

CULTURAL DIPLOMACY: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS

Tetiana Bukina¹, Liudmila Perminova²

Abstract. The article analyzes the leading types of modern diplomacy. *Problem statement.* Changes in the system of international relations have led to increased attention to the study of issues related to modern diplomacy. However, in the scientific community, the study of the features and essence of the varieties of modern diplomacy is considered to be fragmented. The lack of thorough general theoretical works on this issue, as well as the frequent misunderstanding of the essence and tasks of modern diplomacy in the scientific and publicist literature, causes confusion and different interpretations of the terms. This points to the relevance and significance of further research in the field of modern diplomacy. *The purpose of the study* is to reveal the essence and define the terms "public diplomacy", "people's diplomacy", "civil diplomacy", "new public diplomacy", to establish their classification according to the subjects of implementation, addressees and peculiarities of practical implementation. The aim of the work is also to conduct a comprehensive analysis of "cultural diplomacy" and to identify the main achievements in this area in Ukraine. *Methodology.* This study uses the methodology of interdisciplinary level science. The interdisciplinary integration of knowledge and the integration of disparate characteristics into a system allowed to obtain new scientific knowledge, which consists in a comparative analysis of the leading types of modern diplomacy, highlighting "cultural diplomacy" as the main one and analyzing the main institutional achievements of Ukraine in cultural diplomacy. *Results.* The article summarizes the definitions of the concepts of "public diplomacy", "civil diplomacy", "people's diplomacy", "digital diplomacy", "new public diplomacy". Their essential features and main characteristics are highlighted, their comparative analysis is presented, and "cultural diplomacy" as the leading direction of modern diplomatic practice is analyzed. The institutional context of cultural diplomacy of Ukraine is considered. The conclusion is made that despite the failure of systemic cultural reforms in the past, today there are positive changes in cultural diplomacy. Ukraine's cultural vector in foreign policy acquires a systemic and strategic balance. *Value/originality.* A comparative analysis of different types of modern diplomacy is conducted, the definition of "cultural diplomacy" is clarified and the peculiarities of its institutional formation are considered. *Practical implications.* The materials of the article can be used for research and educational purposes, as well as for the further development of the vectors of Ukrainian cultural diplomacy.

Key words: formal and informal diplomacy, public diplomacy, citizen diplomacy, people's diplomacy, digital diplomacy, new public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy.

JEL Classification: F29, L86, Z10

1. Introduction

The beginning of the XXI century was marked by significant transformations in all spheres of human life. The processes of globalization and active development of the latest information and communication technologies have affected the system of international relations. New actors became active in the international arena, new levers of influence began to prevail and new centers of state decision-making and implementation emerged.

Domestic and foreign theorists and practitioners have studied various aspects of diplomacy. The paper is based on the achievements of G. Atamanchuk (Democracy, 2005); N. Bogolyubova, S. Gutsal, T. Zonova, M. Cummings, A. Lukina, D. Mostova, J. Nye, K. Plavšak, G. Pocheptsova, T. Sivak, I. Sukhorolska, P. Sukhorilsky and I. Misyuk, and many others, which allowed to summarize the features of modern diplomacy, to highlight its main types and make a classification,

Corresponding author:

¹ Pervomaisk Branch of the National University of Shipbuilding named after Admiral Makarov, Ukraine

E-mail: tanyshabukina@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3628-6859>

ResearcherID: AAO-5442-2021

² Kherson State University, Ukraine

E-mail: perminova@i.ua

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6818-3179>



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0

based on the essential characteristics and peculiarities of functioning in modern diplomatic practice. These and other works attempt to define the term "cultural diplomacy" and explore different aspects of it. Despite the diversity of interpretations of "cultural diplomacy," there is consensus on the importance and priority of this type of diplomacy today.

In this study, the authors were guided by empirical level methods, that is, inductive generalization. The formation of the empirical basis of the theory requires a theoretical interpretation of the main empirical dependencies and facts, and further development of the initial scientific abstractions. Theoretical activity organizes empirical activity, it predicts and draws new facts into the circle of research. Theoretical knowledge reflects the object at the level of its internal connections, regularities of formation and peculiarities of functioning of cultural diplomacy in the modern space of international relations.

2. Formal and informal diplomacy in modern international space

Today, diplomacy is undergoing a truly profound transformation. In the twenty-first century, the multilateral nature of diplomacy is being asserted. In addition to formal diplomacy, informal diplomacy is becoming increasingly important.

The functions of diplomacy, which used to be the de facto prerogative of foreign ministries and were performed mainly by embassies, are now implemented through numerous state and even non-state channels, in particular through the second line of diplomacy, Track II Diplomacy. The phenomenon of informal diplomacy is not a legacy of the modern system of international relations. Formal and informal diplomacy have existed as a whole since antiquity, as the Greek polis often turned to famous actors to deal with important political issues (Zonova, 2003).

It is known that as early as the Middle Ages, representatives of the state appealed to doctors, bankers, and monks on various diplomatic commissions.

Informal representatives are often approached by official diplomatic services because they can use methods to achieve the desired outcome, even though they cannot formally participate in the signing of formal agreements. Because unofficial diplomacy has no leverage, it is for this reason that official diplomacy turns to them for help when they are unable to reconcile the parties or reach agreement on important international issues. The main task of informal diplomacy is to resolve conflict situations and find compromise, peaceful solutions. However, informal diplomacy cannot be seen as the equivalent of formal diplomacy, which can guarantee the full achievement of a positive result, it can only prepare the ground for complex negotiations and the signing of formal agreements by

representatives of the diplomatic services of states. Representatives of formal and informal diplomacy do not oppose each other. Their concerted action is the key to the development and implementation of important decisions. M. Arkhipova's sees modern diplomacy as a complex conglomerate of formal and informal actions and is quite right (Arkhipova, 2007).

3. Public diplomacy: the essence and main characteristics

Public diplomacy is among the priority types of modern diplomacy today, when it has become an increasingly important factor in the international life of most developed countries. Despite its popularity, public diplomacy is not a relatively new area of international politics. As D. Vosel notes, public diplomacy has always been present in the practice of international relations, but only now has this phenomenon been defined (Seyidov, 2020). The practice of public diplomacy even preceded the integration of its terminology into the work of the diplomatic services.

The United States has been an ancestor of public diplomacy since its inception in the 1960s, a concept that is now widespread. The term "public diplomacy" was first coined by Edmund Gallion, who defined it as "a government-sponsored program aimed at influencing public opinion" (Smirnov, 2017).

Public diplomacy is defined as international activity aimed at public representation of the interests of states or legal institutions (state institutions, non-governmental organizations, and individuals) in international relations.

"Public" in the context of public diplomacy means that it takes place in the presence of people. The focus is on the public (the population of foreign countries) (Nesterovich, 2016). The second important factor of public diplomacy is the information impact on the audience in the context of its foreign policy and national interests.

Public diplomacy is understood as one of the components of strategic communications, which has the key task of forming the image of the state and its institutions at the international level, the consolidation of important brands in the global information space. In the works of domestic scientist G. Pocheptsov, public diplomacy is considered as a method of promoting one's own "picture of the world" to a foreign audience (Pocheptsov, 2008).

Public diplomacy also refers to the way in which a government, individuals, and groups can directly or indirectly influence public opinion and attitudes affecting the foreign policy decisions of another government.

The main tools of public diplomacy are the media, international and national nongovernmental organizations, and international informal contacts.

Public diplomacy is considered different from traditional state diplomacy because it engages non-state actors. It expands the scope of traditional diplomatic activity: from the sphere of "high politics" on various issues and aspects of daily life and from the "closed" sphere of governments and diplomats to new actors and target groups – individuals, groups and institutions entering into international and intercultural communication activities and influencing political relations between countries (Plavšak, 2005).

Firstly, public diplomacy is open, transparent to the general public, whereas disclosure of information about "official" diplomatic activities is very limited.

Secondly, public diplomacy involves communications between governments and the public, whereas traditional diplomacy involves cooperation only at the level of governments. American Analytical Center (R&D) researcher Charles Wolf draws a parallel between official diplomacy and classical diplomacy and highlights the main differences: "public diplomacy is directed from government to the general public, official diplomacy is directed from government to government; the topics and issues of official diplomacy are related to state policy, whereas public diplomacy is related to the attitudes and behavior of the population." (What is public diplomacy, 2021)

Public diplomacy takes place at all levels of communication, when one country communicates with the society of another, shaping its potential, consciousness, worldview (Mostova, 2020).

Thirdly, official diplomacy focuses on the behavior and policies of governments, while in the case of public diplomacy, the attitudes and behavior of the population are of paramount importance. Depending on the extent to which public attitudes influence government strategies, public diplomacy can influence government policies indirectly through the population.

The term "public diplomacy" is often confused with propaganda. In fact, public diplomacy means building relationships: understanding the needs of other countries, cultures and peoples, respecting our views, correcting misconceptions, finding areas where we can find a community with common problems and interests. The difference between public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy is that public diplomacy involves a much wider range of people on both sides, as well as a wider range of interests that involve more than just state issues. Public diplomacy is based on the claim that a state's image and reputation are public goods that can create both favorable and unfavorable conditions for international relations. Work on specific issues in this area is instantly reflected in the state's reputation (Leonard, 2020).

In practice, the differences between propaganda and psychological operations are often unclear (Slisarenko, 2008), and discussions about the differences between propaganda and public diplomacy continue today.

It is known that developed countries are always tempted to use their advantages in information technologies and means of manipulating public consciousness for informational and cultural expansion (Drobot, 2008).

These threats need to be taken into account in the formation of the information security system in Ukraine.

This type of diplomacy is relevant because it has a number of advantages over classic diplomatic activity. First of all, it has a wide arsenal of tools, which are implemented exclusively peacefully, without any military intervention. Public diplomacy does not require significant costs and resources, and can become a more effective tool when classical diplomacy is difficult or impossible to use. It is not without reason that it is regarded "as the fourth dimension of foreign policy" (Leonard, 2017).

The revolution in international relations has manifested itself in the fact that states are increasingly competing not for territory or resources, but for their attractiveness and reputation (Pocheptsov, 2008).

Unlike traditional diplomacy, which provides contact only within the diplomatic corps, public diplomacy is aimed at the general public of another country and tries to communicate with it in a two-pronged way – dialogue. Such actions by individual states are part of the arsenal of so-called "soft power," or the "soft power" of positive stereotypes. American political scientist Joseph Nye, author of the concept of "soft power," considers public diplomacy as one of the effective methods of establishing long-term relations with other countries, which is realized in the ability to achieve the desired result through the voluntary participation of allies, rather than through coercion. "Soft power" manifests itself in motivating people to adopt certain attitudes, and unlike "hard power" it is able to achieve the same goal for less money (Rogozin, 2008).

Joseph Nye points to three sources of state soft power: political action, culture, and values. These can be used by the state to tell the world about itself. In contrast to propaganda, which can be perceived as something dishonest, it declares the principle of truthfulness formulated by former U.S. News Agency Director E. Murrow: "Truth is the best propaganda, and untruth is the worst. To be credible, we have to be reliable, to be reliable, we have to be honest" (Rogozin, 2008).

Public diplomacy is a time-consuming, slow, step-by-step activity. It is often based on stereotypes that exist in certain countries about other people and cultures. Stereotypes can be positive, helping to create a good image of a certain culture among others by showing its positive traits and achievements. Public diplomacy can then use them for its own needs and purposes. Stereotypes can also be negative, in which case public diplomacy tries to change them.

Along with the term "public diplomacy," "civil diplomacy" and "people's diplomacy" are also used. These types of diplomacy should be distinguished.

4. "Citizen diplomacy," "civil diplomacy," and "people's diplomacy" in the system of international relations

There is no single definition of the terms "citizen diplomacy," "civil diplomacy," and "people's diplomacy."

The concept of citizen diplomacy, which emerged in the United States in the 1960s, was identified with "public diplomacy" and used to refer to foreign policy involving the public of foreign countries. According to American politicians, the phenomenon of civil diplomacy has existed in international relations since ancient times, and the American administration has been using it since the late 1940s (Seyidov, 2002).

The identity of the definitions of public diplomacy and civil diplomacy is explained by the peculiarities of the translation of the English term "public diplomacy," as it has many meanings. The phrase "public diplomacy" (as well as "public relations") refers to the target audience of the public. The definitions use the word "publics," which emphasizes the presence of several such audiences, but not a general "public. That is, "public diplomacy" is "diplomacy with the public, citizens," meaning the international actor's connections with foreign target audiences, but not with the general population. The use of the term "citizen diplomacy" demonstrates the inextricable connection of this phenomenon with the PR sphere, the obviousness of which is increasing every day. Many researchers note a clear tendency to unite national and foreign audiences in the process of discussing international issues. This is natural when these audiences can easily find points of contact outside the state.

The term "civil diplomacy" is used to define "community diplomacy". Such diplomacy is widely understood in the context of public interest lobbying (Seidov, 2009). This "civil diplomacy" can extend to any relationship between communities with the goal of building long-term relationships rather than achieving certain one-time goals.

Public organizations and associations as an element of "people's diplomacy" play an important role in modern conditions. Significant theoretical and practical importance is to identify the functions of public organizations and movements, as this helps to understand their place in the system of civil society and the rule of law, as well as to show the forms and methods of their activities (People's diplomacy, 2021).

Some experts distinguish the concepts of "public diplomacy" and "civil diplomacy," as the latter refers to the activities of non-governmental institutions (Makarenko, 2010), as in the case of "citizen diplomacy". From the authors' point of view, using the term "civil diplomacy" to refer to the diplomacy of public organizations will only complicate terminological confusion. The authors of this paper fully agree with scholar I. Sukhorolska that the use of the term "civil

diplomacy" exclusively for the activities of non-governmental organizations, communities, or other voluntary associations is not sufficiently justified. Certain territorial communities generally do not engage in international activities, unlike local governments, businesses, or civil society organizations. A more accurate term for this is "citizen diplomacy". The notion of "people's diplomacy" is currently unproductive, since in democracies the position of the people and society is expressed by state power. Thus, "citizen diplomacy" is characterized by the realization of national interest. Its main objectives are to form a positive perception of the state, to explain the essence of the internal policy of the state, the processes taking place in it, to inform the international community about the state's position on important international issues (Luzan, 2005).

Also common is the focus on foreign audiences and the public. Thus, the direct object of foreign policy implemented through citizen diplomacy is not the authorities of a foreign state, but rather certain target audiences and the public, which coincides with the definition of "public diplomacy". So, a common feature of the terms "public diplomacy" and "citizen diplomacy" is their focus on the "public" – an active target audience. However, their main difference is that "citizen diplomacy" is carried out by nongovernmental institutions, while the subjects of "public diplomacy" can be both governmental and non-governmental organizations and associations.

5. Technological transformations and "digital diplomacy"

The modern foreign policy of states in the international arena is a combination of tradition and innovation. Thanks to the Internet and the rapid development of new technologies, the concept of "digital diplomacy," or "Web 2.0 diplomacy," is emerging. Today, diplomacy that contains elements of Internet activity using electronic devices has a number of definitions: e-diplomacy, electronic diplomacy, social network diplomacy, and so on. But the more common name for the new direction is "digital diplomacy".

According to P. Dosh, a professor at the School of Communication at American University (USA), "digital diplomacy" is a new field in which governments interact directly with the public abroad through any available Internet resources, including websites, blogs and social networks. "Digital diplomacy" is also defined as the use of web, information and communication technologies to realize foreign policy goals (Litra, 2021).

Digital diplomacy is predominantly applied, and is particularly useful in working with foreign audiences on issues of communicating the official position and shaping the image of the state.

The importance of digital diplomacy in international practice is steadily growing. Thanks to the Internet, the

average citizen can get explanatory information about alternative viewpoints in international relations. It opens public access to the results of traditional diplomacy and explains to non-specialists the nature, patterns and prospects of adopted diplomatic documents.

Digital diplomacy is a dynamic tool in dealing with foreign audiences, especially when it comes to disseminating the official position and shaping the image of the state. "This allows state and non-state actors (figures) to convey their information to a multimillion foreign audience in the shortest possible time and to respond flexibly by changing the content of their diplomatic activities." (What is public diplomacy, 2020)

Today, information from a variety of sources allows global players to bypass previously established diplomatic channels and requires quicker responses from officials, as well as allowing various NGOs to express their positions more clearly.

It should be noted that digital diplomacy in the international information sphere contains a number of

threats and risks. Firstly, such risks include the lack of trained specialists. Secondly, the Internet is perceived as an unreliable source because it is a channel for extremism, terrorism, the imposition of someone else's ideology, foreign policy propaganda, and a means of conducting information wars. Thirdly, there is the possibility of information leaks and the spread of viral products. Another important point is the uncertainty of the status of a diplomat's statements in social networks: whether they are personal statements or express the official position of the country. Failure to understand this difference can lead to serious negative consequences.

The worsening epidemiological situation in the world due to the spread of the coronavirus has greatly actualized the potential of digital diplomacy. For the first time in the history of global diplomatic practice, virtual platforms have become virtually the only meeting place for diplomats, politicians and statesmen, transforming the tools of digital diplomacy from auxiliary to key in international cooperation issues.

Table 1

Types of diplomacy: a comparative table of the main characteristics

Types of diplomacy	By subject (active participants)	By object (passive participants)	The main tasks
Public diplomacy formal and informal	governmental and non-governmental organizations, associations	certain target audiences, the public	informing and influencing foreign audiences, as well as expanding international dialogue. Formation of public opinion about the image of the state and its institutions at the international level, consolidation of significant brands in the global information space, etc.
People's diplomacy an unofficial form of diplomacy	unofficial representatives, scientists, artists, businessmen, ordinary citizens	governments and a wide range of citizens	solving the problems in a humane, non-violent, peaceful way.
Citizen diplomacy formal and informal	non-governmental institutions (individuals and legal entities, civil society institutions regardless of the state in the interests of the state), the public.	influence on foreign target audiences (on the policies of governmental and non-governmental structures of foreign countries)	implementation of national interests. The main objectives are to form a positive perception of the state, to explain the essence of the internal policy of the state, the processes taking place in it, to inform the world community about the state's position on important international issues.
Digital (network diplomacy) formal and informal	governmental and non-governmental entities, citizens, organizations.	influence on the mass consciousness and political elites	the use of the Internet and information and communication technologies (new media, social networks, blogs, etc.) to solve diplomatic problems, promote foreign policy interests, and informational propaganda through Internet television, social networks, and cell phones.
New public diplomacy Formal and informal participants, weakening of the state control	there has been a change among the actors – states are forced to compete with networked nongovernmental actors.	governments and a wide range of citizens	the realization of its own foreign policy interests in international relations by methods based on the creation of an atmosphere of trust and equality, the establishment of permanent contacts between civil society institutions of different states, and the development of international networks.
Cultural diplomacy formal and informal	institutions of state power, non-governmental organizations, public activists, artists, journalists, scientists, students, politicians	different segments of society	development of communication channels and networks between representatives of creative, scientific, business and other groups of different states, inter-ethnic interaction and expansion of the state's cultural presence abroad, thereby forming a positive image in foreign audiences.

Source: the table is formed by the authors

Thus, the development of digital diplomacy is related to the emergence of new technologies. Digital diplomacy is applied to social interaction via the Internet. The use of digital technologies in the field of diplomacy opens up new opportunities in international activities. The new format of interaction between society and diplomatic institutions makes diplomacy more public.

The concept of the new public diplomacy was born at the turn of the century in the form of general forecasts of the development of international communication, and then became more concrete through practical experience. The spread of new technologies and the increase in the number of international nongovernmental actors can be considered the main factors that influenced the formation of a new public diplomacy. In the early 2000s, there was a steady increase in the number of Internet users (now called netizens or networkers).

Based on a review of the leading types of modern diplomatic practices, their main characteristics were summarized and a comparative analysis presented in Table 1.

The second important factor in the transformation of public diplomacy is the growing number and role of non-state actors in the international arena (Zaharna, 2010). New technologies have played no small part in this process. International associations with a network form of organization have become so influential that they have achieved the ability to compete with state bodies in performing certain public functions. They

participate in the formation of international policy, and their position is important for shaping the image of international actors.

The main differences of the new public diplomacy are the changes among the participants. States now have to compete with networked nongovernmental structures, which have such advantages as flexibility, reliability, adaptability, and the ability to grow quickly and respond instantly to international developments.

6. Conclusions

Thus, cultural diplomacy has long been an unknown area for Ukrainians, and there has been a conceptual vacuum in Ukraine. Until recently, cultural diplomacy was used on the residual principle. In recent years, however, there have been significant positive changes in this area. First, despite the fact of terminological inconsistency due to the relative "youthfulness" of modern diplomatic activity, interest in it is steadily growing. Second, Ukraine has a deliberate and balanced strategy of state promotion based on the cultural component. The relevant institutions are being created in Ukraine, which successfully represent the country to the world community. It is positive that in recent years Ukraine has been actively developing cultural diplomacy, as it is the basis of formation of the state in the international arena, a mechanism for finding reliable foreign partners and an indispensable channel of communication with the world community.

References:

- Arhipova, M. (2007). Interaction of official and unofficial diplomacy. Available at: www.rau.ru/observer/N1_2007/114_120.pdf.
- Arsenault, A. (2009). *Public Diplomacy. Toward a New Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ph. Seib. New York: PalgraveMacmillan.
- Bogolyubova, N. M., & Nikolaeva, Yu. V. (2011). Sports in the Palette of International Relations: Humanitarian, Diplomatic and Cultural Aspects. *Publishing house of St. Petersburg University*.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). Sociology of politics [Translated of the French. Languages]; *Social space and genesis of classes. Questions of sociology*, 1(1), 17–36.
- From agreements to changes. (2009). Introduction of tools of diplomacy and lobbying in public initiatives. *Ivano-Frankivsk: NGO "Agency for the Development of Private Initiative"*.
- William Hybl. (2011). Narratives and Strategic Communications in Foreign Policy. Available at: <https://www.rand.org/events/2011/11/29.html>.
- Gaidai, D. (2010). Twitter-politics or revolution in the political process. Available at: <http://obozrevatel.com/abroad/07924-twitter-politika-abo-revolutsiya-v-politichnomu-protsesi.htm>.
- Gutsal, S. A. (2010). Public diplomacy as a modern priority of state foreign policy. *Strategic priorities*, 3 (16), 106–114.
- Drobot, G. (2008). Diplomacy is a means of international political interaction. Questions of theory. *Observer*, 12, 91–99.
- Zaharna, R. S. (2010). *Battles to Bridges: U. S. Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy after 9/11*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cultural diplomacy: textbook. manual / for general ed. I.B. Matyash, V.M. Matvienko; (2021). Institute of International Relations of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv; *Scientific Society for the History of Diplomacy and International Relations. Kyiv: State Enterprise "GDIP"*.
- Litra, L., & Kononenko, Y. (2020). Twitter diplomacy. How can the latest technologies strengthen Ukraine's international position? Available at: http://iwp.org.ua/img/policy_brif_1_01_23_ok.pdf.

- Leonard, M., Stead, C., & Smewing, C. (2002). *Public Diplomacy*. London: The Foreign Policy Centre.
- Makarenko, E. A., & Pipchenko, N. O. (2010). *Virtual diplomacy*. Textbook, Kyiv: Free Press Center.
- Mehdiyev, E. T. (2017). Modern diplomacy: new challenges. *Scientific journal: Actual problems of modern science*. Available at: <http://international-relations-tourism.karazin.ua/themes/irtb/resources/e3455c5a5ad92b25e26cf0944c74149f.pdf>.
- Milton C. Cummings (2003). *Cultural diplomacy and the United States Government: a Survey*. *Center for its Arts and Culture*.
- Nai Joseph S. (2010). *New Public Diplomacy*. *Day*. №28. Available at: <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/nye79/Russian>.
- Nye, J. S. (1996). America's Informational edge. *Foreign Affairs*, 75 (2), 20–36.
- People's diplomacy as a factor in international relations: the historical experience of Kazakhstan (2019). Available at: <http://jak.magey.com.ua/articles/narodna-diplomatija-jak-faktor-mizhnarodnih.html>.
- Plavšak, K. (2005). Public diplomacy: basic concepts and trends. *Journal Teorija in praksa*, 41, 643–658.
- Public diplomacy and its types (2011). Available at: <http://nasledie.ru/?q=node/6171>.
- Pocheptsov, G. G. (2008). *Strategic communications: strategic communications in politics, business and public administration*. Kyiv: Alterpress.
- Rogozin, A. (2008). NATO's "public diplomacy": Russia's information security. *Governance*, 9, 26–32.
- What is public and public diplomacy, real-life examples (2019). Available at: <https://jak.koshachek.com/articles/shho-take-narodna-diplomatija-prikladi-z-zhittja.html>.