



ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ДИПЛОМАТИИ И ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2023.2.17>

UDC 327.82
LBC 66.49



Submitted: 30.05.2022
Accepted: 09.02.2023

DIGITAL DIPLOMACY AND SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORKS: CONTEMPORARY PRACTICES OF INNOVATION IN FOREIGN POLICY

Liudmila M. Reshetnikova

Vologograd State University, Vologograd, Russian Federation

Irina M. Samokhina

Vologograd State University, Vologograd, Russian Federation

Abstract. *Introduction.* The article is devoted to contemporary digital diplomacy, which is implemented within the framework of social networks. Unlike traditional diplomacy digital one operates in a different communicative space where blogs, electronic media and global social networks are the key communication channels. Using these tools allows digital diplomacy actors to influence events and communities in other countries. *Methods and materials.* Method of mixing qualitative and quantitative data, hashtag-analysis, comparative analysis of the social networks' messages and accounts were able to understand the dynamics and interactions in social networks, engagement and possibilities of institutional and private actors in digital diplomacy. *Analysis.* In the 2000s foreign policy and public diplomacy began forming based on data on the mood of users of social networks and their preferences in politics. Thanks to this, digital diplomacy may well become one of the innovative tools for resolving modern global problems. Digital diplomacy, as a new method and the tool for implementing foreign policy, contributes to the effective functioning of departments and ministries of foreign affairs, their response to the needs of citizens, to emerging challenges and threats to state security, like a global epidemic or natural disasters. Using digital tools, it is possible to shape the norms of communication, interaction and decision-making by which diplomats perform their work, modifying the diplomatic process. Besides this digital diplomacy increases the attractiveness of the state in the eyes of the world community. *Results.* Based on a comparative analysis study of the content of social networks, it could be concluded that over almost a decade, from the 2010s to the 2020s, digital diplomacy has developed from a "soft power" mechanism to a method of information warfare and propaganda which involves artificial intelligence tools and big data. But this is predominantly characteristic of technologically developed countries. It is possible to conclude about future co-existence of traditional and digital diplomacies in a new hybrid variety. *Authors' contribution.* In this article Liudmila M. Reshetnikova has contributed Introduction, Research Methods, Analysis and Results sections: identified risks and threats to digital diplomacy, analyzed the development of the soft power methods, identified features and tools of digital diplomacy. Irina M. Samokhina has contributed Analysis and Results sections: analyzed social networks and digital infrastructure for digital diplomacy and diplomatic activity, contemporary computer tools for learning about social networks.

Key words: digital diplomacy, public diplomacy, social networks, innovative technology, foreign policy.

Citation. Reshetnikova L.M., Samokhina I.M. Digital Diplomacy and Social Media Networks: Contemporary Practices of Innovation in Foreign Policy. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 4. Istoriya. Regionovedenie. Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [Science Journal of Vologograd State University. History. Area Studies. International Relations], 2023, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 205-213. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2023.2.17>

**ЦИФРОВАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ И СОЦИАЛЬНЫЕ СЕТИ:
СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРАКТИКИ ИННОВАЦИЙ ВО ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКЕ****Людмила Михайловна Решетникова**

Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация

Ирина Михайловна Самохина

Волгоградский государственный университет, г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация

Аннотация. *Введение.* В данной статье рассмотрена современная цифровая дипломатия и ее реализация через глобальные социальные сети. В отличие от традиционной цифровая дипломатия работает в ином коммуникативном пространстве, где ключевыми каналами являются блоги, электронные СМИ и глобальные социальные сети. Использование этих инновационных инструментов позволяет субъектам цифровой дипломатии влиять на события и сообщества в других странах. *Методы и материалы.* Мультиметодологический подход к изучению качественных и количественных данных, хэштег-анализ позволили понять динамику и взаимодействие в социальных сетях, вовлеченность и возможности институциональных и частных акторов в цифровой дипломатии. *Анализ.* В 2000-е гг. внешняя политика и публичная дипломатия стали формироваться на основе данных о настроениях пользователей социальных сетей и их предпочтениях в политике. Благодаря этому цифровая дипломатия вполне может стать одним из инновационных инструментов решения современных глобальных проблем. Цифровая дипломатия как новый метод и один из инструментов реализации внешнеполитического курса, способствует эффективному функционированию ведомств и министерств иностранных дел, их реагированию на запросы граждан, на возникающие вызовы и угрозы безопасности государства, такие как глобальные эпидемии или стихийные бедствия. Используя цифровые инструменты, можно формировать нормы общения, взаимодействия и принятия решений, с помощью которых дипломаты выполняют свою работу, видоизменяя дипломатический процесс. Кроме того, цифровая дипломатия способствует созданию позитивного имиджа страны и повышению привлекательности государства в восприятии мирового сообщества. *Результаты.* На основе сравнительного анализа контента социальных сетей можно сделать вывод, что в период с 2010-х по 2020-е гг. цифровая дипломатия развивалась как инструмент «мягкой силы», впоследствии преобразовавшись в один из методов информационного противостояния и пропаганды с использованием искусственного интеллекта и больших данных, что преимущественно характерно для технологически развитых государств. Это позволяет говорить о будущем сосуществовании традиционной и цифровой дипломатии в новом виде гибридной дипломатии. *Вклад авторов.* Л.М. Решетникова выявила риски и угрозы цифровой дипломатии, охарактеризовала развитие методов «мягкой силы», определила особенности и инструменты цифровой дипломатии. И.М. Самохина проанализировала социальные сети и цифровая инфраструктура для цифровой дипломатии и дипломатической деятельности, современные компьютерные инструменты для изучения социальных сетей.

Ключевые слова: цифровая дипломатия, публичная дипломатия, социальная сеть, инновационная технология, внешняя политика.

Цитирование. Решетникова Л. М., Самохина И. М. Цифровая дипломатия и социальные сети: современные практики инноваций во внешней политике // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 4, История. Регионоведение. Международные отношения. – 2023. – Т. 28, № 2. – С. 205–213. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu4.2023.2.17>

Introduction. The development of international relations led to the emergence and implementation of the principles of public diplomacy with modern innovative technologies, new ways and mechanisms of information support in foreign policy are becoming more relevant. Web technologies like websites and mobile applications

have replaced printed and broadcasting traditional media. Taking into account the crucial role of communication in the organization of communities and government, it creates a fundamentally new dynamic of international relations. From the second half of the 20th century, military power and threat as traditional means of foreign policy

gradually began to be eroded by the methods of the soft power of culture, images and information. The first signs of the digital revolution and the growth of the Internet led to the transition to web communication in the early 1990s that has covered all spheres of life. The appearance of digital diplomacy has become possible because of the fast development of information and communication technologies that make it possible to erase national borders and exert influence globally on society in a given state. Digital diplomacy is a component of public policy and soft power. The first is often equated with the term “soft power” by Joseph Nye. Public diplomacy is a tool for promoting the soft power that in turn has three sources: political values, a country’s culture, and foreign policy. It is a voluntary and informed choice as opposed to propaganda. Further J. Nye developed a concept and added “smart power” that can act as the most winning strategy, and includes a balanced combination of hard and soft power [19, pp. 101-102]. The term “public diplomacy” was first proposed by Edmund A. Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University in 1965. This term denoted the process by which the subjects of international relations are able to achieve foreign policy goals, influencing the foreign society. It means open, respectable and not a secret diplomacy. It described as the role of the media in international affairs, cultivation by governments of public opinion, the non-governmental interaction of private groups and interests in one country with those of another [30, p. 8]. Public diplomacy due to J. Nye is a useful tool when attempting to influence public opinion abroad [14, p. 706]. Public diplomacy began to consider as actions aimed at maintaining long-term relations, protecting the goals of the country’s foreign policy and a better understanding of the values and institutions of their own state abroad. States seek to secure particular or wider interests, including the reduction of frictions between or among themselves. Public diplomacy is one of the core instruments through which the goals,

strategies and broad tactics of foreign policy are implemented [1].

Subsequently, with the development of the Internet, these definitions were concretely embodied in the phenomenon of digital diplomacy. Governments have begun to use Web 2.0 technologies that consist of a set of software applications (second generation) and they allow users to communicate and exchange information on the Internet. These applications include popular world-wide social networks such as Instagram * (banned in Russia in 2022), Facebook ** (banned in Russia in 2022), Twitter (banned in Russia in 2022), Snapchat, TikTok (banned in Russia in 2022). The Web 2.0 model supports two-way exchange of information, promotes the active participation of users and, accordingly, can influence certain aspects of the development of society. New technologies facilitate interaction as they become interactive. In the past diplomacy was primarily a government-to-government relationship. Today, a government indirectly targets the public, and even public-to-public communication can constitute diplomatic actions. Integrating the requirements of social media into the practice of public diplomacy raises a series of challenges and generates fundamental strategic and tactical shifts. It also means an additional step from diplomacy 1.0 to public diplomacy 2.0, therefore the “leap from the old world of web-pages and e-mail to that of social media and sites based on user-generated content” [25, p. 201]. The arrival of “Web 2.0” in the mid-aught made the means to publish information online more broadly accessible. People were increasingly able to post their opinions and experiences. However, doing so still required a substantial amount of technical know-how and access to expensive internet-connected computers. Accordingly, it was the creation and diffusion of social media networks across platforms and devices, especially smartphones that truly expanded interaction capacity by substantially increasing the number of people who could participate in digital communication on a daily basis [7, p. 238].

* The Instagram social network is owned by the terrorist and extremist organization Meta Platforms Inc, whose activities are prohibited in the Russian Federation.

** The Facebook social network is owned by the terrorist and extremist organization Meta Platforms Inc, whose activities are prohibited in the Russian Federation.

The British analyst Sh. Riordan proposed to distinguish between the terms “e-diplomacy”, “cyber diplomacy” and “digital diplomacy.” By the term “digital diplomacy” Riordan means the use of digital tools to solve diplomatic problems. The notion “cyber diplomacy” is associated with the use of diplomatic tools to resolve interstate issues arising in cyberspace. In the modern world, digital diplomacy and cyber diplomacy are carried out by both state and non-state actors, including NGOs and individuals. The term “e-diplomacy” (as well as “Internet diplomacy”) was used at the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries to refer to the process and means of electronic support for diplomacy. The term came from the realm of commerce and was quite popular, but now its frequency is extremely low. It is associated with the creation of an electronic infrastructure for conducting diplomatic activities [22]. The Russian scholar N. Tsvetkova underlines that “digital diplomacy” is designed to influence foreign public opinion. However, instead of the traditional exchange programs or events of cultural centers, digital diplomacy disseminates information of a political nature on the Internet or in social networking. States that use this tool in their diplomatic practice do not hide its nature: for example, the U.S. government has repeatedly stated that digital diplomacy is designed to establish a dialogue between Washington and opposition groups in foreign countries [29, p. 119]. I. Manor notices that the term “digital diplomacy” that is often used as a synonym for “digitalized public diplomacy”, also suggests that the use of digital tools is its own subset of diplomacy. Just as there is bilateral diplomacy and multilateral diplomacy, so diplomats practice digital diplomacy [16, p. 14].

Methods and Materials. The methodology of the article is based on the mixed-method approach that applies quantifiable data and qualitative content. Social network analysis tools like SocioViz, Netlytic, Tweepmap, social media indicators helped to understand the dynamics and interactions in social media, engagement and possibilities of institutional and private actors in digital diplomacy. Especially considering that officials, political leaders through their social media accounts have set foreign policy contours and form the foreign policy agenda, primarily among the young audience, for whom social networks are the common means of communication.

Analysis. The implementation of digital diplomacy through global social media networks defines several of its features. The communication with the huge audience is established quickly and easily, as a result of which there is a dependence on content that is created by the users themselves (through “likes”, comments, reposts and “retweets”). This, in turn, creates opportunities for tracking feedback, monitoring. Uncensored and unfiltered, the media enables leaders to communicate directly with the public and the public to be informed on issues of foreign policy and galvanize against foolish foreign policies in ways impeded in a non-democracy where the media is not free and the public is unable to adjudicate the advantages and disadvantages of a policy with relatively full information. The leaders in more democratic countries were more likely to rely on social media accounts for distributing content about their administration or government [13, pp. 33-34].

Digital diplomacy functions in horizontal relationships based on the exchange of information rather than broadcasting it from top to typical bottom for traditional diplomacy. As subjects of digital diplomacy both foreign policy structures as a whole and individual politicians and officials are distinguished. But at the same time, there is no single strategy or protocol for conducting foreign policy activities on social media networks. Digital platforms have revolutionized the practice of public diplomacy by making it possible for ministries of foreign affairs and embassies to reach and engage with foreign publics directly. Currently, all departments and politicians are presented in the popular and widely known all over the world Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, TikTok. In view of this, it became possible to single out “Facebook-diplomacy” or “Twiplomacy” in a separate category.

“Twitter-diplomacy” or “Twiplomacy”, as an innovative tool of public diplomacy that changed the form of perception of diplomacy, began to spread actively in the early 2010s. By 2020 98% of United Nations member states have official Twitter accounts [28]. Twitter gives to quantify the opinions of users, as well as the degree of public support for world leaders. Thanks to this it became possible to almost instantly learn about international events by commenting on them. It should be noted that the application is more beneficial to the states that are more

technologically advanced. Twitter promotes the exchange of useful information among politicians and the community, increases the functionality of diplomatic officials in collecting information, analyzing risks and challenges, managing and responding to them. Despite the positive effects on communication mentioned, Twitter is not considered to be a substitute for traditional diplomacy. Twiplomacy interacts jointly with diplomacy and expands the field of its activity [4].

The emergence of digital diplomacy as a global concept coincided with the beginning of the Arab Spring of 2010 and “the Occupy” movement that emerged in 2011. When fueled by ample discontent and social organizational power, digital technology has allowed the masses to mobilize against state power and threaten it. Sometimes they radically changed the balance of power in their country, as, for example, in the cases of the overthrow of the government in Egypt and Tunisia. These technologies also challenged state storytelling and social and political event shaping, bypassing traditional state propaganda and existing state control over the media. As a result, states began to develop a strategy for the implementation of digital representation and communication methods, gradually turning into the methods of digital diplomacy that we know about today [2]. The main methods of digital diplomacy are spreading of informational content in the Internet media: analysis and monitoring of social networks and the blogs; distribution of data via mobile gadgets; formation of personal pages of officials in social networks. Another important feature of digital diplomacy is its specific set of communication strategies of informing, evaluating and arguing. In addition, digital tools inform and shape the norms of communication, interaction and decision-making by which diplomats carry out their work. Transparency, decentralization, casualness, interactivity, and real-time governance are essential norms for digital performance, but they may not align with ministries of foreign affairs’ institutionally ingrained preferences for confidentiality, hierarchy, instrumentality, and top-down decision-making [5].

Digital diplomacy has become widespread in the United States. Digital technologies are actively used by the U.S. Department of State to increase the attractiveness of the United States in the eyes of the world community. “We are

adapting our governance by realigning our development and diplomatic programs to address old challenges in new ways, and by leveraging one of America’s greatest assets – innovation. This is the 21st century when traditional foreign policy instruments are complemented by new innovative and adapted public administration instruments that make full use of the technologies of our connected world” [31]. Important decisions for the development of the U.S. digital diplomacy were made by U.S. Secretary of State C. Powell in the early 2000s as part of larger programs for the technological modernization of the U.S. government. In 2003 within the Information Resource Management (IRM) of the U.S. Department of State, a “think tank” was created – the Office of e-Diplomacy that began to deal with issues of IT support. The first priority was to consolidate the infrastructure for digital diplomacy. As a result, by 2005 secure connection to the SIPRNET systems (for transmitting classified information) and OSIS (open networks) was ensured; the servers were consolidated into a single system; the finance was optimized using electronic means. Websites of the main diplomatic departments and public diplomacy programs were completed, e-mail addresses were combined into a global network, and programs were introduced to improve the efficiency of the department’s divisions [32]. By 2012, the US State Department was already managing a social media empire of 288 Facebook pages, nearly 200 Twitter accounts, and 125 YouTube channels. The State Department issued guidelines for embassy use of social media, established standard working routines for sharing information online and offered digital training to those diplomats looking to make use of social media in public engagement [8, p. 475].

In 2014–2016 priorities were related to “mobile diplomacy” (digital diplomacy with using devices with mobile applications and social networking), digital diplomacy with an emphasis on analytics, information and knowledge management, as well as the continuation of the development of the global digital infrastructure and digital systems management methods. For the first time, cybersecurity appeared in the documents as one of the key components of the infrastructure for diplomatic activity. The ICAM identification system was developed and implemented, the development of an internal open messenger for

SMART diplomats and a means for exchanging confidential messages TS was completed [33]. Due to the next IT Strategic Plan digital diplomacy must be taken to a new level. It is characterized by massive use of big data and data diplomacy. Rapid technological growth is driving the modernization of the U.S. digital diplomacy mechanisms. The Strategic Plan in the early 2020s contains tasks for the implementation of voice-to-computer communication interfaces (“voice assistants”). Particular attention is paid to emerging technologies based on artificial intelligence, global satellite navigation systems and digital cartography, as well as the use of translation services on neural networks. Cybersecurity remains one of the key issues on the digital diplomacy agenda [35]. The development of artificial intelligence, bots have given additional opportunities to digital diplomacy. AI could adapt a number of traditional diplomacy tools. AI is possible to improve policy development, public diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral engagement, actions carried out through international and conventional organizations, meetings and partnerships, awarding grants and collecting and analyzing information [23, p. 27]. It's quite applicable to social networks taking into account that the new generation of social bots can autonomously talk with a human via online chat and spoken language, manage social media accounts at the same time bots can actively spread misinformation online, slowing down the diffusion of truthful information [26, p. 256].

Despite the fact that digital diplomacy has gained great importance, the most developed countries along with the United States in this area are China, India, France, Brazil, and Japan. There are special indicators like Digital diplomacy ranking and Digital diplomacy index (DDI) that allow to define most influence states through their digital diplomacy practice. So, because of DDI, the US holds the lead having 20.9 million followers on its diplomatic accounts in social media in 2021 and 29 million in 2022. One of the key actors of digital diplomacy is India being the country with the most followers on its diplomatic accounts of 72 million in 2021 and 86 million followers in 2022 [10]. Over the past decade India has demonstrated vast growth in digital diplomacy using special tools. The campaign in social media with tag #IncredibleIndia became

very popular and gained 236 million in 2015 [3]. #IncredibleIndia promotes positive perceptions of India and aims to exclude Indophobia, Hinduphobia and any other negativity towards the country and its citizens. Additional tool of digital influence of India may be considered the social media account of Prime Minister Narendra Modi as one of the most followed world leaders. In 2009 @narendramodi accounted 1 million followers that 12 million in 2015, and now over 86 million of active followers [18]. Moreover, Indian Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) has deployed mobile apps like MEAIndia and G20India as special source to connect Indians travelling abroad, students and scholars of foreign policy, Indian Diasporas.

The development of digital diplomacy using social networks has led to the emergence of certain risks and threats to the world of real politics. Emerging digital technologies and its involvement in social processes raised the issue about the actors and its role in shaping policy. As the role of the state has stayed important the multinational technology companies that have driven the technological innovation have become extremely influential to the extent that their economic and political power matches – or even surpass the nation states [6, p. 85; 12, p. 187]. At the same time as J. Nye notices this role of non-state actors does not mean the end of the nation-state. Governments remain the most powerful actors on the global stage, but the stage has become more crowded [20, p. 10].

Social networks have become widely used in modern conditions as the most effective environment for the dissemination of false information, unfair competition and active political propaganda. Inaccurate data can be thrown into the Internet special sites, the main purpose of which is precisely the creation and distribution of “fake news” or “fakes.” Bloggers, influencers, “trolls” are used as the tools for promoting content on social networks to discredit political competitors and ideological opponents.

Another threat concerns cybercrimes against the protection of personal data. Social media users often fear unauthorized access, hacking, and identity theft. Such crimes are the most important risks of digital diplomacy that have existed since the emergence of the Internet. Social networks as a communication technology can be used as a means for the dissemination of

extremist and terrorist content, propaganda of ideologically hostile countries as a tool for waging an information war and foreign influence domestic political processes [34]. Generally, the threats and risks of digital diplomacy include: 1. The publication of politically incorrect messages that can lead to social tensions and conflicts. 2. Social networks can be used for illegal purposes for information warfare in the context of election campaigns and other political processes. 3. Social media platforms can be used to create radical content for cyber terrorists and extremists. 4. The Internet is becoming a space for cyber warfare and hacking, given the fast increasing number of hacker attacks on government servers [21, p. 85].

The listed risks remained relevant for digital diplomacy even during the pandemic COVID-19. However, despite this, digital diplomacy continued to operate while borders and airspace were closed. Diplomats were able to respond quickly to rapidly growing calls for help via social media. The pandemic has shown that in the future it would be a hybrid, coexistence of digital and traditional diplomacy, which was forced to adapt to virtuality [9]. Also major global events like summits have been moved to Zoom application. In 2020 virtual meetings have become so popular that many have coined the term “Zoom-diplomacy” referring to the widespread use of Zoom or other platforms in diplomacy. In 2020 the online meeting of the G-20 leaders was a prime example of this [24].

The next decade digital diplomacy will be transformed because of the technological context in which ministries of foreign affairs are to operate. The well-known scholar, head of the Oxford Digital Diplomacy Research Group, Corneliu Bjola mentioned that the development 3G and 5G technology was usher in a whole new level of technological innovative breakthroughs which will lead to the mass adoption of a number of technical tools increasingly relevant to public diplomacy, such as mixed reality, satellite remote sensing or artificial intelligence [15; 17; 27, p. 411]. Digital diplomacy depends on new communication and technical skills. While communication is a cornerstone of diplomacy, the codes, habits, and norms of communication online differ from both the formal and the informal diplomatic communications that take place behind closed doors. Mastering the formatting logic of software,

the navigation of big data and management of relationships with tech companies will become new tasks of diplomacy [11, p. 1607].

Results. Over the past decades, digital diplomacy has become an influential foreign policy instrument of the state that promotes policymakers and officials use new technologies to expand their interaction with their audiences. By 2020 digital diplomacy has become a more complex form of communication, requiring the involvement of artificial intelligence and other forms of intellectual support to manage and regulate various data sets and information risks. AI can improve foreign policy making, public diplomacy, bilateral and multilateral interactions, actions through international and conventional organizations, meetings and partnerships, grant awards, and information collection and analysis of foreign policy processes in different countries.

Digital diplomacy has received the greatest distribution through the tools of social media networks in which almost all states of the planet currently have their representations. In terms of digital leadership, the diplomatic departments of the United States, China, and India have become advanced setting the bar of digital development for officials of ministries of foreign affairs. Social networks will remain an important element of communication as a means of organizing a dialogue on international and national issues. Political leaders, government bodies, public organizations, corporations are interested in maintaining direct contact with their community through social networks, covering more and more, first of all, a young audience. In general, social media platforms, as innovative tools, have provided new opportunities for free political and humanitarian interaction with a growing number of users and thus contribute to the achievement of the goals of digital diplomacy able to coexist with traditional diplomacy in some hybrid form.

REFERENCES

1. Adesina S. Foreign Policy in an Era of Digital Diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 2017, no. 3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175>
2. Akin Ünver H. *Computational Diplomacy*. *Center for Economics and Foreign Policy Studies*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29664.33283>

3. Analyze Hashtags & Keywords #IncredibleIndia. *Tweepmap*, 2015. URL: <https://tweepmap.com/hashtag/B9C1BD4C35C73>
4. Babb C. Is “Twiplomacy” Replacing Traditional Diplomacy? URL: <https://www.voanews.com/a/twitter-diplomacy-social-media/1452891.html>
5. Bjola C. Adapting Diplomacy to the Digital Age: Managing the Organisational Culture of Ministries of Foreign Affairs. *Working Paper of the Project Diplomacy in the 21st Century*, 2017, no. 9. URL: https://www.swp-berlin.org/publications/products/arbeitspapiere/WP_Diplomacy21_No9_Corneliu_Bjola_01.pdf
6. Bjola C., Cassidy J., Manor I. Public Diplomacy in the Digital Age. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2019, vol. 14, iss. 1-2, 2019, pp. 83-101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14011032>
7. Bjola C., Zaiotti R., eds. *Digital Diplomacy and International Organizations: Autonomy, Legitimacy and Contestation*. Oxon, New York, Routledge, 2021. 321 p.
8. Bjola C., Manor I. The Rise of Hybrid Diplomacy: From Digital Adaptation to Digital Adoption. *International Affairs*, 2022, vol. 98, iss. 2, pp. 471-491. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iia005>
9. Bartolome G.D. A Digital Strategy for Post Pandemic Diplomacy – Digital Diplomacy – Medium. *Digital Diplomacy*, 5 Sept., 2021. URL: <https://medium.com/digital-diplomacy/a-digital-strategy-for-post-pandemic-diplomacy-bbc505947aaf>
10. DDI. *DDI | Index*, 2023. URL: <https://digital-diplomacy-index.com/index/?index=diplo-matic-network-reach>
11. Hedling E., Bremberg N. Practice Approaches to the Digital Transformations of Diplomacy: Toward a New Research Agenda. *International Studies Review*, 2021, vol. 23, iss. 4, pp. 1595-1618. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viab027>
12. Klynge C., Ekman M., Waedegaard N.J. Diplomacy in the Digital Age: Lessons from Denmark’s TechPlomacy Initiative. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2020, vol. 15, iss. 1-2, pp. 185-195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-15101094>
13. Kreps S. *Social Media and International Relations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2020. 86 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108920377>
14. La Cour C. Theorising Digital Disinformation in International Relations. *International Politics*, 2020, vol. 57, pp. 704-723. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-020-00215-x>
15. Madden M. Barbados Launches ‘World’s First’ Digital Diplomatic Presence. *Barbados Today*, 16 Nov. 2021. URL: <https://barbadostoday.bb/2021/11/16/barbados-launches-worlds-first-digital-diplomatic-presence/>
16. Manor I. *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy*. Cham, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. 364 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04405-3>
17. MID primenit iskusstvennyy intellekt dlya analiza vneshney politiki [Foreign Ministry Will Use Artificial Intelligence to Analyze Foreign Policy]. *RBK [RBC]*, 14 Dec. 2021, https://www.rbc.ru/technology_and_media/14/12/2021/61b770359a79475adb8e588f
18. Narendra Modi’s Personal Account. *Twitter*, URL: <https://twitter.com/narendramodi>
19. Nye J.S. Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2008, vol. 616, no. 1, pp. 94-109.
20. Nye J.S. Soft Power and Public Diplomacy Revisited. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2019, vol. 14, iss. 1-2, pp. 7-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-14101013>
21. Rashica V. The Benefits and Risks of Digital Diplomacy. *South East European University Review*, 2018, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 75-89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/seur-2018-0008>
22. Riordan S. Cyber Diplomacy vs. Digital Diplomacy: A Terminological Distinction. *USC Center on Public Diplomacy*, 12 May, 2016. URL: <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/cyber-diplomacy-vs-digital-diplomacy-terminological-distinction>
23. Roumate F., ed. *Artificial Intelligence and Digital Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities*. Cham, Springer, 2021. 241 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68647-5>
24. Sandre A. 2020 in Review: Top 10 Moments in Digital Diplomacy. *Digital Diplomacy*, 20 Dec. 2020. URL: <https://medium.com/digital-diplomacy/2020-in-review-top-10-moments-in-digital-diplomacy-57b802e0159c>
25. Sebastiao S.P., Spinola S.C., eds. *Diplomacy, Organisations and Citizens: a European Communication Perspective*. Cham, Springer, 2022. 354 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81877-7>
26. Segumpan R.G., Soraya Abu Zahari J., eds. *Mixed Methods Perspectives on Communication and Social Media Research*. Oxon, New York, Routledge, 2023. 280 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003265887>
27. Snow N., Cull N.J., eds. *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*. New York, Routledge, 2020. 503 p.
28. Tankovska H. *Twitter Presence of UN Member Countries, Heads of State, Governments and Foreign Ministries*. URL: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/348495/number-of-world-leaders-signing-twitter/>
29. Tsvetkova N.A., Yarygin G.O. Politicization of Digital Diplomacy: German, Iranian, American, and Russian Public Diplomacy in Social Networks. *Vestnik of Saint-Petersburg State University. Ser. 6: Philosophy, Cultural Studies. Political Studies. Law. International Relations*, 2013, no. 1, pp. 119-124.

30. Tuch H. *Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1990. 224 p.

31. *U.S. Department of State Archive. 21st Century Statecraft*. URL: <https://2009-2017.state.gov/statecraft/overview/index.htm>

32. *U.S. Department of State. Bureau of Information Resource Management. IT Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2006–2010 – Empowering Diplomacy*, 1 Apr. 2004. URL: <https://2009-2017.state.gov/m/irm/rls/92497.htm>

33. *U.S. Department of State IT Strategic Plan. Fiscal Years 2014–2016*. URL: <https://2009-2017.state.gov/documents/organization/220034.pdf>

34. *U.S. Department of Defence Cyber Strategy. Summary*. 2018. URL: <https://objects.scraper.bibcitation.com/user-pdfs/2023-04-10/7fbf72fd-85be-4fd1-867a-8eccbb45368.pdf>

35. *U.S. Department of State. Fiscal Years 2019–2022. Information Technology Strategic Plan. Final*. URL: https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/FY-2019-2022-ITSP_FINAL-508._with-Signature.pdf

Information About the Authors

Liudmila M. Reshetnikova, Candidate of Sciences (History), Associate Professor, Department of History and International Relations, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russian Federation, reshetnikova_lm@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9509-3974>

Irina M. Samokhina, Senior Lecturer, Department of Computer Science and Experimental Mathematics, Volgograd State University, Prosp. Universitetsky, 100, 400062 Volgograd, Russian Federation, samokhina-im@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8688-3750>

Информация об авторах

Людмила Михайловна Решетникова, кандидат исторических наук, доцент кафедры истории и международных отношений, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация, reshetnikova_lm@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9509-3974>

Ирина Михайловна Самохина, старший преподаватель кафедры компьютерных наук и экспериментальной математики, Волгоградский государственный университет, просп. Университетский, 100, 400062 г. Волгоград, Российская Федерация, samokhina-im@volsu.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8688-3750>