Journal of Peace Studies

Journal of Peace Studies

C O N T E N T S

Journal of Peace Studies

SUBSCRIPTION

In India

This Copy (Two Issues):	Rs. 600.00
Annual (Individual)	Rs. 1200.00
(Institutional)	Rs. 1800.00

Overseas (Air Mail)

This Copy:	US$ 15.00
	UK£ 9.00
Annual:	US$ 60.00

The Power of Words:
Analysing the Role of Communication in Contemporary Diplomatic Practice and International Relations

▼

Ali Mohammed   Al-Qarni*

Abstract

Central to the conduct of diplomacy is effective communication through which states negotiate, represent themselves and resolve disputes. This paper explores how the evolution of diplomatic communication, from traditional face-to-face interactions and written communiques to contemporary digitally enabled exchanges, has transformed diplomatic practices. On the one hand, digital diplomacy has leveraged immediacy and accessibility afforded by the latest technologies, such as social media and the Internet, thereby heralding a new era in the conduct of international relations; on the other, these technologies also pose significant challenges, with issues like miscommunication, disinformation, and loss of nuance, posing risks of potentially detrimental consequences for key diplomatic engagements. This has made it necessary for diplomats to maintain a delicate balance between transparency and confidentiality. As such, this study employs 'Discourse Analysis'' and ''Thematic Analysis' to examine the implications of integrating digital tools with conventional diplomatic practices. It holds that while digital diplomacy creates new avenues for soft power and public engagement, conventional face-to-face diplomatic interactions, where nuance and trust are paramount, continue to remain indispensable. It further underlines why state representatives must adapt to a technologically improved environment where digital campaigns could complement traditional diplomacy so as to ensure the smooth conduct of international relations in the 21st century.

Key Words: Communication, Digital Diplomacy, Data Analysis, Public Diplomacy

Ali Mohammed Al-Qarni heads the Centre for Asia Studies at the Prince Saud Al Faisal Institute for Diplomatic Studies, Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Introduction

At the core of diplomacy lies communication, an indispensable mechanism underpinning the negotiation processes between state representatives, primarily aimed at conflict resolution, the promotion of national interests, and the enhancement of international cooperation.[1] In this context, communication entails the systematic exchange of information among diplomats and state actors, which serves as a crucial conduit for achieving diplomatic objectives.[2] States and international actors leverage communication to convey strategic messages, negotiate agreements, and resolve disputes. It is also the principal medium through which diplomacy accomplishes its main objectives: representation, negotiation, and safeguarding national interests. As scholars have emphasised, communication constitutes the lifeblood of diplomacy, and effective communication is not merely a prerequisite for efficient diplomacy but its foundational element.[3]

Historically, the management of international relations has been facilitated through diverse communication modes. Written correspondences, emissaries, and face-to-face deliberations constituted the essential instruments of traditional diplomacy.[4] These communication forms ensured the conduct of diplomatic engagements within a framework of discretion and a controlled negotiation environment until conclusive objectives were achieved. However, the advent of the 21st century has witnessed the ascendency of digital diplomacy as a significant instrument in the diplomatic repertoire.[5] States and international the diplomatic repertoire.[6] Social media platforms have emerged as the dominant mode of virtual communication being used by international actors and people alike, which has, to an extent, democratised participation in diplomatic discourses. Where once an elite section of the socio-political setup, armed with linguistic finesse, mediated the encoding and decoding of diplomatic messages in the 17th to 19th centuries, contemporary digital platforms now allow virtually unrestricted public involvement, thereby enabling anyone to be part of the conversation around such issues.

The digital epoch has ushered in an era of unprecedented digital public engagement, with the people at large, including foreign publics, targeted through public diplomacy campaigns, accessing and interacting through conventional media channels and an expansive array of

digital platforms. These new forums enable real-time dialogue between citizens and their governments, national security agencies, and foreign publics. Through these mediums, "interactive public relations" have achieved a never-before transformative level of public engagement.

Despite these advancements, the inherently human dimension of diplomacy remains most effective when conducted through in-people interactions. High-stakes negotiations necessitate summits, conflicts demand peace talks, and bilateral meetings articulate national positions vis-à-vis one another in an intimate setting. These deliberative processes are profoundly consequential for our lives by shaping the frameworks through which humanity navigates the complexities of an increasingly interconnected and pressured global landscape.

Nonetheless, the rapid advancement of digital diplomacy opens up both unprecedented opportunities and formidable challenges. On the one hand, digital diplomacy facilitates rapid and unfettered engagement between nation-states and their respective publics, often circumventing delays associated with conventional diplomatic channels. For instance, when President Barack Obama received the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize,

he attributed his ability to surpass traditional modes of communication to digital platforms such as Twitter and Facebook.[7] In scenarios involving the mitigation of international crises, including avoidance and resolution, the immediacy afforded by digital platforms represents a distinct advantage over conventional diplomatic mechanisms.[8]

Conversely, dependence on digital communication engenders a spectrum of risks. The velocity and visibility inherent in online platforms amplify the potential for miscommunication, misunderstanding, and the proliferation of disinformation on a global scale. Diplomatic discourse must navigate the delicate balance of maintaining the façade of confidentiality and decorum in such an environment. Furthermore, the increased virtualisation of diplomacy raises concerns about the slack of nuanced dimensions because of the depersonalisation of online platforms. The nascent tools of digital diplomacy may project an illusion of efficiency but risk undermining the subtle interplay of verbal and nonverbal communication, which is integral to negotiation and conflict resolution.[9]

As such, diplomacy is inextricably linked to communication, forming the foundational basis upon which states build their relationships and engage with one another. While

communication methodologies have evolved over centuries, the current digital age represents a paradigm shift. Nevertheless, as of now, many argue that digital diplomacy, conceptualised by the US State Department as the utilisation of social media and Internet-based tools in foreign policy, redefines the 21st-century communicative landscape for state and non-state actors alike.[10] However, the efficacy of these novel communication tools and platforms is not guaranteed, as highlighted by the contentious US presidential election campaign of 2016, which underscores the nuanced challenges of this emergent paradigm.

Research Question

Any academic inquiry necessitates clear methodological guidance to ensure its structural coherence and analytical precision. This imperative becomes particularly salient when addressing a subject as intricate as communication within the domain of diplomacy. This paper investigates the multitudinous role of communication as a strategic instrument in diplomatic interactions and negotiations. It interrogates both traditional, face-to-face communication forms and contemporary digitally mediated platforms, situating them within the broader context of diplomatic praxis. In addition, the study explores the parameters of the effectiveness of communication while concurrently analysing the challenges inherent in navigating high-pressure communicative environments to achieve optimal diplomatic outcomes. As such, the main research question guiding the study is:

How does communication influence diplomatic outcomes in contemporary international relations?

While addressing the duality of diplomatic communication, encompassing the growing importance of digital diplomacy alongside conventional one, this study attempts to highlight what strategies and methodologies diplomats employ to achieve their objectives. In addition, it also analyses the influence of diverse communication media on the processes and outcomes of diplomatic practice.

Justification of Research Questions

The research questions are designed to address significant gaps within the existing scholarship on diplomatic communication. While traditional diplomacy and the role of face-to-face negotiations in fostering effective communication have been explored extensively,[11] the contemporary communication modes in diplomatic practice remain underexamined. Besides, in an increasingly globalised world, the

influence of linguistic and cultural barriers on diplomatic exchanges necessitates further exploration. By addressing these issues, this research attempts to contribute to the understanding of how effective communication can enhance diplomatic efforts, particularly in the context of the contemporary digital milieu.

Moreover, the sub-questions are integral to offering a nuanced examination of diplomatic communication. The research seeks to capture the intricate dynamics of diplomatic interactions by examining both verbal and non-verbal communication strategies, which hinge not only on explicit dialogue but also on subtler elements such as tone, gestures and body language.[12] With the increasing prominence of social media and digital platforms in international relations, the relevance of emphasising digital diplomacy makes this particularly timely and consequential.

Methodology

The study employs qualitative research methodology to examine the communication practices of diplomats within the complex dynamics of international relations. It directly engages with the communicative artefacts, particularly the discourses and texts that constitute the documented record of

diplomatic interactions and negotiations. As this research does not employ interviews or primary data collection, this methodology enables a rigorous examination of key diplomatic texts and the contributions of prominent figures to the evolving discourse on diplomatic communication. In particular, this method was selected to enable an in-depth exploration of multilayered meanings, both explicit and implicit, embedded in statements made during diplomatic engagements that constitute the fabric of diplomatic communication.[13] In this context, international communication practices are conceptualised as analogous to the "artful dodging" often observed in the strategic use of language for obfuscation or deflection in domestic political arenas.[14] Such perspectives enable a nuanced understanding of how diplomats navigate and exploit linguistic and performative elements to achieve their objectives in international discourse.

Data Collection

The primary data for this research comprises publicly accessible diplomatic documents, including academic literature and case studies. These resources assume particular relevance by providing theoretical frameworks and contextual background for understanding the

evolution and operational dynamics of diplomatic communication across varying contexts.[15] The documents cover some major diplomatic events and have been selected due to their significance in shaping multilateral engagement in the international arena. While many scholars have looked at these documents before, this study attempts to synthesise these analyses into a cohesive framework that offers deeper and more comprehensive insights into the interplay between diplomacy and communication.

Data Analysis

The data has been examined using both thematic and discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a key instrument to interpret how policy-relevant communication is articulated through language. It deals with, on the one hand, the surface structure of communication (syntax, semantics, etc.) and also the deeper structures that influence perceptions and shape narratives. Through analysis of rhetoric, persuasion, and power embedded within diplomatic messages, discourse analysis reveals underlying power dynamics and ideological assumptions in the language of diplomatic communication. These elements are recognised as part of the narrative structure since they both represent and function as persuasion tools and control mechanisms.

The application of discourse analysis to diplomatic communication has gained prominence in academic circles, offering insights into the subtle ideological underpinnings of diplomatic texts. Fairclough (2015) emphasises that diplomatic texts are not merely descriptive but performative, demonstrating how language shapes power dynamics and creates meaning through rhetorical strategies. It, thus, reveals the "how" and "why" behind diplomatic language, highlighting its role as a tool of persuasion and control.[16]

In contrast, thematic analysis enables the identification and interpretation of recurring themes and patterns within the collected data. This method, as articulated by Braun and Clarke (2006), provides a systematic approach to categorising data into measurable clusters.[17] In this study, thematic analysis facilitates two critical objectives: firstly, to identify diverse diplomatic communication strategies employed in selected case studies and secondly, to enable comparative strategies across different geopolitical contexts.

The thematic analysis assists in identifying recurring themes and patterns in qualitative data, particularly when focused on cooperation, conflict resolution, and national security.[18] It enables researchers to categorise and

compare diplomatic strategies across various geopolitical contexts. The integrated use of both discourse and thematic analysis, while aligned with existing scholarship in this domain, provides a nuanced exploration of communication strategies in diplomacy.[19]

This paper examines the key themes of cooperation, conflict resolution, and national security to discern how diplomatic texts prioritise or obscure such themes. It also examines both implicit and explicit messaging in these texts, with a focus on the cultural and linguistic contexts that shape norms and expectations of diplomatic communication.[20]

Ethical Considerations

As this study uses only publicly available documents, the ethical concerns as such are minimal and uncomplicated. Nevertheless, rigorous scholarly standards have been maintained to ensure that all sources used in the study are duly acknowledged and the interpretations are firmly grounded in the data and academic scholarship. In particular, it also acknowledges the inherent possible biases of the analysed texts, recognising that such documents are often crafted to shape public opinion and/or advance specific policy goals. Consequently, the analyses relate not only to the content of these texts but also to their broader context within diplomatic practices and international relations.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study is the absence of new primary data collected through means such as interviews or participant observation and the strong reliance on secondary data. While primary data could certainly have allowed for deeper insights into what drives diplomats and their strategies, the qualitative approach that underlies this study provides a robust framework for analysing the content and context of 'diplomatic texts.' This research thus offers an in-depth examination of how communication operates in formal diplomatic settings. Although overreliance on publicly available documents and existing scholarship, per inherent limitation, does restrict the scope of this study, such data may not fully capture the nuances of informal negotiations or behind-the-scenes dynamics that are often pivotal in diplomatic practice. What the qualitative methodology provides is an enhanced understanding of the strategic deployment of language in diplomacy.

These limitations aside, the research is divided into two complementary parts. The first part examines the dynamics of direct and indirect communication in diplomacy,

focusing on the role of speech acts in the interplay between what is said and what is intended. The second part adopts a thematic focus, investigating how patterns and strategies of diplomatic communication reflect the more general breakdown of trust in contemporary international relations. As such, this dual approach provides a nuanced lens to examine the evolving role of communication in shaping diplomatic outcomes.

Literature Review

The literature review of this study draws upon an extensive corpus of qualitative sources to align with its methodological framework. The review offers a rigorous examination of major theories, academic debates, and research findings in this scholarly domain. This serves to position the study within the broader scholarship on diplomatic communication, emphasising the critical role of language and digital platforms in shaping interactions between diplomats and other stakeholders. Moreover, it also highlights the tension between traditional practices and digital innovations amidst the ever-evolving dynamics of diplomatic communication.

Traditional Diplomacy:

Historically, diplomacy has been conducted through physical face-to-face meetings and formal written communication means. As Berridge (2015) highlights, these traditional forms of interactions have been considered fundamental to international relations, fostering personal trust among negotiators, which is an essential element for conflict resolution. Communication is, of course, widely acknowledged as the foundation of successful relationships, including those between nations, given that it facilitates the exchange of ideas, negotiation of agreements, and resolution of disputes. As such, these various means of pursuing diplomacy over decades and centuries testify to the significance of communication in facilitating the conduct of international governance.

Scholars such as Berridge (2015) and Rana (2011) have extensively examined these diplomatic practices in international relations, emphasising how face-to-face and written communication means continue to triumph, especially in building rapport through non-verbal cues such as body language and facial expressions. Such cues, particularly in high-stakes negotiations, as Rothman (2020) emphasises, help resolve ambiguities and enhance mutual understanding.

Moreover, for Berridge (2015), the art of diplomacy is characterised by two main elements: a formal, often hierarchical framework for communication and a controlled,

discreet setting for dialogue. Historically, diplomacy has also operated through what is now referred to as back-channel negotiations, such as during the World Wars, where discreet engagements enabled high-stakes decision-making and peace agreements that averted further conflicts (Reiter, 1995). As such, these practices demonstrate the enduring relevance of direct, confidential communication in navigating complex international issues.

The Rise of Digital Diplomacy:

The advent of digital technologies, such as digital communication platforms, has transformed traditional diplomatic practices, introducing a new paradigm that has been variously referred to as "e-diplomacy" or "cyber diplomacy." Adopting digital tools, chiefly social media, for diplomatic practices has made these the new lifeblood of modern diplomatic communication. Scholars such as Bjola & Holmes (2015) and Manor (2019) have extensively examined how digital platforms accelerated and expanded the reach of diplomatic communication against traditional means. One of the most significant shifts brought about by digital diplomacy, as Cull (2013) argues, is the ability of states to engage directly with foreign publics, bypassing traditional intermediaries

such as journalists and media outlets. For Bjola & Holmes (2015), digital diplomatic channels assist in the public diplomacy efforts of governments to bolster their credentials in the broader international relations arena. The interactive nature of platforms like Facebook and Twitter, facilitating two-way communication, enables states to project soft power through cultural exchanges and public diplomacy campaigns. Nye (2004) argues that such digital engagement is particularly valuable for states in managing fragmented global narratives and fostering interactive relationships with diverse audiences.

However, digital diplomacy is not without challenges. The rapid, transparent, and public nature of online communication increases the risk of misunderstandings, diplomatic blunders, and information leaks. As such, Hocking (2016) warns of the potential for disinformation campaigns, which can undermine trust and destabilize diplomatic relations. For instance, if a state's sensitive information is leaked, it could be used against it by multiple actors with vested interests. Nevertheless, these challenges highlight the dual-edged nature of digital platforms as tools for both engagement and exploitation, challenges that the states would do well to take note of.

Cultural and Linguistic Barriers

The multicultural and multilingual settings of modern diplomacy present significant challenges, as highlighted by Berridge (2015) and Rana (2011). Effective communication in these contexts requires a nuanced understanding of cultural norms and sensitivities, as well as adeptness in intercultural dialogue. Many of the misunderstandings arising from cultural differences in communication styles have often delayed or derailed negotiations. For instance, as highlighted by Friedman (2021), in the case of US-China diplomatic interactions, cultural differences in communication styles have often resulted in unintended misunderstandings where context-driven indirect Chinese messaging contrasts with the direct communication style preferred by US diplomats.

Linguistic barriers further complicate diplomatic communication even with the assistance of translators and interpreters. The underlying issue lies in the reductive interpretations of meaning at various stages of diplomatic text production. As such, effective diplomacy necessitates more than linguistic translation; it requires cultural translation to bridge gaps in understanding and foster meaningful dialogue.

Data Analysis and Findings

In this part of the study, an in-depth qualitative analysis of literature within the field of communication is conducted, focusing on the art and science of nonverbal, verbal, and written modes of diplomatic communication. The primary emphasis of the analysis is on traditional forms of diplomatic exchange, including speeches, communiqués, treaties, and similar textual artefacts. Nevertheless, considering the increasing significance of digital diplomacy in contemporary IR, the study also examines how the new forms of communication technologies, including electronic and cyber ones, that make these texts available impact diplomatic communication. This dual focus aims to arrive at a nuanced understanding of both conventional and modern diplomatic practices.

A. Traditional Diplomatic Communication

The practice of traditional diplomacy, characterised by in-person interactions and formal written exchanges, continues to occupy a foundational place in international relations. This paper takes a detailed examination of a diverse array of diplomatic texts, ranging from high-level

governmental documents or statements to more localised interactions such as with neighbours, effectively transforming "the art of the deal" into an open and accessible analytical framework.

When we analyse diplomatic speeches, one of the key revelations is the rhetorical potency of these talks. While these addresses may often appear as simple statements of a state's stance position on various issues, their primary function in diplomatic contexts lies in strategic persuasion to win over the intended public. This is particularly evident in speeches delivered at high-profile global and multilateral forums such as the United Nations General Assembly, which serve as powerful instruments of public diplomacy. Such platforms afford state leaders an opportunity to articulate their agendas on a global stage, thereby enabling them to leverage their rhetoric to shape international perceptions.[21] For instance, US President Barack Obama's 2009 Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech symbolises this dynamic. In his efforts to burnish the credentials of the United States as a global leader, President Obama, in his address, emphasised balancing the imperatives of military action with the principles of diplomacy by underscoring the significance and necessity of collective security for common humanity.[22]

The rhetorical strategies employed in diplomatic speeches are a norm for leaders across countries. Consider the speech of Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi during the "Summit of the Future" at the United Nations General Assembly on 20 September 2024. It highlights the deployment of key rhetorical strategies, such as appeals to shared humanity and collective responsibility. The phrases like "Greater solidarity and cooperation", "our shared destiny", and "a future of fairness and justice" were strategically used to implicate all nations in the perpetuation of global instability. He stressed that "In today's world, countries are not riding separately in some 190 small boats, but rather we're all in a giant ship on which our shared destiny hinges. Small boats may not survive wind and waves, but a giant ship is strong enough to brave the stormy seas." It, therefore, demonstrates Wang Yi's efforts to frame the address within the broader narrative of unity and collaboration.[23] Like Fairclough (2015) noted in his analysis of Wang Yi's earlier address at the United Nations, such speeches recurrently demonstrate a heavy prevalence of metaphorical imagery, such as expressions like "giant ship" and "law of the jungle," evoking themes of the need for peace and cooperation, in the above speech.

Beyond verbal rhetoric, the speeches were examined to delve

into the realm of non-verbal communication in diplomacy. It was revealed that diplomatic messages, whether verbal or written, are inherently sensory in their reception. As with any form of communication, the effectiveness of such communication in the broader diplomatic sphere depends on the shared understanding between the sender and the recipient. As such, the diplomatic exchanges operate within a framework where messages must resonate with both sides, necessitating a nuanced comprehension of intended meanings. Consequently, the art of diplomacy lies not only in the transmission and reception of messages but also in ensuring that both sides align in their interpretation, thereby underlining the intricate interplay of communication and understanding in diplomatic practice.

B. Diplomatic Communiqués and Written Agreements

Another critical mode of diplomatic communication is formal communiqués and written agreements. These formal documents serve as the official record of diplomatic negotiations and dictation. These documents serve as the authoritative records of diplomatic negotiations and decisions, often issued and endorsed by high-level state actors, including heads of state and senior diplomats. The language employed in these texts is highly formal and precise and aimed at minimising ambiguity to ensure clarity in communication. Such clarity in written diplomatic communication is paramount, as any vagueness risks misinterpretation, which could ultimately lead to unintended consequences and strategic blunders.[24]

Analysis of several treaties and communiqués reveals the strategic use of hedging language, a key technique designed to preserve flexibility while avoiding overly rigid commitments. For instance, negotiation papers of some landmark treaties reveal the frequent use of phrases and words such as "endeavor" and "seek". Their use helps create a tone for cooperative intent without outrightly imposing binding obligations to start with. What this rhetorical strategy does is allow the states to signal their willingness to collaborate, both domestically and internationally, while leaving significant room for any potential manoeuvre to preserve their positions and interests. Such language can also serve as a dual-purpose signal, conveying different levels of commitment to internal and external audiences.[25]

Furthermore, written agreements and communiques are diligently

drafted to ensure compliance with the principles and frameworks of international law. Terms such as "binding obligations," "jurisdiction," and "ratification" are used to colour these agreements with a formal appearance and legalistic tone to underline the seriousness of the commitments being undertaken with the express faith of their implementation. However, the enforceability of such commitments often remains contingent on the specific circumstances and willingness of the parties to uphold them (Desierto, 2010).

The linguistic intricacies of these documents are far removed from what might be described as "plain language." For example, the Kyoto Protocol, which established legally binding emissions targets on the signatories, employed terms like "annexe" and "commitments" to navigate the complexities of international legal frameworks while preserving necessary diplomatic flexibility. The careful wording of the Protocol exemplifies how legal and diplomatic priorities intersect to ensure that agreements can withstand scrutiny under international law while accommodating the realities of interstate negotiations.[26] As such, while it underlines how language, law, and diplomacy interplay in the negotiation as agreements take shape, it further reveals how such texts function not only as tools of

governance but also as instruments of strategic negotiation.

C. Digital Diplomacy and Communication

The advent of digital diplomacy has fundamentally altered the ways of interaction between states and their domestic and international publics. Through platforms such as Twitter, official websites of foreign ministries, and digital statements, this study evaluates how effectively modern diplomats navigate the exigencies of diplomatic communication as technological advancements revolutionise the way humanity communicates.

One of the primary advantages of digital diplomacy is its capacity to improve the interaction and engagement between diplomats and their foreign counterparts as well as international audiences. This is a direct result of the advent of platforms like Twitter that facilitate personalised communication, which enables diplomats to connect with their counterparts and broader audiences in ways previously unattainable. Before these technological advancements that have revolutionised the communication landscape, diplomacy primarily advanced the national interests of the states through trade agreements, strategic negotiations, and even interpersonal connections between

the heads of state. However, digitalization has gradually adapted these diplomatic functions to these virtual platforms, performing diplomacy in a more immediate and accessible manner.

In the analysis of diplomatic communication on platforms such as X (formerly Twitter), the prevalence of the use of concise and impactful messages to convey complex positions emerges as a recurring theme. Furthermore, the character limits imposed by a platform like X, for instance, necessitate the distilling of intricate diplomatic stances into statements for general mass understanding. While this approach enhances accessibility and ensures masses are provided with easily comprehensible information, there is a risk of oversimplifying nuanced positions that could potentially dilute the full essence of the issue, which is integral to effective diplomacy.[27]

Another critical dimension of digital diplomacy that emerges from the analysis is its role in fostering soft power by continuously engaging foreign publics. Soft power, defined as the ability of states to achieve desired outcomes through attraction and persuasion rather than through coercion or payment, has long been considered central to public diplomacy. With the increasing prominence and affordability of social media forums, these have become virtual public forums where states engage foreign publics, showcase their culture and political values, as well as amplify their foreign policy successes.[28] For instance, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) of China exemplifies the strategic use of digital diplomacy, wherein state-sponsored platforms actively disseminated narratives highlighting Beijing's development and investment initiatives in Asia and Africa. These widely disseminated narratives, as such, aim to foster constructive interactions and engagements with the objective of cultivating influence for these actors, in this case, China.[29]

The proliferation of digital diplomacy has led to its adoption by nearly all nation-states, with ministries of foreign affairs and overseas embassies often spearheading these efforts. Regardless of the institutional mechanism, the underlying objective remains the same for all these actors, which is to shape a favourable image among the foreign public. Such positive perceptions, it is believed, can bolster support for the nation's foreign policy initiatives and even enhance its diplomatic leverage in the long term.[30] This demonstrates the transformative impact of digital technologies on diplomacy wherein these serve as both tools for strategic communication and platforms for fostering global influence in an increasingly interconnected world, or

in Manual Castell's notions, a networked set-up.

D. Risks and Challenges of Digital Communication in Diplomacy

While digital diplomacy offers significant opportunities, it also presents distinct challenges and risks. Among the prominent ones is the heightened potential for mis-communication or public missteps in highly visible public forums. Traditional diplomatic exchanges benefit from private settings, which provide a buffer for resolving misunderstandings discreetly. In contrast, digital communication operates in a public arena where errors are instantly noticeable and often recorded and amplified by the media and public. As Hocking (2016) observes, the immediacy of digital platforms can lead to hastily crafted statements, some of which may be poorly worded or entirely inappropriate, particularly when taken out of context. As an illustration, take the 2018 diplomatic conflict between Canada and Saudi Arabia, which was triggered by a tweet from Canada's foreign ministry critical about the human rights situation in the kingdom. This tweet led to the suspension of trade and diplomatic ties between the two countries, thereby underlining the potential consequences of poorly

calibrated and communicated stances on digital platforms.[31]

Needless to say, an analysis of digital diplomatic messages also highlights the inherent limitations of the online platforms themselves. These platforms, particularly when used for message delivery to foreign publics, often lack the necessary context to frame communications appropriately. When diplomats communicate in the digital realm, it is important that the intended audiences interpret messages within the intended context; however, the public nature of these platforms frequently leads to mis-interpretations. Alternatively, when diplomats address messages to the foreign public, particularly those of rival or allied states, the expansive reach, visibility and public nature of digital platforms can render such communication susceptible to diverse and often conflicting interpretations, exacerbating the risks of miscommunication.[32]

Another significant challenge concerning digital diplomacy pertains to ethical issues, particularly the tension between transparency and confidentiality. Diplomatic communication traditionally demands a delicate balance between openness and discretion, especially when conducting sensitive

negotiations. It is here where digital platforms, with their inherent bias toward transparency and public accountability, complicate this balancing act by making it difficult to maintain secrecy. Online diplomatic statements often occupy a precarious middle ground, providing just enough information to satisfy the public demands for accountability while carefully withholding critical details to maintain operational confidentiality.[33] The resulting language of diplomatic communiqués is often characterised by intentional vagueness, reflecting efforts to navigate these competing imperatives. As such, as digital platforms revolutionise diplomatic communication, their usage necessitates careful consideration of context, framing, and ethical implications. In addition, this has made it incumbent on the diplomats to adapt to these challenges to ensure effective engagement and mitigate the risks of public missteps and strategic vulnerabilities that are inherent in the digital age.

E. Cultural and Linguistic Considerations in Digital and Traditional Diplomacy

One of the major findings of the study is the critical role of both traditional and digital diplomatic communication in managing diverse cultures and languages across borders. Within the global diplomatic community, effective interaction depends on an acute awareness, if not a comprehensive understanding, of the cultural norms and practices of interlocuters and negotiators. Historically, the presence of skilled interpreters and translators has been essential in ensuring that all parties grasp not only the literal content but also the nuanced implications of the discourse.[34]

In the digital era, linguistic diversity presents both a challenge and an opportunity. These modern communication platforms facilitate the near-instantaneous translation and dissemination of diplomatic messages across multiple languages. However, these same technologies also amplify the risks of mistranslations and culturally insensitive diplomatic messaging. The efficacy of digital diplomacy hinges on the linguistic and cultural competency of those crafting and delivering messages, as even minor linguistic inaccuracies can have far-reaching implications, potentially undermining agreements and straining bilateral or multilateral relations. For instance, in complex multilateral negotiations, such as those involving European Union member states, mistranslations have occasionally led to significant delays and misunderstandings. Mis-

interpreted keywords or phrases have distorted perceptions of policy stances or commitments, necessitating additional meetings for clarifying such misconceptions and thereby prolonging the negotiation process, much to the frustration of stakeholders. Such instances highlight the high stakes associated with maintaining clarity and cultural sensitivity in multilingual diplomatic exchanges.[35] As such, with the digital age continuing to reshape diplomatic practices with the advent of digital platforms and enabling broader reach and accessibility, it makes it incumbent on the diplomatic community to exercise heightened vigilance while crafting messages so as to resonate across linguistic and cultural divides, which is critical to fostering mutual understanding and advancing international cooperation.

Discussion

This subsection explores the consequences of the findings outlined in preceding sections, examining how they enhance our understanding of communication in diplomacy. The discussion situates these results within broader theoretical frameworks and existing scholarship on diplomatic communication in order to address key themes identified in the data analysis. These themes include the role of public diplomacy, digital diplomacy, rhetorical strategies, and non-verbal communication.

Additionally, the practical ramifications of these findings for modern diplomatic practices are analysed, with an emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of these approaches in achieving diplomatic objectives while also acknowledging the challenges they pose in maintaining clarity, nuance, and cultural sensitivity in an increasingly interconnected and digitized world.

A. The Role of Rhetoric in Diplomatic Communication

When analysing traditional means of diplomatic communication, a central feature that one finds is the strategic deployment of rhetoric in speeches and formal statements. World leaders while addressing international audiences, do more than mere conveying of information, which is that they engage in performative acts of statecraft. This performativity is particularly pronounced in multilateral settings like the United Nations General Assembly, where leaders, usually state heads, articulate their national interests while appealing to shared values and norms or at least project a semblance of collective international order, however temporary or illusory that may be.[36]

A salient example is the use of metaphors such as "building bridges" or "extending an olive branch," which encapsulate

aspirations for peace and cooperation. The use of this rhetorical strategy was best exemplified by US President Obama's 2009 Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech. Therein, President Obama adeptly used language that balanced the justification of military action with a commitment to peace. By employing metaphors of 'peace' and 'sacrifice,' Obama subtly framed the overseas military operations of the United States as serving the interests of the global peace agenda.[37] Such a pragmatic projection of the US military actions and intertwining these with an idealistic vision was an attempt to bring global acceptance to Washington's international agenda.

Furthermore, the investigation also revealed that the art of rhetoric in diplomatic communication demands a delicate balance between assertiveness and reconciliation. As such, while diplomatic speeches must assert national interests unequivocally, they must do so without alienating other nations or exacerbating tensions. This revelation aligns with the assertions of Sharp (2013), who held that diplomatic communication is a nuanced negotiation of power dynamics, where diplomats assert their positions without showing any signs of aggression or inflexibility.[38] Such balance is achieved through the use of indirect language, hedging techniques, and diplomatic euphe-

misms, which soften potentially contentious or confrontational messages and statements.

Nevertheless, these findings resonate with the constructivist theory of IR, which underlines the significance of language, identity, and norms in explaining state behaviour.[39] From this perspective, international diplomacy transcends the mere pursuit of material interests and instead engages in using language in the service of the social construction of acceptable state behaviour. By carefully crafting their rhetoric and, even more importantly, their narratives, diplomats project the actions of their nations as virtuous and aligned with prevailing international norms. Parallelly, the diplomats delineate distinctions between their own community and those deemed deviant and unacceptable, thereby reinforcing the legitimacy of their own policy and their international stances. This underlines the complex nexus between language and power in the practice of diplomacy, where IR actors can use rhetorical strategies to present their interests as both realistic and normatively achievable.

B. Non-verbal communication in diplomacy

A key component of traditional diplomatic communication is non-verbal communication. During direct

engagements, elements such as body language, tone, and gestures assume greater significance as they often serve as the primary diplomatic signals during high-stakes meetings and negotiations involving heads of state or government ministers. These non-verbal cues enable negotiators to project sincerity and openness, convey defensiveness, or even express hostility, thereby shaping the trajectory of given diplomatic interactions.[40]

Existing scholarship on diplomatic communication underlines the profound influence of non-verbal communication on negotiation dynamics. Accordingly, non-verbal cues frequently reveal subconscious emotions and intentions that remain unarticulated.[41] A notable example is President Jimmy Carter's adept employment of non-verbal indicators, such as handshakes and physical proximity, during the Camp David negotiations between Egypt and Israel.[42] These gestures conveyed goodwill and fostered trust among the negotiating parties, facilitating an agreement that might have otherwise been derailed by mutual suspicion.

Non-verbal communication assumes even greater importance in the context of multilateral diplomacy, where interactions involve three or more parties from diverse cultural backgrounds. In such settings, non-verbal cues become critical as different cultures often adhere to distinct norms of diplomatic etiquette. These cultural variations influence the "semaphore" of negotiation, where facial expressions, gestures, and postures communicate nuanced signals that may differ subtly yet significantly across cultures.

Furthermore, non-verbal communication assumes even greater significance in the context of multilateral diplomacy, where interactions involve three or more parties from diverse cultural backgrounds. In such settings, non-verbal cues become even more critical as different cultures often adhere to distinct norms of diplomatic etiquette. And these cultural variations influence the 'semaphore' of negotiation, where facial expressions, gestures, and postures communicate nuanced signals that may differ subtly yet significantly across cultures. Consequently, cultural competence emerges as an essential skill in multilateral diplomacy as diplomats must not only interpret but also anticipate the non-verbal cues employed by their counterparts to signal acceptance, rejection, or reservation during negotiations.[43] Any failure to appreciate such cultural nuances has the potential to result in misinterpretations and unintended diplomatic friction, thereby highlighting the necessity of a

nuanced understanding of non-verbal communication in fostering successful multilateral engagements.

C. The Impact of Digital Diplomacy

The nature of diplomatic communication, both between states and with the global public, has undergone a profound transformation due to the reliance on digital platforms in contemporary diplomacy. Analyses of digital diplomatic "texts" demonstrate that platforms such as X and Facebook have not only facilitated instantaneous communication but have also amplified its visibility. The burgeoning scholarship on digital diplomacy largely corroborates these observations, often extending them to emphasize both the unprecedented opportunities and significant challenges presented by the integration of digital platforms into International Relations.[44]

Opportunities:

The primary advantage of digital diplomacy lies in its immediacy, enabling state representatives to respond to rapid global developments in real-time, which is characteristic of an increasingly interconnected world. The Arap Uprising protests of 2010 onwards, also referred to as "Arab Spring," serve as a prominent case study that exemplifies this dynamic, as digital platforms such as X (then Twitter) enabled governments and foreign actors to respond promptly to the unfolding events and shape global narratives in real-time.[45] Unlike traditional diplomacy, which relies on formal and often slow-moving channels between governments, digital diplomacy enables direct communication with the foreign public. This immediacy can be instrumental in countering misperceptions and preventing diplomatic tensions by addressing narratives emanating from their source.[46]

Challenges and Risks:

Despite its advantages, digital diplomacy presents considerable challenges. Chief among these is the increased risk of miscommunication or diplomatic missteps in highly visible public forums. The instantaneous nature of digital communication digital communication amplifies any error, with the potential for a poorly worded message or hasty statement to escalate tensions rapidly. The public and media can magnify mistakes, leaving little room for correction or retraction before any damage is done.[47] After all, speaking to the public through a medium that is so fast and so public can lead to several seemingly hasty statements, ill-conceived messages, or just plain poor wording. This shows the precarious balance that the diplomats must maintain in crafting public

messaging to avoid creating diplomatic tensions imbroglios.

Moreover, digital platforms impose technical limitations, such as the requirement for brevity by X, which often necessitates oversimplification of complex diplomatic issues. While conciseness is a practical necessity, it risks diluting the nuance that is critical in diplomacy, where the precise choice of words carries significant weight, particularly in sensitive negotiations or crises.[48] For instance, a badly phrased tweet or an out-of-context quote may escalate tensions in the most limited time, as digital platforms do not offer the possibility of control that private diplomatic discussions afford. The rapid speed of information dissemination on social media leaves little room for correction or retraction in case of a miscommunication from diplomats.[49] As such, while digital diplomacy affords the advantage of speed and reach, it amplifies the risks of diplomatic gaffes and missteps in international relations. Therefore, this can lead to the loss of nuance, something very significant in diplomacy, which can misrepresent a state's position, thereby inadvertently creating misunderstandings or exacerbating existing tensions.

Limitations in Multilateral Contexts:

However, the informality and brevity encouraged by digital platforms often undermine this delicate balancing act, particularly in multilateral settings where messages must navigate intricate power dynamics and competing interests.

Digital platforms also pose distinct limitations of digital platforms in multilateral diplomacy, where interactions involve diverse actors with varying cultural, political, and linguistic backgrounds. Effective digital diplomacy requires a high degree of cultural competence, necessitating the careful framing of messages to account for differing cultural norms and expectations across audiences.[50] However, the informality and brevity, as encouraged by digital platforms, often undermine this delicate balancing act, particularly in multilateral settings, where diplomatic messages must navigate complex power dynamics and competing interests.

This is compounded by the absence of non-verbal cues in digital communication. Traditional diplomacy relies heavily on non-verbal signals through gestures, facial expressions, and tone to convey sincerity, establish trust, and mitigate ambiguities. All these non-verbal elements, essential for interpreting intent and managing emotional undercurrents, are absent in digital diplomatic communication, thereby increasing the risk of misinterpretation, particularly in

emotionally charged or high-stakes situations.[51] Such void highlights the limitations of digital diplomacy in replicating the depth and nuance of traditional face-to-face interactions.

Following the above assertions, while digital diplomacy may have transformed the landscape of international relations by offering speed and accessibility, it simultaneously introduced significant risks and constraints in the conduct of diplomacy. This follows from the inherent limitations of digital platforms, coupled with their public and instantaneous nature, which necessitate a recalibration of diplomatic strategies to mitigate the risks of miscommunication and oversimplification. Therefore, in this evolving dynamic, a nuanced understanding of cultural contexts, careful message framing, and an appreciation of the constraints of digital media are imperative to maximize the opportunities and minimize the pitfalls of digital diplomacy.

D. Public Diplomacy and Soft Power in the Digital Era

The findings highlight an increasingly important dimension of public diplomacy in the digital age. Public diplomacy, defined as the practice of engaging with foreign publics to shape international perceptions, has long been a strategic tool for states to cultivate soft power, which in turn is the ability to influence others through attraction rather than coercion.[52] As such, this practice has evolved in the digital era, taking new dimensions as digital platforms enable states to communicate directly with foreign publics, bypassing traditional media and diplomatic channels.[53]

Digital platforms thus offer states a unique avenue to engage in public diplomacy and project values, culture, and policies to a global audience, enhance their soft power and shape international narratives. The analysis of digital diplomatic texts reveals that many states employ social media to disseminate messages about humanitarian missions, national cultural heritage, and their contribution to addressing global challenges such as climate change and peacekeeping. In return, these efforts aim to construct a positive international image and foster goodwill among foreign publics, with the ultimate objective of leveraging this goodwill in multilateral diplomatic negotiations.[54]

While digital platforms afford states significant opportunities for engagement, these new communication channels also bring heightened scrutiny, especially concerning authenticity and credibility. Public scepticism toward state-sponsored messages, particularly when perceived as

self-serving or propagandistic, poses a significant challenge. It is here where the diplomats are required to tread carefully in promoting the interests of their countries without appearing disingenuous or manipulative. As Hocking (2016) emphasises, effective diplomacy in the digital age requires a high degree of transparency, cultural sensitivity, and responsiveness. States that engage authentically with foreign publics, rather than merely disseminating propaganda, are more likely to succeed in cultivating soft power and shaping international perceptions.

Additionally, digital platforms are inherently interactive, necessitating a shift in diplomatic practice from one-way communication to two-way engagement. Traditional diplomacy, characterized by formal exchanges between states, must adapt to the demands of a digital environment where diplomats engage directly with foreign publics. This requires new skills, including public outreach, managing dialogue, responding to criticism, and addressing questions, all the while maintaining strategic direction and professional decorum.[55] As such, in this context, digital diplomacy transforms the role of diplomats from behind-the-scenes negotiators to visible public figures who are required to actively participate in shaping international discourse. The ability to balance national interests with responsiveness to public sentiment becomes critical, as does the capacity to adapt messaging strategies to diverse cultural and political contexts. This finding thus highlights that while digital platforms offer unparalleled opportunities for engagement and influence, these also require an equally unprecedented level of competence, credibility, and cultural acuity.

E. The Future of Diplomatic Communication

Going forward, diplomatic communication is set to assume a hybrid mode by integrating both traditional and digital forms of diplomacy. While digital diplomacy offers certain advantages in terms of speed, reach, and public engagement, it cannot fully replace the environment of face-to-face diplomacy, which is characterised by greater control, nuance and illustrative depth. Traditional diplomatic meetings, summits, and negotiations will remain indispensable in high-stakes diplomatic scenarios where confidentiality, trust, and cultural understanding remain paramount.[56]

However, digital platforms are expected to increasingly complement traditional channels of diplomatic practice, particularly in the public diplomacy sphere and soft power projection. As states actively engage

with global audiences through social media and other digital tools, one of the most critical skills for diplomats will be crafting culturally sensitive and impactful messages that resonate with diverse publics. The dynamic nature of digital diplomacy, shaped by technological, media, and geopolitical shifts, necessitates continuous adaptation and training to remain effective.[57]

Moreover, results highlight the growing complexity of multilateral diplomacy in the digital age. As more and more diplomatic activity occurs in public forums, the task of managing multiple stakeholders with competing interests becomes increasingly intricate. Similarly, diplomats must skilfully leverage such digital platforms for coalition building, response coordination, and conflict management in ways that are both transparent and inclusive. This requires new modalities of diplomatic communication and a deeper understanding of the framing effects that digital platforms have on international relations.

Consequently, there are critical implications for contemporary diplomatic practices. Firstly, diplomats must recognise the inherent constraints of digital platforms in delivering complex and nuanced messages. However, while digital tools enhance immediacy and outreach, they cannot substitute for the depth and confidentiality offered by face-to-face communications, particularly in high-level negotiations. As such, the future of diplomacy lies in embracing the complementarity of digital and traditional diplomatic approaches rather than allowing one to overshadow the other.

Secondly, the prominence of public diplomacy in the digital era requires an expanded skill set for diplomats. Beyond traditional state-to-state negotiations, one must excel in engaging and persuading foreign publics. This involves crafting messages tailored to diverse constituencies, managing public outreach, and maintaining strategic pacing in the fast-paced digital landscape.

Thirdly, as diplomacy becomes public and globalised, cultural competence and linguistic proficiency assume greater significance. This makes it incumbent on diplomats to navigate the cultural and linguistic contexts that shape how their messages are received and interpreted. This calls for continuous training and adaptation to address the evolving demands of both traditional and digital diplomatic communication.

Conclusion

This paper investigated the role of communication in diplomacy by

focusing on both traditional and digital forms of diplomatic interaction. Through an analysis of diplomatic speeches, communiqués, and digital diplomatic messages, it provided valuable insights into rhetorical strategies, themes, and challenges that shape diplomatic interactions in the contemporary international system. The findings reaffirm the lasting significance of traditional diplomatic communication forms, including written agreements, in international relations. Diplomatic rhetoric, characterised by its persuasiveness, cooperative tone, and strategic ambiguity, remains an essential tool for negotiations to assert national interests while navigating complex power dynamics. Moreover, the significance of non-verbal communication in face-to-face interactions, such as trust-building, signalling intentions, and conflict resolution, cannot be substituted in digital environments.

However, the advent of digital diplomacy has introduced new dynamics into diplomatic communication, presenting both opportunities and challenges. Digital platforms like X and Facebook enable states to engage with the global public in real-time, enhancing their ability to shape international narratives and cultivate soft power. As this paper has identified, the speed and public nature of these platforms equally amplified the risks of miscommunication and diplomatic missteps. In particular, the challenges posed by digital diplomacy underline the need for diplomats to develop new communication strategies that address the limitations of digital platforms while maintaining the nuance and depth required in high-stakes diplomacy. Additionally, as the world becomes increasingly interconnected, effective communication across a wide array of cultural, linguistic, and technological contexts is becoming a critical skill for diplomats.

With such a broader discussion of the imperatives of digital diplomatic tools, this study has attempted to provide a deeper understanding of the evolving nature of communication in the practice of diplomacy, highlighting the interplay between its traditional and modern forms. While the findings reveal significant challenges, they also suggest that diplomatic communication adapts in response to the changing global political landscape. Nevertheless, despite this examination, there exists an avenue to explore these dynamics further, particularly how emerging technologies and cultural factors will continue to shape the practice of diplomacy. ∎

References

1. Harold Nicolson, *Diplomacy (*London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1950)

2. G. R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 5th ed., 2015), p. 1

3. Van Dinh Tran, *Communication and Diplomacy in a Changing World* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987), p. 8.

4. op. cit. 2, p. 10-14.

5. Ilan Manor, *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 1-25.

6. Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President at the Acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize," *The White House Archives*. Available at: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov (2009)

7. op. cit. 5, p. 44-45.

8. Kishan S. Rana, *21st Century Diplomacy: A Practitioner's Guide* (New York: Continuum, 2011), p. 11-37.

9. US State Department (2009), "Long Description for Digital Diplomacy Infographic," Available at: https://2009-2017.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/perfrpt/2013/html/221318.htm

10. op. cit. 5

11. Christer Jönsson & Martin Hall, "Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy," *International Studies Perspectives,* 4, no. 2 (May 2003), p. 195-210

12. Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 5th ed., 2018)

13. John W. Creswell & Cheryl N. Poth, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 4th ed., 2016)

14. Brian Hocking, "Diplomacy in the Digital Age: Soft Power, Cyber-Diplomacy, and New Forms of Diplomacy," *International Affairs*, 92, no. 5 (2016): p. 1175-1196; See also, Corneliu Bjola & Marcus Holmes, *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2015)

15. Norman Fairclough, *Language and Power* (London: Routledge, 3rd ed., 2015)

16. Virginia Braun & Victoria Clarke, "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, no. 2 (2006): p. 77-101, Available from: http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11735

17. Joshua Aaron Tucker et al., "Social Media, Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature," *SSRN* (19 March 2018), Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3144139

18. Denis McQuail, *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory* (SAGE Publications, 2000); ibid.

19. op. cit. 8, p. 105-108.

20. G. R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 5th ed., 2015), p. 169-182

21. op. cit. 6.

22. UNifeed, "SUMMIT OF THE FUTURE / CHINA," *The United Nations* (2024), Available at: https://media.un.org/unifeed/en/asset/d325/d3258632

23. op. cit. 20, p. 72-75

24. Evan S. Medeiros & M. Taylor Fravel, "China's New Diplomacy in Asia," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2003).

25. Michael Grubb, Christiaan Vrolijk & Duncan Brack, *The Kyoto Protocol: A Guide and Assessment* (London: Earthscan, 1999).

26. Ilan Manor, *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 29-65.

27. Sejung Park et al., "Analytical framework for evaluating digital diplomacy using network analysis and topic modeling: Comparing South Korea and Japan," *Information Processing & Management*, 56, no. 4 (July 2019): 1468-1483.

28. Nadege Rolland, *China's Eurasian Century? Political and Strategic Implications of the Belt and Road Initiative* (Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2020)

29 . Evan H. Potter, "Canada and the New Public Diplomacy," *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis*, 58 no. 1 (2003): p. 43-64.

30. Mark Gallom (2018), Canada-Saudi spat highlights perils of Twitter Dlomacy, *CBC,* 9 August 2018, Available at: https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/saudi-arabia-tweet-sanctions-canada-twitter-1.4777825.

31. Olubukola S. Adesina, "Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy," *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3, no. 1 (2017): p. 1-13

32. Kishan S. Rana, *21st Century Diplomacy: A Practitioner's Guide* (New York: Continuum, 2011), p. 11-30.

33. Costas M. Constantinou, "Between Statecraft and Humanism: Diplomacy and Its Forms of Knowledge," *International Studies Review*, 15, no. 2 (2013): p.141-162.

34. David Graddol, "The Future of Language," *Science*, 303, no. 5662 (2004): p.1329-1331.

35. G. R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 5th ed., 2015), p. 185-216.

36 .op. cit. 6.

37. Paul Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

38. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

39. op. cit. 32, p. 105-108.

40. Christer Jönsson and Martin Hall, "Communication: An Essential Aspect of Diplomacy," *International Studies Perspectives,* 4, no. 2 (May 2003): p. 195-210

41. William B. Quandt, *Camp David: Peacemaking and Politics* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 1986)

42 .op. cit. 35, p. 111.

43 .Corneliu Bjola & Marcus Holmes, *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2015), p. 1-10

44. Philip N. Howard & Muzammil M. Hussain, *Democracy's Fourth Wave? Digital Media and the Arab Spring* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

45. Ilan Manor, *The Digitalization of Public Diplomacy* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), p. 1-28.

46. Brian Hocking, "Diplomacy in the Digital Age: Soft Power, Cyber-Diplomacy, and New Forms of Diplomacy," *International Affairs*, 92, no. 5 (2016): p. 1175-1196.

47. op. cit. 45, p. 217-256.

48. op. cit. 46.

49. G. R. Berridge, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 5th ed., 2015), p. 186.

50. Kishan S. Rana, 21st Century Diplomacy: A Practitioner's Guide (New York: Continuum, 2011), p. 105-18.

51. Joseph Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004)

52 . op. cit. 43, p. 1-10.

53 . op. cit. 45, p. 240-256.

54. op. cit. 43, p. 199-206.

55. op. cit. 50, p. 1-10

56 . op. cit. 43, p. 57.

Note for readers and subscribers

We are happy to inform you that from January 2009 we have introduced the system of peer review of articles to ensure quality of publications and improve the scholarly value of our journal. We have a renowned group of scholars and academicians associated with our Centre and they are helping us in this process. We are grateful to them for their kind support and cooperation.

We would request our readers and subscribers to take note of these changes and we would, as ever, encourage them to send in research articles for publication to us. The manuscripts of research papers submitted for publication should be neatly typed in double space and the length of the papers should be ideally between 3,000-5000 words including the references. They should contain an abstract and a short introduction of the author. The authors should use Chicago Manual Style for their references. The articles can be sent to us in an electronic format, preferably Ms Word. For detailed guidelines they may send their queries to us in the following address.

Journal of Peace Studies
Research Section

Emails: cpsndjps@gmail.com, jps@icpsnet.org