

DOI: 10.21847/1728-9343.2020.2(166).200287

**OLEKSANDRA SAHAIDAK,***Lviv Ivan Franko National University (Lviv, Ukraine)**e-mail: oleksandrasagajdak@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-4497-4849***KHRYSTYNA SHOLOTA,***Lviv Ivan Franko National University (Lviv, Ukraine)**e-mail: chrissholota@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-6514-1988*

## **HISTORICAL PARTICULARITIES OF DIPLOMACY AT THE TURN OF 20<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> centuries**

The suggested article analyzes the roots, evolution and contemporary development of diplomacy at the turn of 20<sup>th</sup> - 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. The actuality of the problem consists in the fact that in modern world the boundaries between domestic and foreign policies are constantly disappearing. Issues which were considered to be as an internal matter of one or another country, may be effectively addressed nowadays only on international level, using efforts of a great number of international actors. In democratic countries in contrast to authoritarian regimes, we can see a considerable dispersion of power and decision-making centers. Diplomats of these countries are not always confident if their activity will gain the support of parliamentary institutions and local authorities of their parent countries. All these factors lead to the necessity of study the peculiarities of modern diplomacy and its effectiveness in 21<sup>st</sup> century. The research is based on systematic method, which is manifested in alignment and consistency of the presentation of the material on the basis of analyzed sources. Another important method applied is a historical method by means of which chronological order of the development of modern diplomacy is systematized. The article emphasizes the essence of diplomacy, its basic aims and functions, political and non-political tasks of diplomatic activity. Diplomacy is regarded as set of scientifically established methods and means, the art of conducting negotiations and concluding agreements, the art of realizing state foreign policy goals. The research highlights a new approach to the analysis of public diplomacy regarding it as a practical activity and important mean for achieving strategic purposes in the international arena in the process of active globalization at the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Key word:** *diplomacy; public diplomacy; International Relations; agreements; negotiations; host country; parent country.*

### **Introduction**

In globalized world every phenomenon, which has been formed for centuries, either changes drastically or vanishes completely. Such process can also be applied to diplomacy, as today the discussion about its efficiency in modern conditions is a frequent one. The participants of modern foreign policy process are generally divided into optimists and pessimists, those who predict the disappearance of diplomacy and those who believe in relative stability of this public administration branch.

It leads us to the question whether states need that classic diplomatic system, which appeared at the turning point of late Middle Ages and New Age in the city-states of the Apennine Peninsula. Known as "Italian model" of diplomacy, that system was based on separation of foreign policy into independent public governance branch and relations between secular sovereign rulers, who tried to monitor international balance.

An Ambassador was a personal representative of his autocratic monarch and in the capacity of his alter-ego he possessed all necessary decision-making powers and unstinting support for his own actions from the government. Such state of actions, in turn, was determined by the fact, that central authorities - the Monarch, the President, the Almighty First Minister in the country represented by the

diplomat, were able to reinforce other authorities to play an appropriate role in the political process, conducted by diplomatic methods.

In the globalized world the boundaries between internal and foreign policy are being gradually blurred. Problems that used to be perceived as ones of exclusively internal nature, now can be solved only on the international level by combined efforts of numerous international actors. Unlike states with authoritarian regimes, in democratic countries significant dispersion of power and decision-making centers can be observed. Diplomats representing these countries cannot be always certain whether their activities abroad will gain the support from parliamentary institutions, local and municipal authorities of their parent countries.

All these factors predetermine the need to research particularities of modern diplomacy and determine its effectiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **Materials and Methods**

The research of modern diplomacy and diplomatic activity was the subject of interests of Ukrainian and foreign scholars. The works of A. Zlenko, G. Rudenko, B. Gymeniuk, O. Sagaidak, P. Sardachuk, M. Malskyy, T. Zonova, E. Satow, M. Ruthven, G. Jackson etc. formed the basics of

further studies of modern diplomatic activity and its types within the framework of modern reality of foreign policy.

The research is based on a great number of scientific resources, consisting of legislative documents, in particular acts of international law, statistical data, information gained from international organizations as well as from foreign offices of different states and collections of documents, related to the sphere of International Relations and diplomacy.

Research method is based on the usage of basic methods of scientific research. In particular, we apply systematic method which is manifested in consequent and consistent presentation of material acquired from the sources analyzed. Another important method applied is a historical method by means of which identifying and systematizing chronological sequences of the development of modern diplomacy are fulfilled. The research is also grounded on the principle of objectivism, which manifests itself in objective emphasis of scientific information sources.

The analysis method which consists of the analysis of scientific sources, doctrinal approaches, as well as factual and historical material is used to highlight the most important phenomena related to modern diplomacy.

Using different methodological approaches allow us to avoid subjective evaluations and provide scientific credibility of the research results.

### Results and Discussions

The term "diplomacy" in scientific, journalistic and to a certain extent colloquial vocabulary is used in numerous meanings. Although the type of activity covered by the term "diplomacy" is thousands years old, discrepancies and differences in understanding of this term never ceased to exist. To elaborate and give a cogent definition of the term is of fundamental importance. Otherwise, it would be difficult to adequately define concepts derived from it, such as diplomatic service, diplomat, diplomatic relations.

Oxford English Dictionary (2019) and Ukrainian Diplomatic Dictionary under the editorship of M. Malskyi and Y. Moroz (2014) define diplomacy as the conduct of international relations via negotiations; means, used by ambassadors and envoys with the aim to maintain negotiation process; work and artistic talent of diplomats.

Academic Ukrainian Thesaurus (1970-1980) defines diplomacy as the activity of government and specialized foreign affairs bodies in the process of implementation of external international policy of the state. However, it is worth mentioning that the dictionary was concluded in USSR period, therefore it is rather outdated, since diplomatic means and methods have changed drastically at this stage of development of international relations.

Recalling Soviet diplomatic school, it is interesting to quote I. Stalin in relation to diplomacy. According to one of the cruelest dictators of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there is no need for diplomacy and real actions to match, as "nice words are a mask to cover bad actions. Sincere diplomacy has the same chance to exist as dry water or wooden iron." Still, such approach to diplomacy wasn't out of the ordinary in the time-period in mind. The common diplomacy framework back then can be described as follows: "When a diplomat says "yes", he means "maybe"; when he says "maybe" - it means "no"; when he says "no" he is not a diplomat (Stachan, 2011).

There is no definition of the term "diplomacy" in modern Ukrainian legislation, although The Law of Ukraine "On diplomatic service" (2018) states the definition of diplomatic

service. According to the Law, the diplomatic service consists of professional activity of diplomatic officials, which is related to the implementation of Ukraine's foreign policy, protection of Ukraine's national interests in the sphere of international relations, as well as rights and interests of citizens and legal entities of Ukraine abroad. This approach of Ukrainian legislation to define diplomacy in such a way is obviously quite clear. However, it is worth considering that national and international laws are not intended to define diplomacy, but regulate relations arising out of diplomatic activity. For this reason, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 does not provide the definition of diplomacy, as well as diplomatic activity (Ruthven, 2013).

In general, diplomacy attempts to ensure two types of core objectives for the state it represents. These are political and non-political objectives (Kyntsans, 1992).

When talking about political objectives of diplomacy, it should be mentioned that diplomacy always seeks to achieve the goals of national interest, which are defined by foreign policy and always serves to increase the state's influence in the international arena. In particular, due to rational negotiations, diplomacy tries to achieve main goals of foreign policy of the state and at the same time promote cooperation with other countries.

Concerning non-political objectives of diplomacy, it must be noted that the interdependence between the nations is the most important and also the most valuable reality of international life. Each state depends on other countries in frames of economic, industrial and trade relations. Diplomacy always strives to foster economic, commercial and cultural relations between states. It relies on peaceful means, convincing methods of promotion of national interests and this is a vital non-political objective of diplomacy (Roy, 2012: 452).

Taking into account aims and purposes of diplomacy, the functions of diplomacy have to be outlined. Although there is no common understanding of the concept of functions of diplomacy within the scientific community, the analysis of scientific researches points out the fact, that most of the scientists share the same approach to define functions of diplomacy. The most important of them are the following:

1. Ceremonial and symbolic functions. The diplomats of the state are the symbolic representatives that represent their parent country and its government at all official ceremonies and functions, as well as informal, social and cultural events held within the framework of the diplomatic activity.

2. Representative function. The diplomat officially represents his parent state in a foreign state. He serves as a communication agent between the National Authority for Foreign policy and the state where he is accredited. His representation is juridical and political ones: he may vote at diplomatic conferences on behalf of his government etc., however, he is confined to the course of actions, determined by the National Authority for Foreign policy.

3. Negotiation functions. Negotiating with other states is the core function of diplomacy. As well-known researches N. Palmer and H. Perkins point out, diplomats are negotiators by definition. They are communication channels, who transmit information between Ministries of Foreign affairs of their states and the host state. Along with the subject, the method and the manner of message transmission influence a negotiation process greatly. Through negotiations, the diplomat primarily seeks to reach an agreement, as well as compromises on different conflict

issues and problems between states. Nevertheless, the role of diplomacy in negotiations has decreased nowadays, due to emergence of multilateral diplomacy, personal diplomacy, political diplomacy, high-level diplomacy, as well as direct communication links between world leaders and top government officials. Nowadays, diplomats do not play such significant role in international negotiations, as they used to do earlier. However, they remain main juridical and official negotiation channels of international relations (Palmer and Perkins, 2001).

4. Accountability functions. Accountability involves monitoring of political, economic, military and social conditions of the receiving country, as well as accurate transmission of diplomat's conclusions to his home country. Political accountability includes the report on evaluation of the role of different political parties in the policy of the receiving country. It strives to evaluate the goodwill or hostility of different political entities towards the diplomat's parent country, as well as potential for power of each party and organization. Economic accountability involves sending reports to the national Ministry of Foreign affairs; these reports contain general information on economic conditions and trade potential of the host country. Military accountability involves the evaluation of military power, intentions and opportunities, as well as strategic importance of the host country. The level of social and cultural conflicts between the people of the host country and the level of social harmony and cohesion are evaluated to determine the host country's level of stability. Thus, the accountability is an important and valuable function of diplomacy.

5. Protection of interests. Diplomacy always works on protection and promotion of interests of the country and its citizens living abroad. Promotion of interests is the basis of diplomatic practice. It serves to ensure compatibility in the context of incompatibility by adaptation, reconciliation and benevolence. The diplomat always tries to prevent or change practice which is considered to be discriminative towards the interests of their country. His obligation is to protect individuals, property and interests of those citizens of his home country, who live in a host country (Woods, 1974).

Nowadays, diplomacy as a social regulator (in a broader sense) is in the state of development, under the influence of such factors as democratization and globalization, increasing complexity of international relations, as well as the increase in the number of actors (both state and non-state). The diplomacy is in the process of changing, which influences its essence and form, functions and objectives. Hence the variety of approaches and various uses of the means are logically implied. Today we talk about classical diplomacy (which is conducted by sovereign states and international organizations), parliamentary diplomacy, regional diplomacy, humanitarian diplomacy, economic diplomacy, ecological diplomacy, public diplomacy, civil diplomacy, energy diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and digital diplomacy, which correspond to applied requests for regulation of international relations. In the modern diplomacy, such terms as "network diplomacy", "traditional diplomatic methods", "political and diplomatic settlement of the regional conflicts", "civil diplomacy" are being implemented.

Taking into account all factors mentioned above, the major principles of diplomacy, defining its essence and form, should be pointed out. Firstly, it is the presence of wide-ranging international diplomatic practice. Secondly, it is the existence of a solid international and national

regulatory framework on conducting international relations. In general terms it includes:

- regulatory instruments in the field of diplomatic law (the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961);
- basic principles of international law (respect to national sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs, adherence to fully recognized human rights, etc.);
- international treaties (the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 1950, etc.);
- international declarations (the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, etc.).

The new trends in the development of modern diplomacy were not only influenced by increasing interdependence and emergence of global problems, but many other features. It is worth pointing out the rapid change of the nature of international relations, which causes diplomacy to respond adequately to the current events. A large number of new states with their personal interests, national peculiarities and their own level of development appeared in the international arena. These factors influenced negotiation process, as well as other forms of diplomatic activity.

A new feature of modern diplomacy is its multidimensional nature. Whereas previously the regulation of international relations by diplomatic means focused on foreign policy and trade issues, nowadays the range of issues has dramatically increased. Such spheres, as security, disarmament, economy, ecology, energy, terrorism, technologies, social issues (migration, criminality, demographic issues, increasing poverty), as well as internal conflicts (regional and local), which become protracted or frozen in nature become the subject of discussions and regulations nowadays. As a result, contents of the agenda, which may be subject of diplomatic discussion, has become more complicated and diplomats themselves have to become familiar with the completely new spheres. Consequently, new courses in the training programs of diplomatic personnel, along with the traditional ones (country studies, history, law, economics, language courses) appeared. The Foreign Service Institute (the leading US center in training the diplomatic personnel) has introduced the courses on drug-trafficking issues, refugees' problems, environmental protection technologies and possible market expansions for the USA.

Taking into account current trends in the development of the system of international relations such as a substantial increase in the number of world power centers, enhancement of the role of non-state actors, enforcement of processes of globalization and influence of media, world community starts to focus on foreign policy issues more precisely and demands transparency from the authorities. In this context, the state's communicative policy is especially important, one of the key areas of which is the formation of a favorable image of the country, its citizens, foreign and domestic policy, cultural values and lifestyle. To implement these tasks, information and communication technologies and, in particular, public diplomacy are used.

Polish researcher B. Ociepka notes that the concept of "public diplomacy" in practical activity in the international arena appeared only at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Ociepka, 2015). Indeed, this term has gained particular popularity for the past 20-30 years; however, it can be argued that the essence of this practice is as old as history itself. Thus, official communication with a foreign public, which is now called public diplomacy, existed even in

ancient Greece, Rome and Byzantine Empire, whose rulers never ignored the mood of population in a foreign land. After the invention of the typewriter in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the scale of official communication with citizens in foreign countries significantly expanded. At the end of the Middle Ages, Venetians introduced systematic distribution of newsletters in their own diplomatic service. At the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Cardinal Richelieu pursued an active foreign policy to improve his country's image abroad, considering reputation management to be one of the main sources of power. In the interwar period, the most successful public diplomacy initiatives came down to the need to restore lost trust among international community. Thus, German version of public diplomacy "politische Öffentlichkeitsarbeit" (political public relations) has accompanied the external relations of the Federal Republic since 1949, and has become an important tool in increasing perception and approval of Germany in other Western democracies.

The founder of the concept of "public diplomacy" is considered to be the Dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (USA) and a well-known diplomat in the past E. Julion. In 1965, he noted that public diplomacy deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and implementation of foreign policy. This covers understanding of international relations outside traditional diplomacy ... including formation of public opinion in other countries by governments; interaction of private groups and groups of interests in one country with the same in others, and the interethnic flow of information and ideas (*Public Diplomacy Alumni Association, 2008*).

Scholars of international relations B. Signitzer and T. Coombs understand public diplomacy as a way by means of which governments, private individuals and groups of individuals can directly or indirectly influence public opinion and attitudes that directly affect the decisions of other government regarding foreign policy (*Signitzer & Coombs, 1992: 137-147*).

Ukrainian scientists O. Zaporozhets and N. Pipchenko in the Ukrainian diplomatic encyclopedia give the following definition of public diplomacy: "Public diplomacy is the state's public activity in foreign policy aimed at ensuring national interests and security by establishing dialogue and influencing foreign public by a number of measures of political, economic, educational, and cultural nature; coordinated work of governmental and non-governmental structures to manage the perception of the country's domestic and foreign policy and political values through combination of traditional foreign policy with communicative technologies for influencing public opinion and image positioning of the country in the international arena" (*Ukrainian diplomatic encyclopedia, 2013: 112*).

The most relevant definition of this concept can be derived from comparing the main features of public and traditional diplomacy.

Firstly, public diplomacy includes interaction not only with governments, but also with non-governmental individuals and organizations. The main object of influence is a certain target audience and citizens of foreign states, but not power structures as in traditional diplomatic activities.

Secondly, public diplomacy includes an open process of communication with the public, which is based on the principle of transparency and publicity, while the disclosure of information about "traditional" diplomatic activities is very limited and closed.

Finally, traditional diplomacy is characterized by pro-

tection of institutional hierarchy and opposition to changes, which completely contradicts the concepts of modern public diplomacy (*Wolf, 2004, URL...*).

Some researchers consider public diplomacy to be so-called "soft power". One of such researchers, American professor J. Nye believes that public diplomacy is one of the most effective methods of building the potential of "soft power", the purpose of which is to create a positive image of the state in the minds of citizens of another state, the ability to achieve the desired by voluntary participation, but not by coercion (*Nye, 2010*). Ukrainian political scientist S. Bielie shares the same opinion and in his works he claims the public diplomacy to be a preventive mechanism in the state's foreign policy (*Bieliei, 2012*).

Based on the fact that public diplomacy can be defined as the form of persuasive communication with foreign public through informational channels and an imperceptible influence on the thoughts of target audiences, it is often equated with propaganda - a concept with common origin and similar characteristics.

For example, Oxford Encyclopedia of American Military and Diplomatic History, edited by T.J. Lynch, characterizes public diplomacy as direct propaganda (*The Oxford Encyclopedia of American Military and Diplomatic History, 2013, URL...*).

In particular, a famous American diplomat Richard Holbrook, describing the concept of public diplomacy, notes: "Call it public diplomacy, or public relations or psychological warfare, but if you want to be really honest - call it propaganda" (*Holbrooke, 2001*).

One cannot disagree with the fact that the concept of public diplomacy in its lower forms and activities is really similar to propaganda due to joint historical and international circumstances, but nevertheless, it has its own features that cannot be attributed to the direct concept of propaganda.

The common aspect is that both public diplomacy and propaganda are based on manipulating mass consciousness and persuading people to achieve their own national goals. However, if we analyze these two concepts in detail, we can conclude that propaganda strategies usually use deception techniques, spreading fear among so-called "enemies", intimidation, and ideological indoctrination to influence public behavior. The main principle of public diplomacy is the transparency and truthfulness of the information disseminated (*Nelles, 2004*). In other words, public diplomacy is like propaganda as it tries to convince people what to think, but at the same time it is fundamentally different as it also listens to what the public expresses. The democratization of access to the information has turned citizens into independent observers and participants of international policies, thus modern public diplomacy, gradually developing, is not only one-way communication (*Melissen, 2005*).

The concept of public diplomacy emerges in the mid-60s, as it has been noted earlier. We can say that this was the first attempt by the United States to move away from the negative comprehension of propaganda and psychological war. In addition, the United States Information Agency (USIA), created in the 1950s, has now an official term for providing and justifying the "cultural work of the state" during the Cold War. During the Cold War public diplomacy was reduced mainly to broadcasting to countries behind the Iron Curtain (*Roth, 1986*). With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp, the need for open propaganda disappeared, and as a result a special

"Secretariat for Public Diplomacy and Public Relations" was created in 1999 in the USA and then in other capitalist countries.

After terrorist attacks in New York and Washington on September 11, 2001 public diplomacy attracted even more attention from researchers and scholars than it used to. The "new era" of public diplomacy begins. In contrast to "narrow" traditional state concept of public diplomacy described above, supporters of new public diplomacy point out new media and communication technologies as a new force that gradually erodes old rigid lines between domestic and international information spheres and enhances the role and legitimacy of non-state actors in international politics (Melissen, 2011).

At the beginning of 2000 there was a great increase in the number of Internet users in developing countries (*ICT Data and Statistics, URL...*). The natural development of the Internet included the spread of new technologies which contributed to the active participation of users in creation of web content (Tsvetkova, 2011). It is also important to mention mass distribution of mobile phones, which turned into multifunctional devices with wide communication capabilities in 2010. Along with the serious influence of the Internet on society and politics, its full accessibility is also worth mentioning. Live broadcasts on social media, politicians' tweets, Facebook news mean that the modern world of communications has drastically moved to a new level. As a result, the ability of an ordinary activist or a "blogger" to make international news on the phone in most countries has reached a qualitatively new level and can even compete with well-known newspapers or television channels (Arsenault, 2009).

In addition, the increased interest in public diplomacy in recent years has contributed to the development of concepts based on marketing, such as branding, "image creation", "national brand", or as it is also called - "cultural communication", in which the government is trying to improve its image without seeking support for any immediate purpose. States use these strategies to promote a better understanding of themselves in the world and maintain long-term alliance relations.

The United States is one of the vivid examples of active brand-creator in public diplomacy. For example, representatives of US marketing and advertising businesses have been concerned for a long time that political events in Iraq have significantly undermined the global attraction of US brands such as "McDonald's", "MTV" and "Microsoft" and have promoted the spread of anti-Americanism concept. Therefore, high-ranking image leaders carried out a number of initiatives to rehabilitate the national brand by promoting tourism and cultural exports of the highest quality. The United States is not the only state trying to strengthen its own national brand in the international arena. Almost every state in Central and Eastern Europe plans and supports various projects related to tourism, sports, brand and cultural events export. For some countries, such as Paraguay, which is "known" only to its neighbors, an attractive national brand certainly plays a certain role, but not as a global one. However, for other countries a national branding program management is a valuable asset, the loss of which can be a painful one (Melissen, 2011).

Another modern dimension regards public diplomacy as international public relations and lobbyism. As to the former, it is a form of communication that aims at achieving medium-term goals, has a broader context than lobbyism, crosses political boundaries, and touches upon economic

and cultural issues. Lobbyism includes short-term communication with the aim to have the required influence of the state on a certain decision making process abroad. With the help of public diplomacy, one can convince the target audience, especially the decision-makers (for instance, members of parliament or government officials of another state), change their position to one's own advantage (Hutsal, 2010).

Using informational and communicative capacities of public diplomacy, state authorities can attain such goals as enhancing the awareness of the country; shaping positive perception of the country by other actors of international relations; influence public attitude (encourage investments, get public support for the state's position, persuade politicians to see the state as an ally etc.). To achieve these goals, public diplomacy should embrace such dimensions as explanation of domestic and foreign policy of the government and its decisions, strategic communication spreading a number of topical messages and planning a set of symbolic events with its further visualization to boost the effect and the development of long-term mutual relations on the individual level with politicians, journalists, scholars, businessmen, and other leaders of thought by means of exchange programs, seminars' and conferences' organization and provision of the access for foreign-language media (Leonard, 2002: 48-56).

### Conclusion

Having analyzed different approaches of various scholars concerning the notion "diplomacy" and its historic transformations, it should be stated that diplomacy is a science on international relations and the art of holding negotiations by Heads of States and governments. In general, diplomacy can be regarded as an official activity of state authorities with the capacity to act in matters of foreign affair. It is the process of participation of diplomats in foreign policy determination and its practical realization by peaceful means with the aim to protect interests of the state and its citizens.

In modern informational era, when the success of all political initiatives depends on the understanding and support of the world community, public diplomacy remains an essential mean in the arsenal of 'smart power' for attaining strategic goals of the state in political, economic and security realms.

### REFERENCES

- Arsenault, A. (2009). *Public Diplomacy 2.0. Toward a New Public Diplomacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 135-253.
- Bieliei, S. (2012). Publichna dyplomatiia derzhav serednoi syly v suchasnykh mizhnarodnykh vidnosynakh: dosvid Kanady ta Niderlandiv. *Naukovi pratsi. Politolohiia*, 185(197), 72-77. (In Ukrainian)
- Brown, C. and Ainley, K. (2005). *Understanding International Relations*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 91 p.
- Definition of diplomacy in English. *Oxford Dictionary*. Retrieved from: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/diplomacy>.
- Holbrooke, Richard (2001, October 28). Get the Message Out. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2001/10/28/get-the-message-out/b298b3c9-45b8-45e2-9ec7-20503dd38802/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.9025bfac8f47](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2001/10/28/get-the-message-out/b298b3c9-45b8-45e2-9ec7-20503dd38802/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.9025bfac8f47).
- Hutsal, S. A. (2010). Publichna dyplomatiia yak suchasnyi prioritet zovnishnoi polityky derzhavy. *Stratehichni priorytety*, 3(16), 106-114. (In Ukrainian)

- ICT Data and Statistics (IDS) (2008). *ITU*. Retrieved from: <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/ict/>.
- Ivanova, N. S. (2017). Publiczna dyplomatiia yak efektyvnyi mekhanizm zovnishnoi polityky derzhavy. *Visnyk KhNU im. V. N. Karazina, seria "Pytannia politolohii"*, 32, 121-126. (In Ukrainian)
- Kyntsans, V. P. (1992). *Dyplomatycheskyi protokol*. Ryha, 253 p. (In Russian)
- Leonard, M. (2002). Diplomacy by other means. *Foreign Policy*, 132, 48-56.
- Malskyi, M. Z., Moroz, Yu. M., Kuchyk, O. S. et al. (2014). *Ukrainskyi dyplomatychnyi slovnyk*. Kyiv: Znannya, p. 218 (In Ukrainian)
- Melissen, J. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 221 p.
- Melissen, Jan (2011). *Beyond the new public diplomacy*. Netherlands institute of IR Clingendael. Retrieved from: [https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20111014\\_cdsp\\_paper\\_jmelissen.pdf](https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20111014_cdsp_paper_jmelissen.pdf).
- Nai, Dzhozef S. (2010, Lutyj 18). Nova publiczna dyplomatiia. *Den*, 28. (In Ukrainian)
- Nelles, W. (2004). American public diplomacy as pseudo-education. *International Politics*, 41, 65-93.
- Ociepka, B. (2015). Miękka siła i dyplomacja publiczna Polski. *Historia i Polityka*, 13(20), 207-209. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/HiP.2015.015>.
- Palmer, N. F. and Perkins, H. C. (2001). *International Relations*. CBS, 799 p.
- Rudenko, H. M. (1999). *Ukraina dyplomatychna*. Kyiv, 258 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Ruthven, M. (2013). *Carving Up the Globe - An Atlas of Diplomacy*. Harvard University Press, 256 p.
- Satow, E. (2015). *A Guide To Diplomatic Practice*. Andesite Press, 446 p.
- Signitzer, B. and Coombs, T. (1992). Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual covergences. *Public Relations Review*, 137-147.
- Strachan, F. (2001). The Evolution of Stalins Foreign Policy during Word War Two. *E-International relations*. Retrieved from: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/11/23/the-evolution-of-stalins-foreign-policy-during-word-war-two/>.
- The Oxford Encyclopedia of American Military and Diplomatic History (2013). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199759255.001.0001/acref-9780199759255>.
- Tsvetkova, N. A. (2011). Programmy Web 2.0 v publichnoy diplomatii SShA. *SShA i Kanada: Ekonomika, politika, kultura*, 3, 109-122. (In Russian)
- Vud, Dzh and Serre, Zh. (1978). *Dyplomatycheskyi tseremonyal y protokol*. Moscow: Prohress, 395 p. (In Russian)
- What is Public Diplomacy? (2008). Public Diplomacy Alumni Association. Retrieved from: <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/1.htm>
- Wolf, Charles Jr. and Rosen, Brian (2004). *Public Diplomacy: How to Think About and Improve It*. RAND Corporation, Retrieved from: [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional\\_papers/2004/RAND\\_OP134.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2004/RAND_OP134.pdf).
- Zakon Ukrainy pro dyplomatychnu sluzhbu* (2018). Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2449-19>. (In Ukrainian)
- нішньої політики держави. *Стратегічні пріоритети*. 2010. № 3 (16). С. 106-114.
- Закон України про дипломатичну службу. 2018. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2449-19>.
- Іванова Н. С. Публічна дипломатія як ефективний механізм зовнішньої політики держави. *Вісник ХНУ ім. В. Н. Каразіна, серія "Питання політології"*. 2017. Вип. 32. С. 121-126.
- Кинцанс В. П. Дипломатический протокол. Рига, 1992. 253 с.
- Най Джозеф С. Нова публічна дипломатія. *День*. 2010. 18 лютого. № 28.
- Руденко Г. М. Україна дипломатична. К., 1999. 258 с.
- Український дипломатичний словник / М. З. Мальський, Ю. М. Мороз, О. С. Кучик та ін.; за ред. М. З. Мальського, Ю. М. Мороза. К.: Знання, 2014. С. 218.
- Цветкова Н. А. Программы Web 2.0 в публичной дипломатии США. *США и Канада: экономика, политика, культура: научный и общественно-политический журнал*. 2011. № 3. С. 109-122.
- Arsenault A. *Public Diplomacy 2.0. Toward a New Public Diplomacy* / Edited by Ph. Seib. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2009. 135-253.
- Brown C. and Ainley K. *Understanding International Relations*. Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 91 p.
- Definition of diplomacy in English. *Oxford Dictionary*. URL: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/diplomacy>.
- Holbrooke Richard. Get the Message Out. *The Washington Post*. 2001, October 28. URL: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2001/10/28/get-the-message-out/b298b3c9-45b8-45e2-9ec7-20503dd38802/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.9025bfac8f47](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/2001/10/28/get-the-message-out/b298b3c9-45b8-45e2-9ec7-20503dd38802/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.9025bfac8f47).
- ICT Data and Statistics (IDS). *ITU*. 2008. URL: <http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/statistics/ict/>.
- Leonard M. Diplomacy by other means. *Foreign Policy*. 2002. 132: P. 48-56.
- Melissen J. *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 221 p.
- Melissen Jan. *Beyond the new public diplomacy*. Netherlands institute of IR Clingendael. 2011. URL: [https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20111014\\_cdsp\\_paper\\_jmelissen.pdf](https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20111014_cdsp_paper_jmelissen.pdf).
- Nelles W. American public diplomacy as pseudo-education. *International Politics*. 2004. N 41, P. 65-93.
- Ociepka B. Miękka siła i dyplomacja publiczna Polski. *Historia i Polityka*. 2015. Nr 13(20), P. 207-209.
- Palmer N. F. and Perkins H. C. *International Relations*. CBS. 2001. 799 p.
- Ruthven M. *Carving Up the Globe - An Atlas of Diplomacy*. Harvard University Press. 2013. 256 p.
- Satow E. *A Guide To Diplomatic Practice*. Andesite Press. 2015. 446 p.
- Signitzer B. and Coombs T. Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual covergences. *Public Relations Review*. 1992. P. 137-147.
- Strachan F. The Evolution of Stalins Foreign Policy during Word War Two. *E-International relations*. 2001. URL: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/11/23/the-evolution-of-stalins-foreign-policy-during-word-war-two/>.
- The Oxford Encyclopedia of American Military and Diplomatic History. Oxford University Press. 2013. URL: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199759255.001.0001/acref-9780199759255>.
- What is Public Diplomacy? Public Diplomacy Alumni Association. 2008. URL: <http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/1.htm>
- Wolf Charles Jr. and Rosen Brian. *Public Diplomacy: How to Think About and Improve It*. RAND Corporation, 2004. URL: [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional\\_papers/2004/RAND\\_OP134.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2004/RAND_OP134.pdf).

## LIST OF REFERENCES LINK

- Белей С. Публічна дипломатія держав середньої сили в сучасних міжнародних відносинах: досвід Канади та Нідерландів. *Наукові праці. Політологія*. 2012. Вип. 185. Т. 197. С. 72-77.
- Вуд Дж. Дипломатический церемониал и протокол. М.: Прогресс, 1974. 395 с.
- Гуцал С. А. Публічна дипломатія як сучасний пріоритет зов-

**Олександра Сагайдак,**

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка (м. Львів, Україна)  
e-mail: [oleksandrasagajdak@gmail.com](mailto:oleksandrasagajdak@gmail.com), ORCID 0000-0002-4497-4849

**Христина Шолота,**

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка (м. Львів, Україна)  
e-mail: [chrissholota@ukr.net](mailto:chrissholota@ukr.net), ORCID 0000-0001-6514-1988

### **ІСТОРИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ НА ЗЛАМІ ХХ - ХХІ СТОЛІТЬ**

У статті досліджено витоки, еволюцію та сучасний розвиток дипломатії на зламі ХХ-ХХІ століть. Актуальність даної проблеми полягає у тому, що в умовах глобалізованого світу поступово зникає межа між зовнішньою і внутрішньою політикою. Проблеми, які раніше вважалися суто внутрішньою справою тієї чи іншої держави, часто можна вирішити лише на міжнародному рівні, зусиллями цілої низки різних акторів. На відміну від країн з авторитарними структурами, в демократичних країнах спостерігається значне розосередження центрів влади і, відповідно, центрів прийняття рішень. Дипломати цих країн не завжди впевнені, чи отримають підтримку своїх закордонних акцій з боку парламентських інститутів, органів місцевої влади та муніципальної влади. Усе це зумовлює необхідність дослідження особливостей сучасної дипломатії та розгляду, наскільки вона є ефективною в умовах ХХІ століття. Дослідження ґрунтується на використанні засадничих методів наукового дослідження. Зокрема системного методу дослідження, який проявляється в узгодженості та послідовності викладення матеріалу на основі проаналізованих джерел. Важливим методом дослідження є історичний, за допомогою якого виявлено та систематизовано хронологічні послідовності розвитку сучасної дипломатії, принцип об'єктивізму, що виявляється в об'єктивному висвітленні джерел наукової інформації. У статті розглянуто основні цілі та функції дипломатії, політичні та неполітичні завдання дипломатичної діяльності. Показано, що найбільш чітко сутність дипломатії можна окреслити через визначення її як науки про міжнародні відносини і мистецтво ведення переговорів главами держав і урядів та спеціальними органами зовнішніх відносин, а також як участь дипломатів у визначенні курсу зовнішньої політики та її втілення в життя мирними засобами з метою захисту інтересів держави та її громадян.

*Ключові слова:* дипломатія; публічна дипломатія; міжнародні відносини; договори; переговори; країна перебування; країна походження.

---

© *Oleksandra Sahaidak, Khrystyna Sholota*

Надійшла до редакції: 23.03.2020

Прийнята до друку: 08.04.2020