# The impact of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) on diplomatic communication

**Mohamed Ali Elsherif**

phd candidate

*Abstract-* 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. 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.

*Index Terms*- Technology,messages,diplomacy,mobile,invention

## I. INTRODUCTION

Diplomacy deals with the management of relations between states and between states and other actors. From a state perspective, diplomacy deals with advising, shaping and implementing foreign policy. The development of diplomatic relations between the two actors depends on mutual recognition and mutual readiness to facilitate the relationship. The result can be an exchange of ambassadors or other diplomats, in order to create dialogue and cooperation between the two actors. Multilateralism represents several members or actors working together to address an issue, gain understanding, and help each other achieve common goals.

Diplomacy is a principled substitute for the use of force or covert means in statecraft. Thus comprehensive national power is applied to the peaceful adjustment of differences between states. It can be considered coercive, but typically non-violent measures.[1]

In addition to diplomats, who serve as the main instrument in diplomacy and its primary practitioners, one can find other tools involved in the process such as international summits, conferences, international activities and informal interstate relations. The main two formats, or 'basis', of diplomatic behavior are bilateral and multilateral. Bilateral relations are seen as political, cultural and economic relations between two actors in the international arena, most often – states. The development of diplomatic relations between the two actors depends on mutual recognition and mutual willingness to facilitate the relationship. The result may be an exchange of ambassadors or other diplomats, in order to create dialogue and cooperation between the two actors. Multilateralism represents multiple members or actors working together to address an issue, reach understanding, and help each other achieve common goals.

## II. CONCEPT AND PERSPECTIVES OF DIGITAL DIPLOMACY

According to Cull, public diplomacy emerged simultaneously with "statecraft". However, former American diplomat Edmund Gullion coined the term only in the mid-1960s. Therefore, public diplomacy is historically closely linked to the United States. The United States Information Agency (USIA) played a key role in the development of public diplomacy during the Cold War. However, in 1999, the agency was incorporated into the State Department. According to Kal, the attack of "11. September" became a rude awakening for American diplomacy and made him feel alienated from American foreign policy.[2] In the last few decades, public diplomacy has been widely seen as a transparent means by which a sovereign state communicates with the public of other countries in order to inform and influence

---

[1] Freeman, C. W., & Marks, S. (2016). Diplomacy. http://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy (Preuzeto: 02.02.2022).

[2] See more : Cull, N., 2013. The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy. International Studies Review

audiences abroad in order to promote the national interest and advance its foreign policy goals.

In this traditional view, public diplomacy is seen as an integral part of diplomacy between states, which implies conducting official relations, usually privately, between official representatives (leaders and diplomats) representing sovereign states. In this sense, public diplomacy includes activities such as educational exchange programs for scholars and students; visitor programs; language training; cultural events and exchanges; and radio and television broadcasting. Such activities have typically focused on improving the country's image or reputation as a way to shape the broader policy environment in the "host" country.[3]

Traditional public diplomacy represents an asymmetric communication model, focused on informing the target audience, using traditional media. With the emergence of new media and their wide use in all spheres of social life, they began to be used for public diplomacy activities. Since Hillary Clinton, the country's secretary of state, launched her own 21st century government program in 2009, her department has created 194 Twitter accounts and 200 Facebook pages with millions of "followers." The State Department actually runs a global media empire, according to Fergus Hanson, a fellow at the Brookings Institution, a think tank in Washington, and the author of a study on e-diplomacy.[4]

Thus, in this context, digital diplomacy is perceived as the increasing use of information communication technologies and social media platforms to implement public diplomacy strategies. This concept suggests that the environment and channels change, but the message remains the same. Instead of broadcasting via radio or television, diplomacy currently communicates via Twitter, Facebook, Tumblr. At the same time, digital diplomacy is an easy and cheap tool for other purposes as well: disaster response, information gathering and relationship management. Others believe that it increases the ability to interact with and actively engage with a foreign public, thus enabling the transition from monologue to dialogue. Thus, the Israeli embassy established a two-way communication with its followers through its Twitter channel.

In July 2013, as part of Israel's attempt to engage Internet users in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs launched an official virtual embassy on Twitter called Israel in the GCC (IsraelintheGCC). Due to the absence of any diplomatic relations between Israel and the GCC countries, there was no opportunity to develop any diplomatic representation or provide any cultural or other type of cooperation in the region. This means that there was no possibility for any "soft power" tool to penetrate into the information space of the target audience, because any spread message from the Israeli side would be absorbed by the local audience.

The launch of the "Mission of Israel in the GCC" Twitter page introduced a new approach by engaging the people of the GCC in direct dialogue and secondly establishing a virtual "embassy". The most important feature in this approach that distinguishes this concept of digital diplomacy from the first is the use of two-way communication with the audience. During this virtual campaign, Israeli Foreign Minister Rafael Barak (Rafael Barak) answered questions from Twitter users from the Gulf region and beyond about the politics and economics of Israel's engagement in the GCC.

A brief discussion revealed interesting questions and comments from GCC Twitter users. This approach is mainly based on the narrative that current diplomacy is not only a matter for official representatives of states. Here, social media communities are recognized as a new and highly influential internal actor, whose influence could be valuable and decisive in public decision-making. Digital technologies such as social media platforms Twitter, Facebook and Weibo allow countries to engage in dialogic communication with foreign publics in an inexpensive way. Holmes uses this conceptualization to explore the broader role of e-diplomacy in the management of international change.

Drawing from sociological perspectives often referred to as "practice theory", he outlined two types of change in the international system: top-down structural exogenous shocks and bottom-up incremental endogenous displacement, and argued that diplomacy is ultimately a way for states to manage these two types of changes. Findings from psychology and neuroscience suggest that states manage these processes differently because each type of change requires different responses. Exogenous shocks require building relationships and understanding intent, activities that are most effectively carried out in face-to-face personal interactions.[5] Endogenous change requires the ability to synthesize and analyze large amounts of data in order to determine changing trends, activities that are most effectively carried out with digital technology.

E-Diplomacy represents another set of activities, the collection and analysis of data from the foreign public, which is collected by listening to discourses in the field. This suggests that digital diplomacy should be seen, according to Holmes, as a method of managing change, especially the small types of change that would be difficult to detect with the human eye. Critically, the existence of digital diplomacy does not imply that traditional face-to-face diplomacy is no longer necessary, quite the opposite. Traditional and digital diplomacy coexist and complement each other, they do not compete with each other. So, ultimately, digital diplomacy is a special kind of diplomacy, the value of which derives from the ability of digital tools to identify and respond to small endogenous incremental changes in the international system. Knowledge and resource management, as another perspective, refers to the management and analysis of growing information flows.

As the sources of power have become more diffuse and decentralized, and public finances have either remained constant or declined, governments are trying to adapt, and the Internet is one convenient solution. In this case, it seems paradoxical, because the speed and ease of online communication allows rumors to spread faster and their control becomes a challenge for diplomats. Since in an interconnected world, more communication does not guarantee better communication, but on the contrary,

---

[3] USC Center on Public Diplomacy (2010). What is Public Diplomacy? [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd

[4] Virtual relations (2012). Foreign ministries are getting the hang of social media.   http://www.economist.com/node/21563284

[5] See more: Bjola, C, Holmes, M. (2015). Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. Routledge, New York.

most often increases the possibility of misunderstanding and misinterpretation, there is a need to create a link between government information and cultural relations. Last but not least, this dimension emphasizes the use of digital technologies as a tool for more efficient management of everyday diplomatic activities, including communication, networks or hierarchical procedures.[6]

Cyber policy agendas are a perspective that encompasses various sub-dimensions, such as cyber governance, internet freedom, cyber warfare or cyber security. Given that in today's diplomacy the public is paramount, governments find themselves in a control dilemma and while it is important to generate soft power, it is not always easy, especially in the cyber era. Therefore, digital disruption and its impact on governments requires taking advantage of resources such as infrastructure, networks, software and the human ability to create, control and transmit electronic information, a phenomenon known in the literature as "cyber power".

In a detailed definition, cyber power is the ability to achieve desired results by using interconnected electronic sources of information. In this context, cyber power seems to depend on information management, the effectiveness of this process depends on the model of managing a large amount of information and on the degree of trust in available data and security systems. Consequently, Internet governance has become a new topic in relations between states because it requires international regulation of the cyberspace environment by developing, first of all, global formats of dialogue and cooperation.[7]

Paul Sharp, professor and head of political science at the University of Minnesota, explores one particular aspect of diplomacy, the way revolutions in information technology and the emergence of e-diplomacy have had a significant impact on what is known as "secret diplomacy." He singles out three discrete forms of secret diplomacy. Strategic secrecy, which refers to the concealment of major agreements and commitments. Operational secrecy which refers to the concealment of diplomatic negotiations, relations between diplomats and information of interest to diplomats and thirdly, official secrecy which refers to "known unknowns", things that are known but treated as if they were unknown. Sharp noted that digitization presents challenges and opportunities for any type of secrecy. [8]

## III. THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA IN DIGITAL DIPLOMACY

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.[9]

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 (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter and Weibo);

2) online publications—eg. YouTube, Flickr, RSS, Instagram and Twitter (YouTube, Flickr, RSS, Instagram and Twitter);

3) Online platforms for collaboration — e.g. Wikis such as MediaWiki, blogs such as WordPress or Blogger and office collaboration solutions such as Office 365, Google Docs, Teamwork (Teamwork) or WorkSpot (Workspot);

4) online feedback systems, e.g. voting and debating, rating and commenting, polls and blogs.[10]

## IV. E-DIPLOMACY

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 'speaking' versus 'listening' debate 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. Thus, the diplomat becomes a strategically oriented handler of public opinion.

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. in the Department of State, the CIA, the Department of Defense and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) more than fifteen departments were established to work 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

---

[6] See more: Hocking, B, Melissen, J. (2015). Diplomacy in the Digital Age. Clingendael Report. Netherlands Institute of International Relations- Clingendael.

[7] See more: Barston, R. (2014). Modern Diplomacy, Fourth Edition, Routledge.

[8] See more: Sharp, P. 2009. Diplomatic Theory of International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[9] Human Capital Institute, "Social Networking in Government: Opportunities and Challenges," 2012.
http://www.hci.org/files/field_content_file/SNGovt_Sum maryFINAL.pdf

[10] 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.

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. 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 reforming the State Department based on the published "KDDR" report in 2010, providing units responsible for network work.[11] 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 2010 Quadrennial Review and the so-called "21st Century States" initiative.[12]

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 perceived as a passive object of diplomatic influence by wisdom. The public is now able to see the diplomat "over his shoulder" and judge what he sees. For diplomats, this means a significant loss of control. 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.[13] Third, Public Diplomacy 2.0 and diplomacy in general will largely rely on the web. According to Slaghter (Slaughter), the network is one of the defining characteristics of the modern world. 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." 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.[14]

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.

Since January 2014, the Russian Foreign Ministry has used Twitter to promote the narrative that Russia was forced to come to the aid of Russian minorities in Ukraine following a 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 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".

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

[11] U.S. State department. The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [http://www.state.gov/s/dmr/qddr/2015/

[12] U.S. State department. (2010). The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf

[13] 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.

[14] See more: Nye Jr, J. (2012). Viitorul puterii, Polirom, Iasi

communication as well as the transformative nature of digital diplomacy.[15]

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.[16]

## V. CONCLUSION

Web usage ranges from e-mail, social networking, telephoning, video conferencing, reading print media, and 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.[17]

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. 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.[18] E-mail is increasingly replacing traditional means of communication using fax or telegram when diplomats need to send written information. 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.[19]

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.

## REFFERENCES:

- Freeman, C. W., & Marks, S. (2016). Diplomacy. http://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy (Preuzeto: 02.02.2022).
- Cull, N., 2013. The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy. International Studies Review
- USC Center on Public Diplomacy (2010). What is Public Diplomacy? [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd
- Virtual relations (2012). Foreign ministries are getting the hang of social media. http://www.economist.com/node/21563284
- Bjola, C, Holmes, M. (2015). Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. Routledge, New York.
- Hocking, B, Melissen, J. (2015). Diplomacy in the Digital Age. Clingendael Report. Netherlands Institute of International Relations- Clingendael.
- Barston, R. (2014). Modern Diplomacy, Fourth Edition, Routledge.
- Sharp, P. 2009. Diplomatic Theory of International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Human Capital Institute, "Social Networking in Government: Opportunities and Challenges," 2012. http://www.hci.org/files/field_content_file/SNGovt_Su m maryFINAL.pdf

## REFERENCES

[1] Freeman, C. W., & Marks, S. (2016). Diplomacy. http://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy (Preuzeto: 02.02.2022).

[2] Cull, N., 2013. The Long Road to Public Diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US Public Diplomacy. International Studies Review

[3] USC Center on Public Diplomacy (2010). What is Public Diplomacy? [http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/page/what-pd

[4] Virtual relations (2012). Foreign ministries are getting the hang of social media. http://www.economist.com/node/21563284

[5] Bjola, C, Holmes, M. (2015). Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. Routledge, New York.

---

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

[16] Ibid

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

[18] See more: Rana.s. Kishan (2007). Bilateral Diplomacy. Serbia: Diplofoundation.

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

[6] Hocking, B, Melissen, J. (2015). Diplomacy in the Digital Age. Clingendael Report. Netherlands Institute of International Relations- Clingendael.

[7] Barston, R. (2014). Modern Diplomacy, Fourth Edition, Routledge.

[8] Sharp, P. 2009. Diplomatic Theory of International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[9] Human Capital Institute, "Social Networking in Government: Opportunities and Challenges," 2012. http://www.hci.org/files/field_content_file/SNGovt_Sum maryFINAL.pdf

[10] 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.

[11] U.S. State department. The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [http://www.state.gov/s/dmr/qddr/2015/

[12] U.S. State department. (2010). The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. [http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153108.pdf

[13] 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.

[14] Nye Jr, J. (2012). Viitorul puterii, Polirom, Iasi

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

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

[17] Rana.s. Kishan (2007). Bilateral Diplomacy. Serbia: Diplofoundation.

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

[19] J. Wang, "Fundamentals of erbium-doped fiber amplifiers arrays (Periodical style—Submitted for publication)," *IEEE J. Quantum Electron.*, submitted for publication.

## AUTHORS

**First Author** – Mohamed Ali Elsherif  phd candidate