Diaspora Diplomacy, Emotions, and Disruption
A Conceptual and Analytical Framework

By Alina Dolea

الدبلوماسية العامة

La Diplomatie Publique

Общественная дипломатия

Public Diplomacy

Publiczna Dyplomacja

הסברה

Publieksdiplomatie

Diplomacia Pública

公共外交

Δημόσια Διπλωματία

Публична дипломация

Diaspora Diplomacy, Emotions, and Disruption
A Conceptual and Analytical Framework

Alina Dolea

DIASPORA DIPLOMACY, EMOTIONS, AND DISRUPTION
A CONCEPTUAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

by Alina Dolea

Guest Editor
Emily Metzgar

Managing Editor
Sohaela Amiri

About the USC Center on Public Diplomacy

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD) was established in 2003 as a partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism and the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. It is a research, analysis and professional education organization dedicated to furthering the study and practice of global public engagement and cultural relations.

Since its inception, CPD has become a productive and recognized leader in the public diplomacy research and scholarship community. Having benefited from international support within academic, corporate, governmental and public policy circles, it is now the definitive go-to destination for practitioners and international leaders in public diplomacy, while pursuing an innovative research agenda.

USC received the 2008 Benjamin Franklin Award for Public Diplomacy from the U.S. State Department in recognition of the university's teaching, training and research in public diplomacy.

CPD's Mission

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy seeks to advance and enrich the study and practice of public diplomacy through research, professional education and public engagement.

CPD Perspectives

CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy is a periodic publication by the USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD), that highlights scholarship intended to stimulate critical thinking about the study and practice of public diplomacy.

Designed for both the practitioner and the scholar, this series illustrates the breadth of public diplomacy—its role as an essential component of international relations and the intellectual challenges it presents to those seeking to understand this increasingly significant factor in global society.

CPD Perspectives is available electronically in PDF form on CPD's website (www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org) and in hard copy by request.

For general inquiries and to request additional copies of this paper, please contact:

USC Center on Public Diplomacy at the Annenberg School
University of Southern California
3502 Watt Way, Suites 232-234
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281
Tel: (213) 821-2078; Fax: (213) 821-0774
cpd@usc.edu

Abstract

The article advances diaspora diplomacy scholarship arguing that enabling and disruptive emotions mediate diaspora assemblages comprising states, transnational non-state actors and other international actors; and that diasporic agency, practices and discourses can't be fully analysed and understood if divorced from their underpinning emotions. After reviewing existing literatures and current gaps, I propose a theoretical and analytical framework to study diaspora diplomacy that links (1) identity, belonging and transnational ties in diaspora, (2) with media, migration and digital diasporas, (3) distinguishes between diaspora as category of analysis (entity) and category of practice, and (4) integrates emotions and discourses. I then apply this framework to a corpus of 21 semi-structured interviews with representatives of the Romanian diaspora organizations in the UK to explore how they define their (emotional) ties with home and host state, and how they construct their identity. Recommendations and further reflections are formulated in the end to inform policy making in diaspora diplomacy.

Diaspora and public diplomacy: current gaps

Public diplomacy scholarship defines diasporas as non-state actors conducting people to people diplomacy (Cull, 2008) and often as citizen diplomacy (Huijgh, 2019; Popkova, 2022). Single country case studies are dominant, covering a wide range of state-diaspora relations and diasporas: Indian (Abraham, 2012; Rana, 2009), Chinese (d'Hooghe, 2015; Li, 2012), Israel (Attias, 2012), Lebanese Americans (Trent, 2012), Romanian (Dolea, 2022), Russian (Popkova, 2019), Turkish (Uysal, 2019), and Latin American (see Bravo & De Moya, 2021, and Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and the Dominican Republic - Bravo, 2014; Bravo & De Moya, 2015; De Moya, 2018). The *Routledge International Hand-*

book of Diaspora Diplomacy edited by Liam Kennedy (2022) adds more new case studies from global north and global south, thus contributing to the mapping of existing scholarship to date.

PD studies investigate the diplomacy *by* diaspora and diplomacy *through* diaspora (Ho and McConnell, 2017) using most frequently an analytical perspective rooted in international relations and focused primarily on the nation state as unit of analysis: states are increasingly acknowledging the emergence of diasporas as actors in international relations, using and instrumentalizing them for relationship-building and achievement of policy goals. This is best captured in the typology proposed by Brinkerhoff (2019) that identifies diasporas as agents in their own right, instruments of other's diplomatic agendas, and circumstantial partners on shared interests. Citizens in diaspora, on the other hand, are seen more ambivalently: as a welfare problem to be managed (Cull, 2008) and a source of threat to the image and reputation of the country of origin (Dolea, 2015), but also as a resource of soft power in cultural diplomacy (Cull, 2022). The approaches that dominate are still state-centric functional and normative despite the calls for expanding disciplinary boundaries to study diaspora diplomacy (Brinkerhoff, 2019; Dolea, 2022, 2023; Ho & McConnell, 2017). The paradigm of relationship building between states and diasporas has been equally dominant, reflecting a rather essentializing and homogenous understanding of diasporas along national identities lines and assumptions of loyalty which obscure diversity, tensions, adversarial relations (Uysal, 2019) and disruption (Dolea, 2022) when state-diaspora interests aren't aligned, shared or convergent. Furthermore, as shown by Popkova (2019), "alt agents" of non-state public diplomacy in authoritarian or semi-authoritarian states not only disrupt the official state-supported narratives and propose more complex ones but also become dissenting transnational diasporas.

Diaspora diplomacy has emerged as an interdisciplinary field of study at the intersection of diaspora studies and diplomacy studies as pointed by Ho and McConnell (2017) in their seminal article that pushed for reconsidering territorial dimensions and understanding populations betwixt the domestic and foreign within the paradigm of transnationalism. Theorizing diaspora diplomacy, Gilboa (2022) highlighted the diversity of perspectives and disciplines that engage in studying diaspora (history, economics, geography, political science, sociology, anthropology, communication, law) as well as the lack of cross communication and agreement between them, which ultimately impacts the field and creates conceptual fog and anarchy. A systematic review of scholarship is beyond the scope of this article; yet, diaspora is analysed in relation to home or host states as objects of governance (Gamlen, 2013; Ragazzi, 2017), new diplomats (Stone & Douglas, 2018), for interpersonal work (Cull, 2008), outreach and engagement (Arkilic, 2022; Birka & Kļaviņš, 2020), mobilization (Koinova, 2013; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003), empowerment (e.g. as cyberwarriors Chernobrov, 2022), conflict resolution and terrorism prevention (Curtis & Jaine, 2012), development (Sinatti & Horst, 2015; Weinar, 2010), promotion of homeland nation brand (Dolea, 2018; Thussu, 2020), lobbying (Berkowitz & Mügge, 2014), influencing public opinion and providing material assistance (Koinova, 2018).

Scholars in diaspora diplomacy have gradually shifted their focus from the state to the diasporas, adopting transnational approaches more established in migration and diaspora studies. Transnationalism is one of the most frequently adopted analytical paradigms to study migration and different forms of trans-border mobility (Baucöck & Faist, 2010) "used both more narrowly – to refer to migrants' durable ties across countries – and, more widely, to capture not only communities, but all sorts of social formations, such as

transnationally active networks, groups and organisations." (Faist, 2010, p. 9). Yet, with few exceptions (e.g. Popkova, 1019), transnationalism hasn't been fully explored and problematized by public diplomacy scholars looking at diaspora actors, practices, and discourses, being more frequently used by scholars from other disciplines; this impacts on the scholarship produced as the complexities of diasporas' split existence betwixt home and host states and their consequences (Dolea, 2022) remain largely under researched.

Another area that has been neglected in diaspora diplomacy deals with the emotions and the emotional ties of diasporas, as studies (especially in public diplomacy) tend to focus on the institutional, social, political, and economic ties of diasporas with home and host states. This is paradoxical as emotions have started to be investigated more systematically in migration studies (see Boccagni & Baldassar, 2015), in international relations (Bleiker & Hutchison, 2014; Crawford, 2000; Koschut et al., 2017), in psychosocial studies and diplomacy (Volkan, 1999, 2017). The focus on emotions opens an entire new area of study in diaspora diplomacy.

This article goes beyond stating emotions matter in diaspora diplomacy. I argue emotions mediate diaspora diplomacy; diasporic agency, practices and discourses can't be fully analysed and understood if divorced from their underpinning emotions. I agree with Ho and McConnell's conceptualization of diaspora diplomacy "as *diaspora assemblages* composed of states, non-state and other international actors that function as constituent components of assemblages, connected through networks and flows of people, information and resources […] at times work to reinforce state power, thereby *reterritorializing*, or at other times, exhibit *deterritorializing* forms of power" (2017, p. 250). Yet, I consider it essential to expand the conceptualization of diaspora diplomacy as diaspora assemblages mediated by emotions

that can be both enabling and disruptive; furthermore, these assemblages are fields of power where identities, differences in status, power and relations within diaspora and between diaspora and other actors are constantly negotiated and articulated through discourse. This brings to the fore the tensions and the complex emotions within the diaspora assemblages, the "diaspora positionality" (Koinova, 2018) and the constructivist dynamics of the assemblages; the various actors constituting the assemblages are strategically projecting and taking stances, making claims, proposing projects on behalf of and in relation to diaspora. Adopting a constructivist analytical framework to examine the emotions-mediated diaspora assemblages allows (1) to uncover the continuous interplay, negotiation, and interaction within the assemblages, (2) to account for situation-specific and context-specific positions of actors, (3) to trace the historicity, typification, and gradual institutionalization of relations, practices, claims, emotions and discourses. Thus, it is possible to unpack the seeming 'uniformity' of diaspora as entity and the homeland loyalties conflated in the concept of citizen diplomat that obscure diversity, contestation and challenges from within diasporic communities; it also opens avenues for researching the making of diaspora as actor through the claims, projects and stances articulated by diaspora as well as in the name of diaspora by other actors.

I thus propose a theoretical and analytical framework to study diaspora diplomacy that (1) posits the centrality of identity, belonging and transnational ties in diaspora, (2) highlights the role of media and the digital nature of diasporas, (3) distinguishes analytically between diaspora as category of analysis (entity) and diaspora as category of practice, and (4) emphasize the key mediating, enabling and disruptive role of emotions and discourses.

An analytical framework to theorize and study diaspora diplomacy and emotions

(1) Diasporas: identity, belonging, and transnational ties

Uses and definitions of the term diaspora abound with often different perspectives, within and outside academia, therefore it is important to clarify the terminology. Diaspora is considered to have become an academic concept during the 1970s (Dufoix, 2018). Cohen (2008) notes the classic use of the term for the study of the Jewish experience, dispersion of Africans, Armenians, and the Irish. From the "classical" diasporas, the term has evolved and expanded to include expatriates, expellees, political refugees, alien residents, immigrants, and ethnic and racial minorities (Safran, 1991) and more recently the concept of digital diaspora gains traction (Nedelcu, 2018). In reaction to the proliferation and stretching of the term to accommodate various agendas, Rober Brubaker (2005) cautioned about the emergence of a '''diaspora'' diaspora' - a dispersion of the meanings of the term in semantic, conceptual and disciplinary space" (p.1), in an article that became seminal for the field. He posits that constitutive of diaspora are: 1. dispersion in space (voluntary, forced, or traumatic, generally across borders); 2. orientation to a homeland (existing, projected, or imagined "homeland" or centre as an authoritative focus of value, identity, and loyalty), and 3. boundary-maintenance (involving the preservation of a distinctive identity in relations to a host society or societies) (Brubaker, 2005).

In the 25th anniversary edition of his seminal work, Global Diasporas, Cohen lists the basic features of diaspora: "*members of a defined group have been dispersed to many destinations; they construct a shared identity; they still somewhat orient themselves to an original 'home'; and they demonstrate an affinity with other members of the group dispersed*

to other places." (2023, p. 1). Expending on these ideas and drawing on Wittgenstein's rope metaphor to explore games and Safran's (1991) work on key components of diaspora, Cohen proposes nine strands of what he calls "a diasporic rope" (2023, p. 3): dispersal (from home), expansion (outside homeland), retention (of a collective memory about an original homeland), idealization (mythization of the real or imagined ancestral home and the collective commitment to maintain it), return (to homeland), distinctiveness (a strong ethnic group consciousness), apprehension (in relation with host societies), creativity (in host countries) and solidarity. Cohen cautions these strands are not fixed or indeed completely applicable when analysing any or all diasporas; instead, they are intertwined and mutually reinforcing, rendering visible the complexities of diasporas.

This article conceptualizes diaspora along the lines of Brubaker and Cohen as they highlight the centrality of belonging and the complex transnational ties that ultimately impact the identity building process within diasporas between *here* (host land) and *there* (homeland), at individual and collective level, and are essential for understanding how they play out in diaspora diplomacy. Diaspora is a deeply political idea, linked to social and political identity and to the debates about citizenship, belonging and exclusion (Sigona et al., 2015); diaspora is equally linked to the power relations that come into play when articulating who is 'in' and who is 'out' of the nation-state, who belongs to certain groups and who does not, as diasporas have been "inside the demos but outside the polis: inside the nation, but outside the state" (Sigona et al., 2015, p. XXII). Brah (1996) stresses this important aspect in his reflections on the perpetual in-the-making people's sense of belonging in diasporic contexts and its (re)emergence in constant interplay with 'host' cultures. The in-betweenness and belonging of migrants is constantly negotiated not only in relation to the host, but also to the

homeland, especially as migration is increasingly circular and people migrate further to other destination countries or return to homeland and emigrate again at a later stage; Boccagni (2010) points out transnationalism conflates three quite distinct 'motherland references' including social ties at distance with one's motherland, social ties at distance with one's family and emotional and affective ties with immigrants' earlier lives.

Therefore, I argue the questions of identity and belonging can't be de-coupled from the analyses on diaspora diplomacy, since the politics of fear (Wodak, 2015) and rise in xenophobia in political campaigns at local, national and global level (Boccagni & Baldassar, 2015). Away from homeland, dealing with constant othering processes and negotiating their status and rights in the receiving states (following elections or immigration legislation), migrants and diasporic groups are experiencing a perpetual in-betweenness which ultimately impacts their sense of belonging both *here* and *there*, but also neither *here* nor *there*. These are essential aspects to be included in the study of diasporic projects and more broadly diaspora-state relations to expose complexities and tensions and to understand their dynamics.

(2) Media, migration and digital diasporas

Scholars in public diplomacy have examined diaspora groups as actors and publics in the context of digital diplomacy and the transformation of diplomacy in the digital age (Duncombe, 2019; Manor & Adiku, 2021). These studies are useful in charting how the relationships between diplomatic institutions of countries of origin and diasporas have been changed by digital technologies which facilitate the dialogic communication of diplomatic representatives with the diaspora communities and vice-versa.

Yet, these studies need complementary perspectives to allow scholars to examine and understand the mediated nature of diasporas: media and migration is an established field of study that offers more critical insights to balance the often-dominant policy-driven migration research, as well as public diplomacy research. The transdisciplinary field of media and migration problematizes issues of identity, belonging, representation, borders, and rights, having expanded at an accelerated pace during the last decade: in the introduction of the SAGE Handbook of Media and Migration, editors Smets et al (2020) clarify they refer to media as objects, texts, symbols, technologies, and organizations, while migration refers to the many different forms of human migration and mobilities, both within states and across borders, and the encounters they provoke, with a focus on inequalities. Scholars in media and migration emphasize that diasporic and migrant groups are constantly negotiating their identity, values and belonging (Triandafyllidou, 2001) and (social) media are spaces of visibility where they communicate interests, make claims, and mobilise identities (Georgiou, 2013; Trandafoiu, 2013). The information and communication technologies (ICTs) allowed dispersed populations to gather, mobilise and act across borders facilitating the emergence of digital diasporas (Candidatu & Ponzanesi, 2022; Nedelcu, 2018); yet, precarious migrants have been both empowered by ICTs and controlled by states' surveillance regimes (Nedelcu & Soysüren, 2022).

Diminescu (2008) coined the term *the connected migrant* as a paradigmatic shift from the *uprooted migrant*, pointing "mobility and connectivity … act as a vector that ensures and guides the lines of continuity in migrants' lives and in the relationships they have with their environments at home, in the host country or in between" (p. 568). The web has affected diasporic self-representations and issues relating to strategies of visibility (Diminescu & Loveluck, 2014).

This is an important aspect as despite the digitalization and hyper-visibility of diversity and opinions, Georgiou (2022) cautions there are paradoxical migrant (in-)visibilities in digital mediascapes.

Engaging with media and migration studies allows scholars researching diaspora diplomacy to avoid an essentialized approach on diasporas and their identities (Triandafyllidou, 2001, 2009) and to acknowledge the diverse contexts in which the diasporic experience emerges both bottom up (through various forms of agency and self-reflexive positions of diasporic actors) and top down (diasporas as objects of governance, Gamlen, 2013). It makes possible to examine the mediation of diasporic experience through the interplay between media and other public, often competing discourses (Beciu et al., 2018) and their role in shaping migration and migration policy (Trandafoiu, 2022).

(3) Diaspora as entity and as category of practice

To advance diaspora diplomacy scholarship, I argue we need to follow Brubaker (2005):

> "we should think of diaspora not in substantialist terms as a bounded entity, but rather as an idiom, a stance, a claim. We should think of diaspora in the first instance as a category of practice, and only then ask whether, and how, it can fruitfully be used as a category of analysis. As a category of practice, 'diaspora' is used to make claims, to articulate projects, to formulate expectations, to mobilize energies, to appeal to loyalties. It is often a category with a strong normative change. It does not so much *describe* the world as seek to *remake* it. As idiom, stance, and claim, diaspora is a

> way of formulating the identities and loyalties of a population. Those who do the formulating may themselves be part of the population in question; or they may be speaking in the name of the putative homeland state." (p. 12)

Such a distinction avoids the essentialization and homogenization of diasporic communities through ethnic lenses, as well as ethnic groupism. It allows to identify who makes claims, who takes stances and initiates projects, who constructs loyalties, identities and diasporas as actors both within diasporic groups (bottom up) as well as on their behalf (top down). In a later work, Brubaker (2015) adds further: "rather than speak of 'a diaspora' or 'the diaspora' as an entity, a bounded group, or an ethnodemographic or ethnocultural fact, it may be more fruitful—and it would certainly be more precise—to speak of diasporic stances, projects, claims, idioms, and practices. We can then explore to what extent, and in what circumstances, those claimed as members of putative diasporas actively support, passively sympathize with, or are indifferent or even hostile to the diasporic projects pursued in their name" (p. 130). These additions are important as they reveal the symbolic struggles and inequalities, the constant negotiations, competitions and tensions within diaspora, in-between diasporas, as well as between diaspora and other actors that constitute the complex diaspora assemblages.

Assessing existing scholarship in diaspora diplomacy using Brubaker's approach, it can be noticed that most studies have essentialized and homogenized diasporas, describing them following a positivist approach; the IR tradition with the state as unit of analysis explains the top-down approach for policy formulation. This however obscures the multiplicity of stances, positions, and agendas within diaspora. The pandemic, for example, has shown diaspora sub-groups

emerging and contesting both home and host governments' policies on pandemic management and vaccination. This can be linked to the key debate about publics in public diplomacy, to the tensions, conflicts, protests emerging from domestic publics that the scholarship has largely avoided: as argued elsewhere, diasporas might be agents, instruments, and partners in public diplomacy, but they can also be disruptors (Dolea, 2022).

The way forward in diaspora diplomacy is to focus and develop more the constructivist approach on diaspora as category of practice, alongside the already existing scholarship. Studies on diaspora as entity can also be expanded through the adoption of more prisms (transnational, intersectional) to provide insights into the diversity of various socio-demographic groups and individuals that constitute diaspora (including marginalized and disadvantaged groups), as well as into their multiple ties to home and host state, along Cohen (2023)'s strands of a diasporic rope. Focusing on the different projects, claims and stances allows scholars to investigate positionality and perceptions of belonging (i.e. to diasporas, to homeland, to host countries, to Europe/ West/ Global North, etc); to expose the tensions and struggles between different identity layers (ethnic, national and transnational) articulated within the diasporic communities, aspects of inclusion and exclusion (politics and identity) – who is in and who is out – and what power relations underpin such discourses. Furthermore, such analyses can map the diversity of actors in the diaspora assemblage that instrumentalize, mobilize and construct diasporas as actors in their own discourses.

(4) Enabling and disruptive emotions and discourses

Emotions have been marginally discussed in public diplomacy scholarship (Di Martino, 2021; Duncombe 2019;

Graham 2014), and almost ignored in diaspora diplomacy. The rational actor models that dominated International Relations and the positivist approach in public diplomacy can explain the lack of emotions in current scholarship. In her seminal article, Crawford (2010) notes a systematic study of emotions was missing in international relations due to a) the ubiquity of rationality assumptions in international relations theory, b) a focus on cognition and "cold" cognitive processes when emotions were studied in relation to foreign policy decision-making, c) an unproblematized approach used when emotions recognised by security scholars as important - fear and hate are analysed, and d) the methodological concerns (e.g. their nature – ephemeral and deeply internal, measurement and evaluation of emotions, the issues of genuine/ authenticity vs instrumental display of emotions, the level and generalization of emotions from individual to group, etc). She further reviews the biological, cognitive, psychodynamic, and social learning theories of emotion proposing a research agenda (Crawford, 2010). The last decade, however, saw a rise of scholarship theorising emotions in international relations (Bleiker & Hutchison, 2014; Hutchinson & Bleiker 2014; Koschut et al. 2017), with scholars privileging the socially constructed nature of emotions in defining them, as well as in exploring their expression and effects.

Similarly, in migration studies, scholars have been advocating for the integration of the understudied emotions into the study of migration dominated by economic and political analyses. Boccagni and Baldassar (2015) note that "at all of its 'stages', the migration process is characterized by important transformations along the migrants' life course involving the transmission, reproduction and evolution of emotions in relation to belonging, identity and 'home'. Indeed, the notion of 'the migrant condition' is a reference to the characteristic ambiguities and tensions around emotional connections

to 'here' and 'there'." (p. 74). This illustrates the dynamics of emotions at play in the migrants' life and diaspora communities; it surfaces the ambivalence and contradictory nature of emotional stances as migrants' attitudes towards home and host societies are evolving and might change over time. Furthermore, a variety of social actors (within and outside diasporic groups) may intensify, appeal, strategically and disruptively stir these emotions of migration, aspects that have been so far marginally discussed in diaspora diplomacy. Boccagni and Baldassar (2015) also highlight the link between emotion, space and place in the (re)construction of emotions and draw on the work of Sarah Ahmed (2004) to address their categorization: "emotions are socially and culturally constructed and spatially contingent, as well as fluid and emergent, there is hardly a way to reduce them in a theoretical and conceptual sense, to being either 'positive' or 'negative'" (p. 76).

Drawing on these perspectives, I take a social constructivist approach to emotions, that emphasizes their inter-subjectivity and sociocultural nature. I argue that central to understanding the experience of migration is the sense of loss and trauma that all displaced people, be it refugees, migrants, or expatriates have in common (Volkan, 2017): "loss of family members and friends; loss of ancestors' burial grounds; loss of familiar language, songs, smells, food, in one's environment; loss of country; loss of previous identity and its support system" (2017, p. 4). The loss and trauma of displacement (be it forced or voluntary) constitute the invisible luggage of those displaced (Dolea, 2023) and shape the identity construction and the belonging of diaspora in host countries; the concept of large group identity is very relevant for a psychosocial understanding of these processes as it refers to the sameness of individuals that are unknown to each other but have in common a mixture of myths and realities of the past that shape their sameness (Volkan 2018).

These can be connected to the strands of Cohen's 'diasporic rope' highlighting the powerful emotional ties between the displaced, the homeland and the transnational community they identify with - the need and longing for belonging. Volkan (1999) proposes another two concepts that further allow researchers to understand identity making from this perspective: chosen glories (mental representations of heavily mythologized past events and heroes, and shared triumphs that are perpetuated and reinforced through rituals and ceremonies) and chosen traumas (mental representations of events that "caused the large group to face drastic losses, feel helpless and victimized by another group, and share a humiliating injury" (p. 50). The chosen glories and chosen traumas differ depending on the type of diaspora, its culture and psychology, but they are transgenerationally transmitted and impact on the adaptation and integration of the "newcomers", especially when activated or triggered in contexts of existing or perceived threats to large-group identity; in such instances, Volkan (2018) argues a physical border also becomes a psychological border and newcomers are *othered* because they damage the host group's psychological border and identity. In the current global environment with migration becoming a recurring topic on public, media, and political agendas, the understanding of how chosen glories and chosen traumas play out in diaspora as well as in host societies is essential: as more diverse actors in the diaspora assemblages take stances and make claims in the name of diaspora, these mental representations are easily instrumentalized, appropriated and stirred, including by extremist and illiberal actors seeking to strategically construct exclusionary narratives and discourses of fear, othering the diaspora – the perpetual newcomers and outsiders. These dynamics can offer insights into the enabling and disruptive role of emotions and trauma in triggering engagement and disengagement in diaspora diplomacy.

In studying emotions and trauma, subjective in nature, two aspects are key and have analytical implications: acknowledging emotions are political, following complex processes that turn individual emotions collective; adopting the nexus emotions – discourse – power (Hutchison & Bleiker 2017, Koschut et al. 2017), thus situating emotions in a (critical) discursive analytical framework. This is even more needed as emotions are discursive and discourses construct and reproduce relations of power (Dolea, 2023): discursive representations and constructions of emotions in text, talk and visuals circulate in public discourse, media and everyday life, the dominant ones ultimately becoming institutionalized in the form of policies. Therefore, analysing emotions in diaspora diplomacy would require an explicit and implicit level of analysis: the explicit naming and labelling of emotions and the implicit references to emotions, emotional states and feelings, with the acknowledgement that what is left out is sometimes equally important or even more important that what is said. The context and the situations can also be strategically constructed in discourse, as well as the position of the actors; analyses need to go beyond the identification of strategic narratives to identify the discursive aims of actors in diaspora diplomacy, the power relations they introduce, the contextualization of emotions, and the dynamics of identity building both bottom up and top down. Analyses also need to reflect critically on the role of media as actors with their own agenda, often amplifying and gradually imposing dominant discourses, narratives and frames about diasporas and migrants. In turn, they redefine their space and emotions, identity and belonging through media consumption of both home and host states. While social media have certainly become platforms of visibility and spaces of agency for diasporas and migrants, their voice is subjected to a "containment of the right to speak within a digital order of appearance: migrants speak as outsiders and as individuals who fit within given categories – entrepre-

neurial or vulnerable agents who make no claims to equality or reparations" (Georgiou, 2022, p. 6).

Methodology

I draw on this theoretical framework to propose an empirical study of the Romanian diaspora in the UK, arguing the analysis and the insights collected are relevant for the wider diaspora diplomacy scholarship. My arguments are the extent of the Romanian migration phenomenon (1), its complexities (2) and its consequences for diaspora (3), with a focus on emotions.

(1) Romanians are one of the largest European groups immigrating within Europe: Romania has a total population of 19 million (The Romanian National Institute of Statistics, 2023) of which approximately 5,7 million Romanians are estimated to live outside Romania (The Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2022). Romanians constituting the largest group of EU citizens residing in other EU countries (Eurostat, 2023). Official statistics vary and are incomplete due to several factors including the free circulation of citizens within the European Union, their voluntary self-registration with authorities in countries of residence, the reporting within and between institutions across and outside EU countries, as well as the complexity and circular nature of Romanian migration (Sandu, 2021).

(2) The emergence of new Romanian diasporas after 1989 (Sandu, 2021) is an interesting case as the displacement of significant percentages of one country's population is most often associated with contexts of war, conflicts, natural disasters and the "classical diasporas" (Cohen, 2008). The origins of emigration from Romania can be traced back to the beginning of the 20th century, but the recent, post-communist mass emigration is linked to Ro-

mania's economic development as well as to the cultural, social, and political processes of Romania's transition from a dictatorship to a democratic state and the challenges faced by people. Sociologists investigating this phenomenon point that in addition to the dominant labour migration, there are various forms of cross-border mobilities: an ethnic migration to kin states (e.g. Germany and Hungary), and a migration of minorities to the same ethnic group (e.g. Romanian Roma) (Anghel et al., 2019), short term mobilities and return migration.

(3) Romanian migrants and the Romanian Roma were often targeted by media and political campaigns in Western European countries (Dolea, 2018b; Dolea & Suciu, 2024), especially in the context of an accelerated rise of populism and anti-immigration discourses across Europe (Balch et al, 2014; Dolea et al, 2021); such campaigns were especially vivid in the Brexit referendum context (Beciu et al. 2017; Dolea, 2018a; Mădroane et al., 2020) and were extensively covered also by the Romanian media in terms of "an imminent 'invasion' or 'siege' of the British territory by the 'masses' or 'hordes' of Romanians, 'the immigrants of poverty'" (Beciu & Lazăr, 2016). The shame (as moral emotion) and shaming of Romanian low-skilled migrants were analysed by Mădroane (2021) who posits that "the sources of shame are not only the stigmatising classifications that circulate in the home and host countries and public cultures, but also structural conditions of inequality" (p. 62); she shows this leads to migrants' disempowerment (devalued selves as worthy of respect and recognition based on personal merit), but also re-authorisation in claims for rights and social change (Mădroane, 2021). All these offer a fertile ground for exploring a variety of transnational emotions, attitudes, and behaviours of Romanian diaspora in both home and host state and can inform studies among other diasporas to trace

the role of emotions and their potential enabling and disruptive impact in diplomacy.

Two main research questions structure the article: (RQ1) "How do representatives of diaspora organizations define their ties with home and host state?" and (RQ2) "How do representatives of diaspora organizations construct their identity?". RQ1 aims to capture reflections on belonging and to explore how transnational emotional ties emerge in diaspora diplomacy, beyond the more often-studied diplomatic, economic, social, and political ties. RQ2 investigates how diaspora representatives situate themselves in the diaspora assemblage as field of power, identifying a typology of roles and identities they assume.

Twenty-one semi-structured interviews with representatives of the Romanian diaspora organizations and organizations that serve the Romanian communities across the UK were carried out online, via zoom, between September 2023 and November 2023. The selection of the representatives followed 2 steps: an initial invitation to participate in the study was sent to all the organizations listed on website of the Romanian Embassy in London under the section Organizations and association; another round of invitations was sent to representatives of the Romanian diaspora organizations or of other diaspora organizations serving the Romanian community following recommendations received from the first group of interviewees (snowball sampling). The interview guide included a first section with questions exploring personal trajectories and the organization, while the second section focused on the beneficiaries and the Romanian community in the UK more broadly. Each interview lasted between 1 hour and 2 hours, totalling over 30 hours of recordings. For this article, only responses to the first set of questions were used as they were relevant to the research questions.

The article adopts a transnational approach in which diaspora representatives are situated, thus overcoming methodological nationalism. As diaspora diplomacy is conceptualized as an emotion-mediated assemblage, the analysis aims to capture how diaspora representative construct their identity in interaction and by positioning themselves in relation to a variety of social actors and how emotions are constructed both explicitly and implicitly. Thus, the interviews are analysed using an analytical framework that combines critical discourse analysis with a focus on strategies of self-presentation (Wagner & Wodak, 2006), the concept of positioning in identity construction (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008; De Fina & King, 2011) and the situation of communication from the French school of socio-pragmatics (Charaudeau, 2014). Such mixt analytical approaches have been also used, among others, by Beciu (2018) to analyse identity building strategies in debates and by Madroane (2021) to analyse shame, (dis)empowerment and resistance in diasporic media. Combining these approaches allows me to highlight how during interviews the interviewees label themselves, how they construct their present life situation in relation to past contexts justifying their engagement with the Romanian community and how they build their agency and position of power in relation to other social actors. The topics mentioned and the perspective from which the interviewees narrate their experiences are also captured. A key aspect is the construction of emotions and their link with modes of engagement (Beciu, 2018) understood as interviewees' normative statements (appeal to or invocation of norms, values, responsibilities, commitments), evaluations, claims, etc. Special attention is given to how they recontextualize a series of past events that generated heated public debates in society (e.g. Brexit). I use recontextualization as understood by Fairclough (2003): "Elements of social events are selectively "filtered" ... some are excluded, some included, and given greater or lesser prominence" (p. 139).

Ultimately, the interviewees themselves construct diaspora in their discourse and the decision to establish or join an organization is a form of engagement in relation to diaspora. Their grassroots day to day activities allows them to bring perspectives on the diversity of categories and groups conflated in the top-down approaches on diaspora. This type of bottom-up analysis on their self-presentation, emotions, positionality and recontextualization is especially important as increasingly more actors formulate stances, claims and projects on behalf of diaspora and understanding who else is communicating for and on behalf of diaspora, in which context, and with what agendas is essential.

Romanian diaspora in the UK – self-awareness stage triggered by Brexit

Diasporas are as powerful as their awareness, notes Cull (2022). The UK is home to one of the largest Romanian diasporas in Europe, although the official statistics vary. The latest update of the EU Settlement Scheme quarterly statistics (Home Office, 2024) indicates 1,7 million Romanians have applied for a form of status, followed by Polish (1,2 million). In turn, the 2021 Census indicates 539.000 Romanians (576% growth compared to 2011 Census), making Romania the fourth most common non-UK country of birth and Romanians the 3rd most spoken language in England and Wales (ONS, 2022).

The Romanian diaspora in the UK is a first-generation diaspora, at the stage of emerging self-awareness. The interviewees consider Brexit, and later the pandemic, were key moments that triggered the emergence of a Romanian diaspora in the UK: with few exceptions, most organizations were established during or after 2016.

> "Paradoxically, after Brexit … when people had to register, everybody from the Romanian authorities to the British authorities realised how many Romanians are here… plus, Brexit triggered an engagement with the British state: you need to do something, apply for the settled status" (cultural organization representative, personal interview, October 16, 2023).

Brexit is thus recontextualized as an auspicious moment that made the Romanian diaspora visible for the authorities, generating in turn an engagement of Romanians with the British state. It is equally regarded as a rejection and a moment of collective suffering for Romanians which led to a loss of trust. A heavy emotional terminology and a powerful metaphor depicting the harming of a collective body ("you hit us") are used, further intensified through the construction of Romanian emigration as a forced one; the Romanians are thus portrayed as collectively suffering from a double rejection from both the country of origin and destination.

> "In January one of the MPs asked me how to get to the Romanian community … I told they need to love and engage with Romanians, because these people are forced out of their country because of corruption. We came to you [i.e. UK], and you hit us with Brexit, so you need to take steps towards gaining our trust back." (Stefania Banu, Roconect, personal interview, October 13, 2023).

The emotions around Brexit are reiterated also as part of personal identity construction and a motivation-trigger to set up an organization. The night of the vote and the aftermath are vividly constructed through the metaphor of sadness that is materialized as heavy ("enormous"), felt both

individually and collectively; the sameness with the period when Romanians didn't have the right to work in the UK is emphasized. The parallel with the past and the feeling of witnessing history repeating itself is recurrent in other interviews:

> "I was terribly hurt by Brexit. I really suffered a lot […] being in England for so long and having gone through all the processes of applications [for visa]. I felt we were going back … I followed the evolution of votes till the morning, and I cried. I suffered! When I went out, I felt an enormous sadness in the air. I was talking with other moms at school because where I live there are many Romanians, and it is called Little Romania. And the mothers were also very upset. And this made me even sadder. I felt the need, the urge to help, to do something […] to help people" (Tudorita Poenaru, RCCT, personal interview, October 22, 2023).

Multiple identities and typology of diaspora leadership roles

The interviewees situate themselves in a transnational field from the very beginning of the interview when they introduce themselves. They share their arrival in the UK and personal journey of development and then the engagement with the Romanian community through discursive strategies of storytelling that develop gradually into testimonials and even confessions of their personal hardship and very personal feelings and emotions. With few exceptions, most are self-made, and they reflect on their own experiences as migrants who started from scratch or students who came to study and continued in the UK (in some cases as illegal

migrants before Romanians had the right to work in the UK); others came to the UK as professionals from other Western European countries. Throughout the interview, each participant mobilizes different identities: the individual identity of a Romanian migrant, the social identity constructed in relation to the profession they have and various collective identities – member of the Romanian community at large, representative of an ethnic or religious group, member of the British society (through naturalization and dual citizenship).

> "I am a Roma human rights activist. I've been an activist from 1996 back in Romania [...] I came to the UK in 2010 when Romanians had limited rights to work [...] I've collected scrapped metal and we managed to survive for a while. After they opened the labour market I got employed in constructions. [...] my trigger to reengage was the lack of efficiency of Roma policies." (Virgil Bitu, ROTA, personal interview, November 5, 2023).

They reconstruct the context of their decision to engage with the Romanian community in the UK as well as the tensions of belonging and identity construction: some even share an initial rejection of the Romanian community because they wanted to leave Romania behind. The motivations to establish an organization vary and are justified as a duty to pay forward, as giving voice to the voiceless, as feeling compelled to put a stop to an injustice, as a (moral) imperative to do something, as doing something from the heart, as well as a desire to share positive emotions, create connections and ties with homeland.

Representatives of the Romanian organizations position themselves as key nodes in the diaspora assemblage and network of diaspora diplomacy as a field of power rela-

tions. They see themselves primarily as an equal: a link and connector between the Romanian authorities, local British authorities, the local Romanian-speaking community, and other ethnic communities. The typology of roles includes community leaders, cultural mediators between the Romanian and the British culture, partners of home diplomatic authorities, entrepreneurs, facilitators of contacts with host state authorities, activists giving a voice to the unheard, representatives of the marginalized and neglected, mentors, observers of the community, digital influencers and gatekeepers, especially as social media is essential in the lives of the "connected migrants".

> "We bring together people from very different places and mindsets. For example, Pentecostals, Baptists, Adventists, Orthodox. It was a lot of work and developed relations in time with them [...] We are the link [...] We are the interface between the local community, the Romanian community, the Romanian Roma and the local authorities." (Malina Virtejanu, Belfast Intercultural Centre, personal interview, October 10, 2023).

A recurring pattern in the interviews is the construction of trust and responsibility; they talk especially about the vulnerable members (as opposed to the elites) of the Romanian community that they largely represent, thus constructing a spectrum of vulnerability: Romanians who lack language and functional literacy skills, understanding of the UK systems or IT skills, come from underdeveloped areas of Romania, are lonely, victims of domestic violence, homeless people, people with addictions, young women, mothers, single men or sole providers for their families, Romanian Roma, LGBTQ+ Romanians, victims of misinformation and disinformation. Several representatives highlight their motivation of estab-

lishing an organization was the complete lack of support for vulnerable members of the community in the areas where they live across the UK, stressing the importance of grassroots work to cultivate trust.

> "Sitting with them without any hat or function [i.e. status]. Just a friendly chat to listen to people to hear their needs. It all starts with food. People come to eat, but they gradually trust us and share their problems, so we can help them. People need to trust us before they open; they want to build trust first, before talking." (Tudorita Poenaru).

The representatives of the Romanian organizations are seen by local British authorities as representing Romanian community and as leaders of the community. Consequently, they are invited in mixed local committees or groups on key issues such as modern slavery, exploitation, trafficking, domestic violence.

> "The local institutions see Link Centre as a Romanian centre. And I am seen as the representative of Romanians both by themselves and the local authorities and other organizations ... My role is to explain the culture to the police and vice versa to communicate from the police to the community." (Delia Chiuzbaian, LINK Community Center, personal interview, September 29, 2023).

However, representatives point out the unequal power relations: they are asked to be partners of the British authorities and other NGOs to disseminate information because they have access in the Romanian community; but they are not actually recognised and are not successful in receiving

funding because they are seen as white other, and this is a group that has no problems. This brings to the fore the issue of deservingness, the emergence of a hierarchy of migrants and an invisibility of certain categories, as well as the rise of xenophobia and racialisation in the UK post-Brexit (see Sime et al., 2022). Organizations are fighting to show that vulnerable Romanians need assistance and support, hence resources from the state. Some do that along the issue of rights (access to services and support as a legal right Romanians have here), others focus on highlighting how vulnerable the community is. Again, the issue of deservingness emerges which is an emotional construct. This can reinforce stereotypes of Romanians as a problem to be managed, rather than a resource for the British state.

> "this [i.e. lack of success in getting funding] is not only in the Romanian community. This happens to the Polish as well... Because the white other category is not prioritized or acknowledged." (Mariana Plamadeala, RUDA, personal interview, October 24, 2023).

The Romanian diaspora organizations assume a competition logic in relation to other actors, both vertically (with authorities) and horizontally (with other associations). The interviewees make assessments and evaluations about the Romanian diaspora situating it in a comparative logic and inferiority position vis-a-vis other diaspora organizations, as all diaspora organizations are competing for attention, legitimacy and resources in relation to the British state.

However, the Romanian diaspora organizations reproduce a competition logic between themselves, instead of a partnership one which ultimately weakens the potential of Romanian diaspora's soft power. This can be partly explained through the emerging stage of the diaspora, as with

few exceptions the organizations are very young and too focused on immediate needs to be able to develop structures, processes and standards. The fierce competition for visibility and resources, the prioritization of branding and PR logics (instead of a focus on professionalization) can be linked also to the rupturing of the fabric of trust during communism, but also pre-communist lack of trust in Romanian society which leads to an endemic lack of trust in each other currently in Romanian society (Voicu et al., 2020). Furthermore, in the East, the communist heritage has included a culture of mistrusting neighbours and voluntary organizations (Uslaner & Bădescu, 2003), which can explain the slow development of such Romanian diaspora organizations.

> "There is no support between [i.e. Romanian] associations. There is a sort of competition. A Romanian one. As only we are in competition with everybody and ourselves and everyone around us as we are the best" (Eutalia Leonte, RO KENT CIC, personal interview, October 23, 2023).

Representatives of diaspora organizations with a longer history or especially interested in capacity building, mobilize normative statements, appealing to norms, values, and responsibilities. They focus especially on the need of professionalization, ethics, accountability, and overall leadership development within the Romanian diaspora.

> "Qualifications and standards are essential especially when working with vulnerable members of the community. This makes the difference between a hobby and volunteering in the free time and having a profession and a vocation to serve a community." (Adina

Maglan, RO Eastern European Hub, personal interview, October 13, 2023).

".. those who assume leadership roles realise that they can influence public opinion and political opinion through their actions and words; and it's easy to speak [empty] words, instead of words with substance [...] you need to be up to date or you risk repeating the same things and trigger no change [...] each leader should redefine their aims and motivation and should review their needs because I believe we are beyond survival mode" (Cristina Irimie, Romanians in the UK, personal interview, October 31, 2023).

Transnational emotional ties and the diasporic rope — retention & idealization & return

The representatives of the Romanian organizations reflect on the emotional needs and feelings of the Romanian migrants, talking on behalf of their communities about the need of belonging amongst diaspora members, about their sense of being forced to emigrate from Romania and the idealization of a return to homeland.

"We try to show that the Romanian community has things to be proud of... we bring a positive emotion. We offer a Martisor [i.e. a traditional spring token] [...] People have a nostalgia for home [...] they miss home, they like it at home with its goods and bads. When people see a Martisor, they remember their home, their childhood, their mother and father, relatives, they remember everything; it is such a beautiful moment..." (Corneliu Berdilo,

Emotion, personal interview, November 13, 2023).

"There is a category [of migrants] that is with one foot here and with one foot in Romania; everything they earn they send in Romania, and they continue to build big houses, which happened also 20 years ago … They live here, but automatically they think that house in Romania is for their future, so they don't feel as they are here because they are waiting to go home. But we know this 'when I go home' is actually never." (Cristina Irimie)

The constant negotiation and in-the-making identity are clearly articulated in stances that refer to the self-perception of Romanian migrants as being "exploited" in the UK. Not only the emigration from Romania is thus constructed as being "forced", but the remaining in the UK is equally imposed on them by circumstances – there are thus some Romanians who are depicted as having no choice, being almost trapped between here and there, but neither here nor there. The consequences of such experiences are not only the lack of integration, but also a profound disconnection and disengagement in diaspora; they become vulnerable to nostalgic tropes of times gone-by (e.g. communism), propaganda narratives, anti-establishment and extremist discourses that promise a sense of justice and belonging to an imagined community aiming to disrupt the status-quo.

"Romanians don't integrate here and feel they don't belong here […] They feel exploited by this country that takes from them too many taxes, that they work too much and rest too little […] they live here, but their mind and heart is in the other country. And there

[in Romania] they don't trust the authorities and don't see themselves returning there too soon. The ones who have children here live with the constant frustration that they need to be here for their children, but they don't feel like they belong. And this is very painful to be unable to find your place here and to be forced to live here." (Stefania Banu, Roconect, personal interview, October 13, 2023).

A gender element is brought forward by several inter-viewees who talk about the different groups within their communities: an unexpected finding was the hardships of single men in the UK or of men who are sole providers for their families who are back in Romania or here in the UK, while the wives are staying home to care for small children. Another one was the very small online community of 20 mothers on Facebook that grew over a period of 10 years to an organization gathering over 28,000 Romanian mothers all over the UK. These gender perspectives are brought to the fore by such bottom-up approaches that avoid the es-sentialization and homogenization of diasporic communi-ties. Both gender and cultural stereotypes are mobilized: the expectation from men to be brave and endure, the Roma-nian gender dynamics in the family with women expected to perform traditional roles and tend the house, while men provide for the family; the burden of both roles is not dis-cussed because it is a tabu in Romania, while in the UK con-versations about mental health and wellbeing are not only socially acceptable, but institutionalized through programs and policies.

"The first generation of Romanians [i.e. in the UK] is in my opinion condemned to suffer as they will always live between two worlds [...] it will never be totally adaptable no matter how

hard we would try [...] There is a collective suf-
fering [i.e. among men] but it is covered as it
is shameful for a man to show he is human,
too, that he has a weakness" (Cristian Stanca-
nu, My Romania Community, personal inter-
view, October 25, 2023).

The transnational diasporic rope and the Romanian – British collaboration

The Romanian diaspora is an emotionally mediated as-
semblage in which diaspora organizations represent sym-
bolically strands of the transnational diasporic rope that
keeps the Romanian community tighter together, connect-
ing Romanians with both homeland and the British host so-
ciety.

**Capacity building of Romanian diaspora organizations
supported by authorities.** Romanian diaspora organizations
need to move to the next stage of development, focusing
on consolidation and strengthening capacity. Some organi-
zations show a misalignment between the mission, the ac-
tivities and events carried out and the aspirational discourses
of the leaders. For a sustainable development, diaspora or-
ganizations need to overcome this initial stage of overreli-
ance on the personality of the leader who established the
organization, expanding internal structures, adopting rules
and regulations, principles of transparency, accountabili-
ty, yearly public reporting and evaluation. There is a need
for organizations and their leaders to distinguish between
visibility opportunities, influence, and advocacy. As the Ro-
manian diaspora has become one of the largest European
diasporas in the UK, a variety of political and institutional
stakeholders will increasingly seek to engage it; these op-
portunities should be used with a view of obtaining middle
and long-term structural changes, rather than short term

gains. A paradigm shift is required from "photo ops" with the British and Romanian authorities to lobbying advocacy, policy influencing and structural changes for the Romanian community in the UK.

Knowledge exchange and networking opportunities between British and Romanian organizations, as well as targeted trainings can contribute to the capacity building, leadership development and professionalization of the emerging Romanian organizations. Such collaborations exist already, but they need to be recuring and extended to include joint trainings on key issues and skills (for example, training for project management and reporting, training to understand, recognise and counter misinformation and disinformation, fact-checking, debunking). The diaspora organizations will develop first internal routines and processes, then will be educators and multipliers of knowledge within the Romanian community, thus contributing actively to building societal resilience.

As disinformation was a topic repeatedly mentioned in the interviews, **the Romanian and the UK Government should initiate campaigns to tackle disinformation**. There is a need of recurring programs to strategically increase societal resilience, given the ongoing war in Ukraine and the threat posed by Russia to European security. Such programs should tackle disinformation, counter malign influences, and mitigate divisions amongst Romanian diaspora, along with other diaspora groups in the UK and the UK society at large. Propaganda theories highlight the importance of emotions. The emotional in-betweenness of migrants, the sense of rejection and abandonment by both home and host country constitute a fertile ground for propaganda and disinformation. Targeted approaches and bespoke communication campaigns are needed not only in Romanian diaspora, but also in diasporas with home countries neighbouring Ukraine

as they continue to be strategically exposed to Russian pro-paganda.

A joint grassroots approach to tackle modern slavery and human trafficking. The Romanian organizations are key nodes in reaching out to the heart of the community. However, Romanians are spread throughout the UK and, as shown, have low trust in institutions, authorities and sometimes in Romanian NGOs. Therefore, bottom-up joint approaches are needed in addition to the top-down ones. Information campaigns in Romanian language (e.g., brochures, dedicated numbers, etc) should continue to ensure structurally the information is widely available and people suspecting a case of exploitation or abuse know what steps to follow to report. But a peer-to-peer approach in communicating about modern slavery and human trafficking would mitigate the risk of messages being rejected. For example, joint British-Romanian initiatives can create safe spaces for coming together to share experiences and difficulties of daily life as a Romanian woman in the UK; these can lead to conversations about feeling lonely, vulnerable under the umbrella of 'carrying for women in community' and 'empowering women in community'; thus, no woman participant is a priori placed in a position of (recognising) being a victim (which is often times the case as no victim wants to be perceived and self-identify as victim).

Further reflections

There is a current turbulent and uncertain climate, a state of polycrisis and permacrisis, with compounded effects of post-pandemic, economic and cost of living crisis, a new era of intense geopolitical competition with wars, conflicts and tensions, elections across the world and climate change. Displacement, both forced and voluntary, will increase to unprecedented levels. In addition, the circulatory nature of

migration will add to the existing challenge of capturing in the official statistics the size of the dynamic and evolving diasporic and migrant groups; this can contribute to the invisibility of certain migrant groups (as it was the case of the Romanians in the UK) which impacts national and local policies, resource allocation and support measures, and consequently processes of adaptation and integration of migrants.

Such bottom-up approaches to analyse diaspora can inform policy making more accurately. In a world increasingly diverse, multicultural and multiethnic, essentializing and homogenizing diaspora along home nation-state lines obscures the heterogenous and intersectional make-up of diasporas. Approaches that avoid methodological nationalism highlight multiple belongings and identities that are constantly negotiated, and intersectional approaches reveal the diversity of groups. Within any one diaspora there are a variety of socio-professional, ethnic, class groups and agendas. Traditional and conservative views, progressive views, extremist views coexist and clash within diaspora groups. The imagining of homeland along the past vs along the future, nostalgia for different forms of governing and worldviews equally coexist. Furthermore, formal and informal leaders of diaspora organizations speak for or on behalf of diaspora, as do a range of political actors in both home and host countries with (different) aims to engage and mobilize diaspora. Regular stakeholder mapping and risk assessment are essential in diaspora diplomacy to identify actors, practices, discourses, and their agendas with the assumption these are competing and possible overlapping.

The psychology of diaspora and the emotions of migration are as important as the official statistics that profile diaspora and migrant group. There is a need for more awareness of processes and consequences of policies on immigration (e.g. the othering of particular groups; the hier-

archies of migrants; hierarchies of problems). This taps into the perception of belonging and the always in-the-making identity processes of migrants - in Volkan's terms this feeds into the reinforcement of psychological borders and feelings amongst diasporas as a perpetual "newcomer" that ultimately hinder and complicate their integration in the host societies. Emotions can lead to reconceptualize the listening element in public diplomacy and diaspora diplomacy to include the understanding of complex psychological process beyond conflict resolution and negotiations: as nations are not stable structures, the domestic cultural tensions and struggles from homeland are brought in the host societies; the multiculturalism and multi-ethnic composition of nation-states bring to the fore the need to understand these social, cultural and psychological processes.

Author's Biography

Alina Dolea is Associate Professor in Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy and 2022-24 USC CPD Research Fellow. Her research is situated at the intersection of public diplomacy, migration, media and communication studies, with a focus on discourse. She is particularly interested in the emotions of migration and the role diasporas have come to play in public diplomacy, reproducing, but also contesting and disrupting the state's strategic communication. She has published in *International Communication Gazette*, *Nations and Nationalism*, *Public Relations Review*, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, among others.

References

Abraham, R. (2012). India and its Diaspora in the Arab Gulf Countries: Tapping into Effective 'Soft Power' and Related Public Diplomacy. *Diaspora Studies*, *5*(2), 124-146. https://doi.org/10.1080/09739572.2013.807544

Ahmed, S. (2004). Collective feelings: or, the impressions left by others. *Theory Culture Society*. *21*(2), 25-42.

Anghel, R.G., Toma, S., & Fosztó, L. (2019). Romanian Identity and Immigration in Europe. In S. Ratuva (Ed) *The Palgrave Handbook of Ethnicity*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0242-8_124-1

Arkilic, A. (2022). *Diaspora diplomacy: the politics of Turkish emigration to Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Attias, S. (2012). Israel's New Peer-to-Peer Diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *7*(4), 473-482. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341235

Balch, A., Balabanova, E., & Trandafoiu, R. (2014). A Europe of Rights and Values? Public Debates on Sarkozy's Roma Affair in France, Bulgaria and Romania. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40(8), 1154–1174. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.854691

Bamberg, M. & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Small Stories as a New Perspective in Narrative and Identity Analysis. *Text & Talk 28*(3): 377–96. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.018

Baucöck. R., & Faist, T. (Eds). (2010). *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods* (IMISCOE Research). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Birka, L., & Kļaviņš, D. (2020). Diaspora diplomacy: Nordic and Baltic perspective. *Diaspora Studies, 13*(2), 115-132. https://doi.org/10.1080/09739572.2019.1693861

Beciu, C. (2018). 'Here and There': Identity Building Strategies in Debates with Non-Migrants. In C. Beciu, M. Ciocea, I. D. Mađroane, & A. I. Cârlan (Eds.), *Debating Migration as a Public Problem: National Publics and Transnational Fields* (pp. 233–252). Peter Lang.

Beciu, C., & Lazăr, M. (2016). Instrumentalising the "mobility argument": Discursive patterns in the Romanian media. In M. Endres, K. Manderscheid, & C. Mincke (Eds.), *The mobilities paradigm: Discourses and ideologies* (pp. 48–67). Routledge.

Beciu, C., Mădroane, I. D., Ciocea, M., & Cârlan, A. I. (2017). Media engagement in the transnational social field: Discourses and repositionings on migration in the Romanian public sphere. *Critical Discourse Studies, 14*(3), 256–275.

Beciu, C., Ciocea, M., Mădroane, D. I., & Cârlan, A. I. (Eds.). (2018). *Debating migration as a public problem: National publics and transnational fields*. Peter Lang.

Berkowitz, L., & Mügge, L. M. (2014). Transnational Diaspora Lobbying: Europeanization and the Kurdish Question. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 35(1),* 74–90. https://doi.or g/10.1080/07256868.2013.864625

Bleiker, R. & Hutchison, E. (2014). Forum: Emotions and world politics. *International Theory* ٥٩٤–٤٩٠ :(٣) ٦.

Boccagni, P (2010). Private, public or both? On the scope and impact of transnationalism in immigrants' everyday lives. In Bauböck, R and Faist, T (eds.) *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods* (IMISCOE Research) (pp. 295-323). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Boccagni, P.& Baldassar, L. (2015). Emotions on the move: Mapping the emergent field of emotion and migration. *Emotion, Space and Society, 16,* 73-80. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.emospa.2015.06.009

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting identities*. London: Routledge.

Bravo, V. (2014). El Salvador and Costa Rica's state-diaspora relations management. *International Journal of*

Communication, 8, 1872–1893. http://ijoc.org/index. php/ijoc/article/view/1822

Bravo, V., & De Moya, M. (2015). Communicating the homeland's relationship with its diaspora community: The cases of El Salvador and Colombia. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 10*(1), 70–104.

Bravo, V., & De Moya, M. (Eds.) (2021). *Latin American Diasporas in Public Diplomacy.* Palgrave.

Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2019). Diasporas and Public Diplomacy: Distinctions and Future Prospects. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*. *14*, 51-64. doi:10.1163/1871191X-14101015

Brubaker, R. (2005). The 'diaspora' diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(1), 1–19.

Brubaker, R. (2015). *Grounds for difference*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Candidatu, L., & Ponzanesi, S. (2022). Digital Diasporas: Staying with the Trouble. *Communication, Culture and Critique, 15*(2), 261–268. https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcac010

Charaudeau, P. (2014). Discourse strategies and the constraints of communication. In J. Angermuller, D. Maingueneau & R. Wodak (Eds.) *Discourse Studies Reader: Main Currents in Theory and Analysis* (pp. 286-296). John Benjamins.

Chernobrov, D. (2022). Diasporas as cyberwarriors: infopolitics, participatory warfare and the 2020 Karabakh

war. *International Affairs*, *98(*2), 631–651, https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiac015

Cohen, R. (2008). *Global Diasporas: an Introduction*. (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Cohen, R. (2023). *Global Diasporas: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Crawford, N. C. (2000). The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships. *International Security, 24*(4), 116–156. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539317

Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Lessons from the past. *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*. USC Center on Public Diplomacy, Los Angeles: Figueroa Press.

Cull, N. J. (2022). Diasporas and public diplomacy. From History to Policy. In L. Kennedy (Ed.). The *Routledge International Handbook of Diaspora Diplomacy* (pp. 7-18). New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

De Fina, A., & King, A. K. (2011). Language problem or language conflict? Narratives of immigrant women's experiences in the US. *Discourse Studies, 13*(2), 163–188.

De Moya, M. (2018). Protesting the homeland: Diaspora dissent public relations efforts to oppose the Dominican Republic's citizenship policies. In A. Adi (ed.) *Protest Public Relations* (pp. 106–127). Routledge.

Di Martino, L. (2021). Fear and empathy in international relations: Diplomacy, cyber engagement and Australian

foreign policy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-021-00211-9

Diminescu, D. (2008). The connected migrant: An epistemological manifesto. *Social Science Information, 47*(4), 565–579. https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018408096447

Diminescu, D., Loveluck, B. (2014). Traces of dispersion: online media and diasporic identities. Crossings. *Journal of Migration & Culture, 5*(1), pp.23-39. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjmc.5.1.23_1

Dolea, A., Ingenhoff, D. & Beju, A., (2021). Country images and identities in times of populism: Swiss media discourses on the 'stop mass immigration' initiative. *International Communication Gazette*, *83* (4), 301-325.

Dolea, A. (2018a). Public diplomacy as co-constructed discourses of engagement. In K. Johnston & M. Taylor (Eds.), *The handbook of communication engagement* (pp. 331–345). Wiley-Blackwell.

Dolea, A., (2018b). The impact of migration on the construction of Romania's country image: Two intersecting public problems. In C. Beciu, M. Ciocea, I. D. Madroane, & A. I. Cârlan (Eds.), *Debating migration as a public problem: National publics and transnational fields* (pp. 83–111). Peter Lang.

Dolea, A. (2022). Transnational diaspora diplomacy, emotions and COVID-19: the Romanian diaspora in the UK. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 18, 12–14. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-021-00243-1

Dolea, A. (2023). The invisible luggage of the displaced: emotions, trauma and public diplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 19, 242–247. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-022-00285-z

Dolea, A., & Suciu, A. (2024, April 17). Ethnicity, identity, and branding in post-communist romania. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.1332

Dufoix, S. (2018). Diaspora before it became a concept. In R. Cohen & C. Fisher (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Diaspora Studies* (pp. 13-21). Routledge.

Duncombe, C. (2019). Digital diplomacy: Emotion and identity in the public realm. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* ١٤ (١–٢), ١٠٢–١١٦. https://doi.org/1871191/10.1163X14101016-

Eurostat (2023). *Migration and asylum in Europe – 2023 edition.* https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/interactive-publications/migration-2023#migration-to-the-eu

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Faist, T. (2010). Diaspora and transnationalism: What kind of dance partners? In R. Bauböck & T. Faist (Eds.), *Diaspora and transnationalism: Concepts, theories and methods* (pp. 9–35). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Gamlen, A. (2013). Migration Studies: Taking stock of a new start. *Migration Studies, 1*(3), 253–257.

Georgiou, M. (2013) Diaspora in the digital era: minorities and media representation. *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, *12*(4), 80–99.

Georgiou, M. (2022) Digital (in-)visibilities: spatializing and visualizing politics of voice. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, *15*(2), 269–275.

Ho, E. & McConnell, F. (2017). Conceptualizing 'diaspora diplomacy' Territory and populations betwixt the domestic and foreign. *Progress in Human Geography*. 43(2), 235–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517740217

Huijgh, E. (2019). *Public Diplomacy at Home*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill | Nijhoff.

Hutchison, E., & R. Bleiker. 2014. Theorizing emotions in world politics. *International Theory* ٥١٤–٤٩١ :(٣) ٦.

Kennedy, L. (2022). (Ed.). The *Routledge International Handbook of Diaspora Diplomacy*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Koinova, M. (2013). Four Types of Diaspora Mobilization: Albanian Diaspora Activism for Kosovo Independence in the US and the UK, *Foreign Policy Analysis, 9*(4), 433–53.

Koinova, M. (2018). Sending States and Diaspora Positionality in International Relations, *International Political Sociology*, 12(2), 190–210, https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/oly008

Koschut, S., Hall, T.H., Wolf, R., Solomon, T., Hutchison, E. & Bleiker, R. (2017). Discourse and emotions in international relations. *International Studies Review* ٥٠٨–٤٨١ :١٩.

Li, H. (2012). The Chinese Diaspora and China's Public Diplomacy: Contentious Politics for the Beijing Olympic Float. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2245-2279.

Manor, I., & Adiku, G. A. (2021). From 'traitors' to 'saviours': A longitudinal analysis of Ethiopian, Kenyan and Rwandan embassies' practice of digital diaspora diplomacy. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, *28*(3), 403–427. https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2021.1948915

Mădroane, I. D. (2021). Shame, (Dis)empowerment and Resistance in Diasporic Media: Romanian Transnational Migrants' Reclassification Struggles. In I. Reifova & M. Hajek (Eds.) *Mediated Shame of Class and Poverty Across Europe*, pp. 61-83. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan/Springer.

Mădroane, I. D., Ciocea, M., & Cârlan, A. I. (2020). Diasporic media and counterpublics: Engaging anti-EU immigration stances in the UK. *Journal of Language and Politics, 19*(3): 457–478.

Nedelcu, M. (2018). Digital Diasporas. In R. Cohen, and C. Fischer (Eds.) *Handbook of Diaspora Studies*, pp. 241–250. London: Routledge.

Nedelcu, M., & Soysüren, I. (2022). Precarious migrants, migration regimes and digital technologies: the empowerment-control nexus. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 48*(8), 1821–1837.

Popkova, A. (2019). Non-state Diplomacy Challenges to Authoritarian States: The Open Russia Movement. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 14(3),* 250-271. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14401028

Popkova, A. (2022). Exploring Citizen Diplomacy's Local Impact: The Case of Global Ties Kalamazoo. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 17(2),* 248-276. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-bja10100

Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2003). The Politics of Migrants' Transnational Political Practices, *International Migration Review*, *37*(3), 760–86.

Rana, K. (2009). India's diaspora diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy 4*(3), 361–372.

Ragazzi, F. (2017), *Governing Diasporas in International Relations: The Transnational Politics of Croatia and Former Yugoslavia*. London: Routledge.

Sandu, D. (2021). La nuova diaspora romena tra qui e là [The new Romanian diaspora between here and there]. In A. Ricci, B. Coccia, M. Cajvaneanu (Eds). 2021. *Radici a metà. Trent'anni di immigrazione Romena in Italia*. pp. 118-129. Roma: IDOS.

Sigona, N., Gamlen, A., Liberatore, G., & Neveu Kringelbach, H. (Eds.) (2015). *Diasporas Reimagined: Spaces, Practices and Belonging*. Oxford: International Migration Institute.

Safran, W. (1991). Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora* 1.1: 83-9.

Sime, D., Tyrrell, N., Käkelä, E., & Moskal, M. (2022). Performing whiteness: Central and Eastern European young people's experiences of xenophobia and racialisation in the UK post-Brexit, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 48*(19): 4527-4546, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2022.2085678.

Smets, K., Leurs, K., Georgiou, M., Witteborn, S., & Gajjala, R. (2020). *The SAGE handbook of media and migration*. SAGE Publications Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526476982

Stone, D. & Douglas, D. (2018). Advance Diaspora Diplomacy in a Networked World, *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 24*(6), 710–23.

The Home Office. (2024, March 7). *EU Settlement Scheme quarterly statistics* https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/eu-settlement-scheme-quarterly-statistics-december-2023/eu-settlement-scheme-quarterly-statistics-december-2023

The Office for National Statistics (2022, November 2). *International migration, England and Wales: Census 2021* https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/bulletins/internationalmigrationenglandandwales/census2021

The Romanian Institute of Statistics (2023, May 31). *Primele rezultate definitive ale Recensământului Populaţiei şi Locuinţelor runda 2021* [First final results of the 2021 Census]. https://insse.ro/cms/ro/content/primele-rezultate-definitive-ale-recens%C4%83m%C3%A2ntului-popula%C5%A3iei-%C5%9Fi-locuin%C5%A3elor-runda-2021

The Romanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2022, October 4). *Raspunsuri la intrebari/ interpelari formulate de deputati* [Answers to questions / interpellations formulated by parliament members] https://www.cdep.ro/interpel/2022/2r6073A.pdf

Thussu, D. (2020). Populism and Public Diplomacy. In N. Snow and N. J. Cull (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, 314–322. New York: Routledge.

Trandafoiu, R. (2013). *Diaspora online: Identity politics and Romanian migrants*. Berghahn Books.

Trandafoiu, R. (2022). *The Politics of Migration and Diaspora in Eastern Europe: Media, Public Discourse and Policy*. Routledge.

Trent, D. L. (2012). American Diaspora Diplomacy: US Foreign Policy and Lebanese Americans, *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 125, The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'.

Uysal, N. (2019). The Rise of Diasporas as Adversarial Non-State Actors in Public Diplomacy: The Turkish Case. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *14*(3), 272-292. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14401030

Uslaner, E. M., & Bădescu, G. (2003). Legacies and conflicts. The challenges to social capital in the democratic transition. In G. Bădescu & E. M. Uslaner (Eds.), *Social capital and the transition to democracy* (pp. 219-232). New York: Routledge.

Wagner, I. & Wodak R. (2006). Performing success: identifying strategies of self-presentation in women's biographical narratives. *Discourse & Society, 17*(3): 385–411.

Voicu, B., Rusu, H. & Tufiș, C. D. (Eds.). (2020). *Atlasul valorilor sociale. România la 100 de ani* [Social Values Atlas.

100 years of Romania]. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Volkan, V.D. 2017. *Immigrants and refugees: Trauma, perennial mourning, and border psychology*. London: Karnac.

Volkan, V.D. 1999. Psychoanalysis and diplomacy part I: Individual and large group identity. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* ٥٥–٢٩ :١.

Weinar, A. (2010). Instrumentalising diasporas for development: International and European policy discourses. In: R. Bauböck & T. Faist (Eds). *Diaspora and Transnationalism. Concepts, Theories and Methods,* 73-89. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Wodak, R. (2015), *The Politics of Fear: What Right-wing Populist Discourses Mean*, London: SAGE.

Other Papers in the CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy Series

All papers in the CPD Perspectives series are available for free on the Center's website (**www.uscpublicdiplomacy.org**). To purchase any of the publications below in hard copy, please contact: cpd@usc.edu.

2023/4 Global American Higher Education:
          International Campuses for Competition or Cooperation?
          by Kyle A. Long

2023/3 Strategic Humor and Post-Truth Public Diplomacy
          by Dmitry Chernobrov

2023/2 An Inter-Event Comparison of Two Historic
          Global Mega Events:
          FIFA 2022 and Expo 2020
          by Matthew K. Asada

2023/1 Subnational Diplomacy in the Wake of Social Justice
          Movements:
          The Work of Black Women Elected Officials
          by Shearon Roberts

2022/4 Sport-Tech Diplomacy at the Tokyo 2020 Olympic
          Games
          by Yoav Dubinsky

2022/3 U.S. Sports Diplomacy
          by Edward Elliott

2022/2 Exploring the Semiotics of Public Diplomacy
          by Ilan Manor

2022/1 Planning for Global Engagement in Cities
          by Joel Day

2017/2 Sino-Vatican Faith Diplomacy:
        Mapping the Factors Affecting Bilateral Relations
        by Juyan Zhang

2017/1 Why the Voice of America Remains a Vital Force in the
        World
        by Geoffrey Cowan

2016/5 The Reem Island Ghost: Framing State Narratives on
        Terror
        by Vivian Walker

2016/4 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers Part 2:
        The Case of Indonesia
        by Ellen Huijgh

2016/3 Canadian Public Diplomacy and Nation-Building:
        Expo 67 and the World Festival of Arts and Entertainment
        by Kailey Hansson

2016/2 Intersections between Public Diplomacy & International
        Development: Case Studies in Converging Fields
        by James Pamment

2016/1 The Public Diplomacy of Emerging Powers, Part 1:
        The Case of Turkey
        by Ellen Huijgh and Jordan Warlick

2015/7 Public Diplomacy in Global Health: An Annotated
        Bibliography
        by Tara Ornstein

2015/6 Democratization through Public Diplomacy: An Analysis
        of the European Parliament's Reaction to the Arab Spring
        by Michael Reinprecht & Henrietta Levin

2015/5 Centers of Gravity in Public Diplomacy:
        A Case Study of U.S. Efforts in South Africa
        by Amelia Arsenault

2013/2 Cases in Water Diplomacy
        Edited by Naomi Leight

2013/1 Considering the "Illogical Patchwork": The Broadcasting
        Board of Governors and U.S. International Broadcasting
        by Emily T. Metzgar

2012/10 Engaging India: Public Diplomacy and Indo
         American Relations to 1957
         by Sarah Ellen Graham

2012/9 Silicon Valley's Foreign Policy
        by Ernest J. Wilson III

2012/8 Buddhist Diplomacy: History and Status Quo
        by Juyan Zhang

2012/7 Public Diplomacy and Conflict Resolution:
        Russia, Georgia and the EU in Abkhazia and South
        Ossestia
        by Iskra Kirova

2012/6 Practicing Successful Twitter Public Diplomacy:
        A Model and Case Study of U.S. Efforts in Venezuela
        by Erika A. Yepsen

2012/5 Media Diplomacy and U.S.-China Military-to-Military
        Cooperation
        by Thomas A. Hollihan and Zhan Zhang

2012/4 The Cultural Awakening in Public Diplomacy
        by R.S. Zaharna

2012/3 Promoting Japan: One JET at a Time
        by Emily T. Metzgar

2012/2 Experiencing Nation Brands: A Comparative Analysis of
        Eight National Pavilions at Expo Shanghai in 2010
        by Jian Wang and Shaojing Sun

CPD | USC Center on Public Diplomacy
at the Annenberg School