

Impact of digital technology development on diplomacy

Salah Aldeen Dulayoum

PhD. Candidate

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.13.05.2023.p13726
<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.05.2023.p13726>

Paper Received Date: 25th March 2023
Paper Acceptance Date: 6th May 2023
Paper Publication Date: 14th May 2023

Abstract- Changes in society, driven by the information revolution, redirect one-way communication to the terrain of dialogue. The new mode of communication ensures the connection of diplomats with citizens, which is the basis on which diplomacy is transformed and adapted to the needs of modern times.

Public diplomacy as a tool uses direct information to the foreign public. Digital diplomacy as an upgrade of public diplomacy is emerging thanks to the development of new information and communication technologies. It very quickly becomes inevitable to directly promote diplomatic goals and countries from which diplomats come, including not only information on diplomatic activities but also the promotion of the culture and traditions of those countries.

Index Terms- Revolution. communication. diplomacy. activities. culture

I. INTRODUCTION

In the 19th century, an American president wrote a memorandum to his secretary of state, lamenting the fact that the ambassador to Spain had not been heard from for two years. "If we don't hear from him this year," he added, "let's write him a letter." As technology advances, interstate communication has become faster. The use of the telegraph made it possible to send messages over long distances in a shorter time, and another breakthrough occurred with the advent of the telephone in the 1870s by Alexander Graham Bell and also the advent of radio technology that revolutionized communication.

Diplomacy as "a specific type of international relations that rests on three dimensions: the first is determined by the quantification of the magnitude of integration and fragmentation, the second dimension is determined by the quantification of the magnitude of democratic participation and political centralization, while the third dimension is determined by the quantification of the abundance of resources and the lack of them on the other side."¹

Diplomacy, in the broadest sense, is a field of politics whose activities are related to relations between countries and represents

the skill of representing the interests of a country, government or a certain social group on the international level, that is, in international negotiations and in foreign policy in general.

II. MODERNIZATION OF COMMUNICATION AS AN INCREASING TREND IN POLITICS

Radio communication enabled states to engage not only their citizens on foreign policy issues, but also the foreign public. In the same way, the use of fax increased the speed of sending written information. On the other hand, the use of the telephone increased the indulgence of countries towards summit diplomacy, where directors participate in direct conversations with their colleagues and reduced the need to send envoys, but also speeded up communication by reducing diplomatic bureaucracy. The invention of satellites eventually led to the use of mobile phones on April 3, 1973 at the initiative of Motorola, which allowed phone calls to reach even the most remote areas on the planet. Mobile phone technology has since enabled remote support during negotiation processes and also supports bilateral relationships as they are personal to the owner.

In the same way, the discovery and use of air transport improved the speed with which deputies traveled to foreign countries, but also increased the diplomacy of the summit. The effectiveness of the above technological inventions was bypassed by the invention of the computer and the Internet, which not only facilitated the means of interstate communication, but also improved the storage, processing and duplication of information for several foreign policy actors, thereby reducing the laborious process of communication. Since its invention in the early 1990s, the Internet has progressively moved from Web 1.0 (Web 1.0), which was only used for reading and writing information, to Web 2.0 (Web 2.0), which facilitates interaction and information sharing such as blogs, Twitter and Facebook, and now on Web 3.0, which helps communicate emotions, feelings, and real-life experiences in a virtual world like Skype. An exponentially growing number of people now use the Web to gather information and communicate.²

Web usage ranges from e-mail, social networking, telephoning, video conferencing, reading print media, and

¹ Fatić, A., (1999). "New international relations", Official Gazette of the FRY, Belgrade

² National Intelligence Council (2007) Non-state Actors: Impact on International Relations and Implications for the United States. http://www.dni.gov/nic/confreports_nonstate_actors.html

listening to audio and visual media. It is therefore important for diplomacy to adapt to the use of web tools if it is to remain relevant in an increasingly borderless world, whose citizens are increasingly moving closer to the Internet to meet their information and communication needs. The justifications for the importance of the Web for diplomatic communication are numerous: It is a powerful tool in mobilizing people; Internet campaigns were key to stopping the Multilateral Investment Treaty in the late 1990s. It was also used to mobilize the Egyptian people in the February 2011 demonstrations against the rule of President Hosni Mubarak, who had ruled Egypt for the past 30 years. Similarly, a free online mapping tool, "Ushahidi" (meaning testimony), was used to gather information on where incidents of violence, rioting and rape occurred in Kenya, following the disputed 2007 presidential election results; using the Web and SMS functions of the mobile phone.³

This same tool was used in Brazil and Venezuela to mobilize the masses, as well as to save lives in Haiti after the earthquake. Blogs are an effective tool in facilitating the mutual exchange of information and promoting cross-cultural communication. Email eliminates communication difficulties between embassies and headquarters caused by different time zones. For example, to communicate by telephone with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Kampala from the mission in Washington, an officer will have to wait until 4 am, but he sends information by email that is immediately received and acted upon. This actually increases the communication time between the Embassy and the Ministry. The use of e-mail replaced the traditional means of forwarding hard copies of information and made communication more efficient than before, reducing the hierarchies associated with public service while speeding up the decision-making process.⁴

E-mail is increasingly replacing traditional means of communication using fax or telegram when diplomats need to send written information. This is particularly important because of the benefits of instant delivery, the reduced need to print and forward even the most bulky documents, and the reduced reliance on support staff for communications. This made it easier to conduct diplomacy, especially when dealing with crisis situations and reporting. Emails are commonly used by diplomats from developed and developing countries. Diplomatic missions also deliver information to their home countries via secure intranets. The use of ICT has generally improved service delivery to missions that have limited staff and high requirements for providing information to the public.⁵

Most missions now have websites that provide information on travel advice, application procedures and website forms. ICT adaptation is increasingly becoming a critical tool in high-level

diplomatic negotiations. This has reduced the need for travel to meetings, particularly where there are security and logistical concerns. An example of this is the meeting in February 2000 where President Clinton (Clinton) attended a regional summit in Africa to resolve the crisis in Rwanda and Burundi by video conference. The Internet, however, has contributed to the dispersion of diplomatic authority from states to subnational actors, such as local and multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), special interest groups, social movements, and even groups of private citizens often referred to as civil society.⁶

Computer software manufacturers are increasingly introducing trust-building measures to curb hacker plots, and there is a constant production of newer versions of anti-spyware and anti-virus software. This should be supported by international legislation that regulates the use of the Internet and makes crimes committed in cyberspace punishable. Despite the positive features of ICT for diplomatic communication, governments have not yet fully embraced its use. This may be partly due to the high cost, lack of appropriate skills and the relevance of its application in developing countries with low internet penetration.

Social media provides users with a comprehensive and rich experience for participation, interaction and collaboration. Various social media tools allow their users to create and share information on the web and interact with others, making it easier to find information and stay connected. With the inclusion of mobile technology, not only has there been an intense increase in the number and type of social media tools, but their use is also on the rise. In developed countries such as the USA, Poland, Great Britain and Korea, at least four out of ten adult citizens use social media tools. Social media sites dominate internet usage in Asia Pacific.⁷ Compared to men, women are more actively engaged in social media sites.⁸

Although the use of social media sites is currently more popular among young people, studies reveal that there has been an increasing trend of older participation in recent years. In general, social media can be classified into the following four categories: 1) online networks and ecosystems—eg. Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter and Weibo; 2) online publications—eg. YouTube, Flickr, RSS, Instagram and Twitter; 3) Online platforms for collaboration — e.g. Wikis like MediaWiki, blogs like Word Press or Blogger and office solutions for collaboration such as Office 365, Google Docs, Teamwork or WorkSpot; 4) online feedback systems, e.g. voting and debating, rating and commenting, polls and blogs.⁹

³ Carter M (2010) Technology as democracy: Bridging the digital divide, *The Guardian*. www.ushahidi.com

⁴ See more at: Rana.s. Kishan (2007). *Bilateral Diplomacy*. Serbia: Diplofoundation.

⁵ Theros N (2001). *Information Technology Reshaping Method of Diplomatic Relations*. *The Washington Diplomat*. www.washdiplomat.com/01-06/a2_06_01.html

⁶ See more at: Potter E (2002). *Cyber Diplomacy. Managing foreign policy in the twenty first century*, McGill- Queen's University Press, London.

⁷ Human Capital Institute (2012), "Social Networking in Government: Opportunities and Challenges," http://www.hci.org/files/field_content_file/SNGovt_SummaryFINAL.pdf

⁸ Susanto T. D. and R. Goodwin, (2010). "Factors Influencing Citizen Adoption of SMS-Based e-Government Services," *Electronic Journal of E-Government*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 55-71.

⁹ Banday, M. Tariq and Mattoo, M. M. (2013) *Social Media in e-Governance: A Study with Special Reference to India*. *Social Networking*, 2, 47-56.

III. PARTICIPATION OF ONLINE COMMUNICATION IN PUBLIC LIFE

Networks and online ecosystems build and reflect peer-to-peer networks and relationships. Online publication tools provide services or platforms for sharing and publishing content online. Collaboration platforms facilitate cooperative and work processes between people. Online feedback tools facilitate audience input through one-way or two-way communication. Today, we can confirm that the fragmented environment of social media poses a serious challenge to diplomatic practice that seeks the right voice for its audience on the right social platform. With more than a billion people accessing the internet through their mobile devices alone, focusing on mobile social media is essential. Geo-targeted and mobile-optimized content must be an indispensable component in any global digital strategy. According to Forrester, in 2014 Instagram had four times more engagement than Facebook and Twitter.

Practice confirms that posts or tweets with images usually have a stronger impact than posts without them. For this reason, foreign offices must adapt and create visual social media strategies to promote their content and increase engagement rates. If governments and international organizations really want to get more out of their social media efforts globally, then it would be wise to consider paid social media advertising on various platforms like Facebook, Twitter and others. For diplomacy, in particular, this trend implies new skills and innovative approaches.¹⁰

A key component of efforts to optimize your social media presence is tracking the performance of your content strategy. Governments and international organizations must develop new systems to effectively assess their social media performance and see how it contributes to achieving their strategic goals. Learning how to use the metrics, analytics and data enabled by technology to track information to reach and engage potential audiences is of fundamental importance. The number of active users on social networks has increased exponentially in the last few years. If we take, for example, Facebook and Twitter, the number of monthly users exceeds the billion mark. Diplomats have long understood that in public diplomacy they should be where the audience is. Five years ago, many of today's top e-diplomacy practitioners recognized the importance of social media and began engaging with non-state actors directly on social media. From experimenting with platforms to integrating e-tools, some ministries of foreign affairs today are advanced and active users of social networks with large followings.¹¹ It is only natural that social networking sites have created a new dynamic and opened up a host of previously unimaginable opportunities for public diplomacy. The principles and strategies

of public diplomacy are woven into most aspects of diplomatic activity. Digital technologies have reinforced an established theme in public diplomacy discourses over the last decade: namely, the debate about "speech" vs. of "listening" which is often presented as "public diplomacy 1.0" versus "public diplomacy 2.0". The difference is between top-down public diplomacy models and dialogue-based models in which there is an exchange of information and two-way communication between the public and government representatives.¹² Thus, the diplomat becomes a strategically oriented handler of public opinion. It makes direct contact with the audience, every time it reaches the target audience, which allows for variation in the material. Communication with citizens is no longer a one-sided process, but has turned into a dialogue, exchange of opinions and debate on the most urgent problems.

IV. DIGITAL DIPLOMACY

For the first time in international practice, as an independent digital diplomacy, the direction of the United States, which was seen as an important element of "soft" and then so-called "smart power", began to be actively applied. During 2006-2007, the State Department, the CIA, the Department of Defense and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) established more than fifteen departments for working with foreign Internet audiences, specifically for the analysis of domestic and international social networks, blogs and chats. Since that time, the capability of these units has been constantly increasing. The first working group (consisting of 6 people) for Internet diplomacy in the State Department was formed in 2002. Based on it, the Office for Internet Diplomacy was formed in 2003. Since September 2013, it has been headed by Eric Nelson. The office is part of the information resources management department, which is responsible for the security of computer networks and the introduction of ICT in the work of 260 American diplomatic missions.

In addition to the Office of e-Diplomacy, separate functions within digital diplomacy charged an additional 24 units of the internal State Department. These include the Office of Digital Engagement within the Office of Public Affairs, which is the State Department's official "DipNote" blog and maintains the Department of Social Media's official website, as well as the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, which together with USAID organizes the training of foreign internet activists.¹³ The first digital diplomacy projects were launched in the mid-2000s, under the administration of Secretary of State Rice, but the active development of the projects began only later when Secretary of State Hillary Clinton came to the Office. It began

¹⁰ See more at: Deruda, A. (2014). *The Digital Diplomacy Handbook*. How to use social media to engage with global audiences

¹¹ Diplo (2016). *Infographic: Social media factsheet of foreign ministries*. <http://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/infographic-social-media-factsheet-foreign-ministries>

¹² Clingendael (2015). Report by Brian Hocking and Jan Melissen, *Diplomacy in the Digital Age*.

https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Digital_Diplomacy_in_the_Digital%20Age_Clingendael_July2015.pdf

¹³ Busby, S. (2014). *Ten Things You Need to Know About U.S. Support for Internet Freedom*. [https://blogs.state.gov/stories/2014/05/29/ten-things-you-need-know-about-us-support-internet-freedom]

reforming the State Department based on the published "KDDR" report in 2010, providing units responsible for network work.¹⁴ At the beginning of 2010, Clinton managed to attract the heads of agencies of the largest private Internet companies (Google, Facebook, Twitter, Hovcast, AT&T) to cooperate. It is believed that she soon allowed the United States to directly influence the development of the "Arab Spring" in 2011, when protest activity in North Africa and the Middle East was encouraged with the help of modern means from outside. Although he subsequently made personnel changes, John Kerry, who led the State Department in February 2013, generally maintained the wide use of digital technologies in the diplomatic practice of the United States. Conceptually, the idea of digital diplomacy is outlined in a number of State Department directives, including the so-called Quadrennial Review of 2010 and the so-called "21st Century States" initiative.¹⁵

According to the latest document, the qualitative improvement of technology and the rapid growth of Internet users in developing countries require a change in US foreign policy practice and its reorientation to the possibilities of modern ICT. In general, according to its meaning, digital diplomacy must solve two major problems, to contribute to the improvement of the work of the State Department and to the strengthening of American influence on socio-political processes in other countries. Obviously, some features of public diplomacy 2.0 need to be considered in detail. First, the new public diplomacy implies that career diplomats have largely lost control over the manipulation of public opinion and can no longer count on it. As Cull argued, society has gained significant power now more than ever before, and the public is no longer seen as a passive object of diplomatic wisdom influence.¹⁶

The public is now able to see the diplomat "over his shoulder" and judge what he sees.¹⁷ For diplomats, this means a significant loss of control.¹⁸ Second, public diplomacy 2.0 implies a much more stable and sincere level of engagement of diplomats: it is not enough to simply broadcast a message and expect foreign publics to accept it. It also makes it possible to overcome the negative perception of public diplomacy in the form of propaganda, and thus to develop a "legal and ethical" form of "symmetrical communication", during which the two sides will listen to each other.¹⁹ Third, Public Diplomacy 2.0 and diplomacy in general will largely rely on the web. According to Slaughter (Slaughter), the network is one of the defining characteristics of the modern world.²⁰

War, diplomacy, business, media, community, and even religion - everything is integrated into the network. So, "in this world it is a measure of the power of communication." Zaharna (Zaharna) gives this argument even more importance, saying that the one who has the widest network and the strongest connection wins today.²¹ Finally, an important feature of public diplomacy 2.0 is the public attention it pays to it. As Nye noted, the mass flow of information brought about by modern communications has created a "paradox of abundance," in which the prize becomes attention, not information.²²

Countries like China, Cuba and Russia are probably a bit more challenging on the digital diplomacy front. These governments have different ideas about the free flow of information from the United States, but they are also challenging because there are many sensitivities about US interference in the digital sphere. So, for example, officials in Russia indirectly blame the US for the invasion of Russian cyberspace. In addition, the US government tries to recruit bloggers in these countries, and they are seen as agents of the United States or as spies. More recent definitions have sought to clearly distinguish propaganda from other forms of communication. Therefore, propaganda can be seen as more than biased information aimed at promoting a political cause. Rather, it is the use of fabricated information or lies. Recently, many have argued that Russia is using propaganda when commenting on events in eastern Ukraine.

Such was the case when Russian officials claimed that the soldiers arrested in Crimea were not part of a military incursion, but simply soldiers on leave who had wandered into Ukrainian territory. At the same time, Russian officials are also actively using social media to spread their messages and engage with foreign audiences. Since the beginning of the Ukraine crisis in January 2014, many have expressed concern about the increasing use of propaganda in Russia. A Forbes writer recently described Putin's "parallel universe" in which a neo-Nazi junta has taken over Ukraine, adding that it is just one part of a sinister narrative cleverly designed to promote Putin's goals and prevent effective Western action. Interestingly, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs also projects this parallel universe through its digital diplomacy channels.

Since January 2014, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia has used Twitter to promote the narrative that Russia was forced to come to the aid of Russian minorities in Ukraine after the NATO-backed neo-Nazi coup in Kiev. In keeping with this narrative, tweets detailing violence against Russian minorities were often accompanied by images of desecrated monuments to

¹⁴ U.S. State department. (2015). The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review.

[<http://www.state.gov/s/dmr/qddr/2015/>]

¹⁵ U.S. State department. (2010). The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review.

[<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf>]

¹⁶ See more at: Cull, N., (2013). The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy. *International Studies Review*

¹⁷ See more at: Seib, P., (2012). *Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era*. New York:

Palgrave Macmillan.

¹⁸ Lichtenstein, J. (2010) *Digital Diplomacy* http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/18/magazine/18web2-0t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

¹⁹ Harris, B., (2013). *Diplomacy 2.0: The Future of Social Media in Diplomacy Branding*. *Exchange: The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 4(1), pp. 17-32.

²⁰ Slaughter, A-M., (2009). *America's Edge: Power in the Networked Century*. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(1), pp. 94-113.

²¹ Zaharna, R., (2005). *The Network Paradigm of Strategic Public Diplomacy*. *Foreign Policy in Focus*, 10(1), pp.14.

²² See more at: Nye Jr, J. (2012). *Viitorul puterii, Polirom, Iași*

the Soviet Union's victory over Nazi Germany. The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs routinely re-tweets messages tweeted by "Russia Today" and the news service "Sputnik". Such tweets can be seen as an attempt to lend credibility to Russian claims in the eyes of Western followers who view news organizations as independent and objective. The inclusion of digital diplomacy in Russia's national propaganda efforts has led some diplomatic scholars and practitioners to wonder if Russia is ruining digital diplomacy for the rest of the world.

Social media should not be used to create relationships with foreign publics that can then be used to facilitate acceptance of one's foreign policy – instead, engaging in dialogue with foreign publics should be the goal of digital diplomacy in itself. Therefore, it can be concluded that Russia's use of social media, which supplies followers with inaccurate information and portrays a distorted reality, rejects the essence of dialogic communication as well as the transformative nature of digital diplomacy.²³

This position believes that the state should set its internal political philosophy as the goal of its foreign policy, which generally coincides with the liberal theory of international relations, which is based on the following principles: first, the rejection of power politics as the only possible outcome of international relations, calls into question the principles security/warfare realism; Second, it emphasizes mutual benefit and international cooperation; Third, it implements international organizations and non-governmental actors to shape state preferences and political choices.²⁴

V. CONCLUSION

Diplomacy is increasingly being practiced in conditions of multi-year crisis. In crisis conditions, diplomats have multiple tasks to engage especially carefully with interested parties, more precisely to communicate with them and the public, but also to mitigate the crisis and contain its impact, negotiate the ways and conditions of withdrawal and, where appropriate, to use opportunities for change or gain. Crisis management gives "an air of technical rationality and efficiency", which conceals a series of political goals and diachronic difficulties of diplomatic actors. Diplomatic agreements lead to decisions that concern the citizens of certain countries, which is why the public is particularly interested in them. The activities of diplomats can reflect on cooperation in various areas of social action, such as political, economic or cultural, and can result in unfavorable outcomes that represent, not infrequently, a security risk. That is why it is not surprising that the public needs to "open" diplomacy. Diplomacy has always been subject to constant changes, however, in order to involve the public, society had to break away from authoritarian regimes and establish cooperation with citizens, which is a prerequisite for the emergence of public diplomacy.

REFERENCES

- [1] National Intelligence Council (2007) Non-state Actors: Impact on International Relations and Implications for the United States. http://www.dni.gov/nic/confreports_nonstate_actors.html
- [2] Carter M (2010) Technology as democracy: Bridging the digital divide, The Guardian. www.ushahidi.com
- [3] See more at: Rana.s. Kishan (2007). Bilateral Diplomacy. Serbia: Diplofoundation.
- [4] Theros N (2001). Information Technology Reshaping Method of Diplomatic Relations. The Washington Diplomat. www.washdiplomat.com/01-06/a2_06_01.html
- [5] See more at: Potter E (2002). Cyber Diplomacy. Managing foreign policy in the twenty first century, McGill- Queen's University Press, London.
- [6] Human Capital Institute (2012), "Social Networking in Government: Opportunities and Challenges," http://www.hci.org/files/field_content_file/SNGovt_SummaryFINAL.pdf
- [7] Susanto T. D. and R. Goodwin, (2010). "Factors Influencing Citizen Adoption of SMS-Based e-Government Services," Electronic Journal of E-Government, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 55-71.
- [8] Banday, M. Tariq and Mattoo, M. M. (2013) Social Media in e-Governance: A Study with Special Reference to India. Social Networking, 2, 47-56.
- [9] See more at: Deruda, A. (2014). The Digital Diplomacy Handbook. How to use social media to engage with global audiences
- [10] Diplo (2016). Infographic: Social media factsheet of foreign ministries.
- [11] <http://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/infographic-social-media-factsheet-foreign-ministries>
- [12] Clingendael (2015). Report by Brian Hocking and Jan Melissen, Diplomacy in the Digital Age. https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Digital_Diplomacy_in_the_Digital%20Age_Clingendael_July2015.pdf
- [13] Busby, S. (2014). Ten Things You Need to Know About U.S. Support for Internet Freedom. [<https://blogs.state.gov/stories/2014/05/29/ten-things-you-need-know-about-us-support-internet-freedom>]
- [14] U.S. State department. (2015). The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [<http://www.state.gov/s/dmr/qDDR/2015/>]
- [15] U.S. State department. (2010). The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf>]
- [16] See more at: Cull, N., (2013). The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy. International Studies Review
- [17] See more at: Seib, P., (2012). Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [18] Lichtenstein, J. (2010) Digital Diplomacy http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/18/magazine/18web20t.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- [19] Harris, B., (2013). Diplomacy 2.0: The Future of Social Media in Diplomacy Branding. Exchange: The Journal of Public Diplomacy, 4(1), pp. 17-32.
- [20] Slaughter, A-M., (2009). America's Edge: Power in the Networked Century. Foreign Affairs, 88(1), pp. 94-113.
- [21] Zaharna, R., (2005). The Network Paradigm of Strategic Public Diplomacy. Foreign Policy in Focus, 10(1), pp.14.
- [22] See more at: Nye Jr, J. (2012). Viitorul puterii, Polirom, Iași
- [23] See more at: Manor, I., & Segev, E. (2015). America's selfie, How the US portrays itself on its social media accounts. Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.
- [24] See more at: Manor, I., & Segev, E. (2015). America's selfie, How the US portrays itself on its social media accounts. Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.

²³ See more at: Manor, I., & Segev, E. (2015). America's selfie, How the US portrays itself on its social media accounts. Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.

²⁴ See more at: Manor, I., & Segev, E. (2015). America's selfie, How the US portrays itself on its social media accounts. Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice.

AUTHORS

First Author – SALAH ALDEEN DULAYOUM phd.candidate