: Protecting people, promoting peace*, Montreal 2001, p. 3.

⁴⁴ The list of social media is available at: Government of Canada, Global Affairs Canada, *Stay connected*, 16 October 2019, https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/contact-contactez/social-media_medias-sociaux.aspx?lang=eng [accessed: 8.11.2019].

people. Both have remained a crucial element of states' foreign policies too. Therefore, it is natural for them to take part in a complex interplay, and it is the task of researchers to explore how this is happening.

First, there are two main dimensions of human security: the Japanese school, based on the notion of "freedom from want", and the Canadian school, whose doctrine is "freedom from fear". Numerous definitions of this term go back to these broad or narrow approaches. There are three main groups of definitions that refer to the UN approach to human security (a broad dimension), proposals of scholars who represent either the Japanese or the Canadian school, as well as definitions provided by the governments of these two states, which have been supporters of human security.

Second, in opposite to "classic" diplomacy, public diplomacy uses numerous means of promotion of the vision and values of a state abroad. Therefore, it is used to support foreign policy goals by soft means and, as such, it is complimentary to "classic" diplomacy. In particular, contemporary public diplomacy applies digital tools to reach the broadest possible audience.

Third, Japan and Canada are the key states that implement human security values into their foreign policies. At the same time, they have developed their public diplomacy in a way that makes them currently focused on digital technologies. By spreading their visions on foreign policy abroad, they also spread their human security values.

To conclude, it is clear to see that both public diplomacy and human security remain in the field of interest that pertains to foreign policy. Human security, an official policy in such states as Japan or Canada, is thus supported by a variety of means of public diplomacy abroad, these days these means being chiefly digital.

References

- Annan K.A., *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization: General Assembly Official Records Fifty-fifth Session*. Supplement No. 1 (A/55/1), New York, United Nations, 2000, http://legal.un.org/ola/media/info_from_lc/A_55_1E.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019].
- Annan K.A., *We the Peoples: The role of the United Nations in the 21st Century*, New York, United Nations, Department of Public Information, 2000, https://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/pdfs/We_The_Peoples.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019].
- Axworthy L., 'Introduction', [in:] R. McRae, D. Hubert (eds.), *Human security and the new diplomacy: Protecting people, promoting peace*, Montreal 2001.
- Bergeijk P.A.G. van, Okano-Heijmans M., Melissen J. (eds.), *Economic Diplomacy: Economic and Political Perspectives*, Leiden, Boston 2011.
- Castells M., 'The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 616, no. 1, 2008.
- Exposé 2009: *Informacja Ministra Spraw Zagranicznych Radosława Sikorskiego na temat polskiej polityki zagranicznej w 2009 roku*, http://www.msz.gov.pl/pl/polityka_zagraniczna/priorytety_polityki_zagr_2017_2021/expose2/expose_2009 [accessed: 25.10.2019].

- Freeland Ch., Minister of Foreign Affairs, *Address by Minister Freeland on Canada's foreign policy priorities*, 6 June 2017, Ottawa, https://www.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/news/2017/06/address_by_ministerfreelandoncanadasforeignpolicypriorities.html [accessed: 7.11.2019].
- Global Issues Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, *The Trust Fund for Human Security: For the "Human-centered" 21st Century*, August 2009, https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/t_fund21.pdf [accessed: 7.11.2019].
- Government of Canada, Global Affairs Canada, *Plans at a glance and operating context*, 6 June 2019, <https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/priorities-priorites.aspx?lang=eng> [accessed: 7.11.2019].
- Government of Canada, Global Affairs Canada, *Stay connected*, 16 October 2019, https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/contact-contactez/social-media_medias-sociaux.aspx?lang=eng [accessed: 8.11.2019].
- Hocking B., 'Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy', [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke–New York 2005.
- Huijgh E., 'Changing Tunes for Public Diplomacy: Exploring the Domestic Dimension', *The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2011.
- Jönsson C., Hall M. (eds.), *Essence of Diplomacy*, Houndmills, Basingstoke–New York 2005.
- King G., Murray Ch.J.L., 'Rethinking human security', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 116, no. 4, 2001–2002.
- Krasnyak O., *National Styles in Science, Diplomacy, and Science Diplomacy: A Case Study of the United Nations Security Council P5 Countries*, Leiden 2018.
- Marczuk K.P., 'Evolution of Poland's Cultural Diplomacy: Case Study of Spain, 1977–2017', [in:] M. Mizerska-Wrotkowska, J. L. Orella Martínez (eds.), *Poland and Spain in Late Modern and Contemporary Civilisation and Culture*, Madrid 2018.
- Marczuk K.P., 'Good Neighbourhood Treaties and Public Diplomacy: Polish Activities in Neighbouring States (2007–2014)', [in:] K.P. Marczuk (ed.), *Good Neighbourhood Treaties of Poland: Political, Security and Social Relations*, Cham 2019.
- Marczuk K.P., *Bezpieczeństwo wewnętrzne państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej: od bezpieczeństwa państwa do bezpieczeństwa ludzi*, Warszawa 2012.
- McIntosh M., Hunter A., 'Perspectives on human security: The emergent construct', [in:] M. McIntosh, A. Hunter (eds.), *New perspectives on human security*, Sheffield 2010.
- Melissen J., 'The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice', [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke, New York 2005.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan, *Diplomatic Bluebook 2019: Japanese Diplomacy and International Situation in 2018*, 17 October 2019, https://www.mofa.go.jp/fp/pp/page22e_000929.html [accessed: 5.11.2019].
- Nye J.S., *Soft power: jak osiągnąć sukces w polityce światowej*, Warszawa 2007.
- Ociepka B., *Miękka siła i dyplomacja publiczna Polski*, Warszawa 2013.
- Ogata S., "Human Security: A Refugee Perspective". *Keynote Speech by Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Ministerial Meeting on Human Security Issues of the "Lysoen Process" Group of Governments*, Bergen, 19 May 1999, <https://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fc00/human-security-refugee-perspective-keynote-speech-mrs-sadako-ogata-united.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019].

- Ogata S., *Statement of Mrs. Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Asian Development Bank Seminar "Inclusion or Exclusion: Social Development Challenges For Asia and Europe"*, Geneva, 27 April 1998, <https://www.unhcr.org/en-lk/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fcd54/statement-mrs-sadako-ogata-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees-asian.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019].
- Owen T., 'Human security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition', *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2004.
- Paris R., 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air', *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2001.
- Potter E.H., *Canada and the new public diplomacy*, The Hague, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael, 2002.
- Riordan S., *Cyberdiplomacy: Managing Security and Governance Online*, Cambridge, Medford 2019.
- Rockower P.S., 'Recipes for Gastrodiplomacy', *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2012.
- Rofe J.S. (ed.), *Sport and Diplomacy: Games within Games*, Manchester 2018.
- Secretary-General [Kofi Annan] *salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia*. Press Release SG/SM/7382, Ulaanbaatar, 8–10 May 2000, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2000/20000508.sgsm7382.doc.html> [accessed: 17.10.2019].
- Seib P.M., *The Future of Diplomacy*, Cambridge, Malden 2016.
- Sevin E., Metzgar E.T., Hayden C., 'The Scholarship of Public Diplomacy: Analysis of a Growing Field', *International Journal of Communication*, vol. 13, 2019.
- Sevin E., *Public diplomacy and the implementation of foreign policy in the US, Sweden and Turkey*, London 2017.
- Sharp P., 'Revolutionary States, Outlaw Regimes and the Techniques of Public Diplomacy', [in:] J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke–New York 2005.
- Sharp P., *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*, Cambridge–New York 2009.
- Surmacz B., *Ewolucja współczesnej dyplomacji: aktorzy, struktury, funkcje*, Lublin 2015.
- Tadjbakhsh S., Chenoy A.M., *Human security: Concepts and implications*, Abingdon–Oxon–New York 2007.
- Trudeau J., Prime Minister of Canada, *Minister of Foreign Affairs Mandate Letter*, 1 February 2017, <https://pm.gc.ca/en/mandate-letters/minister-foreign-affairs-mandate-letter> [accessed: 7.11.2019].
- United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford 1994, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf [accessed: 17.10.2019].
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations*, 18 April 1961, https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1964/06/19640624%2002-10%20AM/Ch_III_3p.pdf [accessed: 29.10.2019].

Human security i dyplomacja publiczna *Streszczenie*

Zarówno *human security* (bezpieczeństwo jednostki ludzkiej), jak i dyplomacja publiczna są poddawane krytyce za brak precyzji. Obie te kategorie należą do obszaru polityki zagranicznej. Artykuł dotyczy zależności między dyplomacją publiczną a *human security* w dziedzinie polityki zagranicznej. Po pierwsze, dokonano przeglądu definicji *human security*, wyodrębniając trzy ich główne grupy. Po drugie, wyjaśniono pojęcie dyplomacji publicznej, wskazując na ewolucję „klasycznej” dyplomacji i jej funkcji. Wreszcie zbadano użyteczność dyplomacji publicznej do promocji *human security* na forum międzynarodowym. W tym celu przeanalizowano studia przypadków polityki Japonii i Kanady, wiodących zwolenników *human security*. Główne pytanie dotyczy tego, czy dyplomacja publiczna i jej nowoczesne narzędzia, takie jak technologie cyfrowe, są wykorzystywane do rozpowszechniania założeń *human security* na forum międzynarodowym. Przyjęto, że *human security*, jako oficjalna polityka w państwach, które je promują, jest upowszechniane środkami dyplomacji publicznej. W celu sprawdzenia tego twierdzenia zbadano stanowiska Japonii i Kanady w omawianym zakresie.

Słowa kluczowe: dyplomacja publiczna, *human security*, Japonia, Kanada, polityka zagraniczna

Human Security and Public Diplomacy *Abstract*

Both human security and public diplomacy have been openly criticised for their lack of precision. They also both belong to the area of foreign policy. This paper deals with the interplay between public diplomacy and human security in the field of foreign policy. First, definitions of human security are reviewed, and three main groups of definitions of this term are provided. Second, the concept of public diplomacy is explained, emphasising the evolution of “classic” diplomacy and its functions. The final part of the paper looks at the relevance of public diplomacy to the promotion of human security. To do so, case studies of policies of the two main human security supporters, Japan and Canada, have been scrutinised. The main research question posed is whether public diplomacy, and its modern tools such as digital technologies, is used to spread human security values abroad. The key point is that human security – an official policy of the states that affirm it – is promoted through public diplomacy abroad. To verify this claim, the author has looked at the positions of Japan and Canada in this respect.

Key words: public diplomacy, human security, Japan, Canada, foreign policy

Human security und die öffentliche Diplomatie *Zusammenfassung*

Sowohl *human security* als auch die Public Diplomacy werden für ihren Mangel an Präzision kritisiert. Beide Kategorien gehören zum Gebiet der Außenpolitik. Der Artikel behandelt das Zusammenspiel zwischen *Public Diplomacy* und *human security* auf dem Gebiet der Außenpolitik. Erstens wurden Definitionen von *human security* betrachtet und in drei Hauptgruppen unterschieden. Zweitens wurde der Begriff der Public Diplomacy mit Hinweis auf die Evolution der „klassischen“ Diplomatie und ihrer Funktion erklärt. Der

letzte Teil dieses Paper betrachtet die Relevanz von *Public Diplomacy* für die Förderung von *human security*. Zu diesem Zweck wurden in Fallstudien die Politik von Japan und Kanada, der zwei wichtigsten Befürworter, geprüft. Die zentrale Forschungsfrage ist, ob *Public Diplomacy* und ihre modernen Werkzeuge, wie die Digitaltechniken, zur Verbreitung von *human security* international genutzt werden. Das Hauptargument lautet, dass *human security* als offizielle Politik der Staaten, die diese Politik fördern, durch *Public Diplomacy* international verbreitet wird. Zur Überprüfung dieser Behauptung wurden die Haltungen von Japan und Kanada in diesem Bereich untersucht.

Schlüsselwörter: die öffentliche Diplomatie, *human security*, Japan, Kanada, Außenpolitik

Human security и общественная дипломатия

Резюме

Human security (безопасность человека, безопасность личности) и общественная дипломатия подвергаются критике из-за отсутствия точности определения. Обе эти категории относятся к области внешней политики. В статье рассмотрена взаимосвязь между общественной дипломатией и *human security* в области внешней политики. Во-первых, были рассмотрены существующие определения *human security* и выделены три их основные группы. Во-вторых, объяснено понятие общественной дипломатии и прослежена эволюция «классической» дипломатии и ее функций. Наконец, было исследовано влияние общественной дипломатии на распространение *human security* на международной арене. С этой целью были проанализированы выбранные действия Японии и Канады – двух ключевых сторонников *human security*. Главный вопрос заключается в том, как используется общественная дипломатия и ее современные инструменты (напр. цифровые технологии) для распространения *human security* на международном форуме. Было выдвинуто предположение, что *human security*, как официальная политика государств, которые ее продвигают, распространяется с использованием средств общественной дипломатии. Чтобы проверить это предположение, были изучены позиции Японии и Канады в исследуемой области.

Ключевые слова: общественная дипломатия, *human security*, Япония, Канада, внешняя политика

