# Public Diplomacy 509 - Advocacy in Public Diplomacy: Argumentation & Debate – Fall 2008

Th 9-11:50 am          ASC 236

## Faculty Information:

Dr. Gordon Stables          stables@usc.edu          (213) 740-2759          Office Hours: T, Th 1-3 pm

Office: ASC G4C     (*Located in Trojan Debate Office, Annenberg Building – West Wing, Garden Level*)

## Course Introduction and Purposes:

This course offers students a skills and theory based approach to the criticism and development of public diplomacy campaigns. By completing the course, students will be able to:

- Identify the relevance of contemporary public diplomacy campaigns to the development and implementation of specific public policy goals.
- Become familiar with a series of advocacy skills to critique and assess specific campaigns.
- Develop expertise with regard to implementing these advocacy skills in both oral and written form, with special attention paid to oral proposals supported by computer-mediated presentations.
- Design a public diplomacy presentation advocating a particular public policy and have that presentation engage other student presentations in the form of a debate.

## Assignments:

Students will be evaluated based on three sets of assignments.

**Reaction papers** (40%) – Students will be assigned to a rotating schedule of reaction papers to the weekly readings. Each student should expect to complete four brief (three to five page) papers to highlight significant observations from the readings and to help organize course discussions. Each student will be asked to complete several reaction papers over the course of the semester. These papers will be shared with the entire class each week.

**Class Participation** (10%) – Students are expected to complete and be able to discuss the weekly readings. This will include Mini-debates where students will be assigned to a regular, rotating schedule of brief presentations. Multiple students will be assigned to prepare competing perspectives on the same topic and present those presentations in class.

**Final Presentations & Debate** (50%) – The culminating course project is a structured debate. Students will be required to debate a policy proposition that relates to a prominent public diplomacy controversy. The debate requires both a formal submission and an oral presentation. The formal submission will take the form of a formal PowerPoint presentation and audience notes. The oral presentations will be formal events.

# Course Texts:

The readings will be available either through:
- The Blackboard course site – Items marked as 'BB' and available on blackboard under 'e-packet.'
- Other external websites – All underlined items are hyperlinked.

# Daily Schedule

**Week 1 – August 28 - Introduction to the course**
1. Beehner, Lionel (September 29, 2005). Council on Foreign Relations. "Perceptions of U.S. Public Diplomacy."
2. Nye, Joseph. (2004) "Soft Power and American Foreign Policy." (BB)
3. Payne, Kenneth (Summer 2008). "Waging Communication War." Parameters, pp. 37-51.

**Week 2 – September 4 - Foundations of Argumentation Theory**
1. Gutmann, Amy & Thompson, D. (2004) Why Deliberative Democracy? (BB)
2. Habermas, Jürgen (1981), The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1, pgs. 8-42 (BB)
3. Toulmin, Stephen, Uses of Argument, 2003, pgs. 11-43 (BB)

**Week 3 – September 11 - Argumentative Dimensions of Public Diplomacy**
1. McGee, M.C. & Nelson, J.S. (1985). Narrative Reason in Public Argument. (BB)
2. Hughes, Karen (2006), Remarks at the Council on Foreign Relations.
3. Wolf, Charles & Rosen, Brian. (2004). Public Diplomacy: How to Think About and Improve It.
4. Echevarria II, Antulio J. (June 2008). "Wars of Ideas and the War of Ideas." Strategic Studies Institute.
5. Armstrong, Matt. (2008). "Rethinking Smith-Mundt." Small Wars Journal.
6. Linzer, Dafna. (June 22, 2008). "Lost in Translation: Alhurra—America's Troubled Effort to Win Middle East Hearts and Minds" ProPublica.

**Week 4 – September 18 - History as Contested Narrative**
1. Gronbeck, B. "The Rhetorics of the Past"
2. Goodnight, G.T. "Iraq is George Bush's Vietnam": Metaphors in Controversy"
3. Remarks by the President in Address to the United Nations General Assembly, (September 12, 2002).
4. President Bush Addresses American Legion National Convention (August 31, 2006).
5. Blair, Carole, Jeppeson, Marsha S., and Pucci, Enrico Jr., "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype," Quarterly Journal of Speech 77 (August 1991), 263-288. (BB).
6. The National 9/11 Memorial and Museum website

**Week 5 – September 25 – Visual Argument**
1. Birdsell, David S., Groarke, Leo, (Summer 1996)"Toward A Theory of Visual Argument" Argumentation & Advocacy, Vol. 33, Issue 1 (BB)

2. Livingston, S., (June 1997) Clarifying the CNN Effect."
3. Gilboa, E. (August 2005). "Global Television News and Foreign Policy: Debating the CNN Effect." (BB).
4. Iyengar, Radha & Monten, Jonathan. (February 2008). "Is There an "Emboldenment" Effect? Evidence from the Insurgency in Iraq."
5. Exum, Andrew, (May 2008). "The Spectacle of War: Insurgent video propaganda and Western response, 1990-present." Arab Media & Society
6. Mapping Iran's Online Public: Politics and Culture in the Persian Blogosphere, John Kelly and Bruce Etling, April 6, 2008

**Week 6 – October 2 – No Class**

**Week 7 – October 9 – Visual Argument Through Technology: PowerPoint**
1. Tufte, E.R. (2006) The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint Pitching Out Corrupts Within Second Edition; (BB)
2. Atkinson, C. (2005) Beyond Bullet Points: Using Microsoft PowerPoint to Create Presentations That Inform, Motivate, and Inspire. Microsoft Press. (selections) (BB)
3. Selection of PP Presentations (BB)

**Week 8 – October 16 - Models of Format Debate**
1. Hollihan. T. & Baaske, K. (2005) Arguments and Arguing, Ch 10 & 11. (BB)

**Week 9 – October 23 - Argument in PD Case Studies: Conceptualizing Audiences**
1. Christopher Ross (Summer 2003) "Pillars of Public Diplomacy: Grappling with International Public Opinion" Harvard International Review. (25:2), pg. 22
2. Pipes, Daniel (2002) "Who is the Enemy?" (BB)
3. Telhami, Shibley. "2008 Annual Arab Public Opinion Poll", Survey of the Anwar Sadat Chair for Peace and Development at the University of Maryland.
4. Harris, Lee. (2002). "Al Qaeda's Fantasy Ideology." Policy Review. (114)
5. U.S. Department of State. (2002). "Muslim Life in America."
6. Kapusta, Philip & Campbell, Donovan. (July 30, 2008). "How to Contain Radical Islam: The best global strategy for the US may be the one that won the Cold War." Small Wars Journal.

**Week 10 – October 30 – - Argument in PD Case Study: Articulating Risk**
1. Suskind, Ron - "The One Percent Solution" (BB)
2. Brookings Institution (Regularly Updated) Iraq Index: Tracking Variables of Reconstruction & Security in Post-Saddam Iraq
3. Willis, Henry H., et al, (2005), Estimating Terrorism Risk, RAND Corporation. (BB)
4. Remarks to the United Nations Security Council, Colin L. Powell, February 5, 2003
5. Powell's PowerPoint Presentation

**Week 11 – November 6 - Argument in PD Case Study: Measuring Progress**
1. US Department of Defense, "Report to Congress: Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq"

2. Petraeus, David H. (April 8-9, 2008). Report to Congress on the Situation in Iraq. Testimony.  Charts
3. "Iraq Index: Tracking Reconstruction and Security in Post-Saddam Iraq," The Brookings Institution
4. Rumsfeld Memo - October 2003
5. Iraq Floor Debate Briefing Book (BB)
6. Mack, Andrew (et al). (May 21, 2008). "Human Security Brief 2007" Simon Fraser University. (Chapter 1)

**Week 12 – November 13 – Future of Public Diplomacy Controversies**
1. Clarke, Richard. "10 Years Later" (BB)
2. Staff Report of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy (August 23, 2006) Recognizing Iran as a Strategic Threat: An Intelligence Challenge for the United States
3. US Department of State - Questioning Iran's Pursuit of the  Nuclear Fuel Cycle, 2005
4. Fallows, J.  (2006) "Declaring Victory" (BB)
5. Jones, Seth & Libicki, Martin (2008). "How Terrorist Groups End: Lessons for Countering al Qa'ida" Rand Corporation.
6. Kahl, Colin H., Flournoy, Michèle A, & Brimley, Shawn (June 2008). "Shaping the Iraq Inheritance." Center for a New American Security.

**Week 13 – November 20 – National Communication Association Conference – No Class Session**

**Week 14 – November 27 – Completion of course material & Final Debates**

**Week 15 - December 4 - Final Debates**