ТАРИХ ЖӘНЕ АРХЕОЛОГИЯ ~ ИСТОРИЯ И АРХЕОЛОГИЯ ~ HISTORY AND ARCHEOLOGY

N.A. Antipin[1] ⓘD

[1] South Ural State University
Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor
Chelyabinsk, 454080, Russia Federation
e-mail: antipinna@susu.ru

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Abstract. At thepresent stage of human development, we are witnessing the accumulation of more and more global problems. These include climate change, the growing food crisis, migration, international terrorism, etc. The old system of international security, established since the end of World War II, has served for many years as a guarantor of stability in maintaining peace both at the regional and international levels. But already in the 20th century, we are witnessing the collapse of the former security system by major Powers. The era of globalization in which we live has dramatically changed the lives of entire peoples and regions, and external circumstances emphasize the fragility of such a system. The rapid digitalization of society and the emergence of new technologies also create certain risks, through direct or indirect distortion of reliable information, which we are now witnessing. In the modern world, social hierarchy is provided not only on the basis of the distribution of material resources, but also to an increasing extent on the basisof the distribution of symbolic resources.

In a rapidly changing world, attention is still being paid to the importance of non-military methods and information technologies in foreign policy and the management of modern political processes, and the state is losing its absolute power monopoly in international political processes. There are processes of disintegration both at the level of interstate relations and in the whole world. Based on the increasing role of the image of the state and other actors of international relations in political processes, scientific interest in the problem of image formation by means of public diplomacy in the international arena has increased in recent decades due to the fact that an opportunity has presented itself to take a fresh look at the information and communication field of state activity. The term "public diplomacy" has different interpretations, but they are reduced to two main ones: diplomacy carried out by non-state actors in international relations, and diplomacy whose object of influence is, first of all, the public opinion of other countries.

Key words. Public diplomacy, foreignpolicy, paradigmatic foundations, development of public diplomacy, globalization.

Introduction. On a global scale, the system of international relations continues to change. Since 1975 with the conclusion of The Helsinki Final Act, as well as a number of international legal treaties on the non-proliferation of weapons, including weapons of mass destruction, made it possible to avoid tense situations inworldpolitics. However, recently we have seen, the collapse of the former international security system, which, of course, cannot cause any particular concern. The accumulation of global problems, such as permanent climate change, migration, local and regional conflicts, the threat of a pandemic, international terrorism, cybercrime, and others increasingly pose the need for world players to adhere to at least some forms of diplomacy. In this regard этим, "public diplomacy" has not yet lost its significance and its use in the system of international relations will allow avoiding sharpcorners in interstate relations. Despite the fact that public diplomacy has different interpretations, they are reduced to two main ones: diplomacy carried out by non-state actors in international relations, and diplomacy whose object of influence is, first of all, the public opinion of other countries [1].

In recent years, such subjects of international relations as J. R. R. Tolkien and others have been calledRosenau called"actors outside sovereignty "- non-governmental organizations, political parties and

movements, trans-national institutions-TNCs and international government organizations [2]. The system of relations of "actors outside sovereignty" becomes an independent factor in international relations. The structure and rules of operation of such a system are beginning to play a more important role than their most influential traditional actors in world politics, especially in the framework of public diplomacy.

Materials and methods of research. Today, public diplomacy is undergoing a kind of transformation as a culturally determined type of human activity and an important tool for influencing international relations. Being essentially a cultural phenomenon, public diplomacy, under the influence of modern political realities and aggressive goal-setting, is increasingly subject to the rules of struggle by non-military means. Public diplomacy as a widespread method of conducting diplomatic relations is gaining special significance in our time. As you know, the concept of public diplomacy was first proposed in 1965 by Edmund Gallion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, to refer to the process by which subjects of international relations achieve foreign policy goals by influencing the foreign public. The concept of "public diplomacy" has become widespread and is used in various scientific studies by both foreign and domestic specialists. In the course of considering this phenomenon, we turned to wsse a wide source research base of well-known Russian and foreign diplomats, scientists, and political scientists.

Thisarticle uses the following scientific methods:
 • institutional method (when studying media outlets broadcasting abroad);
 • comparative-historical method (study of the peculiarities of the development of scientific views on public diplomacy by historical periods, depending on the goals of public diplomacy);
 • the case study method (when considering specific examples of public diplomacy);
 • structural and functional analysis (analysis of national public diplomacy systems).

Results and their discussion. 1.The degree of development of the problem. In these исследованияхstudies, the author relies on a large array of scientific works by both foreign and domestic experts In the world practice of diplomacy, a large volume of various international legal acts has been accumulated, of which there are currently more than 300 in various areas of interstate relations. The author also relies on a wide range of documents from international organizations and regional ones. Among them are the United Nations system of international organizations, the European Union, BRICS, EurAsEC, etc. The next important point is numerous scientific works, monographs, scientific articles of leading scientists-specialists in the field of diplomacy, political science, conflictology, sociology, the consular service, and the theory of public diplomacy. Here you should pay attention to the works of Russian scientists, who in their works focused on the problems of image science, various issues in the field of mass and political communication. Among them, A. Agenosov, V. Achkasova, O. Berezkina, A. Vlasov, A. Volkov, E. Galumov, V. Goncharov, B. Grushin et al.

Among foreign authors, a paradigm known as the concept of civilizations (n. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, A. Toynbee, P. Sorokin, S. Huntington), points out the important role of the factor of civilization and similar incompatibility, разнокачественностиdifferent quality of certain styles.

The next important aspect is the scientific works of various foreign and domestic authors devoted to the issues of public awareness among them. Algulyan, E. Bazhanov, Russia Vachnadze, I. Vasilenko et al. Yu was directly involved in public diplomacy research. Kashlev. This type of subjects of public diplomacy, such as political parties and movements, was studied by R. Kostyuk.

As J. R. R. Tolkien points out. Rosenau on the "formation of a new global order" - the crisis of traditional international relations based on a realistic paradigm, the escape of many global processes from the control of the great powers, the irreducibility of the emerging world order to intergovernmental relations; the emergence of new "actors outside sovereignty" beyond the control of states and blocs. The

actors of new international relations that are being born before our eyes are states, subsystems (government bodies at the national, regional and local levels), TNCs, social movements, cohorts, etc. According to J. R. R. Tolkien, Rosenau, contacts in the framework of post-international politics are carried out in a new way. Along with the first world-intergovernmental relations, there is a second polycentric world characterized by turbulence, bifurcation, and unpredictability [5]. The third subgroup includes the works of authors who already directly use the term public diplomacy.

At different times, the authors of scientific studies have evaluated and interpreted the role of public diplomacy in the international arena and the real ability to solve any issues in different ways. However, a considerable number of scholars believe that the role of public diplomacy is underestimated. Therefore, in these studies we try to pay attention to this phenomenon in diplomacy.

However, in all these sources, the problems of public diplomacy and the peculiarities of the development of the state's foreign policy were not considered in a complex and interrelated way, and this work fills in the gap in the study of public diplomacy as an important tool in shaping the state's foreign policy.

2. Theoretical and paradigmatic foundations of the development of public diplomacy

In the current system of international relations, there is a sharp regression among the major Powers. We observe that not all countries adhere to the rules of conducting diplomacy, which leads to an increase in the energy, food, and economic crisis, which can cause unforeseen consequences. Therefore, whatever happens, diplomacymust continueto play a key role in inter-State relations. And the so-called "public diplomacy" plays an important role here.

According to the theoryandproposed by К.ЭделманомAs the Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament, traditional diplomacyis carried out quietly and calmly, while public diplomacy is carried out openly and noisily. In our opinion, the key point in this definition is that public opinion is considered to be the object of public diplomacy, in contrast to traditional diplomacy.

Prominent American political scientist Joseph Nye по-своему defined the sources of power of any state in his own way. Moreover, in his understanding, public diplomacy provided, among other things, for the development of long-term relations, which in the end could become a springboard for such a state.

Next, we will explore several main trends in the theory of international relations.

Traditionalism is a branch of the theory of international relations that is notself-identifying, but identified by realists who opposed it, on the basis of a common ethical and philosophical approach and a causal vision of history, otherwise it is plot-based and structurally heterogeneous.

Realists began to talk about traditionalism as a separate direction, only by themselves, realizing themselves to be a fairly homogeneous direction

U. Fox connects this particularknowledge with the beginning of the Cold War, considering traditionalism all those theories that lacked the scientific courage to call a spade a spade, that is, to recognize ideologies and ethical norms as derivatives of national interest. On this basis, traditionalism is also called idealism.

This factor was most often geographical. International relations within the framework of the traditionalist trend were often presented as a system of states. At the same time, traditionalist theory did not claim to be universal, nor did it attempt to create a scientific base grouped around any fundamental category, such as "strength" for realists, or "psychology" for behaviorists. If traditionalist theory went beyond the scope of international law and international organizations, it focused on narrow, private issues. The problems of traditionalists were different, including those that were later perceived by realists, but the latter still ranked specialists on this problem as traditionalists, based on the criterion of the absence of a claim to universality by the category of force. Thus, the realists attributed K. Friedrich, who dealt with the problem of the balance of power, to the traditionalists, and J. Friedrich, who dealt with the

problem of the balance of power, to the geopoliticians. Fairgreave and N.Spikeman, who continued the A-line.Mahan and H.Mackinder's. As examples of other problems of interest to traditionalists of the pre-war period, one can cite economic studies in the field of international relations. Simonds, B. Emene, L. Robbins, Yu. Staley), problems of security, war and disarmament (J. R. R. Tolkien). Shotwell), problems of world politics (p. Mun, Moscow Priestley), as an example of self - reflection-the study of the theory of international relations. Russell). As an example of the eclectic nature of the "traditionalist" method, many anthologies appeared in the interwar period, which aimed to bring together everything that was then known about political, historical, economic, demographic, geographical and strategic factors in the "system of states" in order to facilitate understanding of the foreign policy of the great powers (p. Buell, C. Hodges, R. Mowatt, F. Schuman, F. Simonds, B. Emeni, F. Dank, F. Brown, J. R. R. Tolkien Puchen). Traditionalist research was conducted in line with the historical-philosophical, moral-ethical and legal approaches of political science. Realists reproached traditionalists for basing their arguments on a set of abstract moral, ethical and legal "ideals", normative criteria, while considering the category of "national interest" exclusively in the context of morality and law. This trait of traditionalism was the source of theories of international relations that legalized the practice of public diplomacy. The traditionalist trend served as a theoretical source for later normative studies. Later, traditionalists became associated with the American liberal ideology. As their theoretical predecessors, they considered d. Washington, T. Jefferson, and A. Lincoln. The most prominent representatives of "idealism" in the United States are traditionally considered to be the D's. Perkins, F. Tannenbaum, Vol. Kuk, Moscow The International Criminal Court, F. Jessup, W. Lippman, T. Murray, W. Dean, and J. McCarthy. Burnham. Even practitioners such as former U.S. Secretary of State F. Dulles are considered traditionalists. The idealists are also divided into the liberal wing (f.Tannenbaum) and the so-called aggressive right (J. БэрнхэмBurnham).

In the post-war period, traditionalism was replaced by political realism. By the 1950s, polemics against realists animated the self-identification of "idealism" as an independent paradigm. As the head of the self-identifying scientific school, the following speaker made a speech: Cook, just as the head of the realists was G.Morgenthau [8]. Cook's controversy andMorgenthau clearly outlined the paradigmatic framework of idealism and realism and their strict separation from each other. Yet both paradigms-idealism and realism-were more traditionalist in the eyes of the soon-to-be advancing scientism. This led to their symbiosis in the fight against the costs of scientism and the replacement of the dominant inter-paradigm alternative "idealism/realism "with another" traditionalism/modernism", in the left part of which, idealists and realists, formed a single anti-behavioral wing. A classic example of the idealist-realist synthesis and anti-behavioral restoration is the work of R. R. Tolkien. Osgood and R. Thacker's "Power, Order and Justice". Later, the anti-behavioral critique of traditionalists was adopted by such a representative of historical sociology as Stanley Hoffman. Now traditionalism has come to mean everything that denies scientific methods, does not trust formalization in the field of international relations, and casts doubt on the possibility of accurately accounting for changes in value systems.

The same can be said about psychological theories of international relations, which, however, stand outside the framework of behaviorism. These trends, created in the early 60s, were related to anthropology and cultural studies and tried to model the personality of individual peoples on the basis of the basic personality type, modal personality, and were based on an institutional approach (b. Kaplan, O.Kleinberg, H. Sebal). However, representative data and quantitative methods have already been applied in this direction, although still in a small volume, which meant either a dead end in this direction, or its gradual transition to behavioral positions.

Modernism is a paradigm of the theory of international relations, the main features of which are the reliance on neo-positivism in its technocratic expression, the desire to introduce into the theory of

international relations the results and methods of natural and technical sciences, the rejection of methods of analyzing international relations that do not give direct access to the possibility of using the results of exact sciences qualified as "metaphysical". Often these features are accompanied by confidence in the ability of the theory of international relations, if it approaches an exact science, to solve a number of social problems, which makes modernism of international relations similar to general cultural modernism. Public diplomacy also often has a claim to solve social problems in countries that are affected by public diplomacy.

Actually, this idea is not a new one, known since the 19th century thanks to French socialism, but ignoredprecisely by the theorists of diplomacy-political realists who absolutized the concepts of "power"and" national interest". This direction goes back toToarlu vonClausewitz [9]. Political realists considered the state as the atom of international relations, ignoring its components with their conflicting interests. The promising idea of social groups and social institutions as independent subjects of international relations was developed by functionalists - followers of D. P. Blavatsky. Mitrani, specializing in transnational relations: E. Haas, G. Almond, K. Deutsch, J. R. R. Tolkien Rosenau, R. Keane, and J. Nye, Ch. Alger.

In England, to. Forward, J. Frankel, J. Burton, Moscow Nicholson shows only a few attempts to link diplomacy with systems, logical-mathematical and statistical research.

In addition to behaviorism, cybernetics and general systems theory played a significant role in establishing the modernist paradigm. They also had a strong impact on the tools of public diplomacy.

The social sciences became interested in cybernetics in the 1950s, when the ideas of K. Shannon, N. Wiener, J. von Neumann, and W. Ross Ashby has become the focus of international political scientists ' attention. A similar theory of foreign policy decisions of a historical nature was developed by R. R. Tolkien. Batou, R. Kekskemefi, A. Whiting, R. Walstetter.

There are many methods for mathematizing the analysis of international relations. Among them, from the point of view of the prospects for the development of public diplomacy, we will only be interested in the use of content analysis in information processing. Among the significant studies of this kind, we should mention the "Stanford Plan", which was developed by R. Holsti, R. McCarthy and others. HopcNors, p. Brody, D. Zinnes, D. Jansen. They proceeded from the theory of Ch. Osgood.

If we keep in mind that the concept of US public diplomacy was morally based on anti-communism, the essence of which was formulated as a struggle for human rights, then political realism can also be considered to some extent a theoretical source of the doctrine of public diplomacy. However, it is important for us, first of all, that the object of public diplomacy is public opinion. And he recognized postmodernism as a decisive factor in politics.

Postmodernism, unlike modernism, is not in the exact sense of the word a paradigm of the theory of international relations, but rather a general cultural phenomenon, to the spirit of which the latter intended to "adapt", since the postmodern works of international relations theorists often resemble a manifesto, rather than the application of a certain methodology to the subject of research.

Postmodernism is a set of philosophical and methodological guidelines used in the analysis of cultural reality, which, according to postmodern views, is inseparable from its creation. The emergence of postmodernism is caused by "a change in the epistemological situation associated with the criticism of the classical philosophical paradigm by non-classical philosophy (Marxism, psychoanalysis, structuralism)." The critical theory of the Frankfurt School prepared the postmodern situation in the social sciences. From the literary and linguistic sphere of post-structuralism, postmodernist ideas have spread to the philosophical and social problems of the destructive methodology of J. R. R. Tolkien. Derrida and R. The concepts of post-structuralist decentralisation of the subject by M. Foucault, the philosophical orientation of linguistic research by J. F. Barth. Liotard and F. Jameson.

The main features of the postmodern paradigm that are essential for the development of the institute of public diplomacy are as follows: attribution of the epistemology of ontological functions, when the perception of any cultural text, which is reality, is the creation of a new cultural text; recognition of the fact that any attempt at categorical systematization of political reality triggers the mechanism of self-identification and brings to life these categories, a new political reality. Translated from the philosophical language to the language of practice, this means the following. If we theoretically assume that there are some population groups in another country that are interested in cooperation with the country that initiates public diplomacy, these groups will actually arise there. The word creates a new political reality.

The groundwork for postmodernism was to a certain extent prepared in the theory of international relations within the framework of previous paradigms - by psychological theories that, despite their behavioral-mathematical bias, focused on the problems of perception and the dissolution of reality outside of it, such as the Stanford Plan for Content Analysis, the SAM (Signal Account Model) model of E. P. Blavatsky. Azara [10], the CRISISCOM model, and others.

Postmodernism has replaced material reality as the object of analysis with symbolic reality as the arena where decisive political battles are played out. However, it is not possible to manipulate such symbolic reality, primarily with the help of power over the word, in any way - this process has certain limitations. These constraints are thought-logical structures of action, that is, they also lie in the domain of representations.

Conclusion.

At the current stage of development of interstate relations, diplomacy is still the key. Despite the permanent problems in international relations, I believethat the role of diplomacy, including public diplomacy, should not be underestimated. Various areas of public diplomacy are, therefore, factors of a long process of changing paradigms in the theory of international relations, which are important milestones in the formation and development of the institute of public diplomacy.

Many experts reduce this concept to a very limited framework, but given the current state of international relations, we should pay even more attention to all forms of diplomatic relations, including public ones.

In the course of the research and detailed study of public diplomacy, the author conducted a systematic analysis; comparative and typological comparison of historical, social, political and international aspects of the problem under study, and at the end of which the following conclusions and suggestions were made:

Argumenting the above, we can refer to the fact that the scientific definition of the term "public diplomacy" was absent in Soviet political science studies. However, the term "propaganda"has always existed. The term "public diplomacy", rather than the concept of "state image", is a product of the evolution of information, communication and technical systems, and is considered by political scientists as an institution of the system of foreign policy and international relations.

The term "image of the state" as a phenomenon of communication is based on more theoretical and scientific significance, since its evolutionary formation largely depends on such areas as social, ethno-cultural, economic, political, etc.

In the new stage of development of internationalrelations, taking into account all the nuances, there is a revival of interest in public diplomacy as the main tool for shaping the foreign policy strategy of one's state. The ability to use the tool of speech and information subtly can be an extremely valuable quality both for a diplomat personally and for successful negotiations at the interstate level.

References

1 Gadzhiev K. S. Image as a tool of cultural hegemony. - World Economy and International Relations (Moscow). - 2007. 205 p.

2 Rosenau J. The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy. - N.Y., 1971. P. 74.

3 The European Union and Russia. - Moscow: Represstvo European Commission in Russia, 2005; EU-Russia: Partnership in the Human dimension, Moscow: Representation of the European Commission in Russia, 2007; European Commission. Global Assessment Report on Implementation of the Communication Strategy for Enlargement, Brussels, 2004; Green Paper on Practical Arrangements for the Introduction of the Single Currency (COM 1995, 333).

4 Aron R. Paix et guerre entre les nations. Préface à la quatrième édition (1966). - Paris, 1984. P. 250.

5 Rosenau J. Turbulence in World Politics: a Theory of Change and Continuity. - Harvester Wheasheaf. 1990. P. 350.

6 Nye J. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics (New York: Public Affairs Group, 2004). P. 450.

7 Modern bourgeois theories of international relations. M., 1976, p.24.

8 Morgentau H. The Mainsprings of Foreign Policy - The National Interest Vs Moral Abstractions. // American Political Science Review, December, 1950, N 34; Morgentau H. Another «Great Debate» - The National Interest in the United States. // American Political Science Review, December, 1952. N 46; Cook T. Foreign Policy - The Realism of Idealism. // American Political Science Review, June, 1952, N 46.

9 Clausewitz K. About the war. Vom Krieg / Translated from German by A. K. Rachinsky.- In 8 volumes. - Moscow: GosvoenizdatPubl., 1934, 692p. (in Russian)

10 Azar E. Analysis of International Events. // Peace Research Review, 1970, vol. 4, N 1, p. 76-106.

ҚОҒАМДЫҚ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ

Аңдатпа. Халықаралық қатынастардың жаһандық дамуының қазіргі шарттары саяси шешім қабылдау процесінде нақты фактілер ғана емес, адамның қабылдауы, идеялары мен бейнелері де көбірек ескерілетіндігінде. Мемлекеттің сыртқы саясаты және оны халықаралық аренада қабылдау маңызды рөлге ие болады, ал имиджді қалыптастыру мемлекеттік сыртқы саясаттың маңызды бағытына айналады. Электрондық бұқаралық ақпарат құралдары мен коммуникацияның қарқынды дамуы халықтың бағытын өзгерту және оның дұрыс қабылдауын қалыптастыру мақсатында мифтер мен құндылықтарды бұқаралық санаға белсенді және жедел енгізуге мүмкіндік берді. Қазіргі әлемде әлеуметтік иерархия материалдық ресурстарды бөлу негізінде ғана емес, сонымен бірге символдық ресурстарды бөлу негізінде де қамтамасыз етіледі. Мемлекеттің жағымды бейнесін қалыптастыру саясатының тиімділігі оны құру барысында Ел ішіндегі және шетелдегі мақсатты қоғамдық топтардың ақпараттық, саяси, әлеуметтік, мәдени, экономикалық және басқа қажеттіліктері мен мүдделерін, олардың мемлекет туралы ауыспалы (ағымдағы) және тұрақты түсініктерін, аудиторияның қоғамдық санасында кездесетін архетиптерді, мифтерді ескере отырып анықталады.

Жаһанданудың серпінді процестерінде сыртқы саясаттағы және қазіргі саяси процестерді басқарудағы әскери емес әдістер мен ақпараттық технологиялардың маңызы артып, мемлекет халықаралық саяси процестерде билікке абсолютті монополиясын жоғалтады. Саяси процестердегі мемлекет имиджінің және халықаралық қатынастардың басқа да субъектілерінің өсіп келе жатқан рөліне сүйене отырып, соңғы онжылдықтарда мемлекеттің ақпараттық-коммуникациялық өрісіне жаңа көзқараспен қарауға мүмкіндік болғандықтан, халықаралық аренада қоғамдық дипломатия арқылы имидж қалыптастыру проблемасына ғылыми қызығушылық артты. "Қоғамдық дипломатия" термині әртүрлі түсіндірулерге ие, бірақ олар екі негізгі ұғымға келеді: халықаралық қатынастардың мемлекеттік емес субъектілері жүзеге асыратын дипломатия және дипломатия, ең алдымен, басқа елдердің қоғамдық пікірі.

Негізгі сөздер. Қоғамдық дипломатия, сыртқы саясат, парадигматикалық негіздер, қоғамдық дипломатияның дамуы, жаһандану.

ПУБЛИЧНАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ

Аннотация. Нынешние условия глобального развития международных отношений таковы, что в процессе принятия политического решения все чаще принимаются во внимание не только реальные факты, но и человеческие представления, представления и образы. Внешняя политика государства и его восприятие на международной арене приобретает значительную роль, а формирование имиджа становится важным направлением внешней политики государства. Стремительное развитие электронных средств массовой информации и коммуникаций создало возможность для активного и быстрого внедрения мифов и ценностей в массовое сознание с целью как

дезориентации населения, так и формирования у него необходимых представлений. В современном мире социальная иерархия обеспечивается не только на основе распределения материальных ресурсов, но и во все большей степени на основе распределения символических ресурсов. Эффективность политики формирования положительного имиджа государства обусловлена учетом в процессе ее построения информационных, политических, социальных, культурных, экономических и других потребностей и интересов целевых социальных групп внутри страны и за рубежом, их переменных (текущих) и постоянных представлений о государстве, состояния, архетипические образы, мифы, содержащиеся в общественном сознании аудитории.

В динамичных процессах глобализации возрастает значение невоенных методов и информационных технологий во внешней политике и управлении современными политическими процессами, а государство теряет свою абсолютную монополию на власть в международных политических процессах. Исходя из возрастающей роли имиджа государства и других субъектов международных отношений в политических процессах, в последние десятилетия возрос научный интерес к проблеме формирования имиджа посредством публичной дипломатии на международной арене в связи с тем, что представилась возможность по-новому взглянуть на информационно-коммуникационное поле государства. Термин "публичная дипломатия" имеет различные толкования, но они сводятся к двум основным: дипломатия, осуществляемая негосударственными субъектами международных отношений, и дипломатия, объектом которой является, прежде всего, общественное мнение других стран.

Ключевые слова. Публичная дипломатия, внешняя политика, парадигматические основы, развитие публичной дипломатии, глобализация.

Information about author:

Nikolai Antipin - Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, South Ural State University Russia, 454080 Chelyabinsk, Lenina avenue, 76. E-mail: antipinna@susu.ru, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4060-5955