

Public Diplomacy in the Service of the National Interest – Australia’s “Stopping the Boats” Campaign

Karina Paulina Marczuk

University of Warsaw

The paper concerns the application of public diplomacy measures to preserve border security of Australia, which nowadays is the key interest of this state. First, the meaning of public diplomacy in Australia is analysed, and next, the notion of border security of Australia – in a broader context of its national, homeland and internal security – is elaborated upon. The main argument is that in the case of Australia public diplomacy is inseparably linked with its security and it is used as one of the means of preserving Australia’s territorial integrity. Border security is therefore an essential national interest of the state and public diplomacy would be applied as a tool to ensure it. The key research questions posed in this article concern the nature of public diplomacy and border security of Australia, the relationship between the two notions in the case of Australia, and the ways in which public diplomacy can be used to pursue border security goals. The analysed period covers the years 2006–2015. First, in 2006 and 2007 there emerged a public debate on the further directions of Australian overseas activities, provoked by the 2006 Australian Senate inquiry on the nature and ways of conducting Australia’s public diplomacy. Second, in 2013–2015 border security and migration policy became hot topics for Australian politicians due to the rapidly increasing number of unauthorised arrivals on boats as well as institutional changes in the service responsible for border security. Between 2006 and 2015 Australian federal authorities adopted the most crucial documents both on public diplomacy and national security (which is linked with border security issues), and during this period Australia carried out the “Stopping the Boats” campaign focused on eliminating unauthorised arrivals to its territory by boat.

Keywords: Australia, border security, national interest, public diplomacy, unauthorised arrivals

In 2009 Naren Chitty, an Australian scholar and government expert who has conducted research on Australian soft power and public diplomacy, openly criticised the latter, claiming that it is a *terra nullius*, i.e. there are neither obvious legal and strategic tools nor recognisable stakeholders acting in the field of Australian public

diplomacy; moreover, there is almost no academic research on this issue.¹ Professor Chitty's words have become an inherent part of the political debate that resulted in passing, in 2007, of a couple of documents focused on enhancing the development of Australia's public diplomacy measures. A crucial step was in fact the adoption of the Public Diplomacy Strategy 2014–2016 by the government of Australia, the first document of this kind that concerned the means of increasing Australia's influence overseas, especially in the Indo-Pacific region. In this regard, one should bear in mind that the authors of the Strategy had paid attention to international security, stressing the regional (and beyond) influence of Australia (middle power public diplomacy). What might be surprising is the lack of direct reference to internal or domestic security – in particular border security issues – in the document.

The topic of the paper concerns the application of public diplomacy measures to preserve border security of Australia, which nowadays is the key interest of this state. For the purpose of the research, the author has first analysed the meaning of public diplomacy, as it is understood in Australia, and then elaborated upon the notion of border security of Australia – in a broader context of its national, homeland and internal security. The main argument is that in the case of Australia public diplomacy is inseparably linked with its security and it is used as one of the means of preserving Australia's territorial integrity. Border security is therefore the essential, national interest of the state and public diplomacy would be applied as a tool to ensure it. The key research questions concern the nature of public diplomacy and border security of Australia, the relationship between these two notions in the case of Australia, and the ways in which public diplomacy can be used to pursue border security goals. The author has mainly used primary sources, i.e. political documents, which are not well known to Polish readers. Secondary resources devoted to Australia's public diplomacy and its border security, of which there are few, were mentioned only where it was necessary.

There are two main reasons why the analysed period covers the years 2006–2015. First, in 2006 and 2007 there emerged a public debate on the further directions of Australian overseas activities, provoked by the 2006 Australian Senate inquiry on the nature and conduct of public diplomacy of Australia submitted to the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade. The outcome of the debate was the passing of the Australia's Public Diplomacy Strategy for years 2014–2016. Second, in 2013–2015 border security and migration policy became hot topics for Australian politicians due to the rapidly increasing number of unauthorised arrivals to Australia on boats as well as institutional changes in the service responsible for border security. Between 2006 and 2015 Australian federal authorities adopted the most crucial documents both on public diplomacy and national security (which is linked with border security issues). Moreover, during this period Australia carried out the "Stopping the Boats" campaign focused on eliminating unauthorised arrivals to its territory by boat.

¹ See: N. Chitty, 'Australian Public Diplomacy', in N. Snow, P.M. Taylor (eds), *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, New York: Routledge, 2009, pp. 314–322.

Public diplomacy as understood by Australia

The notion of public diplomacy has been well researched in academic literature, both Polish and foreign, and numerous definitions exist.² Most scholars have underlined the significance of the distinction between public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy – unlike public diplomacy, the latter one is focused on using the foreign policy measures applied by the political leaders in order to advance state aims. Public diplomacy, by contrast, is aimed at influencing foreign audiences, both authorities and public opinion (so-called ‘people-to-people’ – P2P diplomacy), in order to create a positive image of the country (nation branding) and to win over the foreign public. This is why public diplomacy uses less formal means than traditional diplomacy, complementing it and focusing on realising state goals by such means of influence as: culture (cultural diplomacy), science (science diplomacy), sport (sport diplomacy), food (gastrodiplomacy), gender equality (feminist diplomacy), climate protection (climate diplomacy), and many others.

With regard to academic literature on the understanding of public diplomacy in Australia, one should keep in mind that this topic is covered by a relatively small group of Australian scholars. One of the leading researchers of Australian public diplomacy, the above-mentioned Naren Chitty, defined this issue as follows: ‘[...] public diplomacy, from a government’s point of view, is about engaging with important publics, external or domestic, in order to develop positive responses to foreign policy initiatives of the government with a view to effective implementation of foreign policy’.³ Therefore, it is safe to say that from the perspective of Australia’s government public diplomacy is about advancing Australia’s national interests abroad. In Chitty’s opinion, especially the context of the execution of public diplomacy has been changing nowadays – apart from states, also mass media (and other actors, such as transnational corporations, NGO’s, etc.) have an impact on shaping the image of a country overseas through modern means of communication (i.e. electronic). He has therefore aptly pointed out: ‘In my view public diplomacy should not merely be a therapeutic response by government to an overseas public’s adverse reaction to foreign policy or a government’s response

² See for instance: B. Ociepka, ‘Wstęp’, in B. Ociepka (ed.), *Historia w dyplomacji publicznej*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, 2015, pp. 7–15; B. Ociepka, ‘Dyplomacja publiczna jako forma komunikowania międzynarodowego’, in B. Ociepka (ed.), *Dyplomacja publiczna*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2008, pp. 11–35; B. Surmacz, *Ewolucja współczesnej dyplomacji: aktorzy, struktury, funkcje*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2015, pp. 222–242; J. Melissen, *The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice*, in J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. 3–27; B. Hocking, *Rethinking the ‘new’ public diplomacy*, in J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy...*, op. cit., pp. 28–43.

³ N. Chitty, Submission to the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Committee Inquiry into the nature and conduct of Australia’s public diplomacy, *Public Diplomacy: Developing Road Rules*, 7 February 2007, p. 3, http://www.aph.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/committee/fadt_ctte/completed_inquiries/2004_07/public_diplomacy/submissions/sub15_pdf.ashx (accessed on 3.01.2017).

to negative portrayal of a nation state overseas. Ideally it should include the growing of foreign policy in a nursery of mutual understanding [...]'.⁴

Australia's government is well aware of the importance of developing public diplomacy nowadays. This claim is confirmed by a variety of documents which have been adopted by Australian authorities since 2006/2007, the years that marked the emergence of public debate on the further directions of Australia's activity overseas. The debate had been prompted by the 2006 Australian Senate inquiry on the nature and conduct of public diplomacy of Australia submitted to the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade. Subsequently, a series of documents was issued by the Senate Committee where the problem of conducting public diplomacy was analysed in details.

In general, the understanding of public diplomacy in Australia comes down to '[...] influencing other countries in order to protect and promote national interests'.⁵ Lachlan Strahan, Assistant Secretary at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade at the Australian Government (i.e. a counterpart of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) defined Australia's public diplomacy as follows: 'We see public diplomacy primarily as a means for communicating with the populations of other countries, influencing opinion overseas and shaping our national image overseas. [...] Primarily for us – and this goes for foreign ministries the world over – public diplomacy is about reaching out to the populations and decision-makers of other countries and shaping their opinions and shaping their image of us'.⁶ Similarly, in 2007 the Australian Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade adopted a definition of public diplomacy which – in its view – is the most relevant for Australia. According to the Senate Committee, '[...] public diplomacy is work or activities undertaken to understand, inform and engage individuals and organisations in other countries in order to shape their perceptions in ways that will promote Australia and Australia's policy goals internationally'.⁷ This definition was recognised as the key one and the point of reference in talking about the Australian public diplomacy.⁸ Moreover, in order

⁴ N. Chitty, 'Australian Public Diplomacy...', op. cit., p. 315.

⁵ The Senate, Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Australia's Public Diplomacy: Building Our Image*, Canberra 2007, p. 10, http://www.apf.gov.au/~media/wopapub/senate/committee/fadt_ctte/completed_inquiries/2004_07/public_diplomacy/report/report_pdf.ashx (accessed on 3.01.2017).

⁶ The Senate, Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, Official Committee Hansard, *Reference: Nature and conduct of Australia's public diplomacy*, Canberra, 14.03.2007, p. 4, http://parlinfo.apf.gov.au/parlInfo/download/committees/commsen/10035/toc_pdf/5313-3.pdf;fileType=application%2Fpdf#search=%22committees/commsen/10035/0006%22 (accessed on 3.01.2017).

⁷ The Senate, Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Australia's Public Diplomacy...*, op. cit., p. 12.

⁸ Caitlin Byrne has noticed that the definition given by the Committee in 2007 refers to another one, of 1990, by the then Foreign Minister Gareth Evans, according to whom public diplomacy in Australia 'is the shaping of attitudes in other countries in a way which is favourable to our national interests' – cited in: C. Byrne, *Public Diplomacy in an Australian Context: A Policy-Based Framework to Enhance Understanding and Practice*, PhD thesis, Sydney: Bond University, 2009, p. 126.

to define public diplomacy in this way, the U.S., the United Kingdom and Canada's definitions of public diplomacy had to be analysed first.

The further outcome of all the deliberations on public diplomacy of Australia is supposed to be the adoption of the Public Diplomacy Strategy for years 2014–2016. Although the document contains no direct definition of public diplomacy and is much rather focused on the Australian public diplomacy aims and objectives, it defines this notion in an indirect way. Namely, its authors have outlined the need to engage public opinion in order to '[...] facilitate networks, collaboration and connections between people and institutions to build understanding, trust and influence in advancing our national interests'.⁹ Hence, the notion of advancing national interests overseas has again been underlined and the multi-faceted nature of public diplomacy has been pointed out.

Border security as an essential national interest of Australia

The main way of conducting public diplomacy is, among others, communicating essential interests of the state to foreign audiences. These interests encompass, *inter alia*, ensuring (national) security. Therefore, it is necessary to explain what such a claim might mean in the case of Australia.

With regard to Australia's geopolitical situation (a separate continent which is a state with a long maritime border), one should note the terms which have often been used in official government documents in Australia, namely 'national security', and – recently – 'homeland security'. The latter one – referring to domestic security – is particularly linked with international terrorism, which has been threatening Australia, as well as the state's counter operations in this field. Anthony Bergin has defined homeland security of Australia as covering '[...] the actions that governments [i.e. authorities of Australian states], businesses, individuals and other organisations take to manage ongoing threats to public safety, including natural disasters and terrorism. Homeland security is thus nested within the overall national security jigsaw puzzle, but it is not the same as national security'.¹⁰ This definition does not include, however, border protection issues, which are linked with Australian migration policy.

On the other hand, another term – internal security – besides counterterrorism activities refer to some extent to protecting Australia's borders and migration policy.¹¹ However, taking into consideration the fact that both above-mentioned notions are used mainly in terms of Australia's counterterrorism activities, for the purpose of the research conducted in this paper, the notion of 'border security' seems to be the most

⁹ Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, *Public Diplomacy Strategy for years 2014–2016*, Canberra: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2016, p. 4.

¹⁰ A. Bergin, 'A Safer Australia: Meeting the Challenges of Homeland Security', *ASPI Policy Analysis*, 2009, No. 36, p. 1.

¹¹ See: B. Vaughn, 'Australia: America's Closest Ally', in W. M. Carpenter, D. G. Wiencek (eds), *Asian Security Handbook: Terrorism and the New Security Environment*, Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2005.

relevant since it comes down to preserving Australia's border integrity, one of the pillars of national security of Australia.

What might be surprising in the case of this country is that there was no strategic document on national security until 2013. Before passing such a document, in 2008 the government of Australia adopted the First National Security Statement where the then Prime Minister Kevin Rudd briefly defined the national security concept of Australia: 'What is meant by national security? Freedom from attack or the threat of attack; *the maintenance of our territorial integrity*; the maintenance of our political sovereignty; the preservation of our hard won freedoms; and the maintenance of our fundamental capacity to advance economic prosperity for all Australians'.¹² Rudd not only underlined the necessity of preserving the territorial integrity of Australia, but also – referring to the national security interests – mentioned in the first place 'maintaining Australia's territorial and border integrity'.¹³ Next, he pointed out the need to ensure border security to Australia by eliminating illegal people smuggling operations ('unauthorised arrival of people by boat to Australia') and further advancement of the border management system. To achieve this aim he announced a re-arrangement of the then Australian Customs and Border Protection Service which eventually, on 1 July 2015, was incorporated into the Department of Immigration and Border Protection, at the time when also the Australian Border Force was established. The lessons learned on Australia's border protection issues presented by Rudd were supported by the previous outcomes of the Homeland and Border Security Review (the so-called Smith Review) of February 2008 which was devoted to '[...] the roles, responsibilities and functions of departments and agencies involved in homeland and border security'.¹⁴

An important step that followed the 2008 National Security Statement arrangements was the adoption of the first strategic document on Australia's national security titled *Strong and Secure: A Strategy for Australia's National Security* (passed by the government of Julia Gillard in 2013). Among variety of provisions concerning national security, the authors of the document emphasised the need for 'preserving Australia's border integrity' (one of the pillars of Australia's national security). Although the notion of border security is not explained in this document, its authors have claimed

¹² K. Rudd, *The First National Security Statement to the Australian Parliament*, Address by the Prime Minister of Australia The Hon. Kevin Rudd MP, Canberra, 4 December 2008 (emphasis added), <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=Id%3A%22chamber%2Fhansard%2F2008-12-04%2F0045%22> (accessed on 4.01.2017). The legal definition of Australia's national security is set forth in the National Security Information (Criminal and Civil Proceedings) Act 2004: 'national security means Australia's defence, security, international relations or law enforcement interests' – The National Security Information (Criminal and Civil Proceedings) Act 2004, Part 2, 2004, No. 150, <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2016C01137> (accessed on 4.01.2017).

¹³ K. Rudd, op. cit.

¹⁴ The complete Smith Review had not been released; Prime Minister, *Homeland and Border Security Review*, Media Release, 22 February 2008, [http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=\(Id:media/pressrel/yiqp6\);rec=0;](http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;query=(Id:media/pressrel/yiqp6);rec=0;) (accessed on 4.01.2017).

that it is one of the elements necessary to advance the national security of the entire state. It means that border security is understood as a crucial component of a broader category, which is national security.¹⁵ That is why the adoption of border security strategy was announced, which would cover this crucial branch of Australia's national security, that is border security.

Another significant signal that has proved the importance of border security in the general security policy of Australia was the national security statement of the then Prime Minister Tony Abbott delivered in 2015. Although the statement was devoted mainly to the threat of terrorism to Australia and the need to face it, Abbott mentioned, *inter alia*, '[...] our counter terrorism efforts that worked so well in Operation Sovereign Borders and Operation Bring Them Home'.¹⁶ so the leading operations led by the Australian Defence Forces focused on eliminating unauthorised arrivals to the Australian territory by boat. What is more, he announced '[...] new measures to strengthen immigration laws, as well as new options for dealing with Australian citizens who are involved in terrorism'.¹⁷ His words marked the increasing significance of border security to the national security of Australia.

In 2015 the Department of Immigration and Border Protection adopted *Strategy 2020*, a document that finalised the above-mentioned process of re-building border security service in Australia. On 1 July 2015 the former Australian Customs and Border Protection Service was amalgamated with the Department of Immigration and Border Protection and around the same time the Australian Border Force was created. In order to execute these changes, it was necessary first of all to re-define the concept of border security to make it relevant for Australia. John Coyne, the author of the report titled *Securing the Australian Frontier: An Agenda for Border Security Policy* perceives border security of Australia as a broad category that encompasses many activities such as '[...] facilitation, revenue collection, regulation and control – all related to the seamless movement of people and goods across borders'¹⁸ and constantly remains a national security priority. In order to preserve Australia's territorial integrity a variety of actions has to be undertaken and, among them, external activities aimed at informing foreign citizens on the possibilities of immigrating to Australia. *Strategy 2020* refers to the three key functions of the state, one of which is conducting international relations, including public diplomacy. Furthermore, to advance this goal, one of the tasks of the

¹⁵ See: Australian Government, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, *Strong and Secure: A Strategy for Australia's National Security*, Canberra 2013, p. 5, http://apo.org.au/sites/all/modules/pubdnt/pubdnt.php?nid=33996&file=http://apo.org.au/files/Resource/dpmc_nationalsecuritystrategy_jan2013.pdf (accessed on 4.01.2017).

¹⁶ 'Prime Minister Tony Abbott's full national security statement', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 23 February 2015, <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/prime-minister-tony-abbotts-full-national-security-statement-20150223-13m2xu.html> (accessed on 4.01.2017).

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁸ J. Coyne, 'Securing the Australian Frontier: An Agenda for Border Security Policy', *ASPI Special Report*, 2015, p. 10.

Department of Immigration and Border Protection and the Australian Border Force is to ‘work ahead of, at and after the border’, ‘effectively securing our borders through a programme of *prevention, deterrence and enforcement*’.¹⁹ These three keywords, i.e. prevention, deterrence and enforcement, describe the contemporary Australian policy of dealing with unauthorised arrivals to the Australian territory. Public diplomacy measures would therefore seem to be suitable solutions to prevent and deter from such illegal actions.

The “Stopping the Boats” campaign – an example of border security public diplomacy

For a couple of years Australia has been facing massive immigration, and numerous arrivals were not authorised, by boat. Because Australia is a state with colonial origins, it is still in the process of developing its migration policy and it remains open to new immigrants. On the other hand, the government has undertaken activities aimed at restricting unauthorised arrivals by adopting solutions that have been considered debated by the international community, such as establishing offshore processing facilities on Nauru and Manus Island for unauthorised immigrants.²⁰

The so-called 2001 Pacific Solution programme, implemented by the government of Prime Minister John Howard, was aimed at transferring of unauthorised immigrants from the Australian territory to offshore centres established on Nauru and Manus Island (Australia signed an Administrative Agreement with Nauru in 2001). Although in 2008 the government of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd dismantled the Pacific Solution, in 2012 it was recommended to re-establish the offshore processing facilities since the number of unauthorised boats arriving to Australia had been rapidly increasing.²¹ It is safe to say that Australia’s goal was to prevent and deter potential unauthorised immigrants from arriving to Australia and to advance this aim the government used a variety of means, not only legal and operational – it also run a social campaign focusing on deterring those who may plan to arrive to Australia illegally by boat.

In 2013, the then Prime Minister Kevin Rudd confirmed the above-mentioned claim by issuing the following warning: ‘As of today, asylum seekers who come here

¹⁹ Australian Government, Department of Immigration and Border Protection, *Strategy 2020*, Canberra 2015, pp. 12–13 (emphasis added), <https://www.border.gov.au/CorporateInformation/Documents/strategy-2020.pdf> (accessed on 5.01.2017).

²⁰ The author analysed the issue of Australia’s migration policy in another paper – see: K. P. Marczuk, ‘Australia’s history and background of migration and refugee policies – Lessons for the EU and its Member States?’, *Yearbook of Polish European Studies*, 2016, No. 19 (soon to be published).

²¹ See: J. Phillips, *The ‘Pacific Solution’ Revisited: A Statistical Guide to the Asylum Seeker Caseloads on Nauru and Manus Island*, Parliament of Australia, 4 September 2012, http://www.aph.gov.au/about_parliament/parliamentary_departments/parliamentary_library/pubs/bn/2012-2013/pacificsolution#_ftnref2 (accessed on 8.12.2016).

by boat without a visa will never be settled in Australia'.²² This, among others, led to the flagship social campaign of 2014 aimed at deterring people coming to Australia illegally by boat. Its famous slogan reads: "No way – you will not make Australia home". One of the best-known elements of the campaign is a short video where the current Chief of Army, Lieutenant General Angus Campbell, presented against the background of the campaign's poster featuring a turbulent sea, informs all potential immigrants that they will not be given entry into the country if they come there by boat without a visa.²³

Another example of a variety of mass media actions that the government undertook in 2013 was launching a graphic campaign, namely issuing a cartoon story aimed at discouraging asylum seekers by presenting dangers that they could be exposed to. In particular, the cartoon story showed an Afghan man being attacked by mosquitoes in a detention camp maintained by Australia. Moreover, the campaign's authors took care to prepare the cartoon in Dari and Pashto languages.²⁴

Furthermore, in 2013 the Australian government launched the military-led border security Operation Sovereign Borders (OSB), which involves the military controlling asylum operations. According to the official Internet website of the Australian government devoted to the OSB, 'Australia remains committed to ending the criminal activity of people smuggling. Anyone who tries to come to Australia by boat without a visa will be turned back to their country of departure'.²⁵ The OSB website was translated into majority of the languages of the Asia-Pacific region and the information for people who might be interested in travelling to Australia illegally by boat is very simple and straightforward, e.g.: 'It will not be available to anyone who attempts to arrive in Australia in the future. Australia will continue to turn back boats to the country of their departure'.²⁶ This communication is supported by an animated film titled *No change to Australia's boat turn back policy* while the title of another announces *Australia's borders stronger than ever* and alerts *You will be turned back*. In addition, two factsheets for unauthorised asylum seekers were prepared – the message is very obvious: nobody would be accepted to the Australian territory if they do not have a visa.

²² Cited in: *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 July 2013, <http://www.smh.com.au/national/rudd-slams-door-on-refugees-20130719-2qa5b.html> (accessed on 8.12.2016).

²³ See: S. Whyte, 'New Asylum Seeker Campaign "Distasteful" and "Embarrassing"', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 February 2014, <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/new-asylum-seeker-campaign-distasteful-and-embarrassing-20140212-32h04.html> (accessed on 4.12.2016).

²⁴ See: *ibidem*.

²⁵ Australian Government, *Operation Sovereign Borders*, <http://www.osb.border.gov.au/> (accessed on 5.01.2017).

²⁶ Australian Government, *Operation Sovereign Borders: Outside Australia?*, <http://www.osb.border.gov.au/en/Outside-Australia> (accessed on 5.12.2016).

Conclusions

Naren Chitty's paper on Australian public diplomacy, which was mentioned above, contains a set of stakeholders who are involved in the activities related to Australian public diplomacy. It fails to list, however, the Department of Immigration and Border Protection, the main body responsible for preserving Australia's border security, maybe because Professor Chitty's paper was published in 2009, that is before the border security service reform. The social campaign "Stopping the Boats" seems to prove that migration bodies should be taken into consideration as Australian public diplomacy stakeholders.

The research conducted for the purpose of this paper has led to the following conclusions.

First, the notion of public diplomacy of Australia was defined in official documents adopted in 2007 (The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade report *Nature and Conduct of Australia's Public Diplomacy*) and developed beyond (Public Diplomacy Strategy for years 2014–2016). What is significant, public diplomacy is understood as a way of acting in order to influence foreign audiences to advance Australia's national interests overseas. One of the key national interests of Australia is nowadays the preservation of its border security.

Second, today the nature of border security of Australia comes down to such activities as prevention, deterrence (*sic!*) and enforcement for maintaining Australia's territorial integrity. In particular, it is aimed at dealing with unauthorised arrivals to the Australian territory.

Third, with regard to the relationship between public diplomacy and border security, one should note that public diplomacy measures seem to be relevant solutions to prevent and deter from illegal actions. This conclusion is confirmed by the study of social-media actions undertaken in the framework of the OSB in order to discourage potential unauthorised arrivals. The OSB campaign is also an example of using public diplomacy to pursue border security goals.

The above lessons allow us to state that the main argument – that the Australian public diplomacy is inseparably connected with state security and is used as one of the means of preserving Australia's territorial integrity – has been confirmed. Border security is one of the essential national interests of Australia and public diplomacy is applied as a tool to ensure that it serves this national interest.