

УДК 327

T. A. Poda

THE DEVELOPMENT OF "NETWORK DIPLOMACY" AS A NEW FORM OF INTERNATIONAL INTERACTION

National Aviation University
podatetiana@nau.edu.ua;

Research ID: R-8153-2018; ORCID: 0000-0001-9662-1204

Abstract. *The article is devoted to the new traditional diplomacy branch analysis, which emerged as a result of scientific and technological progress - network diplomacy. The main purpose of the study is to analyze the term base field of this phenomenon. The article examines different ways of the network diplomacy phenomenon understanding, outlines the main directions and main tasks performed by "network diplomacy" as a new form of international cooperation. The author also analyzes the negative side of the information and communication technologies spread, in particular, emphasizes that information is not only an important factor in development, it becomes a tool for achieving certain goals, manipulation, political intolerance.*

Keywords: diplomatic activity; Internet; virtual diplomacy; network diplomacy; digital communication; network society; network.

Introduction

In contemporary world we are observing, that the new world order, formed under the influence of globalization and informatization, is gradually acquiring a certain stable structure. Not only states but also other actors play an active role in international relations. Relationships between different actors on the world stage can be defined as network interaction - an extensive system of relationships within which there are contacts, exchanges, cooperation and conflicts.

Not only states but also other actors play an active role in international relations. Relationships between different actors on the world stage can be defined as network interaction - an extensive system of relationships within which there are contacts, exchanges, cooperation and conflicts.

One of the modern information society features is the growing popularity of social networks operating in the information space. Constantly expanding and covering more and more segments (from economics, politics, science to higher education), the network society directly affects the formation of multilevel globalization, including the work through social networks.

We agree with researchers who have used the concept of rhizome in their analysis of "networks": G. Deleuze, F. Guattari (Делез & Гваттари, 2010) and others. Among the scholars, who emphasize the growing role of networks in the functioning of modern society, there is M. Castells, who introduced the concept of "network society". L. Pai, F. Hanson, G. Gerbner, J. Grunig, have been engaged in digital diplomacy issues.

Among Ukrainian researchers, who are interested in the features of various network society aspects, we can name T. Savelieva (Савельєва, 2012), who refers to the "network society" definition in her study; O. Dzoban and O. Sosnin, who study the network communication systems effects in the globalization process on the horizontal and vertical segments and societies structures (Дзюбань, & Соснін, 2015). T. Bielska analyzes the factors (determinants), that affect the relationship between civil society and public authorities and communication between them (Бельська, 2012). N. Pipchenko addresses the issue of providing the state's foreign policy interests with digital diplomacy tools and comes to the conclusion, that international communication is changing under the Internet technologies influence, which in turn requires the development of a legal mechanism for interaction

between states and world communities (Піпченко, 2015). In general, such scientists as B. Humeniuk, O. Kulyk, O. Sagaidak, P. Sardachuk, K. Buleha, O. Shcherba, I. Skyba, S. Ordenov, N. Chenbai (Скиба та ін., 2019) and others prove in their scientific publications the need to adapt diplomatic work to the modern globalized society demands. In the context of the theme, it is worth highlighting the research of Ukrainian analysts L. Litra and Y. Kononenko on the latest technologies usage possibilities to strengthen Ukraine's international position.

The aim and tasks

The aim of the article is to analyze the current information phase of post-industrial society development, in particular its transition to the network level and determine the network interaction influence level on diplomacy.

The task of the research is to systematize domestic and foreign experience in determining the components that influence the "network diplomacy" phenomenon formation, as well as outlining the main network interaction features.

Research methods

To achieve the goal set in the article, a set of basic principles and methods of scientific knowledge was used, among which the leading ones are: system analysis, structural functionalism, dialectics and synergetics, comparison, critical analysis.

Research results

The scientific and technological or as it also known "information" revolution has become a catalyst for globalization and the accompanying processes, that are still continuing and covering almost all public life spheres, including the sphere of diplomacy. In nowadays, as J. Habermas notes, "worldwide media, networks and systems contribute to the symbolic and social relations consolidation" (Хабермас, 2001), resulting in the mutual influence of local and distant events, that is a hallmark of the modern world.

The modern system of international relations can be defined as polycentric, in which traditional forms of diplomacy are replaced by network diplomacy. The main catalyst for networking and intensification of various international cooperation forms is informatization. Social processes increasingly depend on the virtual world, not the real one.

M. Castells defines the information society as a network, in which the network is the system-forming society basis. He argues that the impetus for the transformations, that the modern world is experiencing, are information-processing technologies and communication (Кастельс, 2000).

Ukrainian researcher T. Savelieva, looking for grounds for defining modern society as a networking, outlines the following decisive factors in the formation of the latter: increasing the information role in society, increasing the computer communications share, creating a global information (communicative) space, and, accordingly, social reality change, in which all major areas of life are based on "network logic" (Савельєва, 2012: 91).

We also agree with the opinion of I. Devterov, who notes that "Many areas of social life have undergone changes with the advent of global digital networks in our lives," the political sphere and the diplomacy are not inclusive (Девтеров, 2019: 5).

As it was noted in our previous study: "Network society is a specific form of social structure defined by researchers as an integral feature of the information age, a modern historical period characterized by extremely rapid development of information and communication technologies with a clear dominance of information exchange and production of new knowledge" (Пода, 2019: 141).

As the American political scientist Joseph Nye aptly points out, modern politics is "played out" on a "three-dimensional chessboard", where the first traditional state dimension is organized according to the classical principles of a state-oriented system; the second dimension (flows) reflects the world of business, and the third dimension reflects networks (Nye, 2002).

The network form of organization is reflected in such relatively new concepts as "multilevel diplomacy" and "hybrid organizations". Multilevel diplomacy involves the interaction of various governmental and non-governmental organizations, actors. "Hybrid organizations" is a modern phenomenon, that involves close cooperation between intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental and network organizations, which together form common structures.

Therefore, it is necessary to highlight certain features that are typical for a network structures based society. Firstly, there is the lack of a clear distinction between "center" and "periphery". Secondly, there is no strict hierarchy of problems being solved or discussed. Third, the specific features of the different network actors interaction is the presence of different channels, space openness, its boundaries mobility, and so on.

We can define that network interaction is an extensive communication system, within which there are contacts, information exchange, cooperation and conflicts. In international relations, networking primarily includes diplomacy, which undergoes significant changes and transformations under the informatization influence.

The informatization process has made international communication available to different participants. They carry out different types of communicative interaction at different levels (local, regional, global). As a result, new types of diplomacy emerged: public diplomacy, regional diplomacy, e-diplomacy, network diplomacy, etc.

The term "network diplomacy" often refers to the need for nations to form temporary coalitions to achieve their foreign policy goals. Such coalitions can be considered as networks with each coalition member.

As N. Pipchenko emphasizes: "The relationship between digital diplomacy and international relations takes place on several levels: personal, intergroup, collective, resulting in increased non-traditional international actors influence on government or non-governmental institutions and attracting public attention to existing global problems" (Піпченко, 2015).

It is worth noting that diplomacy is an important component of soft power. In his works, Nye J., revealing the phenomenon of "soft power" noted, that "the state can get the desired result in world politics, when other states want to follow it, admire its values, follow its example, and strive for its level of prosperity and openness" (Nye, 2002: 14). Modern networking is a set of connections made by matching values and finding common ground, goals and interests. The common interests and goals of the actors are based on common values and can sometimes be placed above their own values. However, the opposite situation can also be observed, when value conflicts arise, when the victory of one of the actors means the loss of the other.

Scientists note that network interaction is characterized by a certain chaos, uncertainty. At the same time, there is a profound transformation of the international relations system, in which "multilevel" players "who have become an integrated part, no longer complement and serve bilateral relations between states, but become a key element of the system itself" (Воронков, 2013). Ukrainian researcher M. Abysova while exploring the communicative possibilities of the multi-modular form of the modern world, rightly notes that "thanks to new information technologies, the principle of the network can be provided in all types of processes and organizations. The growing and consolidation of public communication encourages openness of society and strengthens the dialogical processes in it (Абисова, 2018: 42).

One of the components of "soft power" is public diplomacy, which involves not only governments, but also, above all, non-governmental organizations and individuals. The scholars point out that over the last twenty years public diplomacy has begun to play a key role, becoming a foreign policy influential tool. This type of diplomacy is defined as "new public diplomacy" (Концева, 2013).

Scientists characterize the "new world order" as a communication network that crosses borders and even replaces a traditional state structure. American researcher K. Fitzpatrick emphasizes that these networks can be perceived as agents of power. And thanks to them the nation's relations with foreign audiences become extremely important. "Nowadays, diplomats have to involve a large number of players from another country. The outdated "club model" of diplomacy gave way to a less hierarchical and strict "network model" (Fitzpatrick, 2007).

In the scientific community there is no consensus as to the term of "public diplomacy", but most scholars use the following definition: "The new public diplomacy is no longer confined to messaging, promotion

campaigns, or even direct governmental contacts with foreign publics serving foreign policy purposes. It is also about building relationships with civil society actors in other countries and about facilitating networks between non-governmental parties at home and abroad" (Melissen, 2005: 22). One of the key characteristics of modern public diplomacy is the dialogue between different social communities, such as youth movements, national diasporas and others.

Analyzing modern research, we can find out that F. Hanson, an analyst at the Brookings Institution (USA) and a researcher at the Lowy Institute for International Policy (Australia) defines e-diplomacy as "the use of the Internet and information and communication technologies (ICT) to achieve diplomatic goals" (Hanson). Speaking of e-diplomacy subspecies, it is necessary to single out "twiplomacy", social media diplomacy, Internet-diplomacy etc. Video conferencing and electronic negotiation systems are also increasingly used.

Modern Ukrainian researchers L. Litra and Y. Kononenko recently presented a thorough analytical study "Twitter-diplomacy". They define Twitter - diplomacy as a form of traditional diplomacy that uses technologies and networks of the XXI century to achieve foreign policy goals. Meanwhile, they distinguish two main features of Twitter diplomacy: first, the use of the latest ICT (social media, software for Internet telephony, video channels); secondly, the Twitter diplomacy functioning as a powerful and important addition to traditional diplomatic relations forms, which can accelerate and improve diplomatic contacts, as well as expand their scope (Litra).

All this leads to global interdependence, to the new political life areas creation, such as "media policy", "cyber policy" and "noopolitics", etc., which operate in the network space, resulting in the fact, that social networks become a powerful tool for influencing public opinion, the cultural life of people" (Скиба, 2019: 175). Analyzing the architecture of global information networks, which according to Ukrainian researchers L. Drotianko and S. Yagodzinskyi is not being reduced to either a formal or a meaningful network component as a structure, in their study they conclude that "The informational and technological revolution in the formation of contours of social reality of the late 20th - early 21st centuries... is not the last one and only prepares foundation for further sociocultural changes" (Drotianko, Yahodzinskyi, 2019: 13).

Discussion

Researcher E. Grebenkina studying the interaction between actors of international relations issue defines it as a network interaction, within which there are contacts, cooperation and conflicts. The researcher also identifies the following network diplomacy features: 1) network diplomacy is opposed to traditional, "bloc" diplomacy; 2) it is based not on the participants hierarchy, but on their interdependence; 3) it is aimed at forming the collective participants leadership; 4) the main motive for the participants actions is their precise overlapping goals; 5) network diplomacy operates within a polycentric international system; 6) it is under the influence of different worldviews and value systems (cultural and civilization diversity) (Гребенкіна, 2014).

Modern models of diplomacy: electronic, digital, Twitter diplomacy, public, etc., each of them has its own values, which will be strengthened in the world network structure compiling process:

- for public diplomacy can be defined such values as active public dialogue and its openness, exchange of cultural, scientific and other values between representatives of different countries, peoples, cultures;

- for e-diplomacy the values will be knowledge and information, the degree of their availability, communication openness, high speed of response to events;

- for network diplomacy – communication flexibility and transparency, reduction of its formal and hierarchical components, expansion of the participants' circle at different levels of government, their active.

Thus, with the emergence of new diplomacy types, it is transformed from within, towards larger and more diverse interaction and openness. The new species emergence indicates the international relations network structure formation, which, despite political, economic and other differences, will gradually include more and more countries and regions of the world. Such a structure is a result of the globalization process.

It should be noted that in recent decades there has been a significant increase in the number and importance of formal and informal international intergovernmental and non-governmental forums, institutions and organizations that serve these processes and are their unique infrastructure (Воронков, 2013: 62).

It is obvious that the global information society and information and communication technologies development will continue. The components that will be important for international communication in the information society and are already manifesting themselves, include the following:

- 1) information correspondence to real facts and events;

- 2) the value of open dialogue between actors and their actions clarity;

- 3) the speed of response to events.

It is possible that these values, to which all participants in international communication should strive, will become the basis for a new international relations system in which the dialogue between the participants will be interactive and constant, and their conflict potential will be minimal. But at the same time we need to remember the threats posed by information technology, and as N. Chenbai notes "a prerequisite for further society progressive development should be the introduction of strict state control over the introduction into the new social media technologies environment, strengthening the personal creators' responsibility to society in order to reduce the risks that will bring the latest technologies in the future" (Ченбай, 2019: 160). T. Mershchii agrees with the researcher, saying that "Interaction under the influence of information and communication technologies is being created in a complex and contradictory way in nowadays. On the one hand, they promote, expand opportunities, generate new channels of communication; on the other hand - have a distorting effect, changing the way of thinking and communicating" (Мерщій, 2019: 60).

Conclusions

Network diplomacy is in demand in the modern world as it provides flexible participation forms in multilateral structures. The role of network diplomacy is growing under the modern digital technologies influence and the growing "soft power" role and other hybrid forms influence.

Recently, governments have increasingly used e-diplomacy to achieve foreign policy goals. Unlike traditional diplomacy, where government officials sit opposite each other and communicate exclusively with each other, e-diplomacy professionals perform dialogue (using social networks, webinars, online Skype conferences, etc.) not only with official foreign representatives, governments, but also with international organizations and NGOs representatives, etc.

In the context of networking, the diplomacy role will continue to change. Network diplomacy is a successful example of interaction that does not depend on the distances between the subjects. Modern diplomacy successfully overcomes barriers in the hierarchies' form, other values and the actors' affiliation to other cultures. The network structure and network interaction that the world has come to as a result of globalization is an example of nature's self-organization. It is likely that networking between various actors - states, international organizations, NGOs and even individuals involved in international communication - will be a determining factor in the development of international relations in the coming decades.

Literature

1. Deloz, Zh., Gvattari, F. (2010). Tyisyacha plato: kapitalizm i shizofreniya [Thousand plateau: capitalism and schizophrenia] Ekaterinburg: U-Faktoriya [in Russian].
2. Savelyeva, T. (2012). Suchasne merezheve suspilstvo: problemy vyznachennya [Modern Network Society: Problems of Definition]. Suchasne suspilstvo, 1 [in Ukrainian].
3. Dzoban, O., Sosnin, O. (2015). Informatsiynne suspilstvo yak merezhevo-komunikatyvnyi prostir upravlinnya [Information society as a network-communication space of control]. Viche, 10. 7-13 [in Ukrainian].
4. Belska, T. (2012). Komunikatsiyna vzaemodiya vlady ta gromadskosti v informatsiynomu suspilstvi. [Communication interaction between government and the public in the information society]. Derzhava i suspilstvo, 3: 163-169 [in Ukrainian].
5. Pipchenko, N. O. (2015). Tsyfrova dyplomatiia yak instrument zovnishnopolitychnoi diialnosti SSHA. [Digital diplomacy as a tool of US foreign policy]. Mizhnarodni vidnosyny. Seriya «Politychni nauky», 5: 15-26 [in Ukrainian].
6. Skyba, I.P., Ordenov, S.S., Chenbai, N.A. (2019). Fenomen informatsiino-komunikatsiinykh tekhnolohii [The phenomenon of information communication technologies]. Filosofski obrii: Nauk-teoret. Zhurnal. Poltava, 42: 62-67 [in Ukrainian].
7. Habermas, J. (2001). Vovlechenye drugoho. Ocherky politicheskoi teorii. [The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory]. SPb.: Nauka [in Russian].
8. Castells, M. (2000). Informatsionnaya epokha: ekonomika, obshchestvo i kultura [The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture]. Moscow: GU VSE [in Russian].
9. Devterov, I. (2019). Fenomenolohiya sotsyokulturnykh praktyk tsyfrovoy noosfery [The phenomenology of socio-cultural practices of the digital noosphere]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 2(30): 5-9 [in Ukrainian].
10. Poda, T. A. (2019). Sotsiokulturnyi aspekt fenomena internet-zalezhnosti [Social networks phenomenon and its impact on social and political processes in globalized world]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 1 (29): 141-9 [in Ukrainian].
11. Nye, Josef S. (2002) *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

12. Voronkov, L. S. Mezhdunarodnye orhanyzatsyi i sovremennye mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya [International organizations and modern international relations]. <https://interaffairs.ru/jauthor/material/951> [in Russian].

13. Abysova, M. (2018) Komunikatyvnyi potentsial kulturnykh vidminnostei v informatsiynomu suspilstvi [Communicative potential of cultural differences in the information society]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu*. Seriya: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia, 1 (27): 39-43 [in Ukrainian].

14. Kontsevaya, N. A. (2013) Pablik ryleishnzz v sisteme pablychnoi dyplomatii [Public relations in the system of public diplomacy]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 10. Zhurnalistika*, 1: 52-64 [in Russian].

15. Fitzpatrick, K. (2007). *Advancing the New Public Diplomacy: A Public Relations Perspective*. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2(3): 187-211.

16. Melissen, J. (2005) *The New Public Diplomacy*. *Soft Power in International Relations* New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from www.Culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomac.

17. Hanson, F. *Baked In and Wired: e Diplomacy @ State*. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/baked-in-hansonf-5.pdf>

18. Litra, L. and Kononenko, Yu. *Twitter-dyplomatiia. Yak novitni tekhnolohii mozhut posylyty mizhnarodni pozytsii Ukrainy? [Twitter diplomacy. How can the latest technologies strengthen Ukraine's international position?]*. Retrieved from http://iwp.org.ua/img/policy_brif_1_01_23_ok.pdf

19. Skyba, O. P. (2019) Internet-komunikatsii v informatsiynomu suspilstvi: sotsiokulturnyi aspekt [Internet communications in the information society: socio-cultural aspects]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 2 (30): 113-117 [in Ukrainian].

20. Drotianko, L. and Yahodzynskiy, S. Digitalization of educational environment: tendencies and perspectives. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 2 (30): 9-13.

21. Grebenkina, E. (2014) Problema setevogo vzaemodeystviya v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniyah [The problem of network interaction in international relations]. *Idey i idealy*, 3(21), vol. 2: 134-142 [in Russian].

22. Voronkov, L. S. (2013) Mezhdunarodnye organizatsii i sovremennye mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya tendentsyi i perspektivy razvitiya [International organizations and modern international relations: Trends and development prospects]. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/mezhdunarodnye-organizatsii-v-sisteme-mezhdunarodnykh-otnosheniy-tendentsii-i-perspektivy-razvitiya> [in Russian].

23. Chenbai, N. Mediatekhnolohii v kulturi informatsiinoi epokhy (sotsialno-filosofskiy aspekt) [Media technologies in the culture of information era (social and philosophical aspect)]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 1 (29): 158-163 [in Ukrainian].

24. Mershchii, (2019) Mistse informatsiino-komunikatsiinykh tekhnolohii v interaktsii v informatsiynomu suspilstvi [Place of information and communication technologies in interaction in the information society]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu, Proceedings of the National Aviation University*, 2 (30): 56-61 [in Ukrainian].

References

1. Abysova, M. (2018) Komunikatyvnyi potentsial kulturnykh vidminnostei v informatsiynomu suspilstvi [Communicative potential of cultural differences in the information society]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiynoho universytetu. Seriya: Filosofiia. Kulturolohiia*, 1 (27): 39-43. (In Ukrainian).
2. Belska, T. (2012). Komunikatsiyna vzaemodiya vlady ta gromadskosti v informatsiynomu suspilstvi. [Communication interaction between government and the public in the information society]. *Derzhava i suspilstvo*, 3: 163-169. (In Ukrainian).
3. Castells, M. (2000) *Informatsionnaya epokha: ekonomika, obshchestvo i kultura [The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture]*. Moscow: GU VSE. (In Russian).
4. Chenbai, N. Mediatekhnolohii v kulturi informatsiinoi epokhy (sotsialno-filosofskiy aspekt) [Media technologies in the culture of information era (social and philosophical aspect)].

Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia, 1 (29): 158-163. (In Ukrainian).

5. Deloz, Zh., Gvattari, F. (2010) Tyisyacha plato: kapitalizm i shizofreniya [Thousand plateau: capitalism and schizophrenia] Ekatrinnburg: U-Faktoriya. (In Russian).

6. Devterov, I. (2019) Fenomenohyia sotsyokulturnykh praktyk tsyfrovoy noosfery [The phenomenology of socio-cultural practices of the digital noosphere]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia*, 2(30): 5-9. (In Ukrainian).

7. Drotanko, L. and Yahodzynskiy, S. Digitalization of educationa lenvironment: tendenciesandperspectives. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia*, 2 (30): 9-13. (In English).

8. Dzoban, O., Sosnin, O. (2015). Informatsiynе suspilstvo yak merezhevo-komunikatyvnyi prostir upravlinnya [Information society as a network-communication space of control]. *Viche*, 10: 7-13. (In Ukrainian).

9. Fitzpatrick, K. (2007). Advancing the New Public Diplomacy: A Public Relations Perspective. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2(3): 187-211.

10. Grebenkina, E. (2014) Проблема сетевого взаимодействия в международных отношениях [The problem of network interaction in international Relations]. *Idei i idealny*, 3(21), vol. 2: 134-142. (In Russian).

11. Habermas, J. (2001) Vovlechenye drugogo. Ocherky politicheskoy teorii. [The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory]. SPb.: Nauka. (In Russian).

12. Hanson, F. Baked In and Wired: e Diplomacy @ State. [Electronic resource]. - Available at: URL: <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/baked-in-hansonf-5.pdf>

13. Kontsevaya, N. A. (2013) Pablik ryleishnnyz v sisteme publichnoy dyplomatii [Public relations in the system of public diplomacy]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 10. Zhurnalistika*, 1: 52-64. (In Russian).

14. Litra, L. and Kononenko, Yu. Ttwitter-dyplomatiia. Yak novitni tekhnologii mozhut posylyty mizhnarodni pozytsii Ukrainy? [Twitter diplomacy. How can the latest technologies strengthen Ukraine's international position?]. [Electronic resource]. - Available at: – URL : http://iwp.org.ua/img/policy_brif_1_01_23_ok.pdf

15. Melissen, J. (2005) The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. [Electronic resource]. – Available at: URL: www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomacy.

www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomacy.

16. Mershchii, T. (2019) Mistse informatsiino-komunikatsiinykh tekhnologii v interaktsii v informatsiinomu suspilstvi [Place of information and communication technologies in interaction in the information society]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia*, 2 (30): 56-61. (In Ukrainian).

17. Nye, Josef S. (2002) The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

18. Pipchenko, N. O. (2015). Tsyfrova dyplomatiia yak instrument zovnishnopolitychnoi diialnosti SShA. [Digital diplomacy as a tool of US foreign policy]. *Mizhnarodni vidnosyny. Seriya «Politychni nauky»*, 5: 15-26. (In Ukrainian).

19. Poda, T. A. (2019) Sotsiokulturnyi aspekt fenomena internet-zalezhnosti [Social networks phenomenon and its impact on social and political processes in globalized world]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia. № 1 (29)*: 141-9. (In Ukrainian).

20. Savelyeva, T. (2012) Suchasne merezheve suspilstvo: problemy vyznachennya [Modern Network Society: Problems of Definition]. *Suchasne suspilstvo*, 1. (In Ukrainian).

21. Skyba, I.P., Ordenov, S.S., Chenbai, N.A. (2019) Fenomen informatsiino-komunikatsiinykh tekhnologii [The phenomenon of information communication technologies]. *Filosofski obrii: Nauk.-teoret. Zhurnal. Poltava*, 42: 62-67. (In Ukrainian).

22. Skyba, O. P. (2019) Internet-komunikatsii v informatsiinomu suspilstvi: sotsiokulturnyi aspekt [Internet communications in the information society: socio-cultural aspects]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho aviatsiinoho universytetu. Seriya: Filozofia. Kulturolohiia*, 2 (30): 113-117. (In Ukrainian).

23. Voronkov, L. S. (2013) Mezhdunarodnyie organizatsii i sovremennyye mezhdunarodnyie otnosheniya tendencyi i perspektivy razvitiya [International organizations and modern international relations: Trends and development prospects]. [Electronic resource]. – Available at:– <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/mezhdunarodnyie-organizatsii-v-sisteme-mezhdunarodnyh-otnosheniy-tendentsii-i-perspektivy-razvitiya>

24. Voronkov, L. S. Mezhdunarodnyie orhanyzatsyi i sovremennyye mezhdunarodnyie otnosheniya [International organizations and modern international relations]. <https://interaffairs.ru/jauthor/material/951> (In Russian).

T. A. Пода

РАЗВИТИЕ «СЕТЕВОЙ ДИПЛОМАТИИ» КАК НОВОЙ ФОРМЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНОГО ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЯ

Статья посвящена анализу нового ответвления традиционной дипломатии, которое возникло в результате научно-технического прогресса – сетевой дипломатии. Главная цель исследования заключается в анализе терминологического поля данного явления. В статье рассмотрены различные способы понимания феномена сетевой дипломатии, определены основные направления и главные задачи, которые выполняет «сетевая дипломатия» как новая форма международного взаимодействия. Автор также анализирует негативную сторону распространения информационно-коммуникационных технологий, в частности отмечает, что информация становится не только важным фактором развития, она превращается в инструмент достижения определенных целей, манипуляций, политической нетерпимости.

Ключевые слова: дипломатическая деятельность; Internet; виртуальная дипломатия; сетевая дипломатия; цифровая коммуникация; сетевое общество; сеть.

T. A. Пода

РОЗВИТОК «МЕРЕЖЕВОЇ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ» ЯК НОВОЇ ФОРМИ МІЖНАРОДНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ

Вступ. Однією з особливостей сучасного інформаційного суспільства є зростання популярності соціальних мереж, що функціонують в інформаційному просторі. Постійно розширюючи і охоплюючи все нові і нові сегменти (від економіки, політики, науки до вищої освіти), мережеве суспільство безпосередньо впливає на формування багаторівневої глобалізації, у тому числі, і через роботу соціальних мереж.

Метою статті є аналіз сучасного інформаційного етапу розвитку постіндустріального суспільства, зокрема його переходу на рівень мережевого та визначення рівня впливу мережевої взаємодії на дипломатію. **Завдання** систематизувати вітчизняний та зарубіжний досвід щодо визначення складових, що впливають на формування феномену «мережевої дипломатії», а також окреслення основних ознак мережевої взаємодії. **Результати.** Досліджено різні способи розуміння феномену мережевої дипломатії, окреслено основні напрями та головні завдання, що виконують «мережева дипломатія», як нова форма міжнародної взаємодії. На відміну від класичної дипломатії, де представники урядів сидять один навпроти одного і контактують виключно один з одним, фахівці в галузі електронної дипломатії ведуть діалог (використовуючи соціальні мережі, вебінари, онлайн конференції в скайпі і т.п.) не тільки з офіційними представниками іноземних урядів, а й з представниками міжнародних організацій і громадських організацій тощо. **Обговорення.** Вказано на негативний бік поширення інформаційно-комунікаційних технологій, зокрема авторка наголошує, що інформація стає не тільки важливим фактором розвитку. Вона перетворюється на інструмент досягнення певних цілей, маніпуляцій, політичної нетерпимості. **Висновки.** Роль мережевої дипломатії все більше посилюється під впливом сучасних цифрових технологій, а також в процесі зростання ролі «м'якої сили» та інших форм пбридного впливу. Швидше за все, саме мережева взаємодія між різними акторами – державами, міжнародними організаціями, громадськими об'єднаннями та окремими людьми, які беруть участь в міжнародному спілкуванні, – стане визначальним фактором розвитку міжнародних відносин у наступні десятиліття.

Ключові слова: дипломатична діяльність; Internet; віртуальна дипломатія; мережева дипломатія; цифрова комунікація; мережеве суспільство; мережа.