

MUNICIPAL SOCIAL POLICY AND PUBLICS:

REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

"An 'Organic Model' of Public Relations:

The Role of Public Relations for Governments, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)

and Corporations in Developing and Guiding Social and Cultural Policy

To Build and Maintain Community in 21st-Century Civil Society"

By

Dr. Dean Kruckeberg, APR, Fellow PRSA

Professor of Public Relations

Department of Communication Studies

351 Lang Hall

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614-0139 U.S.A.

Ph.: (319) 273-2501 (voice mail)

FAX: (319) 273-7356

Home Ph.: (319) 266-5842 (voice mail)

E-Mail: kruckeberg@uni.edu

Web: <http://www.uni.edu/~kruckebe>

Presented in the International Conference:

Municipal Social Policy and Publics: Realities and Perspectives

Ulan-Ude City

Buryatia (Autonomous Republic)

Russia

30 June through 1 July 2006

Sponsored

By the Ulan-Ude City Government

**"An 'Organic Model' of Public Relations:
The Role of Public Relations for Governments, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)
and Corporations in Developing and Guiding Social and Cultural Policy
To Build and Maintain Community in 21st-Century Civil Society"**

ABSTRACT

Democratic societies having capitalist economic systems can and will exist in the 21st Century only through the support of—and directly resulting from—the cooperative community-building efforts of governments (particularly municipal governments), civil society organizations (“CSOs,” formerly known as “NGOs,” i.e., nongovernmental organizations) and corporations that provide, not only goods and services, but also employment, a tax base and an array of other social benefits that are essential to a well-functioning and healthy society. Metaphorically, these are the minimally requisite three legs of a stool, each of which must bear its share of the weight of that stool, i.e., society, or else the burden of the stool (society and its members) will collapse. However, none of the stool’s three legs can bear its share of this burden only through its sole attachment to the stool’s seat; rather, the burden that each leg of the stool must support, i.e., its share of the weight of a well-functioning and healthy society, also requires cross-braces that connect each of these legs to one another. The overall strength and stability of the stool, therefore, comes, not only from each leg’s independent support of the stool, but additionally from the increased strength that each leg can provide by being supported by the other legs in their common mission of providing a strong and stable foundation to support the stool’s burden, i.e., society. By being linked to one another, and with each leg supporting the others, each leg’s strength is greater than if it were supporting its share of the stool’s burden alone, and the legs collectively can provide a stronger foundation to support society than could the sum of the strength of these legs individually.

The needed creation, restoration and maintenance of these linkages to support society are the responsibility of public relations in its philosophical, ideological and strategic sense. This model of public relations that emphasizes community-building is an “organic model” of public relations that is of particular value in social/economic/political systems that have undergone rapid transformation to a more individualistic social system, to a more capitalist economic system and to a more democratic political system. Philosophically and ideologically, this model must theoretically ground the policies of organizations, whether they are governments, CSOs or corporations. The primary responsibility for practicing this model—philosophically, ideologically, strategically, tactically and technically—rests with the staff of the public relations unit, whose practitioners must possess the requisite professional knowledge as well as a professional ideology that has clear and articulate values that are defined by morally defensible ethics—all of which must be predicated on a well-grounded theory of society. Only then can public relations practitioners help to create, restore and maintain a communicative cultural environment that can assure a well-functioning and healthy society through the development and guidance of social and cultural policy that is designed to build and maintain community in 21st-Century democratic and capitalist societies.

Kruckeberg/2-2-2

This paper provides a theoretical argument for such an “organic model” of public relations in 21st-Century newly democratic and capitalist societies, a model that is predicated on public relations professional ideology, values and ethics that are grounded in a theory of society. The paper also makes specific recommendations for the implementation of such a model that can help to develop and guide social and cultural policy to build local, national, regional and global communities that allow and encourage peace, harmony and prosperity for all global citizens. These societal benefits can be accomplished through such social values as collective and individual human rights, equal justice for all, universal compassion to and from all members of society and an egalitarian concern for the welfare of each member of society (including women, children and animals) as well as respect for and care of the physical environment.

The model gives special emphasis to the humane protection of the weak and powerless as well as to the preservation of the physical environment—in part through openness and transparency of all social institutions and through the mutual support that these social institutions must provide to one another in their common goal of serving society, which unquestionably is their primary stakeholder.

**"An 'Organic Model' of Public Relations:
The Role of Public Relations for Governments, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)
and Corporations in Developing and Guiding Social and Cultural Policy
To Build and Maintain Community in 21st-Century Civil Society"**

INTRODUCTION

Some would argue that the 20th Century was among the most horrific 100 years in the history of the world! Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) observe that, while the past century may have given birth to the most extraordinary achievements of all time, those years were also among the most cataclysmically dysfunctional and the most bloody for significant populations of the world. While acknowledging that much that had occurred in the 1900s was beneficial to humankind, the authors nevertheless warn that society must do far better in the Third Millennium for the human species and its physical environment even to survive.

Indeed, if nostalgia exists for the 20th Century, it is because the resolution to even the most complex societal problems of the past century seemed far simpler than those challenges that are facing global society today. Kruckeberg (1995-96, Winter) predicted that Cold War dichotomies, such as democracy vs. communism and capitalism vs. socialism, would be considered passé compared to new 21st Century challenges to the most fundamental ideological worldviews, values and beliefs of organizations and their indigenous communities throughout the world. Incontestably, the world has become a McLuhanesque "global village" in which values and beliefs of peoples throughout the world are ideologically confronting one another (Kruckeberg & Tsetsura, 2004). Starck and Kruckeberg (2003) point to the global challenges that have been created by the complex ideas and events of the 21st Century, e.g., free trade, the global emergence of fledgling democracies, the ever-increasing power of transnational corporations, a growing public distrust, the rapidly changing media environment, including new media, and corporate mega-mergers—all occurring within a global context. Kruckeberg (2000, Fall) pondered the implications of the continuing juxtaposition of power between nation-states and corporations. Kruckeberg, Starck and Vujnovic (2006) pointed to the dynamics of a 21st Century society in which consumerism has become inextricably linked to people's lives, for good or for bad. Kruckeberg and Tsetsura (2004) observed that the 21st Century already has experienced an extraordinary amount of tension and conflict between modernity and traditionalism, between pluralism and monism and between nationalism and tribalism—whether this tribalism is in its old familiar form or in its new corporate forms. Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) have concluded:

Although the Cold War may have been effectively won, the categorizations of the First, Second, and Third World may not yet be obsolete. However, with the effective removal of Marxist ideologies throughout much of the world, problems between the First World and the Third World may in fact have been clarified. (p. 285)

Kruckeberg/4-4-4

Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) say that among the basic questions that must be addressed and adequately resolved for the 21st Century are:

What does it mean to be human and to be part of humankind in postmodern global society? What moral fields must be developed or modified to ensure this humanity, this humanness? What ethos—that is, moral and spiritual character—must be developed or modified in global society to nurture this humanness? After late 20th-century victories of democracies and capitalism in former Eastern Bloc countries, what new forms of democracy and capitalism can or must be developed, not only regionally, but also within a global ethos? (p. 280)

Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) frame these questions in a contemporary world context that includes a perhaps irreversibly damaged physical environment; continuing growth of the world's population, which is exacerbated by increasing demographic imbalances between rich and poor countries, together with rampant global poverty and hunger as well as continual warfare throughout much of the world; fundamental changes in the relationships among governments, corporations and private citizens; tensions between nationalism vs. globalism and between the past vs. the future, i.e., between traditional and modern societies—particularly when traditional societies are being faced with overwhelming pressures to rapidly modernize; continuing social conflicts due to the stratification of social/economic classes; and rapid advances in technology, together with fundamental concerns about the control of this technology.

The authors conclude:

All of the world's resources, and its people's best minds, must give priority to threats to the environment, to responsible management of the world's population, and to the elimination of poverty, hunger, and war. (p.281)

THE GLOBAL IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY

Kruckeberg and Tsetsura (2004) consider communication technology to be the most influential and powerful intervening variable that simultaneously permits and encourages a global society through the compression of time and space, while paradoxically exacerbating social conflicts that are caused by the resulting multiculturalism of these globalizing forces—both in the world at large and in its regions, nations and localities. Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) further warn that the interaction of these three variables, i.e., technology, globalism and its converse, multiculturalism, will create dynamic tensions in the future that will need examination and resolution.

Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) identify what they call ironic paradoxes in the escalating development of these three phenomena, noting that, through communication/transportation technology, new communities can and are being formed, but anomie and societal fragmentation nevertheless exist, perhaps as never before, and social relationships are being rapidly changed in ways that are not fully understood.

Kruckeberg/5-5-5

In addition, note the authors, new values have not evolved to replace traditional paradigms that are being discredited, and even educational goals remain uncertain because of confusion regarding what knowledge and skills students will need to live in a future world that is impossible to predict and thus is difficult for which to prepare.

TECHNOLOGY'S IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRACY

Without question, communication technology will facilitate new democracies. However, Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) note an irony in communication technology's contribution to democracy-building, questioning the assumption that the well-being of democracy is assured because of the unprecedented opportunities that communication technology provides for self-government. They predict that, despite past Cold War victories, democracy and democratic principles will be challenged as never before—observing that overt ideological confrontations of the past have been replaced by more nebulous—but potentially more insidious—technological and economic challenges.

... (A)lthough democracy has proven to be ideologically victorious, ironically, democracy will become increasingly threatened by one outcome of its cold war victory—increased power and influence of global transnational corporations that can challenge the power of nation-states including those that are democratically governed. Such corporations also become the primary beneficiaries of communication/transportation technology.... (p. 53)

Kruckeberg (2000), however, recognizes that the world's peoples have reached a point of no return in accepting both globalism and technology, acknowledging:

Castigating globalism and modern communication technology and seeking regress to a pastoral and isolationist existence can be likened to a Canutian attempt to hold back the tides. There can be no return to a preglobal and pretechnological society, nor is there a desire to do so by most people who are quick to embrace the advantages of contemporary life—despite its accompanying social problems and troubling issues of power differentials. (pp. 152-153)

21ST-CENTURY CHALLENGES TO FLEDGLING DEMOCRACIES AND NEW CAPITALIST ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

The final decade of the 20th Century and the first years of this century have been particularly trying for fledgling democracies, especially as these countries have embraced new marketplace economies, i.e., capitalism. Despite new freedoms to be savored, democratic forms of government have nevertheless seemed to some to have been grossly inefficient, highly unstable and unnervingly fragile when compared to the more autocratic governments that people may have experienced in the past. Furthermore, democracy at times has seemed to have been subject to highly undemocratic external forces and influences that might not always have been in the best interests of all citizens. And unrestrained capitalism has seemed especially brutal and merciless to many members of those societies that had previously provided a social safety net for all of its citizens.

Kruckeberg/6-6-6

Indeed, Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2007) reasonably ponder:

Can and should democracy be culturally specific, and should culturally specific capitalism be embraced in different parts of the world according to societal tradition and heritage? (p. 280)

Nevertheless, Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) express confidence and optimism and urge open-mindedness about democratic forms of government, noting:

... (W)e must not lose faith in a democratic system that espouses life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Such goals represent an ideal, and as we know, ideals are to be sought after despite never being fully realized. Next, we must recognize that the way of the United States is not necessarily the way of other nations. Each nation has its own distinctive set of historical and cultural circumstances and must discover its own path. (p. 58)

Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) are more cautious in their enthusiasm about the most raw forms of capitalism, questioning the likelihood that corporate constitutions and policies can be depended upon to preserve and safeguard human and civil rights and to embrace democracy and democratic principles. Rather, they warn:

Left unaccountable, these behemoth organizations will not likely foster tomorrow's "communities" or become transnational corporate "tribes" that will protect *all* of their stakeholders including society at large. (p. 53)

However, Starck and Kruckeberg (2001) argue that the intent should be not to dislodge capitalism, which has brought security and comfort and prosperity to millions of people, but to improve it, i.e., to make it better! Nor should corporations be pre-judged as being villainous. Rather, they maintain that corporations are neither inherently good nor evil; certainly, corporations should not be abolished, nor should a priori assumptions be made about the need for increased corporate regulations or size limitations. However, these authors submit that corporations do operate by the consent of society, to which these organizations are irrefutably answerable, and society has the right and obligation to examine the power and influence of these corporations as well as their effects on society. And any corporate threats to democracy and to society must be categorically removed!

THREE LEGS SUPPORT DEMOCRATIC AND CAPITALIST SOCIETIES

Democratic societies—particularly highly vulnerable fledgling democracies with new capitalist marketplace economies—can and will exist in the 21st Century only through the support of—and directly resulting from—the cooperative community-building efforts of governments (particularly municipal governments), civil society organizations (“CSOs,” formerly known as “NGOs,” i.e., nongovernmental organizations) and corporations that provide, not only goods and services, but also employment, a tax base and an array of other social benefits that are essential to a well-functioning and healthy society.

Metaphorically, these are the minimally requisite three legs of a stool, each of which must bear its share of the weight of that stool, i.e., society, or else the burden of the stool (society and its members) will collapse. However, none of the stool's three legs can bear its share of this burden only through its sole attachment to the stool's seat; rather, the burden that each leg of the stool must support, i.e., its share of the weight of a well-functioning and healthy society, also requires cross-braces that connect each of these legs to one another. The overall strength and stability of the stool, therefore, comes, not only from each leg's independent support of the stool, but additionally from the increased strength that each leg can provide by being supported by the other legs in their common mission of providing a strong and stable foundation to support the stool's burden, i.e., society. By being linked to one another, and with each leg supporting the others, each leg's strength is greater than if it were supporting its share of the stool's burden alone, and the legs collectively can provide a stronger foundation to support society than could the sum of the strength of these legs individually.

The needed creation, restoration and maintenance of these linkages to support society are the responsibility of public relations in its philosophical, ideological and strategic sense. This model of public relations that emphasizes community-building is an "organic model" that is of particular value in social/economic/political systems that have undergone rapid transformation to a more individualistic social system, to a more capitalist economic system and to a more democratic political system. Philosophically and ideologically, this model must theoretically ground the policies of organizations, whether they are governments, CSOs or corporations. The primary responsibility for practicing this model—philosophically, ideologically, strategically, tactically and technically—rests with the staff of the public relations unit, whose practitioners must possess the requisite professional knowledge as well as a professional ideology that has clear and articulate values that are defined by morally defensible ethics—all of which must be predicated on a well-grounded theory of society. Only then can public relations practitioners help to create, restore and maintain a communicative cultural environment that can assure a well-functioning and healthy society through the development and guidance of social and cultural policy that is designed to build and maintain community in 21st-Century democratic and capitalist societies.

'ORGANIC MODEL' OF PUBLIC RELATIONS IS NOT WESTERN-BIASED

This "organic model" of public relations that focuses upon and is predicated upon the need for "community-building" is not Western-biased in its theoretical grounding; indeed, it takes issue with some basic theoretical assumptions of Western public relations, which practice is often perceived as being of most value—if not essential—in developed, i.e., complex, societies that have achieved the highest levels of social/economic/political modernity, e.g., North America, Western Europe and some Pacific Rim countries. For example, this model rejects two harmful myths that are pervasive in Western public relations literature, i.e., an historical denial of the significance of "nonpublics" and of the existence of the "general public," for both of which Western public relations disavows any responsibility.

One must argue that, especially for governments, CSOs and corporations that are operating in fledgling democracies having new capitalist economic systems, both “nonpublics” and the “general public” are today’s most challenging—and arguably most important—publics that demand the fullest attention of theorists and practitioners alike, i.e., the whole of the nation’s citizens who are not segmented into “publics” according to their perceived importance to an organization but rather who must collectively be considered to be a *strategic public* solely by virtue of their membership in society. American public relations theorists Grunig and Hunt (1984) argue that, if an organization has no consequences upon other systems in its environment and if those systems have no consequences for the organization, there is no need for public relations. Grunig and Hunt’s (1984) pre-occupation with the threat of consequences for the organization compel them to further argue that “active publics” are of primary concern to the organization. Those the authors call “nonpublics,” are dismissed as being of no concern—simply because these “nonpublics” ostensibly do not threaten or intend to harm the organization. However, Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2006, March) contend:

If we do not recognize and respect all publics—whether we determine them to be active, aware, latent or nonpublics, or for that matter the “general public,” which goes unrecognized by the public relations literature and which Grunig and Hunt (1984) consider a “logical impossibility”—then we ... are reduced to a reactive, defensive, asymmetrical relationship with stakeholders whom the public relations practitioner and his organization perceive and thereby ignore as powerless and benign. The considerable literature that has been grounded in two-way symmetry focuses exclusively on *strategic publics*, implicitly—if not explicitly—suggesting two-way symmetrical communication is not really important for less-threatening publics or for society-at-large.

Even though Grunig (1992) argues that excellent organizations do monitor the effects of their decisions on society as well as on their organizations, Kruckeberg and Vujnovic (2006, March) observe that, whatever concern for society that is identified in most contemporary public relations literature nevertheless is restricted to a pre-occupation with strategic publics that can threaten the organization—and not to “nonpublics” nor to society as a whole, i.e., the “general public,” both of which are relegated in much contemporary public relations theory and practice as being insignificant, i.e., powerless and, thereby, benign. The authors counter that institutions’ responsibility must extend beyond their *strategic publics*, i.e., organizations must view society, not as a web of strategic publics that are identified as being the most threatening to the organization, but rather as a larger social system in which organizations can co-exist and seek harmony. Western models of public relations center the organization and its interests at the hub from which the “spokes” of an organization’s communication and relationships radiate outward to satellites of stakeholders. In an “organic model,” the organization is not centered so self-importantly. Rather, this model recognizes that each organization is only one part of the social system. And the “general public” is a primary beneficiary of this “organic model” that recognizes an organization’s responsibility to *all* members of society!

Furthermore, in an “organic model” of public relations, the organization and its interests are not the hub, but metaphorically are one of the legs that support the stool, i.e., society, with the mutual support of the other legs. Thus, this “organic model” of public relations has refinements that begin with the recognition of the existence and primary importance of “nonpublics” and the “general public,” i.e., citizens who may not be members of an organization’s self-perceived *strategic* publics, but who in Western models would be dismissed as insignificant, i.e., powerless and, thereby, benign. Without this recognition of “nonpublics” and the “general public,” public relations in its theory and practice is hypocritical in its attempts at relationship-building and is inadequate in its efforts in community-building. Indeed, the lack of recognition of these publics in much of the Western public relations literature only continues to allow and encourage societal inequities, e.g., prejudices against those within society who do not enjoy the benefits of productive and beneficial “relationships” with those possessing power in society, and thus who are not deemed worthy of an organization’s efforts in two-way symmetry and in relationship-building that would result in these “nonpublics” membership within an organization’s community. It is only after such recognition of and reconciliation with “nonpublics” and the “general public” that the value of public relations can become meaningful to much of the world’s populace. Despite theoretical models of public relations that advocate two-way symmetrical negotiation, relationship-building and community-building, the Western practice of public relations at many levels remains pre-occupied with marketing, often even more so than with strategic publics, the former from where profits come and the latter where the threats may be. Kruckeberg, Starck and Vujnovic (2006) observe:

Distinctions between *publics* and *markets* are widely recognized—if not fully understood or discretely conceptualized—by scholars and practitioners in public relations, marketing, and advertising. Nevertheless, marketers and advertisers too often see public relations as a tactical tool for their sales missions, whereas public relations practitioners commonly see an encompassing role for public relations, in which public relations practitioners have a societal—as well as an organizational—function that may in fact co-opt and include the marketing and advertising roles as subfunctions. (p. 486)

While marketing public relations (MPR) must remain an important component of the public relations practice of corporations (which are one leg of the stool), MPR is not a primary—nor even a particularly significant—part of the role of public relations for governments and CSOs. Thus, Western models of public relations that focus upon marketing public relations should not be used to ground the theory that provides the foundation for public relations practice in government and CSO organizations (which are the other two legs of the stool). Rather, even for corporations, an “organic model” of public relations is concerned, not only with an organization’s relationships with its strategic publics, but this model focuses upon and is predicated upon the need for “community-building” for all members of society—not just for those within those publics that are identified as being *strategic* or as an important market.

Kruckeberg/10-10-10

Thus, this “organic model” of public relations has benefits, not only for every organization that practices it, i.e., governments, CSOs and corporations, which also must practice marketing-related public relations, and their *strategic* publics, but also for every individual (including those in “nonpublics,” who are equally important in this public relations model) as well as for the “general public,” i.e., society-at-large. This is because this model advocates that the three legs of a stool, i.e., government, CSOs and corporations, must not only share in their support of society, but this sharing can only occur when their community-building efforts are directed, not just toward those in *strategic* publics, but to “nonpublics” and the “general public,” i.e., all of society. This is only possible through the cooperation and relationship-building of governments, CSOs and corporations’ with one another, i.e., in their support of one another in achieving their overall mission of supporting society by building community. For public relations practitioners in governments, CSOs and corporations to do this, Kruckeberg (1995-96, Winter) says practitioners must be “keepers and reconcilers” of organizations’ values and belief systems up to and including their base ideologies.

Those professionals will be critically needed who can examine, maintain and modify as necessary traditional organizational and societal values and beliefs that will be challenged in a McLuhanesque “global village” in which the values and belief systems of peoples throughout the world will ideologically confront one another (p. 37)

Thus, says Kruckeberg (1995-96, Winter), public relations practitioners must be their organizations’ interpreters, ethicists and social policy-makers who guide organizational behavior as well as influence and reconcile public perceptions. Obviously, an “organic model” of public relations as a professional occupation is highly value-laden and is unquestionably ideological. In an “organic model,” practitioners need to examine, maintain and modify as necessary indigenous organizational and societal values and belief systems. To do so, Kruckeberg (1995-96, Winter) emphasizes that public relations practitioners must first recognize and articulate their own values, belief systems and ideologies. This articulation must be beyond a practitioner’s predictable acceptance and defense of basic moral values and cultural beliefs about freedom of information. Ultimately, practitioners will need to define themselves globally as professionals, in part by articulating and reconciling their own values, belief systems and ideology as a professional community. Kruckeberg (1995-96, Winter) argues:

... public relations not only *represents* ideologies; rather, ... public relations practice is, *itself*, highly value-laden and ideological with a concomitant set of professional beliefs and worldview. (p. 38)

In many ways, an “organic model” of public relations in fledgling democracies having new capitalist economic systems has similarities—particularly for governments and CSOs—with Al-Enad’s (1990, Spring) conception of public relations in “Third World” nations, i.e.:

Kruckeberg/11-11-11

(I)n developing nations (public relations) is located between the material and the nonmaterial aspects of the culture. It functions in the same manner; it tries to adapt each side to the needs and expectations of the other. In both cases, its role may not meet the standards as stated by public relations theoreticians. But playing it does help maintaining the equilibrium of the system. (p. 26)

A NORMATIVE THEORY OF SOCIETY IS NEEDED

Starck and Kruckeberg (2003) argue that public relations requires a normative theory that defines the type of pluralistic society that is needed and wanted, and this theory of society must be complemented by a morally defensible theory of social ethics that is both professionally agreed upon and adhered to by public relations practitioners. Furthermore, this theory of society must be compatible, if not totally consonant, with the normative moral fabric of the indigenous society.

From this theory of society, based on a morally defensible theory of social ethics, must emanate a 'professional ideology' from which social values can be identified and subscribed to by practitioners, embraced by practitioners' organisations and communicated to and reconciled with their organisations' stakeholders. In this context, the most important stakeholder of every corporation is society itself. The reason? In civil society, the rights of all take precedence over the rights of the few—including corporate citizens with inordinate access to power and wealth. (p. 34)

Starck and Kruckeberg (2003) observe that an agreed-upon normative theory of society might best be developed by basing it on a determination of social values that this theory should embrace, i.e., what values would seem desirable, if not essential? They identify democracy to be a core value, accompanied by a corresponding societal value that emphasis individual human rights. However, they also identify other core values:

... (J)ustice, compassion, egalitarian concern about the welfare of all members of society (including women, children and animals) and a special emphasis on the humane protection of the weak and powerless. Preservation of the physical environment also would be a valued and protected. Of utmost importance in safeguarding these values are the foundation values of openness and transparency of all social institutions, including corporations. (p. 35)

CONCLUSION

Democratic societies having capitalist economic systems will exist in the 21st Century only through the support of the cooperative community-building efforts of governments, civil society organizations and corporations. Each of these three legs of a stool must bear its share of the weight of that stool. However, the burden that each leg must support requires cross-braces that connect each of these legs to one another. By being linked to one another, each leg's strength is greater, and the legs collectively can provide a stronger foundation than could the sum of the strength of these legs individually.

Kruckeberg/12-12-12

The needed creation, restoration and maintenance of these linkages to support society are the responsibility of public relations in its philosophical, ideological and strategic sense. The model of public relations that emphasizes community-building is an “organic model” that is of particular value in social/economic/political systems that have undergone rapid transformation to a more individualistic social system, to a more capitalist economic system and to a more democratic political system.

Public relations practitioners must possess the requisite professional knowledge as well as a professional ideology that has clear and articulate values that are defined by morally defensible ethics—all of which must be predicated on a well-grounded theory of society. Only then can public relations practitioners help to create, restore and maintain a communicative cultural environment that can assure a well-functioning and healthy society through the development and guidance of social and cultural policy that is designed to build and maintain community in 21st-Century democratic and capitalist societies.

A non-exhaustive list of core values includes collective and individual human rights, equal justice for all, universal compassion to and from all members of society and an egalitarian concern for the welfare of each member of society (including women, children and animals) as well as respect for and care of the physical environment. The model gives special emphasis to the humane protection of the weak and powerless—in part through openness and transparency of all social institutions and through the mutual support that these social institutions, i.e., governments, civil society organizations and corporations, must provide to one another in their common goal of serving society, which unquestionably is their primary stakeholder.

REFERENCES

- Al-Enad, A. H. (1990, Spring). Public relations' roles in developing countries. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 35(1), 24-26.
- Grunig, J. E. (Ed.) (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J. E., and Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kruckeberg, D. (2000). Toward a global professionalism. In J. A. Ledingham and S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 145-157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kruckeberg, D. (1995-96, Winter). The challenge for public relations in the era of globalization. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 40(4), 36-39.

Kruckeberg/13-13-13

Kruckeberg, D., & Vujnovic, M. (2007). Global advertising and public relations. In Y. R. Kamalipour (ed.), *Global communication* (pp. 271-292). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Kruckeberg, D., & Vujnovic, M. (2006, March). *Toward an 'organic' model of public relations in public diplomacy*. Paper presented at the 9th International Public Relations Research Conference, Miami, FL.

Kruckeberg, D., Starck, K., & Vujnovic, M. (2006). The role and ethics of community-building for consumer products and services: With some recommendations for new-marketplace economies in emerging democracies. In C. H. Botan and Vincent Hazleton (eds.), *Public relations II* (pp. 485-497). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kruckeberg, D., & Tsetsura, K. (2004). International journalism ethics. In J. C. Merrill and A. De Beer (eds.), *Global journalism: Survey of international journalism (4th ed.)* (pp. 84-92). New York: Longman.

Starck, K., & Kruckeberg, D. (2003). Ethical obligations of public relations in an era of globalization. *Journal of Communication Management: An International Journal*, 8(1), 29-40.

Starck, K., & Kruckeberg, D. (2001). Public relations and community: A reconstructed theory revisited. In R. L. Heath and contributing editor G. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 51-59). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.