

**EPISTEMOLOGICAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY,
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES**

ISSN 2618-1274 (Print), ISSN [2618-1282](#) (Online)

Journal home page: <https://visnukpfs.dp.ua/index.php/PFS/index>

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

Олександр Юрійович Висоцький

Доктор політичних наук, професор,
професор кафедри міжнародних відносин,
Дніпровський національний університет
імені Олеся Гончара,
пр. Гагаріна 72, Дніпро, 49000, Україна

Email: vysalek@gmail.com,

Ольга Євгенівна Висоцька

Доктор філософських наук, доцент,
завідувач кафедри філософії,
КЗВО «Дніпровська академія неперервної
освіти» ДОР,
вул. Антоновича, 70, Дніпро,
49096, Україна

Email: vysolga@gmail.com,

Oleksandr Vysotskyi

D.Sc. (Political Science), PhD (History),
Professor, Professor of the International Relations
Department,

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University,
72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, 49010, Ukraine

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0712-8499>

Olha Vysotska

D.Sc. (Philosophical Science), Associate Professor,
Head of the Philosophy Department,

Communal institution of higher education

«Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education»

of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Council,

70 Antonovycha str., Dnipro, 49006, Ukraine

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1265-7582>

UDC 316.774:004.738.5:327

**TECHNOLOGIES OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY:
METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICAL POTENTIAL**

Received 17 March 2020; revised 20 April 2020; accepted 17 May 2020

DOI: 10.15421/342015

Abstract

A technological approach allowed the authors of the article to understand public diplomacy in a new way. As a result of the research, the essence and potential of public diplomacy technologies were identified, their specific features were identified and characterized. The authors demonstrated that public diplomacy technologies are innovative means of competition for influence in the international arena. Technologies of public diplomacy not only influence the thinking and behavior of political leaders and activists of other countries, but also act as a driver of a full-fledged anthropological project for the formation of a modernized transnational human consciousness. That is the main source of support and legitimacy of the cultural, economic and geostrategic interests of the country that is the subject of public diplomacy. Successful implementation of public diplomacy technologies is not so much about winning hearts and minds, as well as establishing institutional channels for fruitful lobbying of their own interests anywhere in the world.

Keywords: *public diplomacy, communication, technology, legitimation, international propaganda, public opinion formation, external governance, international relations.*

**Технології публічної дипломатії:
методологічні принципи та практичний потенціал**

Анотація

Технологічний підхід дав можливість авторам статті по-новому осмислити публічну дипломатію. У результаті проведеного дослідження були виявлені сутність та потенціал технологій публічної дипломатії, виокремлені та охарактеризовані їх видові особливості. Автори продемонстрували, що технології публічної дипломатії виступають новітніми засобами конкуренції за вплив на міжнародній арені. Технології публічної дипломатії не тільки впливають на мислення і поведінку політичних лідерів і активістів інших країн, а й виступають рушійною силою повноцінного антропологічного проекту з формування модернізованої транснаціональної свідомості, яка є головним джерелом підтримки і легітимації культурних, економічних і геостратегічних інтересів країни, що є суб'єктом публічної дипломатії. Успішне впровадження технологій публічної дипломатії - це не стільки завоювання сердець і умів, скільки створення інституційних каналів для плідного лобювання власних інтересів у будь-якій точці світу.

Ключові слова: публічна дипломатія, комунікація, технології, легітимація, міжнародна пропаганда, формування громадської думки, зовнішнє управління, міжнародні відносини.

Introduction.

Technologies in the modern world are increasingly perceived as the shortest and least expensive path to the desired goal. Knowledge is structured as technology to be most useful in a particular area of life. The orientation of modern education to the formation of competencies indicates that the best performance of professional tasks requires specialists who are in the habit of relying on an Arsenal of various technologies to solve current problems and perform professional tasks. All areas of professional activity require the use of technologies to increase their efficiency and additional opportunities to win in competition with professionals whose activities are based on modern algorithms. Therefore, the experience of any activities in the past, in order to work successfully today and in the future, must be rethought on the basis of a technological approach in order to highlight the most successful practices that have demonstrated their effectiveness and can be effective universal repeated tools for solving urgent problems in a particular area. One of the most important spheres for the realization of national interests on the world stage is public diplomacy. Successful use of its technological tools determine the course of the international political process and the distribution of power potentials among global players.

Literature review.

Based on the analysis of recent publications on the subject of the article, it is worth noting that a certain number of interesting works on public diplomacy have appeared recently. We would like to highlight among them a number of interesting studies by J.Pamment [Pamment 2016], C.Bjola, L.Jiang, M.Holmes [Bjola,Jiang,Holmes 2015], N.Cull [Cull 2019], E.Huijgh [Huijgh 2019], C. Carta, R.Higgott [Carta, Higgott 2020], D.Copeland [Copeland 2013], A.Wichowski [Wichowski 2015], A.Velikaya, G.Simons [Velikaya, Simons 2020], I.Manor [Manor 2019], N.Snow [Snow 2020], Z.Huang, R.Wang [Huang, Wang 2020], J.Cortes, T.Jamieson [Cortes, Jamieson 2020], C.Hayden [Hayden 2013]. These works laid a solid Foundation for thinking about the topic under study and gave us a significant impetus for

understanding public diplomacy in the technological dimension, as well as outlined ways to identify and specify its technologies.

Based on the above, the *purpose* of the article is to identify the essence and potential of public diplomacy technologies, identify and characterize their specific features.

Research methodology.

The research methodology is a technological approach that allowed us to structure knowledge about public diplomacy in such a way as to highlight its effective practices that can be interpreted as technologies.

Research results.

Analysis of the history of public diplomacy as a foreign policy tool in many countries has shown that a number of developed countries have long understood public diplomacy as an effective tool of international policy for the implementation of their national interests on the world stage, but used it through trial and error. Our goal is to isolate from this rich experience only effective tools that can be understood as technologies.

To begin, let's define the concept of «public diplomacy technologies». To do this, let's first turn to the concept of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is the implementation of a country's soft power in the international arena, promoting the interests of the state in the world by mobilizing the support of the foreign public [Висоцький 2020: 13]. This support is provided by stimulating the desire of the foreign public to consume the ideals of democracy, good governance, integrity, welfare, security, success and unlimited opportunities for human development [Висоцький 2020: 13]. Since technologies are any means of achieving the goal with saving resources, public diplomacy technologies can be understood as effective practices for promoting the interests of the state in the world by obtaining a favorable attitude of the foreign public.

As we can see, the very definition of public diplomacy in a certain way (although not directly) indicates the main technology of its implementation – soft power, in other words, attractiveness or seduction. The author of the concept of «soft power» J.Nye points

to seduction when describing the mechanism of its action. [Nye 2008: 29]. According to the American scientist, the things that should seduce are attractive culture, political values, attitudes and politics itself. Seduction must manage the desires of the foreign public in the interests of the state, which has a soft power, which J.Nye defines as the ability to make others want what the one who forces them wants, but does not force others to do what they do not want [Nye 2005: 5]. So, the quintessence of seduction technology is to attract and seduce, to control the desire of the public to win its approval. In the case of public diplomacy, it concerns the foreign public and the mobilization of its support in favor of the policy of the state that carries out public diplomacy. J.Baudrillard draws attention to the fact that today seduction is a universal technology for the exercise of power. He notes that seduction penetrates everywhere, surreptitiously or openly, permeating any social relationships» [Baudrillard 2001: 176]. And in the case of public diplomacy, the same thing happens. Seduction technology plays an important role at all stages of public diplomacy, and at the stages of engagement and retention – plays a crucial role.

One can see the successful implementation of seduction as a technology for managing the public's desire already at the stage of forming the concept of «public diplomacy», which is a certain symbolic substitute for foreign propaganda. The world public no longer wanted to face any manifestations of propaganda, so it was offered a different concept, behind which the transformed foreign propaganda was hidden. It is well known that the name «propaganda» has negative connotations of something insidious and false, and this exposes its subjects or agents as scoundrels, enemies of good citizens. Therefore, the technology of euphemization has become one of the successful steps towards hiding the propaganda essence of public diplomacy. By the way, concealment or hidden influence is one of the important conditions for effective propaganda.

The euphemization technology in the case of public diplomacy has a double force, since the noun «diplomacy» and the adjective «public» evoke only positive feelings and, in contrast to international propaganda, do not scare off the

public with a possible foreign policy threat. Indeed, publicity has such attractive connotations as «transparency», «openness», «democracy», and diplomacy – no less seductive associations as «politeness», «peacefulness», «integrity», «humanity».

As noted earlier, propaganda forms the essence of public diplomacy. For example, researchers K.Osgood, G.Berridge, and A.James consider public diplomacy as a form of propaganda [Osgood 2008: 543; Berridge,James 2001: 197]. However, it is important to emphasize that propaganda is not just specified in public diplomacy. Propaganda as the imposition of targeted meanings and the formation of desired attitudes through the use of cognitive distortions is a substantial, basic technology of public diplomacy. In other words, all other technologies of public diplomacy are conditions for the implementation, expansion and/or development of propaganda technology.

The simplest technologies of public diplomacy are: 1) informing, i.e. providing positive information in various forms about the state, its foreign policy, culture and social system; 2) ideologizing, i.e. spreading ideas about freedom, democracy and prosperity as socio-political ideals and criteria for evaluating, for example, american reality.

Informing has many forms of implementation. Its channels are television, radio, press, news, as well as educational activities that explain politics, the socio-political system of the state, the behavior of social groups and society as a whole (for example, while teaching political science, sociology, etc.). Ideologization acts through the proposal or, better to say, the imposition of ideas that 1) act as ways to implement interests, 2) justify the strongest aspirations of individuals, giving hope for their rapid implementation. In the case of the United States, these are the ideas of liberal democracy, market relations, and society of unlimited opportunities. During the cold war, the US political establishment viewed the «campaign of ideas» as an important tool in the fight against the spread of Soviet influence in the world. For example, in the 1950s, the Americans implemented the Nobel project, which provided training for Nobel laureates in order to spread

the ideas of the free world [Memorandum 1987]. Note that simple technologies such as informing and ideologizing are used as part of complex ones.

The technology of educational exchanges is one of the most effective in the framework of public diplomacy. The institutionalization of this technology in the United States took place in 1946 thanks to senator W. Fulbright, who linked its implementation with the global collective security organization, as well as the weaning of peoples from national sovereignty, the elimination of xenophobia, cultural barriers and mutual understanding between nations [Woods 1987]. It was assumed that the training of politicians, officials and promising students in targeted countries would form a new elite that would understand the policies of other states and their political culture, and the system of collective security would be based on this understanding. [Fulbright Act 1985: 568-569; Johnson 1965].

It is important to note that the technology of educational exchanges as a tool of foreign policy has a strategic character, since it is aimed at forming a foreign elite, which should become an ally of the state that implements that technology. It is quite clear that thanks to such an elite, it is easier to carry out external governance of weak states that do not have their own strategic plan for the implementation of national interests on the world stage. Because if they had their own strategic plan, they would be more difficult for managing them through the «tamed» and properly trained elite within the framework of other socio-cultural rules, standards and civilizational norms. It is obvious that the more primitive technologies of public diplomacy, such as films, radio voices, and printed materials, are of tactical importance, aimed at a mass and passive audience, and have a rapid impact.

A notable auxiliary technology of public diplomacy is the technology of systematic expertise, which consists in creating an Institute of advisers and experts who monitor the implementation of public diplomacy, identify its failures and outline opportunities for improving efficiency. Such an institution, for example, was created in the United States in 1947 and was called the Advisory Commission on Public

Diplomacy [United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy].

An equally important auxiliary technology of public diplomacy is the identification of target groups that become key in shaping the country's public opinion. The subject of public diplomacy is interested in the proper response of these groups. The target audience of public diplomacy is usually divided into the current elite and potential elite. The current elite can be understood as such socio-professional groups as 1) politicians (first of all, representatives of the government, as well as opposition parties); 2) journalists (first of all, editors of magazines and channels); 3) teachers (University professors and school teachers). In turn, the potential elite is mainly active students with leadership qualities. In american government documents, these groups are called opinion-molders [Launching 1952: 16-17].

Technology for searching and analyzing data of potential objects of public diplomacy is used to identify opinion-molders. It involves collecting biographical data of potential participants in public diplomacy programs, as well as analyzing the social structure of foreign societies in order to select the most significant figures in a particular country.

The technology of control over international processes of uniting representatives of the political, intellectual and financial elite of the world in an informal influential organization is quite effective. Back in 1954, the Bilderberg group was created, which brought together the world's leading scientists, politicians, economists and businessmen. In fact, this technology was intended to create an informal euro-atlantic alliance, so it can be called an informal alliance technology [Gijswijt 2019].

One of the most common technologies of public diplomacy is the technology of creating educational and cultural centers that influence the foreign public. One of the first such centers was the American cultural center, which was opened in Germany in 1952. In turn, Germany has been opening branches of the Goethe Institute abroad since 1958. Since 2004 China is beginning to establish branches of the Confucius Institute in other countries, of which there are more than 540

today [Confucius Institute].

Such a technology of public diplomacy as holding summer schools is effective in influencing the youth of foreign countries. This technology was proposed by the American scientist and later statesman Henry Kissinger in 1950 for European youth who may take key positions in society in the future. Through summer schools, European youth were educated in the spirit of anti-communism and attachment to American values.

A significant technology of public diplomacy is to finance the translation of the literature of the country performing public diplomacy into the language of the target country. This technology was most actively implemented by the United States and China to spread their cultural influence in the world.

The concept of cultural diplomacy as a complex of various technologies for the implementation of public diplomacy tasks involves holding festivals and competitions for the dissemination of cultural values in the target country. Significant success in winning the cold war was achieved through rock music and Hollywood films. Cultural diplomacy as a set of technologies is aimed at bringing peoples' cultures closer together, achieving mutual understanding and cultural consensus, and, at the same time, enhancing the significance of socio-cultural institutions for the target country as effective mechanisms for solving social problems.

The technology of introducing new academic disciplines in the field of international relations, history, and political science in higher education institutions as the responsibility of participants in training programs after an internship as the implementation of the tasks of public diplomacy in the United States has demonstrated its effectiveness in a number of regions.

International aid technologies also work well in public diplomacy. It is important to note such institutional technologies as humanitarian organizations. They help solve social problems for the population of States experiencing socio-economic difficulties with the money of the donor country. An illustration of such institutional technologies can be found in the functioning of Peace Corps, which was founded in the United States in 1961.

One of the key technologies of public diplomacy, which is related to the external governance of weak and dependent states in the international arena, is the formation and support of a dissident or opposition movement in the target country as a tool for political upheaval in the future. For example, Poland's Solidarity and Czechoslovakia's Charter 77 received stable American funding to expand the network of organizations and carry out underground activities [Schweizer 2003: 177; National Endowment 1987: 34-44].

After the cold war, the technologies of public diplomacy aimed at forming political opposition in post-Soviet countries, supporting its leaders in the electoral process, creating and financing organizations and experts engaged in monitoring elections, and mobilizing and financing social activism in various forms come to the fore. Monitoring elections with the support of opposition leaders and monitoring the electoral process with the help of a network of experts has made public diplomacy not just propaganda, but a system of effective technologies for managing the political process in post-Soviet States. In our view, the key element in this technological management was the dependence of grant recipients on such American institutions as the US Agency for International Development, the National Endowment for Democracy, and the US Department of State.

In a whole, public diplomacy technologies related to interference in the political process of other countries, aimed at changing the policy of such countries in the interests of the issuing country, the subject of public diplomacy.

The main auxiliary technologies for implementing the global technology of making geostrategic interests a reality are trainings, conferences, seminars, round tables for election observers, representatives of NGOs, mass media, political parties, members of parliament, publishing and distributing instructional brochures, leaflets, and organizing training programs for representatives of executive and local authorities.

Technologies of public diplomacy for changing the policy of another country (in other words, technologies of external governance) can

be divided into five types: 1) technologies for changing legislation related to the conduct of elections, the functioning of parties and NGOs; 2) creating opposition parties and training election observers; 3) creating independent media and influencing media policy taking into account their own interests; 4) creating a network of NGOs for activists; 5) training executive authorities and politicians. Thanks to the systematic implementation of these technologies, for example, in Ukraine, the US Agency for International Development managed not only to achieve the adoption of a new Constitution in 1996, new electoral legislation that provided for elections on a multiparty basis, the creation of an extensive network of NGOs that are a constant source of personnel for the executive branch and the deputy corps, but also a special, super-loyal attitude to the United States. Conversation of the current President of Ukraine V. Zelenskyi with the President of the United States D. Trump on July 25, 2019, which was made public in September of the same year, is more than indicative in this regard. From the conversation, we learn that the President of Ukraine is ready to take any steps, even to interfere in the process of investigating a criminal case, in order to strengthen strategic relations with the United States.

An important result of US public diplomacy technologies, which are aimed at implementing external governance, is the formation of a group of politicians, media professionals and social activists loyal to the US, whose thinking, values, behaviors and decision-making styles are formed by American training programs.

It is important to note here that the algorithm of operation of almost all american public diplomacy technologies can be best described using the expression «insidious gift» and the metaphor «Trojan horse». In other words, almost all american public diplomacy technologies are trojan technologies.

In contrast to the US technologies, Russian ones of public diplomacy in a whole clearly differ in their mechanism of action. This statement is based on an analysis of their actions in the post-soviet space, primarily in Ukraine. Russian technologies of public diplomacy operate on the principles of provocation and salvation, which

implies the presence of such elements as a threat to the normal existence of individuals, the induction of fear (through indirect financing of nationalist forces), the aggregation of interests of groups of symbolic oppression and information domination in the media space through the financing of a number of influential ukrainian media, experts and bloggers.

It is important to note that the mechanism of action of russian technologies of public diplomacy is fully described by S. Karpman's drama triangle, in which the role of the rescuer is determined by the actions of the persecutor and the presence of the victim. In contrast to the classical technology based on the principle of action in accordance with the S. Karpman drama triangle, where the persecutor is only symbolized based on the real social interests of certain groups of society, the persecutor in the structure of russian technologies of public diplomacy is provoked or financed, and its role in the perception of the victim is extremely exaggerated, which in turn requires the extraordinary role of the rescuer.

A separate group of public diplomacy technologies consists of digital diplomacy technologies, which are effective ways to implement the tasks of public diplomacy through electronic means, mainly through the Internet.

Digital diplomacy technologies can be divided into information, evaluative, and argumentative ones. Information technology of digital diplomacy is implemented through: 1) selection of certain information; 2) concretization of some information; 3) information restrictions; 4) concealment of facts (various forms of implementation of technologies of non-disclosure) or ignoring them; 5) distortion of information; 6) adaptation of information to the peculiarities of perception of the target audience. On the websites of foreign policy agencies or organizations, information technology is technically implemented through a system and location of hyperlinks to additional, specific information, as well as photos and videos, and due to the lack of necessary hyperlinks, if the technology of non-disclosure is implemented, which is specific to traditional diplomacy with its tendency to secrecy [Висоцький 2018].

The information technology of digital

diplomacy for information distortion is mainly based on the method of unverified version, which consists in communicating information about an event or fact to the audience without verifying its authenticity. The emphasis is on the mechanism of primary perception of information, which makes it much more difficult to change the initially formed opinion despite the refutation of the false message later [Висоцький 2018].

One of the important tools for implementing information technology in digital diplomacy is to adapt information to the specific perception of the target audience. A variation of this tool is to expand the language range of messages that are broadcast to a global audience. So, all materials are published on the official UN website in six languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish). In addition, UN information is also published in social networks in six languages. On the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, all messages are broadcast in two languages (Ukrainian and English), which may be explained by the fact that English is a universal communication tool in the era of globalization, and Ukrainian is the state language. Although it would be much better, in terms of the requirements for the effectiveness of digital diplomacy, to translate the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine to the UN multilingualism standards [Висоцький 2018].

The evaluative technology of digital diplomacy is implemented through means of defamation, including disapproval, neglect, condemnation, aggression, and means of positive representation [Висоцький 2018].

The technology of defamation or dissemination of defamatory or discreditable information is one of the most effective in political struggle, especially on the world stage. One variation of this technology is to inform the political leaders or institutions of other States through an appeal to negative values (anti-values) by using appropriate metaphors, allusions, concepts that imperceptibly include an assessment from the perspective of democratic values of an open society. Thus, accusations of corruption or violation of human rights are one of the ways to use the technology of defamation through value-loaded words-images that cause

a negative reaction from the world community. Ironic assessments, labeling, and creating an image of the enemy are also effective means of discrediting the policies of hostile states and their leaders [Висоцький 2018].

The technology of positive representation is implemented through the demonstration of empathy, the use of terms with a positive connotation in relation to allies. Demonstrating a positive attitude to the policy or leaders of another state, the subject of digital diplomacy simultaneously solves the task of his own positive self-representation. It is quite common to express condolences to the heads of state or the nation as a whole in connection with various types of terrorist attacks and disasters that killed civilians [Висоцький 2018].

Argumentative technologies of digital diplomacy are based on citations, eyewitness testimonies, links to information sources, visual evidence in the form of video and photographic materials, the choice of bright metaphors, epithets, images, appeals to positive values. A significant component of the implementation of argumentative digital diplomacy technology is an appeal to authority, refutation or confirmation of a fact through the use of examples, illustrations and video materials. An important example of the implementation of argumentative technology was the publication of materials from the investigation of the Dutch Prosecutor's office on the MH17 crash in social networks [Висоцький 2018].

The distribution of digital diplomacy content is successfully carried out thanks to participatory technology, which is one of the most effective in social networks. Its essence is that the target audience of the subject of public diplomacy becomes the distributor of the message. It is seduced to pick up a compelling or unusual message, and itself initiates the production and distribution of content in a given direction. This leads to a snowball effect, when the message reaches an increasing number of consumers.

Conclusion.

The technologies of public diplomacy allow not only to form a positive opinion of the foreign public, but also to carry out external governance of weak countries. Effective technologies of public diplomacy not only influence the thinking

and behavior of political leaders and activists of other countries, but also act as a driver of a full-fledged anthropological project for the formation of a modernized transnational human consciousness. That is the main source of support and legitimacy of the cultural, economic and geostrategic interests of the country that is the subject of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy technologies are innovative means of competing for influence in the international arena. Successful

implementation of public diplomacy technologies is not so much about winning hearts and minds, as well as establishing institutional channels for fruitful lobbying of their own interests anywhere in the world.

Further research into the technologies of public diplomacy involves understanding the differences and common features of the implementation of technologies by various states of the world and international organizations.

References

- Baudrillard, J. (2001). *Seduction*. Montreal: Ctheory books.
- Berridge, G.R. & James A. (2001). *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Bjola, C., Jiang, L., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Social media and public diplomacy: A comparative analysis of the digital diplomatic strategies of the EU, US and Japan in China*. In C. Bjola & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, 71-88.
- Carta, C. & Higgott, R. (2020). *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe: Between the Domestic and the International*. Springer International Publishing; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Confucius Institute / Classroom*. Retrieved from http://english.hanban.org/node_10971.htm.
- Copeland, D. (2013). *Taking diplomacy public: Science, technology and foreign ministries in a heteropolar world*. In R.S.Zaharna, A.Arsenault, & A.Fisher (Eds.), *Relational, networked and collaborative approaches to public diplomacy* (pp. 56–69). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Cortes, J.J. & Jamieson, T. (2020). Incorporating Research Design in Public Diplomacy: The Role of Listening to Foreign Publics. *International Journal of Communication*, 14, 1214-1231.
- Cull, N.J. (2019). *Public diplomacy: foundations for global engagement in the digital age*. Cambridge, UK; Medford, MA, USA: Polity Press.
- Fulbright Act*. Public Law 584, 79th Cong., 2nd sess., August 01, 1946. (1985). *A Decade of American Foreign Policy. Basic Documents, 1941–1949*. Washington: Dept. of State.
- Gijswijt, T. (2019). *Informal alliance: the Bilderberg Group and transatlantic relations during the Cold War, 1952-1968*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hayden, C. (2013). Engaging Technologies: A Comparative Study of U.S. and Venezuelan Strategies of Influence and Public Diplomacy. *International Journal of Communication*, 7, 1-25.
- Huang, Z.A. & Wang, R. (2020). 'Panda engagement' in China's digital public diplomacy. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 30(2), 118-140.
- Huijgh, E. (2019). *Public diplomacy at home: domestic dimensions*. Leiden; Boston: Brill Nijhoff.
- Johnson, W. & Colligan, F. (1965). *The Fulbright Program: a History*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Launching the Campaign of Truth*. (1952). Second Phase. Seventh Semiannual Report of the Secretary of State to Congress, January 01 to June 30, 1951. Wash. D.C.: Office of Public Affairs, Division of Publications.
- Manor, I. (2019). *The digitalization of public diplomacy*. New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Memorandum of J.Webb*. (1987). Third Progress Report. The Foreign Information Program and Psychological Warfare Planning. November 8, 1951. In Documents of the NSC, 1947-1977. Fourth Supplement. A Microfilm Project. Wash. D.C.
- National Endowment for Democracy*. Annual Report. (1987). Wash. D.C, 34-44.
- Nye, J.S. (2005). *Power in the global information age: from realism to globalization*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Nye, J.S. (2008). *The powers to lead*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Osgood, K. (2008). *Propaganda*. In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences: in 9 volumes. – Vol. 6 / W.A.Darity, Jr., ed. and chief; 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 543-544.
- Pamment, J. (2016). *British Public Diplomacy and Soft Power: Diplomatic Influence and the Digital Revolution*. Cham, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schweizer, P. (2003). *Reagan's War: The Epic Story of His Forty-Year Struggle and Final Triumph over Communism*. Westminister, MD: Doubleday Publishing.
- Snow, N. (2020). *Rethinking Public Diplomacy*. In Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / edited by Nancy Snow & Nicholas J. Cull. 2nd edition. New York, NY: Routledge, 3-12.
- United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/pdcommission/reports/index.htm>.
- Velikaya, A. A. & Simons, G. (2020). *Russia's public diplomacy*. New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Wichowski, A. (2015). 'Secrecy is for losers': *Why diplomats should embrace openness to protect national security*. In C.Bjola & M.Holmes (Eds.), *Digital diplomacy theory and practice*. Oxon: Routledge, 52–70.
- Woods, R.B. (1987). Fulbright Internationalism. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 491, 22-35.
- Висоцький, О.Ю. (2018). Електронна дипломатія як інструмент пропаганди [Vysotskyi, O. Electronic diplomacy as a tool of propaganda]. *Politology bulletin*, 81, 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2415-881x.2018.81.51-59>.
- Висоцький, О.Ю. (2020). Публічна дипломатія як форма нової пропаганди [Vysotskyi, O. Public diplomacy as a form of new propaganda]. *Освіта і наука у мінливому світі: проблеми та перспективи розвитку. Матеріали II Міжнародної наукової конференції. 27-28 березня 2020 р., м.Дніпро. Частина II.* / Наук. ред. О.Ю.Висоцький. Дніпро: СПД «Охотнік», 11-13 [Education and Science in a Changing World: Problems and Prospects for Development.Proceedings of the Second International Scientific Conference. March 27-28, 2020, Dnipro, Ukraine. Part II. / Scientific editor O.Vysotsky. Dnipro: SPD «Hunter», 11-13]. Retrieved from <https://www.twirpx.com/file/3079540/>.