

**Kukeyeva F.<sup>1</sup>, Alipkyzy R.<sup>2</sup>, Shokparova Zh.<sup>3</sup>, Batrbekova A.<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Doctor of History, Professor, e-mail: fturar@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup>PhD student, e-mail: alipkyzy89@mail.ru

<sup>3</sup>MA student, e-mail: shokparova.zhanel@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>Master of Social Sciences, assistant, e-mail: aigerim.batrbekova@gmail.com  
al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

### **SOME THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF THE PUBLIC DIPLOMACY**

The new geopolitical realities, information technologies' rapid development are changing the international relations structure, and complicating the tasks of diplomacy. Today, it is not enough for the world community to take into consideration only its political, economic or demographic characteristics to form a perception of the country. Image becomes one of the most important aspects of the overall assessment of the state. This fact explains the important role of public diplomacy in international relations. Public diplomacy has now become an effective instrument of foreign policy and is widespread in the world. In the contemporary international relations, public diplomacy serves as a diplomatic mechanism, and is recognized by all states. It is also an additional opportunity to implement foreign policy objectives in the context of the international relations new system formation. The authors analyze the main theories and conceptual approaches in the study of public diplomacy: the «soft power concept, constructivism and strategic communication. The authors also note that these theories and concepts focused on the both the state activity and non-state actors under the public diplomacy. The proposed article will be interesting for specialists in the field of international relations, dealing with theoretical issues of world politics and diplomacy.

**Key words:** public diplomacy, international relations, theory, concept, soft power, constructivism, strategic communications, branding.

Кукеева Ф.Т.<sup>1</sup>, Алипқызы Р.<sup>2</sup>, Шокпарова Ж.<sup>3</sup>, Батрбекова А.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор e-mail: fturar@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup>PhD докторанты, e-mail: alipkyzy89@mail.ru

<sup>3</sup>магистрант, e-mail: shokparova.zhanel@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>халықаралық қатынастар магистрі, оқытушы e-mail: aigerim.batrbekova@gmail.com  
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

#### **Қоғамдық дипломатияның кейбір теориялық аспектілері**

Жаңа геосаяси жағдай, ақпараттық технологиялардың қарқынды дамуы дипломатияның міндеттерін күрделендіре отырып, халықаралық қатынастардың құрылымын өзгертуде. Бүгінгі таңда елдің әлемдік қауымдастықпен қабылдануын қалыптастыру үшін оның саяси, экономикалық немесе демографиялық сипаттамаларын есепке алу жеткіліксіз. Имидж мемлекетті жалпы бағалаудағы ең маңызды аспектілерінің біріне айналуға бастады. Бұл факт халықаралық қатынастардағы қоғамдық дипломатияның өзекті рөлін түсіндіріп отыр. Қоғамдық дипломатия бүгін сыртқы саясаттың тиімді құралына айналды және әлемде кең таралған. Қазіргі халықаралық қатынастарда қоғамдық дипломатия дипломатиялық механизм және халықаралық қатынастардың жаңа жүйесінің қалыптасу жағдайында сыртқы саясат міндеттерін іске асыру үшін бүкіл мемлекеттермен танылатын қосымша мүмкіндік ретінде әрекет етеді. Мақала авторлары қоғамдық дипломатияны зерттеуде негізгі теориялар мен концептуалды тәсілдерді сараптайды: «жұмсақ күш» тұжырымдамасы, конструктивизм, стратегиялық коммуникация және брендинг. Сонымен қатар, мақала авторлары бұл теориялар мен тұжырымдамалардың қоғамдық дипломатия шеңберінде мемлекеттік және мемлекеттік емес акторлардың қызметіне назар

аударатынын атап көрсетеді. Берілген мақала әлемдік саясат пен дипломатияның теориялық мәселелерімен айналысатын халықаралық қатынастар саласындағы мамандарға арналған.

**Түйін сөздер:** қоғамдық дипломатия, халықаралық қатынастар, теория, тұжырымдама, жұмсақ күш, конструктивизм, стратегиялық коммуникация, брендинг.

Кукеева Ф.Т.<sup>1</sup>, Алипқызы Р.<sup>2</sup>, Шокпарова Ж.<sup>3</sup>, Батрбекова А.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>доктор исторических наук, профессор, e-mail: fturar@mail.ru

<sup>2</sup>PhD докторант, e-mail: alipkyzy89@mail.ru

<sup>3</sup>магистрант, e-mail: shokparova.zhanel@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>магистр международных отношений, преподаватель, e-mail: aigerim.batrbeikova@gmail.com  
Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы

### Некоторые теоретические аспекты публичной дипломатии

Новые геополитические реалии, стремительное развитие информационных технологий меняют структуру международных отношений, усложняя задачи дипломатии. Сегодня для формирования восприятия страны мировым сообществом становится недостаточным учитывать лишь ее политические, экономические или демографические характеристики. Имидж становится одним из самых важных аспектов общей оценки государства. Этот факт объясняет важную роль публичной дипломатии в международных отношениях. Публичная дипломатия сегодня стала действенным инструментом внешней политики и получила широкое распространение в мире. В современных международных отношениях публичная дипломатия выступает в качестве дипломатического механизма, и признаваемой всеми государствами, дополнительной возможностью для реализации задач внешней политики в условиях формирования новой системы международных отношений. Авторы статьи анализируют основные теории и концептуальные подходы в изучении публичной дипломатии: концепцию «мягкой силы», конструктивизм, стратегическую коммуникацию и брендинг. Авторы статьи также отмечают, что эти теории и концепции сфокусированы на деятельности государственных и негосударственных акторов в рамках публичной дипломатии. Предлагаемая статья ориентирована на специалистов в области международных отношений, занимающихся теоретическими вопросами мировой политики и дипломатии.

**Ключевые слова:** публичная дипломатия, международные отношения, теория, концепция, мягкая сила, конструктивизм, стратегическая коммуникация, брендинг.

### Introduction

The new geopolitical realities, information technologies' rapid development are changing the international relations structure, and complicating the tasks of diplomacy. Today, it is not enough for the world community to take into consideration only its political, economic or demographic characteristics to form a perception of the country. Image becomes one of the most important aspects of the overall assessment of the state. This fact explains the important role of public diplomacy in international relations.

There are various channels for influencing to the foreign public opinion through public diplomacy. The impact can be implemented through diplomatic channels, as well as through statements by officials in the media, with public lectures, in social networks, etc. through unofficial channels: through NGOs, funds, educational programs, women's and youth organizations, universities, etc. As the fact that the channels of public diplomacy are a reflection of the development of international and interstate relations, the concept itself and its

components are changing along with changes in world politics.

The term «public diplomacy» has different interpretations, but they tend to two main ones: diplomacy realized both by state and non-state actors of international relations, and diplomacy, whose object of influence is primarily the public opinion of other countries. Thus, public diplomacy acts as a diplomatic mechanism, and is recognized by all states, as an additional opportunity to realize the tasks of the foreign policy in the conditions of the international relations' new system formation.

The purpose of the article is to analyze theoretical discussions, schools and scientific directions about public diplomacy in contemporary international relations.

Historically, public diplomacy had the form of communication between the government of one state and the people of another state. Using different channels to influence to foreign civil societies (cultural, folk, media, digital, etc. types of diplomacy), this or that state seeks to manage the international environment.

The new realities of the contemporary world require a deep analysis of the trends in the development of modern public diplomacy. First of all, one should proceed from the fact that the problem of public diplomacy has the interdisciplinary nature, which explains the interest not only of diplomats, but also of historians, anthropologists, culturologists and international experts. In order to understand the role of public diplomacy in the new conditions of the world development. It is necessary to use approaches, both from the standpoint of historical experience, and the desire to equate public diplomacy with propaganda.

It is obvious that in the last 25 years public diplomacy comes out the periphery of the foreign policy of the most developed countries. The US experience acts as an example of the public diplomacy realisation. Domestic and foreign public support of the American policy allows receiving assistance for the economic or military programs realization and to provide states' healthy economy and security. In spite of the fact that the USA is the leading country in studying of public diplomacy and practical use of its mechanisms, scientists and experts from the other countries more and more successfully develop their own national experience in this direction. In other words, it is as about continuous expansion of borders of a profile discourse, and about enrichment of its contents.

The general definition of the public diplomacy allows to indicate its main subjects which include the governments, public authorities, private groups of interests, media, journalists and participants of cross-cultural communications (the organizations, certain citizens) (Луккин 2013: 1).

The complex and comprehensive analysis of the public diplomacy role demands to address not only the superpowers' experience, but also the middle and small countries not always possessing characteristics of the democratic state.

### **Methods and theoretical approaches to the public diplomacy**

The «public diplomacy» concept was used in the diplomacy of the modern period of International relations, but it had a bit different value. For example, in article of the British newspaper «London Times» in 1856 it was used as designation of «respectable diplomacy», and several years later in the American edition «The New York Times» meant «open, not secret diplomacy». (Cull 2006: 2).

In general, it should be noted that public diplomacy instruments in various forms were used in the

international relations throughout many centuries, but only in the middle of the 20th century E. Gallion gave the conceptual explanation to it. These years was the period of the public diplomacy blossoming when the US and the USSR, using various methods of its realization in the foreign policy, fought for global leadership has also had.

Initially public diplomacy and propoganda have been closely connected and served as the similar purposes. The public diplomacy was used as a synonym to the word «propoganda». However if in English the term «propaganda» has a negative connotation, then, having introduced the concept public diplomacy into circulation, the American scientist has given him neutral coloring. At the official level this term has been for the first time used at a meeting of the U. S. Congress in 1977 in the report of the Commission of Murphy on the organization of the foreign policy device (Цатурян, 2010: 3).

In the conditions of Cold War public diplomacy has been directed to creation of positive image of the USA abroad. During Cold War the experts who were traditionally mediating information streams in the field of interstate communications were engaged in the public diplomacy generally: actually diplomats and profile journalists. Public diplomacy was considered as an exclusive state foreign policy prerogative that was explained by the «Iron Curtain» dividing the East and the West. Then, in the conditions of low permeability of borders, «the only actor capable it is systematically qualitative to carry out the international communication, there was a state» (Nye, 2009: 4).

Theoretical judgement of public diplomacy has begun approximately at the end of 1950 – x – the beginning of the 1960th when a certain empirical material about the U.S. Government actions in this sphere has been collected. Then the discourse about foreign cultural policy or about cultural diplomacy dominated among scientists – historians. Since the end of the 1950th the historical science investigates historical prerequisites, the foreign policy purposes and the strategy of the public diplomacy. Researchers, as a rule, use such concepts as «foreign cultural policy», «cultural diplomacy», «national diplomacy» for the analysis of projects of the US in the field of culture, education, information, sport, etc. According to a number of domestic and foreign scientists, the foreign cultural policy – it the actions realized by the government, but they aren't connected with political tasks and propaganda. (Боголюбова, 2012: 5). This definition is considered as classical one, close to the modern value, but not the only one and generally accepted.

In the mid-sixties. Edmund Gallayon, the Dean of Fletcher's Diplomacy Law School has entered «public diplomacy» as the scientific term to describe process for actors of the international relations to achieve the objectives of foreign policy, influencing the foreign public (Merrou: 6). This definition is considered classical, close to modern value, but not only and conventional. American researcher J. Fisher, trying to explain the public diplomacy constitutes wrote in 1976: «It is not enough to be sure that your foreign diplomatic colleagues understand the policy of your state. It should be understood by the mass audience, which influences the policy of its Foreign Ministry. (Fisher, 1972: 7).

In the 1960-1980-s. experts in the field of cultural studies and anthropology joined the to study American cultural diplomacy. Scientists are focusing on the issue of the public diplomacy programs final results. Program «recipients», i.e. foreign states and societies, are the main object of research. Supporters of this approach use in their studies such concepts as «cultural imperialism», «Americanization» and «mutual cultural exchange».

Supporters of the concept of cultural imperialism argue that the US information, culture and education penetrate into foreign society and exert significant influence on it, transforming the political, economic and social system of the state (Carnoy, 1974: 8).

Critics of this concept argue that the US public diplomacy can be viewed from the perception of cultural imperialism, but the resistance of local communities and traditional cultures (for example, in the countries of the Middle East) negates the US efforts to spread its values (Tsvetkova, 2013: 9). Instead of the cultural imperialism ideas, researchers propose to use the response theory and shift the topic of cultural expansion of the United States towards studying the methods of the local communities «resistance», the fate of peripheral cultures and indigenous populations affected by the United States (Tibi, 1995: 10). After the attacks of September 11, 2001 it was the revival of public diplomacy. The process was held in parallel with the fight against international terrorism. The US authorities sought to understand why this tragedy occurred in their country, while simultaneously trying to improve the international image and justify their invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq. Richard Holbrook, a former US Assistant Secretary of State, said in an interview with the Washington Post: «Call it public diplomacy, public relations, psychological struggle, or – if you want to speak directly – propaganda. Whatever you call it, the most important is the explanation of the war's

goals for a billion Muslims in the world.» (Долинский, 2011: 11).

So the desire to win in the «battle for the minds and hearts of people» has again become a topical issue not only for the United States (Blinken, 2002: 12). This fact served as an impetus for the activation of public diplomacy in other countries. At the present time, one can observe a sharp growth of scientific and practical interest in this sphere. (Зюнова, 2003: 13).

Public diplomacy as a theory and practical activity appeared in the United States. American public diplomacy tasks included the representation of a positive image of the state outside.

The accumulation of knowledge and skills in the field of public diplomacy in the US ultimately required the systematization and scientific and theoretical comprehension of this phenomenon, which was dynamically filled with new features, scientific and institutional component. This required a revision or supplement to the classical definition of public diplomacy, which was put forward by E. Gallion. For example, the American diplomat Hans Thach defines public diplomacy as «the process of communication of the government with a foreign audience whose goal is to understand the ideas and ideals of the nation, understand the institutions and culture of the country, as well as about national goals and modern politics». (Hans 1990: 14). Philip Taylor, the British professor of the Lida University, considers public diplomacy as «actions that are 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 its own state abroad» (Snow 2009: 15).

Hans Tuch defined public diplomacy as «the process of communication between the government and foreign public organizations in order to attract attention and achieve an understanding of the ideas and ideals of their country, its cultural institutions, as well as its national goals and policies» (Hans, 1990: 14).

Public diplomacy today can be called as one of the international relations dimensions going beyond traditional diplomacy and it is the means by which governments and private groups influence the opinions and attitudes of other governments and peoples with a view to influencing their foreign policy decisions.

Today in the expert community actively discuss the definition «The new public diplomacy». This term reflects attention to the following key shifts in the public diplomacy practice: plurality of the international participants including both

government, and not government actors; the new mechanisms using global technologies (especially the Internet); progressive forms of interaction of civil societies (marketing, branding, etc.)

### **Discussion in the context of studying the Public diplomacy issues**

There are various approaches to study the phenomenon of public diplomacy within the framework of political science. As the result, history, international relations, political communication, culturology, anthropology and other sciences offer us a certain number of concepts that can be applied to the study of public diplomacy.

Scholars critically examine the attempts to develop the theory and methodology of the public diplomacy. This field is probably one of the most multidisciplinary areas of modern science.

After the end of the Cold War, public diplomacy is mainly seen in connection with the neoliberal concept of «soft power». Joseph Nye, an American political scientist, a professor at Harvard University is the author of this concept. He developed a whole concept, singling out «hard power», «soft power» and «smart power» of the state. «The hard power is based on military and economic power. The essence of «soft power» is the ability to achieve other desired results on a voluntary basis – without coercion and threats. «Smart power is the most winning strategy, and includes a balanced combination of» hard «and» soft «strength. (Nye, 2005: 16).

But systematic research of the important topic firstly requires valid and generally accepted definition. During the evolution scientists and practitioners have used many different definitions of public diplomacy. In the XXI century. The experts started to use the term «new public diplomacy» (NPD). Their efforts were reduced to adapting public diplomacy to the conditions of the information age. Vickers (Vickers, 2004: 17) proposed to characterize the NPD as a set of measures that combine cultural diplomacy, marketing and information influence.

Melissen gives more informative definition of the public diplomacy. He notes that public diplomacy is characterized by an increasing role of the non-state actors (Melissen, 2005: 18). Gilboa suggested that public diplomacy should be viewed as an interactive relationship between states and non-state actors; use of «soft power», bilateral communication, strategic public diplomacy, media education, information management, PR, national branding, self-presentation (Gilboa, 1998: 19).

Thus, despite the growing importance of public diplomacy in contemporary international relations, it is difficult to talk about systematic theoretical research in this field. They developed various theories and concepts of public diplomacy.

#### *1 The «soft power» concept*

After the end of the Cold War, public diplomacy is mainly seen in connection with the neoliberal concept of «soft power». Joseph Nye, an American political scientist, a professor at Harvard University is the author of this concept. He developed a whole concept, singling out «hard power», «soft power» and «smart power» of the state. «The hard power is based on military and economic power. The essence of «soft power» is the ability to achieve other desired results on a voluntary basis – without coercion and threats. «Smart power is the most winning strategy, and includes a balanced combination of» hard «and» soft «strength (Nye 2005: 16). In addition, J. Nye expressed the opinion that one of the main ways to develop the «soft power» potential is to implement public diplomacy. He proposed to consider three dimensions of public diplomacy. The first is daily coverage of domestic and foreign policies and an explanation of the audience of government decisions. The second dimension is «strategic communication,» which is a deliberate discussion of the most important political issues for the state. The third is the development of direct contacts with foreign public through exchange programs, scholarships, scientific conferences that allow foreign citizens to get acquainted with the culture and way of life of the country (Nye, 2008: 20). He considers the public diplomacy as a communication mechanism, a tool for increasing the attractiveness and strengthening of authority (Nye, 2008: 20).

«Soft power» as the ability of the state to form preferences of other countries rests on three major components: the culture of the state, the political values of the state and foreign policy. Public diplomacy is designed to convey (broadcast or sell) these three components to other countries. Thus, a state that does not have attractive values can not influence foreign society through public diplomacy (Gilboa, 2008: 21).

#### *2. Constructivism*

The representatives of the other theoretical areas also suggest the interesting approaches for studying public diplomacy phenomena. Constructivism represents one of the scientific school. The constructivism theory has brought the new ideas to the understanding the US public diplomacy. The public diplomacy is considered by constructivists as a means of understanding «different» culture,

traditions of «others», which leads to the formation of more humane relations between people and states. The J. Nye's neoliberal concept about «soft power» argues that the transfer of social behavior, norms of international law from state to state can harmonize international relations or make them more predictable. Proponents of constructivism point out that each state has its own perception of the world, different from other cultures and values, and this diversity is the basis for the creation of stable peace and relations. The main condition is the desire to understand the «other» without denying their right to their own identity. And understanding is achieved through public diplomacy programs [Van Ham 2008: 22]

Public diplomacy, like constructivism, casts doubt on the exceptional importance of material factors in achieving ultimate goals. For it is important intersubjective measurement (Byrne, 2012:23).

Based on its activity on the account of the identity factors, culture and the value of another state, it builds bridges between societies/states. This understanding of public diplomacy makes it a mechanism for the operationalization of constructivist ideas (Cull: 2). Public diplomacy is viewed by constructivists as a means of understanding the «different» culture and traditions of «others.» Given the diversity of states on a wide range of non-material criteria (perception of the world, culture, values, etc.), one must strive to understand such diversity. The basis for creating stable relations lies in understanding.

It is known that «public policy» is a new genre of exercising power in the period of global informatization.

Public diplomacy, closely connected with this policy, represents a whole «cosmos» where politicians, cultural workers, scientists and educators, media, NGOs, users of social networks operate. And what is especially important is that now publicity is an inalienable feature and professional diplomacy. Theorists believe that public diplomacy of professionals is called upon to become a catalyst for the activities carried out by non-governmental actors. And this synergy is very important.

### *3 Strategic communications*

The new conceptual paradigm «strategic communication» («dialogue promotion/propaganda») which assumes to use the new Internet technologies for raising the state's image enters the diplomatic practice. Social media play the role of transformers of the ideas on a global scale and exert impact and on the interstate relations. These technologies in diplomatic practice has received the name «digital diplomacy». Today programs of

digital diplomacy are developed by the majority of the world countries. Social networks represent the tools which possess a number of functions in political communication on a global scale. They allow: to gain an impression about the world events, to form the relation to this or that event, to distribute information, including culture, values, religion and so forth.

Thus, digital diplomacy is one of the directions of the public diplomacy focused on involvement in diplomatic practice of a general population, but not on interaction with political and diplomatic elite of the foreign states. The United States government defines digital diplomacy as application of social networks in diplomatic practice of the U.S. Government for ensuring interaction of the American diplomats with foreign Internet users (24).

For a example, during 2013-2015 the new concept of dialogue promotion has been officially designated by Washington as strategic communication. It began to dominate in the US foreign policy discourse. Practical application of the new concept was expressed in new reform of the public diplomacy directed on development of the propaganda programs (Цветкова 2011: 25).

The dialogue between the US and representatives of foreign society through information portals, social networks (digital diplomacy) creates the conditions for the formation of so-called strategic communication. (Цветкова, 2011: 26).

Today this concept supplants the soft power concept of J. Nye not only in scientific publications, but in the practice the United States public diplomacy. Supporters of this concept argue that Nye's ideas of attracting foreign countries to US values are not in demand in a world where tension is growing and direct political propaganda is needed. At the present stage, public diplomacy is studied by specialists not only in the field of diplomacy and international relations, but also journalism, marketing workers and other research areas.

In the XXI century the possibility of the public diplomacy, its image questions and brand are actively studied in and a framework of such areas of scientific knowledge as marketing and political communication. Representatives of these areas began to study the principles of public diplomacy, image and a brand. Experts in the field of marketing believe that the concept of «the national brand» explains the nature of modern public diplomacy. They explain the nature of modern public diplomacy with the concept of a national brand. According to them, combination of the public diplomacy principles and marketing laws help in the image

promotion of the country and its policy as a product which needs to be sold to foreign audience. This process is called «a national brand», and «soft power» is its key designing force. Public diplomacy gets the status of the channel of advance of such brand (Anholt, 2006: 27).

Thus, these and other theories and concepts about a role of public diplomacy in the international relations include the neoliberalism (soft power), constructivism, strategic communication and branding. It is also necessary to note that these theories and concepts are focused on activity of the state and non-state actors within public diplomacy.

#### 4. Components of public diplomacy:

*National diplomacy* represents informal activity of natural and legal entities, NGO, various institutes and movements which directly don't depend on the government, but nevertheless can promote improvement of the interstate relations and establishing cooperation between the people. Public diplomacy includes more wide range of activity. Therefore, the concept public diplomacy is only one of the directions of public diplomacy, but not a synonym in any way.

*Cultural diplomacy* is the system of government and non-governmental actors measures who seek to reach certain foreign policy tasks, using cultural mechanisms in the activity. It is implemented in practice by the organization of conferences, exhibitions, festivals, the thematic weeks devoted to national culture, literature, cinema, etc. By means of distribution and promoting of culture, science, education, literature, language abroad it is possible to achieve far bigger result, than through threats, intimidations and bribes.

*Digital diplomacy.* Digital diplomacy can be treated as application of social networks and opportunities of the Internet in the diplomatic practice. It assists the government and public authorities to connect with foreign policy including mechanisms of influence on foreign audience. (Сурма, 2015: 28). Posting online telecasts, extending a certain literature and official documents, the government is capable to influence the foreign public. Besides, a concept «tviplomas» recently is very relevant one. It has appeared quite recently when Foreign Ministries, government institutions and also Presidents,

Ministers, diplomats began to use social networks and Twitter (Зюнова, 2003:29).

Through the Internet accounts they have had an opportunity to publish different information which is in open access and is capable to influence foreign audience definitely.

*The Panda diplomacy* is applied by China to civil society of foreign countries. Her essence consists that the People's Republic of China presents as a gift to the foreign state a big panda, a national symbol of the country, thereby expressing the gratitude and respect. It should be noted that this step promotes strengthening of the bilateral relations and establishing dialogue.

### Conclusion

The theoretical evolution of public diplomacy took about fifty years and continues to evolve in the face of changing geo-economics and geopolitics, and the development of the new technologies. In the Post-bipolar period, public diplomacy was seen as a formal replacement of the foreign policy propaganda for new forms of interstate communication. At the same time, it seems that the most significant moments that led to the New Public Diplomacy are related to the following aspects. An essential distinction of the New Public Diplomacy from the practice of the Cold War period is its orientation towards the concept of «soft power», so its arsenal lacks tools related to the use of lies, blackmail, pressure and the like.

Today, this phenomenon includes various actors that differ in the degree of involvement and mechanisms for implementing public diplomacy. During this period, in the framework of public diplomacy, several more terms have spread: soft power, popular diplomacy, branding, etc. Public diplomacy should be considered as an independent direction of the foreign policy of the state, which is responsible for influencing the population of a foreign state with the aim of forming a positive image of the state

The separate analysis deserves the theory and the concept which historians, culturologists or anthropologists for a research to use reaction of programs recipients of public diplomacy of the state in foreign countries.

### Литература

Лукин А.В. (2013): «Публичная дипломатия» // Международная жизнь. – № 3. 2013. (69-87)

Cull N. (2006): «Public Diplomacy» Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase // USC Center on Public Diplomacy // Available at: [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/060418\\_public\\_diplomacy\\_before\\_gullion\\_the\\_evolution\\_of\\_a\\_phrase](http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/060418_public_diplomacy_before_gullion_the_evolution_of_a_phrase)

- Цатурян С. А. (2010): «Общественная дипломатия США в новом информационном столетии»//США и Канада: экономика, политика, культура. – № 8. 2010. (105)
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. (2009): «Get Smart: combining Hard and Soft power» // Foreign Affairs // Available at: [www.foreignaffairs.com/articles65163](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles65163)
- Боголюбова Н. М. (2012): «Роль зарубежных культурных центров в развитии современного межкультурного сотрудничества» // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. – № 6. 2012. (40-42)
- Edward R. Merrou (2016): «What is Public Diplomacy?» // USC center of Public Diplomacy. Fletcher's school. Tufts University // Available at: <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/murrow/diplomacy>
- Fisher G.H. (1972): «Public Diplomacy and the Behavioral Sciences» // (4)
- Carnoy M. (1974): «Education as Cultural Imperialism» // (378 p. p. 32-34)
- Tsvetkova N. (2013): «Failure of American and Soviet Cultural Imperialism in German Universities, 1945-1990» // Leiden: Brill. – 2013. (428 p., p. 400-403)
- Tibi B. (1995): «Culture and Knowledge: the Politics of Islamization of Knowledge as a Postmodern Project? The Fundamentalist Claim to De-Westernization» // Theory, Culture, Society. – Vol.12. 1995. (1-24)
- Долинский А. (2011): «Дискурс о публичной дипломатии» // Международные процессы. – Т. 9. № 1. 2011. (64)
- Blinken A. (2002): «Winning the War of Ideas» // The Washington Quarterly. – Vol. 25. № 2. 2002. (102)
- Зонова Т.В. (2003): «Современная модель дипломатии: истоки становления и перспективы развития». 2003. (129)
- Hans Tuch. (1990): «Communicating with the world: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas» – 1990. (3)
- N. Snow, Ph. Taylor. (2009): Routledge handbook of public diplomacy. – 2009. (13)
- Nye J.S. (2005): «Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics». – 2005. (63)
- Rhiannon Vickers (2004): «The new public diplomacy: Britain and Canada compared»// British Journal of Politics and International Affairs. – №6 2004 (182-94)
- Melissen (2005): «The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In The new public diplomacy». – 2005. (3-27)
- Eytan Gilboa (1998): «Media diplomacy: Conceptual divergence and applications»// Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics. – №3 ((3):56-75)
- Nye J.S. (2008): «Public Diplomacy and Soft Power» // The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. – Vol. 616. 2008. (101-102)
- Gilboa E. (2008): «Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy» // The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. – Vol. 616. 2008. (55–77)
- Van Ham P. (2008): «Place Branding: The State of the Art» // Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. – Vol.616. 2008. (126-149., 128)
- Byrne Caitlin (2012): «Public diplomacy and constructivism: a synergistic and enabling relationships» // International studies and annual conference // Available at: [www.files.isanet.org](http://www.files.isanet.org)
- JCU IT Strategic Plan 2010-2012 DRAFT// Available at: [https://www.jcu.edu.au/\\_data/assets/.../jcuprd1\\_063659.pdf](https://www.jcu.edu.au/_data/assets/.../jcuprd1_063659.pdf)
- Цветкова Н.А. (2011): «Публичная дипломатия США и революции в арабском мире» // Мир и политика. – № 4. 2011. (45–53)
- Цветкова Н. А. (2011): «Программы Web 2.0 в публичной дипломатии США» // США и Канада: экономика, политика, культура. – No 3. 2011. (109-122, 117)
- Anholt S. (2006): «Why Brand? Some Practical Consideration for Nation Branding» // Place Branding. – Vol. 2. No 2. 2006. (97-107, 107)
- Сурма И. В. (2015): «Цифровая дипломатия в мировой политике» // Государственное управление. Электронный вестник. – № 49. 2015. (222)
- Зонова Т.В. (2003): «Современная модель дипломатии: истоки становления и перспективы развития». – 2003. (129)

## References

- Lukin A.V. (2013): «Publicnaja diplomatija» // Mezhdunarodnaja zhizn'. – № 3. 2013. (69-87)
- Cull N. (2006): «Public Diplomacy» Before Gullion: The Evolution of a Phrase // USC Center on Public Diplomacy // Available at: [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/060418\\_public\\_diplomacy\\_before\\_gullion\\_the\\_evolution\\_of\\_a\\_phrase](http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/060418_public_diplomacy_before_gullion_the_evolution_of_a_phrase)
- Caturjan S. A. (2010): «Obshhestvennaja diplomatija SShA v novom informacionnom stoletii»//SShA i Kanada: jekonomika, politika, kul'tura. – № 8. 2010. (105)
- Joseph S. Nye Jr. (2009): «Get Smart: combining Hard and Soft power» // Foreign Affairs // Available at: [www.foreignaffairs.com/articles65163](http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles65163)
- Bogoljubova N. M. (2012): «Rol' zarubezhnyh kul'turnyh centrov v razvitii sovremennogo mezhkul'turnogo sotrudnichestva» // Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul'turologija i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. – № 6. 2012. (40-42)
- Edward R. Merrou (2016): «What is Public Diplomacy?» // USC center of Public Diplomacy. Fletcher's school. Tufts University // Available at: <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/murrow/diplomacy>
- Fisher G.H. (1972): «Public Diplomacy and the Behavioral Sciences» // (4)
- Carnoy M. (1974): «Education as Cultural Imperialism» // (378 p. p. 32-34)

- Tsvetkova N. (2013): «Failure of American and Soviet Cultural Imperialism in German Universities, 1945-1990» // Leiden: Brill. – 2013. (428 p., p. 400-403)
- Tibi B. (1995): «Culture and Knowledge: the Politics of Islamization of Knowledge as a Postmodern Project? The Fundamental-ist Claim to De-Westernization» // *Theory, Culture, Society*. – Vol.12. 1995. (1-24)
- Dolinskij A. (2011): «Diskurs o publichnoj diplomatii» // *Mezhdunarodnye processy*. – T. 9. № 1. 2011. (64)
- Blinken A. (2002): «Winning the War of Ideas» // *The Washington Quarterly*. – Vol. 25. № 2. 2002. (102)
- Zonova T.V. (2003): «Sovremennaja model' diplomatii: istoki stanovlenija i perspektivy razvitija». 2003. (129)
- Hans T. (1990): «Communicating with the world: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas» – 1990. (3)
- N. Snow (2009): *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy*. – 2009. (13)
- Nye J.S. (2005): «Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics». – 2005. (63)
- Rhiannon Vickers (2004): «The new public diplomacy: Britain and Canada compared»// *British Journal of Politics and International Affairs*. – №6 2004 (182-94)
- Melissen (2005): «The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In *The new public diplomacy*». – 2005. (3-27)
- Eytan Gilboa (1998): «Media diplomacy: Conceptual divergence and applications»// *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*. – №3 (3):56-75)
- Nye J.S. (2008): «Public Diplomacy and Soft Power» // *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – Vol. 616. 2008. (101-102)
- Gilboa E. (2008): «Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy» // *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – Vol. 616. 2008. (55–77)
- Van Ham P. (2008): «Place Branding: The State of the Art» // *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – Vol.616. 2008. (126-149., 128)
- Byrne Caitlin (2012): «Public diplomacy and constructivism: a synergistic and enabling relationships» // *International studies and annual conference* // Available at: [www.files.isanet.org](http://www.files.isanet.org)
- JCU IT Strategic Plan 2010-2012 DRAFT// Available at: [https://www.jcu.edu.au/\\_\\_data/assets/.../jcuprd1\\_063659.pdf](https://www.jcu.edu.au/__data/assets/.../jcuprd1_063659.pdf)
- Cvetkova N.A. (2011): «Publichnaja diplomatija SShA i revoljucii v arabskom mire» // *Mir i politika*. – № 4. 2011. (45–53)
- Cvetkova N. A. (2011): «Programmy Web 2.0 v publichnoj diplomatii SShA» // *SShA i Kanada: jekonomika, politika, kul'tura*. – No 3. 2011. (109-122, 117)
- Anholt S. (2006): «Why Brand? Some Practical Consideration for Nation Branding» // *Place Branding*. – Vol. 2. No 2. 2006. (97-107, 107)
- Surma I. V. (2015): «Cifrovaja diplomatija v mirovoj politike» // *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie. Jelektronnyj vestnik*. – № 49. 2015. (222)
- Zonova T.V. (2003): «Sovremennaja model' diplomatii: istoki stanovlenija i perspektivy razvitija». – 2003. (129)