N.J. Cull & N. Snow (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy* (2020), pp. 38-49

Exchange Programs and Public Diplomacy

Giles Scott-Smith

Public diplomacy covers an array of different activities, all of which function at various distances from and combinations with the practice of foreign policy and its specific objectives. Amongst these activities, exchange programs are an interesting case. Most forms of public diplomacy involve the presentation of image and information, and most public diplomacy research also focuses on these 'fast media'. Exchanges are different in that they directly involve the 'human factor', where an engagement with the personality, psychology and both short- and long-term personal development of participants is central. The inter-personal nature of the exchange experience, coupled with its inherently private character, have caused this field to be largely written out of the documentation of diplomacy and its conduct in the public realm. This diffuse interchange of people, ideas, and opinions are generally so lost in the myriad of global social contacts that their worth is often questioned. Most public diplomacy researchers avoid dealing with exchanges for this reason, since it is hard to gather the necessary data to reach hard conclusions on results. Nicolas Cull has argued that exchanges represent a specific activity separate to other forms of public diplomacy, in terms of *raison d'etre*, mechanisms, and outcomes.[1] Notably, contributions outlining public diplomacy in recent major anthologies on diplomacy have failed to mention exchanges in any form at all, the emphasis being more on the role of non-state actors, domestic publics, and social media.[2] International education has a burgeoning literature, but one that rarely addresses the exchange experience outside of study of the "circulations of knowledge".[3] Nevertheless, there are various tools to assess influence in some shape or form, moving beyond anecdotal evidence and what Frank Ninkovich has termed the 'act of faith' that these circulations of people actually succeed in their designated objectives.[4] How to situate exchanges within the broad panoply of public diplomacy, or indeed international relations?

Exchanges and Evaluating 'Success'

In his overview of diplomatic trends and possible futures, Philip Seib commented the following:

> Consider the 19-year-old who comes to your country for a year in an academic exchange program that is part of your public diplomacy. The young woman has a good

> experience and returns home with positive thoughts about your country. How are the effects of that measured? Now suppose that 30 years later she becomes her nation's prime minister, and her policy toward your country is strongly influenced, in a positive way, by her experience in that exchange program. This is a public diplomacy success, but 30 years have passed before the result could be seen …. Unlike the elements of modern diplomacy that are so profoundly affected by demands for high-speed action, the seeds planted by exchange programs and the like take time to germinate and produce a crop.[5]

Seib illustrates several of the issues at stake here. Is 'success' here that the female exchange student had a positive experience while on exchange and took that experience home afterwards, or is it that the same individual later achieved political power, through which the positive exchange experience may positively influence decisions as a leader? The first is clearly possible to verify, based on exit data that can be collected through interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires. The US State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) has developed an extensive anonymous evaluation process that gathers both qualitative and quantitative responses from participants across a range of exchange programs, producing reports the extent of outreach activities, personal reflections on impact, and shifts in worldview and perspective.[6] This kind of short-term data is generally the type gathered and used by academics as well, in studies of exchanges run by, for instance, the European Union or China's Confucius Institutes.[7]

To return to Seib's example, the bigger issue is to what extent longer-term claims can be made that link the exchange experience with either the continuing positive outlook towards the host nation thirty years later, or – more problematic – that the exchange experience actually contributes in some way towards the *achievement* of a position of influence or leadership afterwards. An interesting example (which perhaps Seib was alluding to, at a distance) is that of Margaret Thatcher, who first visited the United States as a participant in the US State Department's International Visitor Program in 1967.[8] This kind of data is also used as a measure of success by US programs, to imply that they are reaching the talented few who go on to do great things later, be it in politics, economics, culture, or whatever. For instance, the ECA maintains a site on 'Notable Fulbrighters' who have gone on to achieve fame in one form or another (including 59 Nobel Prizes), as confirmation of the Fulbright Program's relation with intellectual advancement, prestige, allure, and career-enhancing assets.[9]

This information is useful, both to attract future participants and to convince those in Congress and the rest of the federal government that this is a program worth continuing

support for US foreign relations in general. But its analytical value, numerically seen, is limited. What of the thousands of other Fulbrighters who did not become leaders in their field, but who nevertheless benefitted, be it personally, intellectually, or professionally, from the experience? Bringing in the data on this majority of cases is hard, and explains why, even though the Fulbright Program began with its first bilateral agreement between the US and China in 1947 and has since grown to involve exchanges with over 140 other countries, there is still no research-based overview of its academic impact and influence on a global scale. Such an undertaking would require the study of Fulbright's relevance for personal careers, disciplinary development, and institution-building across many decades and multiple regions. Until that is attempted, we are left with the results of detailed national case studies and anecdotal collections that give a glimpse of the Program's influence in both breadth and depth on global intellectual networks and knowledge production.[10]

A Global History?

It is not only public diplomacy researchers who have largely avoided exchanges as a field of study – historians in general have rarely engaged with their significance as a form of circulation. This is all the more surprising considering the 'transatlantic turn' in history over the past couple of decades. The extensive Cold War anthologies from Oxford and Cambridge do not address them in any detail. The *Global Interdependence* anthology refers to "official exchange programs" only in passing. The *Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* refers to scholarships in half a page under the heading of "Temporary Migrations."[11] Clearly, this is a subject field that has suffered from something of a credibility problem. Nevertheless, recent trends suggest this is changing. Research into early twentieth century internationalism has filtered into considering the circulation of experts as a vital element in the creation of cross-national networks, particularly in the field of education, yet these circulations are still often regarded as arbitrary and not planned.[12] A recent volume has attempted to redress this by emphasising how organized "regular transnational circulations … with some form of learning as the principal goal" have influenced inter-state and inter-national relations since the late nineteenth century.[13] The volume highlights structural trends over time, covering examples ranging from the Rhodes Scholarships of the early twentieth century to the Japanese JET programmes of the 1980s and the EU's Erasmus. Exchanges were developed in the modern era as another form of inter-state / inter-imperial competition before becoming a means to pursue progress and modernisation as part of inter-war internationalism.[14] After WW II the Cold War saw two poles of global circulation revolving around Washington DC

and Moscow,[15] but already since the 1960s other participants – notably India, China, Japan, and the EU – have 'globalised' exchanges into complex, overlapping networks. While the United States continues to function as a central point in terms of global educational and expertise circulations,[16] there is no doubt that differences across north-south and east-west axes have begun to gradually even out, such that the US and Europe can now be completely bypassed by south-south knowledge networks. Organised circuits of exchange such as those running through centres of Islamic learning in the Middle East have so far been largely overlooked in terms of their contribution to global trends. China, with over 300 universities of its own, hosted 328,000 international students in 2012, a trend fueled by the low cost of living, multiple scholarship opportunities and the chance to experience the society of a rising global power at first hand. This number will inevitably rise in the years to come. The geography of centres of exchange is therefore changing, and with it the paths that participants take.[17]

Political Context

Exchanges, however educational and 'apolitical' they may be presented, inescapably operate within the broader political environment of international affairs. The ability of individuals to cross national boundaries has been a matter of major consequence since the arrival of the nation-state, and exchanges are naturally no exception. Attempts have been made to apply IR theory to this field of activity.[18] Even the most politically neutral of exchanges, such as those between high schools, have either political intent behind their creation or are promoted for the purpose of developing cross-border relations that can subsequently lead to political outcomes, such as a reduction in conflict. The best example of the latter here is probably the Franco-German high school exchanges after WW II, which saw upwards of five million students being exchanged by 1997, contributing to the normalisation of relations between the two countries.[19] Political outcomes, in other words, can represent a mix of national and general interests, such that it becomes difficult to disentangle strategic communication from 'mutual understanding'. This is also the case with exchanges run wholly by the private sector, which still operate within a broader political environment. Good examples were the exchanges being run with Iranians and North Koreans by various US private sector initiatives, which have successfully generated cross-cultural contacts but which are still inevitably heavily burdened by the political context of relations in general.[20]

Exchanges are a flexible medium that can be applied in various ways according to the purpose they are designed for, and all social groups can be reached in this way. Of course, the

higher in the hierarchy of a profession one aims for, the more prestigious the program has to be, and the likelihood increases that the person will be unable to accept due to work pressure or simply protocol. Exchanges may well be utilised as a form of strategic communication, which refers to the tailoring and directing of information at specific target audiences in order to generate a specific (policy) response.[21] In the worst cases, this may create problems for the recipient afterwards. The offer of an exchange trip for a specific purpose, for instance someone directly involved in a policy area of great value to the initiator of the contact, will generally be taken as an attempt to build a relation with said individual related to that policy, preferably in the short term. This may raise questions as to whether the participant's allegiance is being deliberately influenced. Whether this is deemed acceptable or not will depend on the state of bilateral relations between the two nations. However, if the political environment is favourable, the opportunity is open for using exchanges to acquaint professionals with their policy-making counter-parts in order to smoothen negotiating processes. Exchanges can be very useful for laying the grounds for "trans-governmental networks", involving the development of shared policy expertise across issue areas, a very useful tool when the level of importance of the relations demands constant attention.[22] A good example is the relationship between the United States and the European Union, where a dense policy interchange has been facilitated by the regular exchange of officials from both sides. From 1959 onwards, European officials were invited to the US via the State Department's Foreign Leader and Foreign Specialist Programs. These contacts were subsequently expanded with the arrival of the EU's own Visitor Program in 1974 and various transatlantic training and professional exchange programs that were developed through the 1970s and 1980s.[23]

Long-term political influence can also occur in the host nation. Heike Jöns' in-depth study of the Humboldt fellowships during the second half of the twentieth century has provided evidence that these academic interactions have contributed directly to further professional mobility and the integration of German higher education into transnational knowledge networks after WW II.[24] Others have also focused attention on the impact on host communities through exchanges, and how inter-cultural contact can generate a greater involvement in local initiatives and/or international outlook over time. Exchanges can therefore have both an internal and external effect in terms of individual and social change.[25]

Risk and Unpredictability

Whatever the goals they are intended to achieve, exchanges are best kept independent from any sense of direct political interference and obligation in order to maintain the integrity of

the participants and the credibility of the programmes themselves.[26] Whereas propaganda refers to the deliberate manipulation of information to achieve a desired result, exchanges are (ideally) the most two-way form of public diplomacy, opening up spaces for dialogue and the interchange of alternative viewpoints. 'Mutual understanding', the catchphrase for the Liberal understanding of cross-border contacts, does mean something here, even in the most politically-orientated programmes. Exchanges are at their most effective when they allow the participant to experience openness and transparency in their interaction with the host nation. This openness is optimised if combined with allowances for freedom of choice to enable study at a chosen institution, a personal itinerary or the satisfaction of individual interests, thereby adding to a sense of empowerment and self-discovery for the participant. A fixed itinerary of sites and meetings may be appreciated by participants, but it may not escape the suspicion of a 'Potemkin village' type of experience. Neither does such an arrangement leave space for the development of independent initiative or the chance encounter that can become a defining moment.

Inevitably, there is an ever-present risk factor within these kinds of contact. It is impossible to predict exactly how an exchange experience will influence an individual, and the elements of chance and contingency are ever-present. Exchanges "cannot be easily fine-tuned into a political instrument," and if this is attempted, it is highly likely that the resulting limitations and sense of propaganda that this will project will rebound and undermine the overall impact.[27] An interesting example here are the educational exchanges run under Israel's Hasbara public diplomacy campaign, which have largely been used (as has the entire campaign) to bolster support for Israel abroad rather than establish 'cultural bridges' with the Palestinian territories.[28] The use-value of the exchange for both organiser and participant may not coincide, but that does not mean that the results may be malign, only unpredictable. This goes for all types of exchanges, whether educational, academic or professional. The process of selecting participants, an essential part of most programs (even those who apply to participate in programs must still be accepted), offers some control over who becomes involved, but this remains a question of judgement based on necessarily incomplete information. The most notorious case that exemplifies risk is the visit of Seyyed Qutb to the United States in 1948-49. Qutb, an Egyptian civil servant, went to study the education system in Colorado for the benefit of implementing reforms in his home country. Instead his disgust at American society and its immoral materialism only furthered his own path towards a pure form of Islamic radicalism, and he subsequently became a major influence in the fundamentalist politicisation of Islam and its associated purist rejection of Western culture.

This case highlights how things can seriously go awry, but while the chance of a culture-clash is ever-present it would be a mistake to use Qutb as a reason to limit exchanges in general.

Cultural Difference

Qutb's case points out how regional and cultural differences have a crucial impact on how exchanges function. An interesting dimension to this is the extent to which exchanges are (or should be) about maintaining or 'flattening' cultural difference. Have exchanges contributed to global homogenisation over time, or have they exactly enhanced awareness of the divide between cultures? This is difficult to verify, due to the scale of the question. Ninkovich has argued that the inherently Liberal approach to exchange – at least from an American perspective – carries the danger of 'cultural imperialism' for its rejection of cultural or religious attributes as defining life-worlds.[29] A whole literature has developed on inter-cultural communication and its relevance for exchanges, particularly in terms of best practices.[30] Recent studies have pointed to how cross-border contacts do not necessarily generate a sense of "shared international community" but instead can result in forms of "enlightened nationalism" that at least involve reduced threat perceptions of others.[31]

In the 1950s, during the early years of the US State Department's Foreign Leader Program, it was discovered that the most complaints were coming from participants from India. The reason was that the US embassy was selecting mainly individuals from the higher castes who expected far more of a VIP treatment than they received, and they did not understand how the US government could run such a Program with so little official protocol (when that was in fact the whole point). Cultural divides have also been evident with the JET Program in Japan, where the host society was unaccustomed to the kind of hospitality required for incoming participants.[32] The often individual nature of the exchange experience, especially for the longer student exchanges, can also generate problems of social isolation for some groups. In educational exchange, risks can be minimised if special attention can be given to this problem by an alert international student advisory/counselling apparatus coordinated through the university system. In many cases it took some years before the need for an organised host apparatus was recognised. Also, the post-exchange relation – often referred to as 'follow-up' – can have very different connotations for different cultural groups. Whereas some will have no expectations, others may be surprised (and disappointed) if no further contact materialises. It is vital to take into account local perceptions in order to avoid undermining the exchange's purpose.

Overall, the exchange experience will be valued most by the participant because of its uniqueness. The levels of cross-border contact are now so high that it is difficult to appreciate how any particular form of exchange can still offer something extra, but this is a vital element to making its effects stick. It can be related to the opportunity to gain new knowledge and skills otherwise unavailable locally. This can be combined with absorbing and appreciating a new cultural environment, where first-hand experience will always have a greater effect than second-hand knowledge. For other types of exchange there could be a prestige factor in being invited, which may also involve obtaining access to persons or institutions that would otherwise be either closed off or accessible only via more formal routes. The importance of youth here cannot be overstated, but this needs to be clarified. Access and prestige can always have some impact, but an exchange will have the greatest impact if it takes place both before the host nation is already familiar for the participant, and it offers openings and opportunities that the participant can utilise for their own personal and/or professional benefit afterwards. The initial contact, if well managed and well timed, can have a long-lasting effect.

The Opinion Leader

In terms of models for interpreting the exchange participant, one of the most oft-cited is that of the 'opinion leader'. This connects to the important issue of the participant's status after their return home. Here it is ideal if the value of the exchange operation for both organiser and participant can coincide as much as possible. If successful the experience will contribute towards not just personal knowledge and self-evaluation but also a further encouragement of ambition and, possibly, leadership potential.

In 1944 a group of researchers led by Paul Lazarsfeld at Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research produced a body of work with profound implications for the functioning of exchange programmes. Published as *The People's Choice,* a survey of several years empirical analysis of voting behavior, Lazarsfeld argued that mass media had a more differentiated effect on its audience than had been assumed.[33] Instead of everyone being reached by the same message, which anticipates a relative conformity of response, there was instead a "two-step flow" of information via opinion leaders with local influence. Receiving information from a member of one's peer group or a respected figure would have a greater impact than simply hearing or reading the same information directly from the media outlet. To utilize this finding, an exchange program could focus on nurturing opinion leaders within each society who could then serve as the principal channels for well-targeted information campaigns.[34] As Ron Robin has described, this approach was a radical departure because "it

claimed that the diffusion of ideas via respected members of an individual's social network – the opinion leaders – was more effective than the mechanism of mass media".[35] If these opinion leaders – or 'multipliers', as they later became known – could be identified within specific groups of strategic value throughout a society (such as up-and-coming politicians, trade unions, media professionals, academics), exchanges could function as a channel of information dissemination in a more targeted fashion.

Exchanges were first applied to develop this role among participants by the US occupation forces in post-war Germany and Japan, as part of the re-education process towards democratic principles. Analysis of these programs seemed to indicate that the 'opinion leader' model did operate as intended, with exchange participants acting (voluntarily) as legitimate and respected sources of opinion and judgement on the United States.[36] As a result, the ingrained belief in the efficacy of the opinion leader model became a standard justification for implementing exchanges, even when evidence was sketchy that this was actually the case.[37] It is also a question of to what extent this model still functions in a twenty-first century social context where access to media outlets has multiplied exponentially. Nevertheless, exchange participants can still function as important multipliers for information transfer to wider communities in more closed social settings.

The Cultural Broker

Exchanges can also function in an important way to create neutral spaces for a form of 'cultural brokerage'. This generally refers to no more than introducing and linking individuals and institutions working in the same field, and allowing professional inclination to take its course, with unspecified results. Private-sector exchanges with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe took this approach, looking to break down inter-bloc antagonism through professional interchange, and with some success.[38] It can also involve the organisation of multinational group visits, perhaps based around a specific theme to unite a particular group around a particular goal. Travelling around for days or weeks in a third country will generally contribute to breaking down barriers that would remain intact in other more formal settings, stimulating curiosity, dialogue, and perhaps longer-term contact. This method can then be employed for the deliberate (though perhaps unstated) purpose of removing various individuals from a conflict zone in order to set up, on a low level, a chance at reconciliation within a distant environment. Maximum opportunity must be given for personal contact to break down prejudicial barriers. Once again, selection is crucial in order to ensure only participants with sufficient open-mindedness take part. This is no more than small-scale

conflict resolution, and care must be taken not to expect too much once the participants return home, but it is typical of the kind of inter-personal, grass-roots effects that can, if coordinated with determined conflict resolution measures in the 'hard policy' field, have a long-lasting effect. In this sense, exchanges can function as a kind of extension of Track Two initiatives run by the private sector, dislocated from official diplomacy but nevertheless operating in the same overall context.[39]

An increasingly important role has been played in this field by what might be called corporate or entrepreneurial cultural diplomacy. Perhaps the most important example is George Soros' Open Society Institute (OSI), which has been promoting the development of civil society and good governance practices across Central Europe and Central Asia since 1993 as part of an explicit strategy of democratisation. The Institute runs many fellowship and grant programs to increase professional interchange with the region and encourage leadership potential. Other institutions look to use exchanges to break down cultural barriers within the context of the global market, such as the Atlantic-Pacific Exchange Program (APEP) based in Rotterdam (which began as an effort to improve Dutch-American relations in the mid-1980s) and the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy (ICD) in Berlin. What is most interesting about these operations is that they are not related to any particular national interest. Whereas the OSI is a fully independent actor, the APEP and ICD both function and adapt to the changing needs of their corporate clients over time.[40]

Identity and Orientation

There is quite a body of work on the impact that direct experience of another culture can have on a participant's own psychological outlook.[41] As one astute practitioner has put it, cross-border contacts can lead to "a subtle but important shift in identity and self-conception," whereby previously fixed political and/or cultural allegiances are not abandoned but become more flexible.[42] Identities are the basis for how interests are defined, and whereas this generally occurs in a routine manner according to the familiar settings we find ourselves in, "sometimes situations are unprecedented in our experience, and in these cases we have to construct their meaning, and thus our interests, by analogy or invent them *de novo*."[43] One goal of an exchange can be to precisely create that unprecedented experience, thereby dislodging previously fixed notions of identity and interest. For optimum impact, what needs to be created is a wider community or institution that can engage with and encompass the changed outlook of the former participant, so that they can continue to share and develop their new-found perspective. This can mean in the first place involving former grantees in the

operation of a program afterwards, particularly in the selection and orientation phase for new candidates. Satisfied former grantees are valuable as the best advertisements available, themselves functioning as both 'opinion leaders' for a program and evidence of its democratic form of governance. An alumni association is not only a useful tool as a visible community and 'multiplier' organization for the program, but also, over time, an important lobby group defending the interests of continuing such exchanges over the longer term. For instance, lobbying by Fulbright alumni associations in Germany and Japan has been very successful in maintaining local political support for this form of educational exchange. More broadly, in the professional and academic field this can ideally point towards some form of allegiance to a larger (intellectual) community not limited by the borders of the nation state, thus fomenting a broader conception of national interest itself.

What are the necessary conditions for actors to reinvent their identities? According to social theorist Alexander Wendt, two factors must apply. Firstly, "there must be a reason to think of oneself in novel terms. This would most likely stem from the presence of new social situations that cannot be managed in terms of pre-existing self-conceptions." Secondly: "The expected cost of intentional role change cannot be greater than its rewards."[44] Yet it is impossible to know beforehand to what extent the exchange experience will affect someone's outlook. By seeking out an exchange experience or accepting an invitation for one, it can be assumed that the participant is already convinced this is something they want to pursue in a location they want to be in.

A subtle variation of the 'identity change' approach is the move to use exchange experiences to build on and strengthen already-existing positive sentiments among selected participants, with the goal of thereby strengthening a sympathiser or potential (political) ally for the future. Research into the post-war German programmes and other investigations into psychological warfare techniques highlighted the fact that critics will rarely be swayed, but doubters may become believers and supporters will feel empowered. Thus a study from 1955 concluded:

> It may well be that some of the exchangees who will in the long run do most to realize the objectives of this program are those whose attitudes were initially so favorable that their reinforcement could not register as 'more favorable' in the second interview, but whose conviction, motivation, and capacity to act in accordance with the viewpoint fostered by the program were intensified by the exchange experience.[45]

From this perspective, exchanges are a prime means for alliance management, since they can be applied to build up, over the longer term, a community of individuals united around a common cultural affinity that takes positive relations between certain nations more or less for granted.[46] Since its initiation in 1946 the Fulbright Program has been very successful in developing such an affinity with the United States, firstly via the means of academic exchange itself and secondly by encouraging the establishment of American Studies in universities around the world. As even Realist Hans Morgenthau recognised, before Joseph Nye became the name associated with 'soft power', creating and sustaining forms of cultural affinity amongst foreign publics represents a potent form of power:

> The power of a nation, then, depends not only upon the skill of its diplomacy and the strength of its armed forces but also upon the attractiveness for other nations of its political philosophy, political institutions, and political policies. This is true in particular of the United States....[47]

This is of course a classic rendition of American exceptionalism, but it is also the case that the United States has utilised this drawing power to an unprecedented degree through the use of exchanges to acquaint hundreds of thousands of individuals with what it has to offer over the past century. No other nation has come close to such a large scale implementation of a particular form of public diplomacy over a long period of time, with the result that the central location of the US within global circulations (goods, ideas, people, money) has definitely been enhanced in this way. This central position, however, has been waning, and will probably continue to do so.

Conclusion

The scope and range of exchange programs, from the short-term orientation tour to the study abroad experience, from the schoolchild crossing the national border for the first time to the aspiring journalist receiving training in the tools of the trade, make it hard to evaluate their overall impact as a form of public diplomacy. In the 1880s there were annually only a few hundred participants worldwide, but by 2000 there were 1.8 million students studying in a country other than their own, and this does not include military, technical assistance, health or other specialist programs. The OECD projects a total international student population of eight million by 2025.[48] Higher education is a profitable market, and the "knowledge economy" is now central for many national and regional economic strategies. In an era of increasing digital communications and virtual technologies, exchanges as a means of circulation are exactly *not*

fading out in importance. The search for personal experience in a world where space has shrunk coincides with the interests of institutions to benefit from this increasing mobility. Various broader factors influence this: the postcolonial turn in global power relations, causing a shift in wealth from West to East; the rise in nationalist discourses of actors who previously had not invested in promoting their ideological and/or cultural worldview; and the fact that technology has not fundamentally shifted the driving forces behind the scholarship appeal. As a report from 2013 explained, "while digital technology and the opportunities for progress and access it provides are not doubted, the experiential values of international education remain at the heart of individuals' aspirations to learn and grow. Technology is a tool as important as people make it."[49]

Whatever the particular merits of exchanges as a form of public diplomacy, they are always operating within an international political environment that may or may not facilitate international cooperation. No public diplomacy campaign will sell bad or unpopular policy, and because of the 'human factor' exchanges are particularly vulnerable in an antagonistic political context. Nevertheless, exchanges as a form of foreign relation can function on multiple levels outside of the dominating influence of foreign policy. A period of international unpopularity caused by foreign policy decisions can also generate curiosity as to the 'real' opinion of the people themselves. Private sector exchanges that pursue contacts between civil society organisations, often focused on delivering specific social goods or practices, can be especially effective if governments do not provide these channels of best-practice interchange. Evidence suggests that the 'exchange experience' in whatever form does bring about significant changes in attitude, albeit with uncertain longevity. Cultural identities are brought into contact and communication is enhanced, even if outcomes are not guaranteed. The global circulation of knowledge has been greatly expanded, even if the centres of knowledge for these networks continue to be located in the West (although there has been a notable shift in terms of the scale of Asia-Pacific circulations within the region itself). In terms of assessing the overall contribution of exchanges within global interactions, therefore, we are still largely facing the problem identified by Mark Granovetter of relating "micro-level interactions to macro-level patterns in [a] convincing way".[50] In short, this form of public diplomacy won't change the world, but – *pace* the risks exemplified by Qutb – as far as we can tell it does seem to contribute towards holding it together.

Notes

[1] See Nicolas Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy 1945-1989* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. xviii. Significantly, he decided to exclude exchanges from this broad-based study of USIA.
[2] See Jan Melissen, 'Public Diplomacy', in Andrew Cooper, Jorge Heine and Ramesh Thakur (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 436-452; Ellen Huijgh, 'Public Diplomacy', in Costas Constantinou, Pauline Kerr, and Paul Sharp (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy* (London: Sage, 2016), pp. 437-450.
[3] See for instance Claire Madge, Parvati Raghuram and Pat Noxolo, "Conceptualizing international education", *Progress in Human Geography* 39 (2015), pp. 681-701.
[4] Frank Ninkovich, *US Information Policy and Cultural Diplomacy*, Headline Series No. 308, Foreign Policy Association, 2008, p. 58.
[5] Philip Seib, *The Future of Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Polity, 2016), pp. 66-67.
[6] See <https://eca.state.gov/impact/evaluation-eca/evaluation-initiative/completed-evaluations> (accessed 17 May 2018).

[7] Covina Kwan, 'Cultural Diplomacy and Internationalization of Education: The Experience of Three Confucius Institutes in Canada', *Frontiers of Education in China* 9 (2014), pp. 110-126; Yifan Yang, 'Does the Academic Programme Work? The Jean Monnet Programme and European Union Public Diplomacy,' *Journal of European Integration* 37 (2015), pp. 611-628.
[8] Giles Scott-Smith, 'Her Rather Ambitious Washington Program': Margaret Thatcher's International Visitor Program Visit to the United States in 1967,' *Contemporary British History*, 17 (Winter 2003)
[9] See <https://eca.state.gov/fulbright/fulbright-alumni/notable-fulbrighters> (accessed 18 May 2018).
[10] For detailed assessments see Nancy Snow, *Fulbright Scholars as Cultural Mediators: An Exploratory Study* (Ph.D. dissertation, American University, 1992); Frank Salamone, *The Fulbright Experience in Benin* (Williamsburg, VA, 1994); Jan C.C. Rupp, "The Fulbright Program, or the Surplus Value of Officially Organized Academic Exchange," *Journal of Studies in International Education* 3 (1999), 59-82; Guangqiu Xu, "The Ideological and Political Impact of US Fulbrighters on Chinese Students: 1979-1989," *Asian Affairs* 26 (1999), 139-57; Thomas König, *Das Fulbright in Wien: Wissenschaftspolitik und Sozialwissenschaften am 'versunkenen Kontinent'* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Vienna, 2008); Lorenzo Delgado Gomez-Escalonilla, *Westerly Wind: The Fulbright Program in Spain* (Madrid, 2009); Alice Garner and Diane Kirkby, "'Never a Machine for Propaganda?' The Australian-American Fulbright Program and Australia's Cold War," *Australian Historical Studies* 44 (2013), 117-33; Juan José Navarro, "Public Foreign Aid and Academic Mobility: The Fulbright Program (1955-1973)," in Fernanda Beigel (ed.), *The Politics of Academic Autonomy in Latin America* (London: Routledge, 2013); Giles Scott-Smith, "The Fulbright Program in the Netherlands: An Example of Science Diplomacy," in Jeroen van Dongen (ed.), *Cold War Science and the Transatlantic Circulation of Knowledge* (Leiden, 2015), pp. 128-154. Institutional histories are few: Walter Johnson and Francis Colligan, *The Fulbright Program: A History* (Chicago, 1965); Sam Lebovic, "From War Junk to Educational Exchange: The WWII Origins of the Fulbright Program and the Foundations of American Cultural Globalism," *Diplomatic History*, 37 (April 2013), 280-312. Anecdotal accounts include Arthur Power Dudden and Russell Dynes (eds.), *The Fulbright Experience 1946-1986: Encounters and Transformations* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1986); Leonard Sussman, *The Culture of Freedom: The Small World of Fulbright Scholars* (Lanham, MD, 1992); Richard Arndt and David Lee Rubin (eds.), *The Fulbright Difference* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1996);

Molly Bettie, *The Fulbright Program and American Public Diplomacy* (Ph.D. dissertation, Leeds University, 2014).

[11.] See Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier (eds), *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Melvin Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Richard Immerman and Petra Goedde (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Akira Iriye (ed.), *Global Interdependence* (Cambridge MA: Belknap Press, 2014).

[12] See Heather Ellis and Simone M. Müller, 'Educational Networks, Educational Identities: Connecting National and Global Perspectives,' *Journal of Global History*, 11 (2016), pp. 313–319.

[13] Ludovic Tournès & Giles Scott-Smith (eds), *Global Exchanges: Scholarships and Transnational Circulations in the Modern World* (New York: Berghahn, 2017).

[14] Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World 1850–1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).

[15] On Soviet bloc exchanges see Simon Godard, "Construire le bloc de l'Est par l'économie? La délicate émergence d'une solidarité internationale socialiste au sein du Conseil d'aide économique mutuelle," *Vingtième Siècle: Revue d'histoire* 109 (2011), pp. 45–58; Rachel Applebaum, "The Friendship Project: Socialist Internationalism in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia in the 1950s and 1960s," *Slavic Review* 74 (2015), pp. 484–507; Julie Hessler, 'Third World Students at Soviet Universities in the Brezhnev Era', in Tournès and Scott-Smith, *Global Exchanges*, pp. 202-215.

[16] See Paul Kramer, 'Is the World Our Campus? International Students and US Global Power in the Long Twentieth Century,' *Diplomatic History* 33 (2009), pp. 775–806.

[17] Sarah Holloway and Heike Jöns, 'Geographies of Education and Learning,' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (2012), pp. 482–88.

[18] See Giles Scott-Smith, 'Mapping the Undefinable: Some Thoughts on the Relevance of Exchange Programs within International Relations Theory', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616 (March 2008), pp. 173-195.

[19] See Ulrich Krotz, 'Parapublic Underpinnings of International Relations: The Franco-German Construction of Europeanization of a Particular Kind,' *European Journal of International Relations*, 13 (September 2007), pp. 385-417.

[20] Negar Azimi, 'Hard Realities of Soft Power,' *New York Times Magazine* (24 June 2007), pp. 50-55; Gi-Wook Shin and Karen Lee, *US-DPRK Educational Exchanges: Assessment and Future Strategy,* Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center, Stanford University, 2011; Giles Scott-Smith, 'The Heineken Factor? Using Exchanges to extend the reach of US Soft Power,' *American Diplomacy* (June 2011), available online <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2011/0104/comm/scottsmith_heineken.html> (accessed 22 May 2018).

[21] See Jarol Manheim, *Strategic Public Diplomacy and American Foreign Policy: The Evolution of Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[22] See Thomas Risse-Kappen, *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[23] Giles Scott-Smith, 'Mending the 'Unhinged Alliance' in the 1970s: Transatlantic Relations, Public Diplomacy, and the Origins of the European Union Visitors Programme', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 16 (December 2005), pp. 749-778.

[24] Heike Jöns, 'Brain circulation" and transnational knowledge networks: Studying long-term

effects of academic mobility to Germany, 1954-2000,' Global Networks 9 (2009), pp. 315-338.
[25] See Katarzyna Pisarska, *The Domestic Dimension of Public Diplomacy: Evaluating Success through Civic Engagement* (London: Palgrave, 2011).
[26] On the issue of credibility see the important work of Sherry Mueller: The US Department of State's International Visitor Program: A Conceptual Framework for Evaluation (PhD diss., Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, 1977).
[27] Lawrence T. Caldwell, 'Scholarly Exchanges with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union,' Evaluations of the International Research and Exchanges Board, 1980, Grant No. L79-256, Report No. 012108, archive of the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Archives Center, Tarrytown NY (hereafter FF).
[28] See Jon Dart, "Brand Israel: Hasbara and Israeli Sport", *Sport in Society*, 19 (2016), pp. 1402-1418; Gal Hadari and Asaf Turgeman, "Public diplomacy in army boots: the chronic failure of Israel's Hasbara", *Israel Affairs*, 12 April 2018, pp. 1-18;
[29] See Ninkovich, *US Information Policy*.
[30] See for instance Joana Almeida, Alvino Fantini, Ana Raquel Simoes and Nilza Costa, "Enhancing the intercultural effectiveness of exchange programmes: formal and non-formal educational interventions", *Intercultural Education* 27 (2016), pp. 517-533.
[31] Calvert Jones, "Exploring the Microfoundations of International Community: Toward a Theory of Enlightened Nationalism", *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (2014), pp. 682-705.
[32] See Jesse Sargent, "Importing Barbarian Knowledge : The JET Program and the Development of Cultural Internationalism in Japan (1987-2014)", in Tournes and Scott-Smith, *Global Exchanges*, pp. 290-304; Emily Metzger, *The JET Program and the US-Japan Relationship: Goodwill Goldmine* (Lanham MA: Lexington, 2017).
[33] P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson and H. Gaudet, *The People's Choice* (New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce, 1944).
[34] R. Holt and R. van de Velde, *Strategic Psychological Operations and American Foreign Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 58.
[35] Ron Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Industrial Complex* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), p. 83.
[36] Henry Kellermann, *Cultural Relations as an Instrument of US Foreign Policy: The Educational Exchange Program between the United States and Germany 1945-1954* (Washington DC: Department of State, 1978). Oliver Schmidt has since criticized these assessments as "self-fulfilling prophesies", but he still admits to the targeted impact of the German programmes. See Oliver Schmidt, Civil Empire by Cooptation: German-American Exchange Programs as Cultural Diplomacy, 1945-61, PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1999, pp.420-433.
[37] See Iain Wilson, *International Education Programs and Political Influence: Manufacturing Sympathy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
[38] The debate on exactly how much such exchanges contributed to the downfall of the Soviet system is still continuing. See Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).
[39] See Peter Jones, *Track Two Diplomacy in Theory and Practice* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).
[40] Giles Scott-Smith, 'Cultural Exchange and the Corporate Sector: Moving Beyond Statist Public Diplomacy?' *Austrian Journal of Political Science* 40 (2011), pp. 301-313.
[41] See for instance Ithiel de Sola Pool, 'Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images' in Herbert Kelman (ed.), *International Behavior: A Social Psychological Analysis* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965), pp. 106-129.

[42] Gail Lapidus, 'The Impact of Soviet-American Scholarly Exchanges,' Evaluations of the International Research and Exchanges Board, 1980, Grant No. L79-256, Report No. 012108, FF.
[43] Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is what States make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, 46 (Spring 1992), p.398.
[44] Ibid., p.419.
[45] E. Wilson and F. Bonilla, "Evaluating Exchange of Persons Programs," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 19 (Spring 1955), p. 29.
[46] See Alan Hendrikson, 'What can Public Diplomacy Achieve?' Discussion Papers in Diplomacy, Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 2006, where he refers to the usefulness of public diplomacy for the 'consolidation' of existing relations.
[47] Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1985), p. 169.
[48] See "Four Trends that are Shaping the Future of Global Student Mobility," ICEF Monitor, 2 September 2015, <http://monitor.icef.com/2015/09/four-trends-that-are-shaping-the-future-of-global-studentmobility>.
[49] Elizabeth Shepherd, "Megatrends: Predicting the Future of International Education," *IIE Networker* (Fall 2013), p. 13.
[50] Mark Granovetter, "The Strength of Weak Ties", *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1973), p. 1360.