Digital Diplomacy: Twitter and Face book
impact on International Relations

الدبلوماسية الرقمية: تأثيرات التويتر والفيسبوك على العلاقات الدولية

larbi larbi *

Mostaganem University-Algeria

larbi.larbi@univ-mosta.dz

_____

Abstract

This study aims to follow the historical trajectory of diplomacy from traditional to digital, Regarding the literature review and conceptual framework of this new phenomenon and asymmetric models of communication in public relations. Besides, our analysis will focus on the role of social media, particularly Facebook and Twitter, and the fundamental changes that have affected diplomacy in concept and practice. This paper also aims to shed light on new players thanks to digital diplomacy and its effects on the international relations scene. We aim to highlight the effects of development in communication technologies and its impact on the Future direction of this phenomenon, and its challenges and risks output.

Keywords: Digital Age, Digital Diplomacy, International Relations, Smart Power, Twiplomacy.

 * Corresponding author

Introduction

The technological development that the world has known in the Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) field has played an important role in achieving fundamental changes in structuring relations on the international scene. Among the outputs of this technological revolution were complex digital media, the emergence of blue space, smartphone applications and social media networks, which created digital platforms that have become a device on which the body of the international community already depends, or through which several actors interact.

These changes due to the digital age at the horizontal level imposed new approaches in the vertical dealings of decision-makers in different parts of the world and prompted them to respond at these new changes to implement their internal and external policies, with an urge adoption of new mechanisms to achieve their different goals. Digital diplomacy has emerged; Twitter and Facebook have been an area of promotion. Digitalization has enabled diplomats to interact with foreign populations, establish global virtual embassies and overcome traditional gatekeepers.

This article is divided into eight basic elements. Through the first element, we tried to expose the various definitions that accompanied the different historical periods of diplomacy process. After reviewing the literature and the theoretical framework of the topic, particularly the communication models in public relations. in the second and third elements, we focused on the fourth and fifth elements on statistical data that showed the importance of the Internet (Facebook and Twitter) in changing the information dissemination approaches, and how to handle it with the call for a plan, and the need to establish a strategy to exploit the digital age and take advantage of the technological revolution. Finally, the most important element of this study relates to the impact of digital diplomacy on international relations.

A-Problematic: The problematic of this study is focused on Understanding the Complex and Analyzing the Multifaceted Impacts of Twitter and Facebook on International Relations, Navigating the Pros and Cons of Social Media Diplomacy, including issues of diplomacy, misinformation, regulation, geopolitical tensions and implications, digital divide issues, and ethical considerations in the era of digital diplomacy. and examining how these factors shape the dynamics of international relations in the digital age.

B-Research questions: This study aims to answer the main problem regarding the new footprints of digital diplomacy in the field of international relations which leads us to ask the following sub-questions:

✔ What does digital diplomacy mean?
✔ What are Twitter's additions to the field of diplomacy?

✔ How has digital diplomacy contributed to the introduction of new actors in international relations?

✔ What does the digital era mean, and how important are Facebook and Twitter on the global scene?

B-Research purposes: The main purposes of this article are:

✔ Presentation of the theoretical framework and literature review of digital diplomacy. In addition to performing the cumulative function in the field of scientific research.

✔ To offer data on the features of digital diplomacy;

✔ Explain the effects of digital diplomacy and social media on international relations.

Firstly: Definition of Diplomacy and Digital Diplomacy Evolution.

Most sciences suffer from the alteration of terminology, its overlap and lack of clarity, and this led each party to use the term according to its interpretation, and sometimes to hide facts and erroneous information. Many terms in the social sciences still need to be defined and tuned to agree on the limits of their use, and the development of new areas for their employment.

In the literature concerning this subject, there is no agreement on a unique definition; like any new term in the humanities, each definition is based on the context in which it is used. One of the reasons for this trend is the reference by

specialists in different terms; it has been called by the nature of activities in cyberspace.[1] Such as "Net-Diplomacy", "Cyber-Diplomacy", "E-Diplomacy", and "Twiplomacy". However, although these terms are relatively similar in meaning, each refers to a more specific area of the topic, and they have to use in the right context. "Cyber" is usually used in security issues, "E-"is related to economic and trade issues, and "Twi" is usually referred to Twitter diplomacy. However, the last and most powerful of these concepts at the international level is digital diplomacy. Which is the use of digital social contacts to interact with the public. To disclose the variables that make up this phenomenon, we need to explain these concepts and clarify the areas of intersection between them.

1.Traditional Diplomacy: Traditional diplomacy has brought many positive aspects to the international community, moving from clashes and wars to the promotion of trade and bringing closer views among states, and trying to find appropriate solutions to each situation. Its absence fueled and increased conflicts.

Harold Nicholson, defines[2] diplomacy as the conduct of international relations through negotiation or how ambassadors, and envoys modify these relations. Diplomacy is a vehicle and instrument for negotiation, the art of dealing with bilateral and international issues, and negotiating to achieve common goals. It aims to persuade certain parties to sit at the negotiating table to achieve goals. It is

the art of managing international relations through dialogue, and negotiation. It is the language of a calm mind, not war and conflict. We can define four basic and traditional functions of diplomacy:[3]

    1- It takes care of state affairs;

    2- It is done principally by peaceful means;

    3- Negotiation has an important role;

    4- This occurs under a condition of plurality of intsts.

    The foreign ministries have begun to modify their structures,[4] adapting them to the new times. Something that will eventually end up, causing changes also in the profile of the diplomat, who in the public imaginary is still associated with high-class public relations, good family. With mastery of languages, these changes are already being noticed in the new generations of diplomatic schools, in many other countries of the world.

    Traditional diplomacy was very recent practiced in the area of semi-exclusive relations, between states with international and transnational organizations.[5] However, technological development made the context different; previous tasks, which focused solely on relationships with these actors, became traditional tasks that had reached higher levels represented in actions outside of such simple relationships, to reach an international public opinion.

    2.Public Diplomacy: According to Nicholas J. Cull's definition,[6] an actor attempts to manage the international environment through engagement with a foreign audience. Jan Milissen defines it as the instrument that states use ... to understand cultures and attitudes by behavior. Within this context,[7] public diplomacy as a mechanism that seeks to influence and connect with foreign audiences takes on greater relevance since it allows managing the country's presence on the Internet, through social networks.

    3.Digital Diplomacy: When the British Prime Minister Lord Palmerston,[8] received the first telegraphic message in 1860, he shouted: "Oh my God, it is the end of diplomacy!" it was a surprised cry, expressing a new development. Diplo-Foundation is the main source of debates on digital diplomacy. Publications on the Foundation's website began to promote this phenomenon, following examples of its use in diplomats' tweets. This organism[9] saw digital diplomacy as describing new ways, and methods of diplomacy practice, with the help of the internet, ICT, and explaining their impact on contemporary diplomatic practices.

    Andreas Sandri,[10] the specialist in digital diplomacy, saw it as space where technology and tradition swelled; where "nodes" and "links" are components of networks beyond government control, in which all actors interact. It is not just a practice, but a spirit derived from the cultural practices and values associated with the technology itself.

Digital Diplomacy is the incorporation of virtual social networks in the diplomatic exercise, as a fundamental tool for achieving foreign policy objectives. Sabrina Sotiriu,[11] Digital Diplomacy refers to the use of the Internet and information for the achievement of diplomatic objects ... or to solve problems.

Digital Diplomacy[12] is the incorporation of virtual social networks in the diplomatic exercise, as a fundamental tool for achieving foreign policy objectives.

Arturo Sarukhan said[13] that the use of digital diplomacy increases the rise of his messages by connecting them directly with people, without going through state-controlled media which can distort the original message.

Digital diplomacy has become a new approach, to provide keys to encrypted diplomatic messages, with network 3.0 and its digital platforms. Social media sites such as Twitter have become important tools in promoting Digital diplomacy. Digital diplomacy cannot abolish traditional diplomacy, but it enhances the work of the State in international relations and increases its speed and effectiveness. Diplomacy continued to respond to all changes, despite the internet's reshaping of traditional methods of diplomacy.

Secondly: **Literature Review.**

Digital diplomacy is a new concept, and we have a few relevant studies on this topic because it is a recent phenomenon. Scientists tried to dismantle this phenomenon to provide theoretical approaches that help to understand this modern phenomenon. Nevertheless, there is a great debate between academics and professors as to how novel digital technologies are touching public diplomacy? Like the important theoretical contribution,[14] of Alister Miskimmon, Ben O'Loughlin, and Laura Roselle argue through three case studies, the treatment of strategic narratives for public diplomacy. Based on the four dimensions of the proposed conceptual framework, the authors demonstrate how the digitalization of public diplomacy, bringing strategic value to the communication of the foreign affairs ministries.

In their book The New Digital Age [15] Eric Schmidt, and Jared Cohen one of the architects of the '21st-century statecraft' in Hillary Clinton's State Department, argues that the revolution in communications technologies means that governments will have to develop two general orientations, and two foreign policies Online and offline. The challenge to measure the impact of digital diplomacy on international relations Facebook and Twiplomacy, an accessible website has led numerous item readings in this field. While academics make more interest in digital diplomacy as it carries on to grow, holes persist. Lastly, diplomacy scholars have asserted that the 21st century is the century of networked diplomacy.

Thirdly: Theoretical and Conceptual Framework.

During recent years, studies in this area have multiplied, and many of them offer global analysis and practical guidance in the exercise of digital public diplomacy. It is a conceptual change in diplomatic practice that places and weighs on communicating with foreign populations. Theoretical reflections on digital diplomacy in international relations can have a triple theoretical dimension:[16] cooperation (liberalism), power (realism) and cultural interaction (constructivist).

Many researchers[17] have been interested in this new phenomenon. Such as Bollier 2003, Armstrong (2009), Torrealba and Rodríguez 2015 and Barringtong (2016) among others. They concluded that diplomacy is no longer an exclusive task for a particular elite. Moreover, those social networks have allowed citizens to demand more transparency, reduced the gaps in direct dialogue with the authorities, and have become platforms that establish certain values.

The accreditation of SNSs by foreign ministries and missions has added great academic interest in recent years. Because "SNS" provided diplomatic missions with an unprecedented opportunity to communicate directly with foreign audiences on various topics. Its objective is to promote self-esteem and influence international opinion. Establishing to expand "two-way communication" with foreign audiences, drawn from theories in public relations and marketing. Among the most prominent are the four Grunig models. We can detail is as follows: [18]According to Grunig, the re are four models surround public relations behavior:

1.Press Agentry/Publicity (One-Way Asymmetrical model): It is an asymmetric and one-way communication model. Designed by the magician "P. T. Barnum" in the middle of the nineteenth century. It is a model that gives no regard to the truth. Hence, press agency professionals defend the institution in which they belong according to the logic of the purpose justifying the means. Moreover, the information it contains is transmitted in one direction from the provider, the government or the institution, to the recipient, meaning the public for advertising. The objective of the public relations programs on which the press is based has to use all methods to persuade and manipulate the data to influence public opinion.

2.Public Information (One-Way Symmetrical Model): This model emerged to communicate in the early twentieth century, based on the asymmetric model. Ivy Lee believed that the professional's public relations were "Resident Journalists," who should provide true and accurate information about their clients' institutions. However, Grunig reformulated the concept of this asymmetric model.

He believed that practitioners who follow this model influence their audience manipulation, although this may not be their goal. This model has the pressure of promotion and publicity. In addition, the communication remains in one direction, from the provider to the recipient. This type of model is used by public relations

professionals in governments, non-profit organizations, and some companies that are active in the field of press releases.

3.Two-Way Asymmetrical: Its scientific roots go back to the work of the General Information Committee chaired by George Creel during the First World War. This model enriched by Mr. Edward Bernays with a large part of social science theories.

Bernays believed that public opinion could be molded, and constructed for evil purposes. Such as the use of propaganda by the Nazis to gain community support to achieve their expansionist goals. Then, public opinion can be designed to benefit society. Organizations believe they can make the decision, and then sell it to their public.

4.Two-Way Symmetrical Model:[19] This model can be considered the most ethical of all these models. This model is intended to promote dialogue, not to establish a monologue. This model works to balance interests through mutual concessions depending on negotiation conflict resolution understanding, and mutual respect between the organization, and the public in general.

The main difference[20] between the symmetric and asymmetric two-way communication model is that two-way symmetric communication means the desire to change oneself, and personal convictions if necessary for mutual benefit.

Fourthly: Internet, Soft Power and New Actors.

The emergence of the Internet has led to fundamental changes in the shape of relations between persons and countries. It supported communication between different sides and made adjustments to the concept of space-time. Individuals as used by governments. The second revolution in the world of Internet technology or "Web 4.0"; strengthened the network of relationships within the global village, and made communication with sound and image, a reality after it was a kind of imagination.

Joseph Nye[21] warned that the information revolution has fundamentally altered the world of foreign policy, making it difficult for officials to organize themselves due to a change like governments, and the concept of sovereignty the growing power of non-State actors, and the occupation of **soft power** in a broad field in foreign policy-making.

The Internet has been established for the creation of virtual transnational corporations; it has opened its doors to millions of people without restrictions on gender, social status or religion. Through communication, and coordination methods for the various activities, and asking questions that force them to rethink their role as citizens.

The Internet has been able to monitor the development of many phenomena and movements, and make their voices heard strongly on the global scene.[22] This

has brought new actors into the world of diplomacy and enabled them to participate in political and diplomatic processes.

People became subjects of international relations, especially those who are more socially active, and who have prints on national and international public opinion. Lev Grossman[23] described this phenomenon resulting from social networks as an opportunity to build a new kind of international understanding, not between politicians but between citizens of all nationalities. De Ugarte in his book "De las naciones a las redes", considered that states had an expiration date. The Internet has become a new scenario, and perhaps the most important with activities that have direct implications on international relations that are daily organized.

Fifthly: Facebook and the Wired Society.

The emergence of social networks such as Twitter and Facebook have made easily accessible communications access to information, and interaction patterns of its user audience. Citizens increasingly depend on social networks to communicate not only with their friends or work teams but also with companies, social organizations, and the government.

Facebook is the social media platform, which influences the broadest audience. On the other hand, YouTube and Instagram only reach a small category compared to Facebook. Facebook is one of the biggest, and most popular social networks worldwide. Founded in 2004, with subscribers[24] that exceed 2.45 billion monthly active users as of the third quarter of 2019. During the last reported quarter, the company stated that 2.8 billion people use one of the company's core products, Facebook...

 Facebook's mission[25] is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. 1.62 billion people on average log into Facebook. Five new profiles are created every second. 50% of 18–24-year-olds go on Facebook when they wake up. Every 60 seconds on Facebook 510,000 comments are posted, 293,000 statuses and 136,000 photos are uploaded. This platform now has magnitudes that permit it to be a worldwide actor. Its "population" is larger than any country in the world, its users connect in more than 70 languages.

Diplomatic staff will open their accounts, it will serve as a direct channel of communication between citizens living outside their home countries. It also allows officials to expand their professional communications networks and helps them carry out their tasks. This platform helps to announce the cultural events of an Embassy among those who live in the respective city and spread consular assistance. Many foreign services chose to create official pages on Facebook. The Mexican Secretary of State "Patricia Espinosa", sharing interventions and photos in international forums.

The Jasmine Uprising in Tunisia in 2010 had its first flash with the immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi, who complained by burning himself in protest for the local authority's arbitrariness. Before this act, the collective anger did not wait and the popular revolt broke out. The Tunisian decision-maker decided to censor the Network to cut dissident expression pathways and blocked access to much of social networks, such as YouTube and Twitter. However, Facebook was the only network that continued outside the censorship, which caused all the protest content that managed to demolish the dictatorship of Zine el Abidine Ben Ali.

Needless to say, it is a modern tool that has determined a vertiginous change in communications personal and inter-institutional interrelation, due to its ability for coverage usefulness, and speed. Facebook has become a foreign policy tool.

Sixthly: From Twitter to Twiplomacy, New Influence Areas.

Twitter is a microblogging services company,[26] based in the United States of America, created in 2006 by "Jack Dorsey". In 2014 there were at least 560 million registered users. It generated 340 million daily interactions and more than 1.6 million daily search queries. Since 2006, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has spoken about new technologies and considered them an excellent way to connect with millions of new people around the world.

According to a study[27] conducted by "Twiplomacy.com", it was discovered that 97% of UN member states have a presence on Twitter, and that among 951 accounts on Twitter there are 372 accounts of heads of states, and government employees. 579 represents the official institutions of the states, from presidents and governments of 187 countries in the world.

The use of Twitter and other SNSs is not only to influence foreign public opinion and the policies of foreign nations. U.S. President Donald Trump daily posts tweets that allow his followers to know what topics will be discussed and the personality he will meet. Studies have confirmed that personal messages have positive effects, raise public attention to the direction of information being disseminated, and draw visual images in their minds. Emotionally charged tweets get the most attention online. Many tweets are often reposted, and sent to President Trump thus getting the message and performing its functions.

The Israeli Foreign Affairs Ministry is a leading Twitter user,[28] and this is done through two channels. The Foreign Affairs Ministry maintains an account and another account for the State of Israel. The same issues are published but they are addressed to the masses within the borders and the Jewish community abroad. These two central channels are assisted by other channels operated by Israeli embassies in countries allied to Israel, such as the Israeli embassy in the United Kingdom the Israeli consulate in Los Angeles or Ottawa.

The Spanish political party PODEMOS[29] is the first in the world to take advantage of "Reddit's" social platform to listen to Spanish citizens answer questions and debate to take into account the proposals of all users.

These tools allowed foreign affairs ministers, and decision-makers[30] to shape public opinion away from their geographical borders, and form prestige that serves the national interests of their countries, based on social networks. They use social media as well to communicate, and sawing information, which makes them closer to its population on a national level, and colleagues in the international arena. This new scene has changed international policy-making.

Social networks in the new century are presented as a tool to solve problems between states, internal affairs, and a means for different actors to be heard in the international community through the exercise of soft power.

Efe Sevin pointed out the importance of communication in times of crisis,[31] and how Recep Tayyip Erdogan's government has framed dealing with Turkey's failed coup, and the public diplomacy carried out by the Turkish Foreign Ministry, and its embassies via Twitter. This is what happened in 2008,[32] when the US embassy in China decided to install a screen to determine air quality in the capital Beijing, and to broadcast hourly readings on Twitter to draw attention to the level of pollution to stir up Chinese public opinion against its country's policy.

Twitter has revolutionized the dissemination of information in promoting new digital diplomacy. Antonio Deruda says[33] Twitter is an important platform for information that provides access to a global audience and has become a favorite tool for diplomats, and international officials around the world. Lüfkens[34] believes that the most successful diplomats are those who own an iPad instead of a letter of credence.

In foreign policy social networks, and particularly Facebook and Twitter, present new opportunities for influence, and exchange of ideas for State actors in the international system. In 2013 83% of UN member states have a Twitter account which represents 68% of all heads of state, and government worldwide. Two-thirds of the world's leaders representing 125 countries are on Twitter. In 2015 the percentage of leaders with a Twitter account was 86%. Giulio Terzi the Italian Foreign Minister[35] said, Twitter has positive effects on foreign policy helps reduce barriers between politicians, and those affected by the results of the political process. Twiplomacy has changed the traditional and formal forms of diplomatic interaction. Emails, and online communication redesigned the diplomatic scenario by shortening distances between countries.

In 2011 the Australian Prime Minister[36] did not respond in his "Twitter" account to his New Zealand counterpart. Likewise Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu did not respond to Palestine's friendship. The world public opinion

believed that it is a diplomatic position. In this context the "follower", and "non-follower" service on Twitter has become a focus of diplomatic tension between governments. The lack of response however means "Something is happening" between them, especially with complicated issues. Therefore, following a head of State on Twitter, and not tweeter him means an important diplomatic event. We can take the example[37] of the United States, and the role of Twitter in restoring relations On May 25th 2015 with Cuba after several years of embargo, and estrangement.

The follow-up of the late Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez the presidents of Ecuador Argentina Brazil, and Cuba on Twitter, has mapped alliances with the left governments that have marked the Latin America region. While the government heads of Colombia Chile and Peru followed each other on Twitter, forming a center for right-wing governments. It pointed to another map of alliances in the region that remained until 2014, with some exceptions. That is the interest in following on Twitter has become a diplomatic sign, and has prompted many countries to act as a follow-up by leaders, who influence the global diplomatic stage.

The current scene is demonstrating the interaction of diplomats and ministers on Twitter with increasing frequency. On January 28th 2017[38] the Israeli Prime Minister published a tweet praising him for Trump's idea of building a "Separation Wall" with Mexico and considered it a great idea to curb illegal immigration. Hours later the Mexican government publicly called on the Israeli Prime Minister to apologize for his statement. On February 20 of the same year the Swedish embassy in the United States responded to President Trump's tweet alleging a terrorist attack in Sweden. Diplomats turn to Twitter for knowing if their peers follow them.

Transparency on the Internet has led to the disappearance of secrets and has changed everyone's approach to dealing.[39] It has facilitated communication between Governments, their ambassadors and their civil societies, and made everyone more aware of the positive and negative impacts. A single word, tweet, comment, or video resulting from not knowing how to use these techniques can be a dislike, with serious consequences and severe conflicts resulting in dismissal or resignation. In a tweet of the U.S. Embassy in Cairo on the anniversary of 9/11, it was "strongly rejected the actions of those who violate the universal right to free expression, to harm the religious beliefs of others," led to a resounding scandal. Republicans have accused the Obama administration of siding with Islamist terrorists.

In the diplomatic sphere,[40] it is evident through communication that is a fertile ground for building a kind of digital coexistence, aims to establish friendly

relations with citizens of other countries, and to present a positive image of the country to which they belong. Social media supports efforts to listen to citizens' concerns, send messages of public interest; promote cultural diplomacy and promote academic exchange. Like the initiative that brought together students from APEC member states, they communicate online and present their local concerns to an international audience.

Seventhly: The Digital Diplomacy Impact on International Relations.

The societal transformations that the world experienced at the beginning of the twenty-first century had deep effects on diplomacy compared to previous periods. Until the 1950s, the focus of interaction in international relations was focused on states as an independent variant, and diplomacy was a way of managing these interactions. The Internet has three fundamental implications for international relations: [41]

1-The number of factors in international policy-making has doubled, hampering international decision-making and reducing State control. Public diplomacy infinitely opens the playing field of international relations[42] and makes it difficult for states to fully cover it with their strength as well as every one of their spaces. Foreign policy is no longer the private preserve of governments, nor is it limited to territorial relations. Both individuals and private organizations are beginning to intervene directly in international politics establishing strategies that greatly affect public policy, which before was only in the hands of the State. With technological development[43] the number of people responsible for international policy-making has increased. This network which connects these factors has increased the volume of communication, and the level of interaction.

2- The freedom and speed of dissemination of information regardless of its validity or error, without regard to the effects and consequences. Speed refers to the rapid frequency at which digital technologies move in the market and the quickness by which they are accepted.[44] The phone has taken 75 years to touch 100 million operators around the world however only 16 years and 4 ½ years to the mobile phone, and its most popular app Facebook to pass the same landmark respectively.

Another vital element is the speed of communication. Networks allow the transmission of information in real-time, to the point that any individual can become a news correspondent if they are in the right place at the right time. In times of crisis[45] embassies can set up WhatsApp groups including staff who collect information online. This group acts as a crisis management cell collecting it for real-time information helps to make the right decisions, and apply the "Think Globally, Act Locally" formula.

3-To provide diplomatic services more effectively and less costly, to citizens or governments, and citizens of other countries. The world's technological revolution[46] has reduced the burden of financial costs because of the huge incomes it generates to investors in this area. Digital diplomacy does not require major investments. With everyone's tweets different issues can be investigated, problems identified. It has also reduced the costs of connecting foreign representatives via Skype and Face Time without having to move around for a meeting thereby saving travel housing, and food costs.

An important element of the concept of confidentiality should be noted in this study. The traditional belief [47] that the power of information was concealed and used secretly was changed. The sphere of power has expanded among multiple partners sometimes putting governments on the sidelines. In New Zealand for example[48] the assumption is that "information must be made available unless there is a good reason to withhold it". The logic of Governments is no longer based on an information monopoly because the cost rises, and the severity of rejection increases. They must break the myth of storing it within the "Tight Box".

Making private information available to all may have profound implications for the direction of International Affairs. The Abu Ghraib scandal is a stark example of this effect. After the publication of the horrifying images the inhuman treatment of Iraqi prison inmates, and their global circulation by the network was an incident that tarnished the reputation of the United States of America, and fuelled jihadist attacks out of revenge. Thanks to the Internet the war in Iraq overthrows the heads of Spain government José María Aznar, and Tony Blair in Britain, and its repercussions on the international relations scene.

Citizens themselves have become a source of data, a source of inspiration for policy-making. Most people who use social networks are characterized by having a high level of schooling and better political consciousness. The information circulating on social networks is frequently extremely critical about the situation, both locally and internationally.

According to Corneliu Bjola[49] the important aim of diplomats is their endeavor to forge a positive vision of foreign societies toward their countries, and their foreign policies using Online Influence. This influence is done through the issues being discussed by the online public.

The rise of networking sites like Twitter Facebook is important, but the ongoing debate equally needs to address the wider impact of digitalization on the external relations of governments, and other international actors. The imperative to adapt to the Internet is not limited to states;[50] Amnesty International Oxfam Greenpeace, and Human Rights Watch have supported their strong online presence, and used them as a primary source of information by the internet public.

Javier Noya[51] in his book ¨Diplomacia pública para el siglo xxi¨ attributes great importance to the image of the States "Marca del país" for the construction of public diplomacy strategies since it considers that these actions mainly seek to project an image at the service of foreign policy interests. Diplomatic institutions and the capacity of diplomats may have a role in the configuration of prestige concept[52] but the way they interact and the ability to deal with different circles play a positive role in the influence shape. It becomes difficult to conceive that Tunisians and Chinese who use social media have a similar vision towards France. Rather the French embassy in both Tunisia and Beijing must establish this image.

The use of digital platforms has given diplomats new tools to measure old concepts, such as the concept of power. There were conversations about soft power indicators and the possibility of using culture values, and ideology to achieve foreign policy objectives.

The dissemination of information will mean that power will be more distributed and unofficial networks will diminish the monopoly of the traditional bureaucracy. Governments will have less control of their strategies also those of communication. They will have a lower degree of freedom by having to answer the facts, and will have to share the stage with more actors.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the impact of Twitter and Facebook on international relations cannot be underestimated. These social media platforms have transformed the landscape of diplomacy, communication, and global interactions. They have provided new avenues for engagement, enabling real-time communication, and facilitating the spread of information across borders. However, the implications of social media on international relations are not without challenges. Issues such as misinformation, regulation, geopolitical tensions, and ethical considerations require careful attention.

As we navigate the complex dynamics of social media in international relations, it is important for policymakers, diplomats, to recognize both the opportunities and challenges. Responsible and strategic use of Twitter and Facebook can enhance diplomatic efforts, promote dialogue, and foster understanding among nations. However, it is crucial to address concerns related to misinformation, data privacy, cybersecurity, and social media manipulation. Proper regulation and ethical guidelines are necessary to ensure that social media is used in a way that upholds the principles of diplomacy, respects international norms, and promotes positive relations among nations.

In summary, Twitter and Facebook have had a significant impact on international relations, transforming the landscape of diplomacy and global interactions. While they offer opportunities for engagement and communication,

they also pose challenges that need to be addressed. With careful consideration, responsible use, and regulation, social media can contribute to shaping a positive and meaningful international relations landscape in the digital age.

Margins:

[1]-Bridget Verrekia (2017), **Digital Diplomacy and Its Effect on International Relations**, SIT Graduate Institute, Gettysburg College Political Science and International Affairs, SIT Switzerland, 2 May Spring 2017. P.14.

[2]-Graig Hayden (2018), **Digital Diplomacy, the Encyclopedia of Diplomacy School of International Service**, American University, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. USA. P.05.

[3]-Alberto Lozano Vázquez y Otros (2018), **Diplomacia y teorías de Relaciones Internacionales,** Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, México. P.53.

[4]-Rafael Rubio (2011), **Las relaciones internacionales en el tránsito al siglo XXI**, escuela diplomática 44, ESPAÑA. P.29.

[5]-Alfredo A. Rodríguez Gómez (2015), **Diplomacia digital, ¿Adaptación al mundo digital o nuevo modelo de diplomacia?,** Opción, Año 31, No. Especial 2. p.12.

[6]-Daniel Aguirre, Matthias Erlandsen, Miguel Ángel López (2018), **Diplomacia pública digital: el contexto Iberoamericano**, Escuela de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad Nacional, Costa Rica. P.37.

[7]-Ibíd. P.244.

[8]-Bridget Verrekia (2017), Ibid. P.p. 06 and 28.

[9]-خالد بن إبراهيم الرويتع، الدبلوماسية العامة الرقمية والسياسة الخارجية، جريدة الشرق الأوسط، العدد 12785، 29 نوفمبر 2013.

[10]-Graig Hayden (2018), Ibíd. P.04.

[11]-Daniel Aguirre, Matthias Erlandsen, (2018), **Diplomacia pública digital: el contexto iberoamericano**. Ibíd. P.36.

[12]-Diego Bassant, **Diplomacia Digital. Las relaciones internacionales en tiempos de Twitter y Facebook**, p.77. https://afese.com/img/revistas/revista59/diplodig.pdf

[13]-Alejandro Ramos Cardoso, Luz Mariana Espinoza Castill (2018), **La diplomacia en 140 caracteres: El caso de México**, Escuela de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad Nacional, Costa Rica. P.39.

[14]-Daniel Aguirre Azócar, (2018), La digitalización de la diplomacia pública: hacia un nuevo marco conceptual, Revista Mexicana de Política Exterior, núm. 113, mayo-agosto. P. 11.

[15]-Schmidt E., and J. Cohen (2013), **the New Digital Age, Reshaping the Future of People**, Nations, and Business, (London: John Murray). P.12.

[16]-Alberto Lozano Vázquez y Otros (2018), Ibíd. P.62.

[17]-Matthias Erlandsen Lorca (2017), **Twitter como herramienta de para-diplomacia: un estudio cuantitativo exploratorios basado en los casos de Quebec y Cataluña,** Tesis para optar al grado de Magíster en Estudios Internacionales, Santiago, Chile, septiembre. P.55.

[18]-Linda Childers, (1989) J. Grunig's, **Asymmetrical and Symmetrical Models of Public Relations: Contrasting Features and Ethical Dimensions**, Transactions on Professional Communication, Vol 32, No 2, June 1989. P. 87.

[19]-Ebony Simpson (2014), **The Four Models in Grunig's and Hunt's PR Theories**, June 11. P.01.

[20]-SAIF Shahin (2019), Friend, Ally, or Rival? Twitter Diplomacy as "Techno-social" Performance of National Identity, International Journal of Communication 13, University of Texas, USA. P.5103.

[21]-Bridget Verrekia (2017), Ibid P.28.

[22]-Nicholas Westcott (2008), **Digital Diplomacy: The Impact of the Internet on International Relations**, Oxford Internet Institute, London Research Report 16, July 2008. P.08.

[23]-Helle C. Dale (2009), **Public Diplomacy 2.0: Where the U.S. Government Meets "New Media"**, No. 2346 December 8, The Heritage Foundation, Washington. P.04.

[24]-J. Clement (2019), Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 3rd quarter 2019, Statista, Nov 19.

[25]-Zephoria, The Top 20 Valuable Facebook Statistics, Updated January 2020.

[26]-Alfredo A. Torrealba (2018), La República Google, Edición Española. P.50.

[27]-https://twitter.com/Twiplomacy/status/1016577969547108352

[28]-Rafael Rubio (2011), Ibid. P.54.

[29]-La era de las redes sociales y su impacto en las Relaciones Internacionales. 30/11/2014.

 https://www.facebook.com/notes/foreign-affairs-latinoamérica/la-era-de-las-redes-sociales-y-su-impacto-en-las-relaciones-internacionales/755733171141056/

[30]-Clara Knäpper Bohman, **Digital Diplomacy Social Media Platforms as Instruments for implementing Foreign Policy**, Vienna School of International Studies. P.08.

[31]-Daniel Aguirre Azócar, Ilan Manor y Alejandro Ramos Cardoso (2018), La digitalización de la diplomacia pública: hacia un nuevo marco conceptual, Revista Mexicana de Política Exterior, núm. 113, mayo-agosto. P. 12.

[32]-SAIF Shahin (2019), Ibid. P.5101.

[33]-A. Deruda (2014), "**Chapter 6-Twitter." The Digital Diplomacy Handbook: How to Use social media to Engage with Global Audiences**, Creat espace Independent Publishing Platform, p. 63.

[34]-Matthias Erlandsen Lorca (2017), Ibid. P.p.56-57.

[35]-Alfredo A. Torrealba (2014), LA TWITPLOMACIA, octubre. P.05. https://www.academia.edu/8897221/Twitter_Diplomacia_Twitplomacia_2014_

[36]-Alfredo A. Torrealba (2018), La República Google, Ibid. P.08.

[37]-Efe Sevin and Ilan Manor (2018), From Embassy Ties to Twitter Links: Comparing Offline and Online Diplomatic Networks, Policy & Internet, Vol. 9999, No. 9999, 2018. P.02.

[38]-Ibid. P.03.

[39]-Viona Rashica (2018), the Benefits and Risks of Digital Diplomacy, SEEU Review, Volume 13, Issue 1. P.83.

[40]-Daniel Aguirre Azócar y Matthias Erlandsen (2018), **Diplomacia pública digital: el contexto iberoamericano**. Ibíd. P.132.

[41]-Nicholas Westcott (2008), Ibíd.P.p.02-03.

[42]-Rafael Rubio (2011), Ibíd. P.30.

[43]-Viona Rashica (2018), Ibid. P.80.

44-Ralf Dreischmeier and Others, the Digital Imperative, the Boston Consultant Group. P.03. http://www.thpii.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/The_Digital_Imperative_Mar_2015_tcm80-183101.pdf

[45]-Viona Rashica (2018), Ibid. P.81.

[46]-Alfredo A. Rodríguez Gómez (2015), Ibid. p.16.

[47]-Nicholas Westcott (2008), Ibid. P.08.

[48]-Richard Grant (2004), the Democratization of Diplomacy: Negotiating With the Internet, Oxford Internet Institute, Research Report No. 5, November 2004. p.28.

[49]-Noam Katz (2016), Digital Diplomacy Conference Summary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, State of Israel. March 30, 31. P.p.31-32.

[50]-Nicholas Westcott (2008), Ibid. P.08.

[51]-Javier Noya (2007), **Diplomacia pública para el siglo xxi: la gestión de la imagen exterior y la opinión pública internacional**, Real Instituto Elcano/Ariel, Barcelona 2007. P.02.

52-Noam Katz (2016), Ibid. P.45.