

EPISTEMOLOGICAL STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY,
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES

ISSN 2618-1274 (Print), ISSN 2618-1282 (Online)

Journal home page: <https://visnukpfs.dp.ua/index.php/PFS/index>

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

Іван Костянтинович ГОЛОВКО

Кандидат політичних наук,
доцент кафедри міжнародних відносин,
Дніпровський національний університет
імені Олеся Гончара,
пр. Науки, 72, Дніпро, 49000, Україна

E-mail: ivan.dnu@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2907-3046>

Ivan HOLOVKO

PhD of political sciences,
Associate Professor of International Relations
Department,
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University,
Nauka Ave., 72, Dnipro, 49000, Ukraine

УДК 327.8

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY IN MODERN
SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE: THE ROLE OF PARADIPLOMACY**

Received 9 June 2024; revised 24 June 2024; accepted 28 June 2024

DOI: 10.15421/342429

Abstract

The article reveals the essence of the concept of public diplomacy and a retrospective of its formation in the current scientific discourse. It is noted that the field of US public diplomacy is quite actively researched by modern scientists. It is shown that the term “public diplomacy” should be understood as the activity of various actors, both governmental and non-governmental, which is intended to explain to the foreign public the foreign policy pursued by the country and to encourage this or that state to make its foreign policy decisions in the direction that is beneficial to the given actor. It has been established that the concept of “cultural diplomacy” is narrower than the concept of “public diplomacy”, which should be understood as a set of activities carried out by both central and foreign bodies of external relations of the state with the aim of researching the attitude and informing the foreign public, as well as establishing contacts abroad, with the aim of improving the state’s image and achieving national interests. So, in the United States of America, there is no separation of “cultural diplomacy” from “public diplomacy”. The concept of paradiplomacy is also considered as a tool of activity of subnational actors in the international arena and components of diplomatic communication processes taking place in the modern world. It has been proven that paradiplomacy is an integral part of modern international relations along with public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy.

Keywords: *public diplomacy, soft power, cultural diplomacy, paradiplomacy, foreign policy strategy, governmental actors, non-state mechanisms of influence.*

**СТАНОВЛЕННЯ КОНЦЕПТУ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ В СУЧАСНОМУ
НАУКОВОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: РОЛЬ ПАРАДИПЛОМАТІЇ**

Анотація

У статті розкривається сутність поняття публічної дипломатії та ретроспектива його становлення в сучасному науковому дискурсі. Зазначається, що сфера публічної дипломатії США досить активно досліджується сучасними вченими. Показано, що під терміном «публічна дипломатія» слід розуміти діяльність різних суб’єктів, як урядових, так і неурядових, яка має на меті роз’яснити іноземній громадськості зовнішню політику, яку проводить країна, та заохотити ту чи іншу державу приймати зовнішньополітичні рішення в тому напрямку, який вигідний даному актору. Встановлено, що поняття «культурна дипломатія» є вузьчим за поняття «публічна дипломатія», під якою слід розуміти комплекс заходів, що здійснюються як центральними, так і зовнішніми органами зовнішніх зв’язків держави з метою дослідження ставлення та інформування іноземної громадськості. а також встановлення контактів за кордоном, з метою покращення іміджу держави та досягнення національних інтересів. Так, у Сполучених Штатах Америки не існує відокремлення «культурної дипломатії» від «публічної дипломатії». Також, розглядається поняття парадипломатія, як інструмент діяльності субнаціональних акторів на міжнародній арені та складова дипломатичних процесів комунікації, що відбуваються в сучасному світі. Доведено, що парадипломатія є невід’ємною складовою сучасних міжнародних відносин на ряду з публічною дипломатією та культурною дипломатією

Ключові слова: *публічна дипломатія, м’яка сила, культурна дипломатія, парадипломатія,*

Formulation of the problem.

Public diplomacy traditionally occupies an important place in US foreign policy. To date, in the United States, the effectiveness of public diplomacy is recognized at the official level, the need to use it to create a favorable atmosphere abroad, contributes to the effective conduct of American political or economic actions.

From the second half of the 20th century, the external cultural expansion of the USA began, which turned out to be an effective tool of the foreign policy of the American government, even if we are talking about non-state mechanisms for the implementation of public diplomacy (moreover, it is at the level of these non-state mechanisms that the strongest influence is exerted).

Knowledge of the institutions and instruments of public diplomacy of the USA will allow to better understand the foreign policy of the United States, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of the information and image work of the state and the need for the development of this direction of diplomacy in Ukraine. The uniqueness of the United States, compared to other world states, lies in the existence of a dense network of connections and contacts that connects it with the population of almost all countries of the world – a network that exists independently of any official channels of interstate interaction. All this determines the relevance of research on the implementation of US public diplomacy.

Literature review.

Among the group of Ukrainian scientists, it is worth highlighting the works of O.Vysotskyi and I.Gavrylenko, in which researchers analyze the peculiarities of the implementation of US public diplomacy in general and in Ukraine. I.Gavrylenko reveals the origin and evolution of this activity of the USA, identifies specific features. Special attention is paid to the question of the effectiveness of US public and cultural diplomacy. The cultural diplomacy of the USA in the cultural and propaganda context is highlighted in his work by V.Rozumniuk. It should also be noted the works of G.Shemayeva and F.Bafoyev, in which researchers analyze the essence of cultural diplomacy and its significance for the modern system of interna-

tional relations. The evolution of the US cultural diplomacy strategy is analyzed in the work of Ukrainian researcher O.Kuchmiy. It is also worth noting the work of I.Misiuk, in which the scientist analyzes the institutional support of US public diplomacy. The article by M.Trofimenko analyzes the structure and peculiarities of the activities of the US diplomatic service, which is one of the most professional, modern, effective and ensures the global leadership of the US in the world. The group of American scientists is represented by the works of S.Brown, J.Fuller, E.Mason, and N.Pashios and others, which analyzed certain aspects of the implementation of US public diplomacy in different regions of the world. It is also necessary to single out the works of M.Cummings and N.Kull. Thus, scientist M.Cummings devotes his research to the analysis of the institutions and mechanisms of implementation of US cultural diplomacy. In his work, N.Kull analyzes the evolution of US cultural diplomacy. which is one of the most professional, modern, efficient and ensures global leadership of the USA in the world. The group of American scientists is represented by the works of S.Brown, J.Fuller, E.Mason, and N.Pashios and others, which analyzed certain aspects of the implementation of US public diplomacy in different regions of the world. It is also necessary to single out the works of M.Cummings and N.Kull. Thus, scientist M.Cummings devotes his research to the analysis of the institutions and mechanisms of implementation of US cultural diplomacy. In his work, N.Kull analyzes the evolution of US cultural diplomacy. which is one of the most professional, modern, efficient and ensures global leadership of the USA in the world. The group of American scientists is represented by the works of S.Brown, J.Fuller, E.Mason, and N.Pashios and others, which analyzed certain aspects of the implementation of US public diplomacy in different regions of the world. It is also necessary to single out the works of M.Cummings and N.Kull. Thus, scientist M.Cummings devotes his research to the analysis of the institutions and mechanisms of implementation of US cultural diplomacy. In his work, N.Kull analyzes the evolution of US cultural diplomacy. which analyzed

certain aspects of the implementation of US public diplomacy in different regions of the world. It is also necessary to single out the works of M.Cummings and N.Kull. Thus, scientist M.Cummings devotes his research to the analysis of the institutions and mechanisms of implementation of US cultural diplomacy. In his work, N.Kull analyzes the evolution of US cultural diplomacy. which analyzed certain aspects of the implementation of US public diplomacy in different regions of the world. It is also necessary to single out the works of M.Cummings and N.Kull. Thus, scientist M.Cummings devotes his research to the analysis of the institutions and mechanisms of implementation of US cultural diplomacy. In his work, N.Kull analyzes the evolution of US cultural diplomacy.

The purpose of this work consists in the characteristics of theoretical and methodological developments in the field of research on US public diplomacy.

Presenting of the main material.

Today, the factor of culture as a component of “soft power” in world politics acquires a new sound, its influence on global socio-economic processes and interstate relations is seriously growing. In this regard, states are beginning to pay more and more attention to their public and cultural diplomacy.

Within our study, the key categories are “soft power”, “cultural diplomacy” and “public diplomacy”.

There is no single definition of “soft power” in scientific literature. Nevertheless, J.Nye defines soft power (or soft influence, power) as “the ability to achieve what you want by attracting and persuading others to adopt your goals. It differs from hard power, the ability to use the “whip and gingerbread” of economic and military leverage to force others to do your will. Both types of power are important... but it is much cheaper to attract than to coerce’ [Nye 2004: 27].

Scientist H.Filimonov considers “soft power” in the focus of global economic, socio-political and cultural processes that form a new system of international relations, in which classical hierarchical models of relations between international actors begin to give way to network structures [Fylymonov 2004: 70]. For him, “soft power” is

a symbolic concept that reflects American political thinking and US approaches to understanding the specifics of the non-military components of the state’s foreign policy power.

The term “cultural diplomacy” was introduced into scientific circulation by the American researcher F.Barghorn, who defined it as the manipulation of cultural materials and personnel for propaganda purposes. This interpretation shows that cultural diplomacy is considered as an ideological tool, a political-technological tool [Shemayeva 2018: 74].

Cultural diplomacy is a component of the concept of “soft power”, which by its very nature, unlike “hard power”, has the ability to “persuade through culture, values and ideas”. This belief was reflected in the developer of the theory of “soft power” Joseph Nye. Harvard University professor J.Nye characterizes “soft power” as the ability of a specific country to be attractive to partners and to demand the desired behavior from them without resorting to violence or bribery. Thus, a state with a high moral authority and an impeccable reputation is able to achieve the required result in its foreign policy activities much more efficiently and with the least costs than a state that relies exclusively on the paradigm of hard power, that is, military power and sanctions levers of influence [Nye 2004: 6].

American political scientist M.Cummings calls cultural diplomacy “the exchange of ideas, information, values, beliefs and other aspects of culture with the aim of strengthening mutual understanding” [Cummings 2003: 1]. That is, cultural diplomacy is a set of practical actions in the field of interstate cultural interaction. Cultural diplomacy is considered as the main component of the concept of “public diplomacy”, which means informing the international public, supporting and developing contacts with other peoples in the field of education and culture, which is aimed at creating an attractive image of the country abroad.

In turn, E.Onukh, a practicing cultural diplomat, ex-director of the Polish Institute in Ukraine and the USA believes that “diplomacy is part of culture, and not the other way around, which is often forgotten by professional diplomats, and even more often by politicians. Cultural

diplomacy is a multi-year activity, an instrument of state policy, designed for a long-term perspective, and therefore should not be a specific tool of the political orientation that prevails at the moment. Cultural diplomacy is the sale of the country's image by means of culture" [Oleshko 2017].

Cultural diplomacy, with its successful implementation, can serve as a very strong auxiliary ideological tool that accompanies the implementation of the general foreign policy strategy of the state, creating a solid foundation that allows the state not only to defend and promote its national interests on the world stage, but also to directly influence various political, economic, social processes in the world. "Soft power" as a force in international relations is always connected with diplomacy, because every state needs to represent its people and culture in the international arena. Therefore, in theoretical and practical terms, much attention is paid to such a concept as "public diplomacy". According to J. Nai, public diplomacy has the following parameters: – daily communication, the purpose of which is the clarification of political and administrative decisions in the field of internal and foreign policy of the state, while the emphasis is on the foreign press in order to form the international image of the country; – strategic communication, which deals with the planning of symbolic actions and communications throughout the year to provide such a brand to the central themes; – development of long-term relations with individuals of other countries for many years through a system of various conferences, seminars, exchanges, etc. [Nye 2004: 97].

It is worth noting that in the USA there are specific features of the understanding of the term "cultural diplomacy" in the context of proximity, but not identity, to the term "public diplomacy". Unlike Great Britain or Germany, where activity in the field of culture is singled out as a specific foreign policy method, for the implementation of which bodies were created that only deal with its use – respectively, the British Council and the Goethe Institute, in the United States there is no separation of "cultural diplomacy" from "public". Although these two types of diplomatic activity are not consciously distinguished in US diplomatic practice, "public diplomacy" is a

broader concept, because it includes influencing the public opinion of another state by all available means, and therefore not all types of public diplomacy can be called cultural diplomacy.

"Public diplomacy" can be defined as a set of activities carried out by both the central and foreign bodies of external relations of the state with the aim of researching the attitude and informing the foreign public, as well as establishing contacts abroad, with the aim of improving the image of the state and achieving national interests.

Cultural diplomacy is a complex of purposeful actions aimed at exchanging ideas, information, values, traditions, beliefs and other aspects of culture with the aim of promoting intercultural understanding [Lutsenko, Piskors'ka 2011: 87].

The term "cultural diplomacy" is narrower and is used to describe cultural programs as one of the components of the state's foreign cultural policy. The main function of public diplomacy, in fact, is to lobby the interests of a certain state abroad, but primarily not among governments, but among the public of other countries. Since the emergence of the concept of "public diplomacy", and it was introduced into science by the American diplomat E. Gallion in the 1960s, in the sense of the conscious active activity of informing the foreign public about the actions of the state in domestic and foreign policy, mainly for the purpose of forming understanding and, if possible, a favorable attitude, to the greatest extent it was associated with the practice of the United States of America.

In fact, all official state officials participate in public diplomacy: presidents, leading members of the administration, congressmen, as well as public figures, famous scientists, journalists, etc. Their performances are watched by millions of people in the United States and around the world. Another example, close to public diplomacy, is the radio address to the American people every Saturday, started by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which was actually addressed not only to US citizens, but also to the whole world [Bafoev 2016: 665].

The system of objects of cultural diplomacy includes cinematography, choreography, music, painting, sculpture, exhibition activities, educational programs, scientific exchanges, opening of

libraries, translation of literary works, broadcast of cultural programs, interreligious dialogue, etc. Among the subjects of cultural diplomacy, as a rule, the following are named: state administration bodies, business entities that are engaged by the state as a monopolist in foreign policy activities, non-governmental organizations [Bafoev 2016: 667].

So, the concept of “soft power” was formulated only at the end of the 20th century. As a systemic phenomenon and precisely the processes of globalization and the development of the latest information technologies have radically increased the importance of communication processes and informational influences. Under public diplomacy is the activity of various actors, both governmental and non-governmental, which is designed to explain to the foreign public the foreign policy pursued by the country and to encourage one or another state to make its foreign policy decisions in the direction that is beneficial to the given actor.

Paradiplomacy is the key mechanism for the entry of subnational actors into international relations. Paradiplomacy is a relatively new concept in world politics, however, as noted by J.Rosenau, it demonstrates a steady tendency to divide international politics into “two worlds” - state and non-state actors. Paradiplomacy is manifested in the activation of the activities of subnational actors, i.e. intrastate, border regions on the world stage, while each of them focuses on close foreign economic, political, cultural and other ties with various foreign countries and has its own specific forms of representation on the international stage [Holovko 2017].

The postulate that “democracy in general contributes to reducing the size of jurisdictions” is known in domestic and foreign literature. Usually, democratization and liberalization lead to administrative and governmental decentralization in nation-states. Consequently, paradiplomacy is more common in countries with market economies, democratically elected national government, elected subnational government and local government officials, as well as competing political parties and human rights mechanisms, including property rights.

The main motives of paradiplomatic activity,

according to the representative of the North American school Ivo Duhachek, are politics, economy, culture and ecology [Grachevska 2014]. Political motives can be aimed not only at attracting the attention of the central government and international society, but also have a separatist character. The American researcher J.Kincaid emphasizes that the solution to the problem of separatism is not to suppress the international activity of the region, but to resolve internal conflicts as a priority. A condition for the center’s effective regional policy is the democratic mechanisms for its implementation, which provide for “compliance of the measures with the interests and expectations of regional communities” [Kincaid 2001].

The international activity of regions depends on their structural capabilities (domestic and international), which can change the motives and strategies of regions. Domestic capabilities mean the level of autonomy, which is determined by the form of the state system, the constitution and other legal documents. The geographic position and resources of the region (natural, labor, economic, etc.) should be added to the classification of domestic opportunities. The British scientist M.Keating attributes globalization, the complication of international relations and the decline of the role of the state to the international opportunities of the regions: “capital, goods, services and, to a lesser extent, people have found mobility, they cannot be kept within the borders of one state” [Keating 2008].

The author of the term paradiplomacy, Ivo Duhachek, argued that the subnational government uses certain mechanisms (“participation channels”) to carry out its policy in the international arena: the opening of permanent representative offices of regions, business trips abroad and participation in conferences of representatives of local authorities, holding international trade and industrial -investment exhibitions [Holovko 2018]. M.Keating, in turn, divided the channels of participation into two forms of international interaction – bilateral partnership and interregional network cooperation. Bilateral partnership is implemented between regions artificially separated by borders, and interregional cooperation in the network is carried out by regions without a common border, but with similar

goals and tasks for the development of the local community and regional economy. The main mechanism for implementing network cooperation is the creation of interregional associations, which become a platform for communication and finding contacts. Based on the ideas of the British political scientist M. Keating, when analyzing the relations between the center and the regions, it is necessary to turn to the legal and political factors of the relationship, giving preference to the latter way of observing the “change of attitude towards paradiplomacy with the change of regional elites” [Keating 2008].

A. Lecours, a representative of the theory of paradiplomacy, points to the lack of theoretical explanations of “methods of creating actors of world politics, factors affecting their behavior and formulating the strategy of international activity” [Lecours 2016]. The theory of constructivism significantly complements the concept of paradiplomacy. At the center of the constructivist paradigm is the interaction of agents (actors), mainly states, creating social reality in the macro- and microstructural environment, that is, at the global and regional level. Based on the systemic approach, the following elements can be distinguished in cross-border cooperation (microstructural level) – intrastate regions and cities, internal structure – interregional connections, external structure – interaction between states (macrostructural level). Various micro- and macro-structural factors of the external environment affect the activity of international cooperation of regions [Holovko 2018]. Norms of international law regulating cross-border cooperation, basic principles of cooperation within the framework of regional organizations, tools for supporting cross-border cooperation form a group of macro-structural factors.

American constructivist A. Wendt points out in his studies that “the nature of international life is determined by the beliefs and expectations that agents have about each other, and this is established by social, not material structures.” The concept of “agent” reflects the social and cultural control of the system over individuals and/or social communities, and the role they seek (consciously or unconsciously) to play in accordance with the expectations of others based on the

agent’s social status [Wendt 2001].

As the researcher of cross-border regionalization E. Shlapeko points out, obtaining the status of an agent occurs through socialization, internationalization and cultural selection. Regarding the formation of cross-border regions, it looks as follows [Shlapeko 2015].

Socialization – the inclusion of regions in the system of relations within the international society with the help of both persuasion and “normative pressure”. Regional integration is also facilitated by the process of Westernization, which implies the adaptation of Western norms, decisions, and values through institutional cooperation between national and subnational actors. International agreements and conventions, rules of participation in subregional organizations, such as the Madrid Convention of 1980, the European Charter of Local Self-Government of 1985, can be attributed to the norms regulating behavior. Constructivists describe socialization using such concepts as “intersubjectivity” (common understanding, unity of ideas in the field of international relations) and “identity” (self-representation, self-perception and dissimilarity of an individual with others) [Holovko 2018].

One of the most important for the constructivist approach is the relationship between the concepts of interest and identity of the agent. Notions of agents’ interests and preferences provide identities that are reflected in social events, norms, and processes.

The formation of regional identity is one of the foundations of “new regionalism” and the highest degree of regional integration according to the scale of the European political scientist B. Hettne. Identity is formed as a result of everyday practice and contacts between individuals of different levels – from professional politicians to ordinary citizens. The processes of regionalization of individual states are connected not so much with the economic and political claims of the authorities, but with cultural self-identification, the preservation of traditions in the given territory [Holovko 2017].

Political scientist A. Makarychev develops the concept of “soft regionalism”, according to which the “epistemological community” has a significant influence on the process of

constructing ideas and forming the institutional structure of the region. According to the theory of social capital, “the presence of a strong regional identity contributes to economic prosperity” [Holovko 2018]. However, the creation of regional identity is often associated with the emergence of nationalist movements and separatist tendencies. According to the French scientist A.Lecours, nationalism is the most important factor determining paradiplomacy: “regions with strong nationalist movements are more likely to create an international image” [Lecours 2018].

As for the cultural component, the evolution of agents of the international system is accompanied by “cultural selection” in the form of imitation (one-sided reproduction) of successful experience or learning (a two-way process that requires interaction between the source of experience and the recipient). In cross-border cooperation, cultural selection takes place through the implementation of projects and the creation of joint development strategies. Training can be expressed in the participation of regions in international organizations, such as the Council of Ministers of the Nordic countries or the Barents region. Organizations of this type accumulate intellectual capital, involving the expert and scientific community. Data exchange, holding round tables and working meetings allows finding solutions to common problems, and then applying the lessons learned in the regions. An important role in this process is given to institutions codified in formal norms and rules, but which have

motivational power only due to the socialization of actors and their participation in collective knowledge. Such institutions should include official relations based on agreements, activities of working groups, Euroregions and cross-border regions [Holovko 2020].

Conclusions.

Thus, public diplomacy should be understood as a whole set of activities that are used through specific communication channels to form and promote a positive image of the country in the world, activities are carried out by both central and foreign bodies of external relations of the state with the aim of researching the attitude and informing the foreign public. The timely emergence and effective activity of paradiplomacy, which appeared together with the processes of regionalization, and their direct relationship, can be interpreted as a response to the processes of institutionalization, globalization, and regionalization, and the processes of regionalization themselves should be considered a factor in the emergence of paradiplomacy. It is also worth noting that paradiplomacy uses tools that do not differ significantly from the tools of classical diplomacy. The main approaches and mechanisms of activities of paradiplomacy actors, aimed at mobilizing regional resources, fully justify themselves and contribute to the implementation of initiatives designed to ensure the interests of regions and their citizens in the field of external relations.

Бібліографічні посилання

- Cummings, M. (2009). Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey. *Americans for the Arts*, 1-15.
- Keating, M. (2008). *Paradiplomacy and regional networking. Forum of Federations: an International Federalism*. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://www.forumfed.org/libdocs/ForRelCU01/924-FRCU0105-eu-keating.pdf> (дата звернення 15.11.2023)
- Kincaid, J. (2001). Foreign Relations of Constituent Units: Working Paper. *Forum of Federations. Winnipeg*. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://www.forumfed.org/libdocs/ForRelCU01/924-FRCU0105-int-kincaid.pdf> (дата звернення 05.05.2024)
- Lecours A. (2002). When Regions Go Abroad: Globalization, Nationalism and Federalism. *Globalization, Multilevel Governance and Democracy: Continental, Comparative and Global Perspectives*. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: https://www.jura.fu-berlin.de/fachbereich/einrichtungen/oeffentliches-recht/lehrende/bolewskiw/dokumente/5__Para_diplomacy/Lecours_When_regions_go_abroad-1.pdf (дата звернення 11.11.2023)
- Lecours, A. (2016). Paradiplomacy and Stateless Nations: a Reference to the Basque Country. *Spanish National Research Council (CSIC)*. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <https://www.researchgate.net/>

publication/28100099_Paradiplomacy_and_stateless_nations_a_reference_to_the_Basque_Country (дата звернення 29.05.2024)

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. *New York: Public Affairs*, 4-6.

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. *Public Affairs*, 26-27.

Wendt, A. (2000). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press, 8-15. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239065011_A_Social_Theory_of_International_Politics (дата звернення 15.05.2024)

Бафоев, Ф. (2016). Культурна дипломатія в системі міжнародних зв'язків на пострадянському просторі. *Молодий вчений*, 6, 662-667.

Головко, І. (2017). Процеси глобальної регіоналізації як компонент глобалізаційних процесів постбіполярної доби. *Гілея: науковий вісник*, 121, 195-199.

Головко, І. (2018). Теоретичні основи дослідження парадипломатії як форми міжнародного співробітництва. *Slovak international scientific journal*, 21, 66-71. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://sis-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Slovak-international-scientific-journal-№21-2018.pdf> (дата звернення 18.12.2023)

Головко, І. (2020). *Співвідношення дефініцій “регіон”, “регіоналізація”, “парадипломатія” в контексті дослідження зовнішньої діяльності субнаціональних одиниць*, у: *Research, challenges and development prospects in the area of social sciences: Collective monograph*. Riga: Izdevnieciba “Baltija Publishing”, 107-124.

Грачевська, Т. (2014). Парадипломатія як складова процесів регіоналізації на сучасному етапі. *Грані*, 12, 77-82.

Луценко, А., Піскорська, А. (2011). *М'яка сила в сучасній геополітиці*. К.

Олешко, С. (2017). *Дипломатія і культура, або онук розумніший за мене*. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: <http://culture.pl/ru/article/diplomatiya-i-kultura-abo-onuh-rozumnishiy-zamene> (in Ukrainian) (дата звернення 25.05.2024)

Шемаєва, Г. (2018). Місце культурної дипломатії в міжнародних відносинах. *Вісник Харківської державної академії культури. Серія: Соціальні комунікації*. 52, 71-79. [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/haksk_2018_52_7 (дата звернення 18.12.2023)

Шлапеко, Е. (2015). Конструювання регіональної ідентичності у Північній Європі: інститути та інструменти. *Людина. Спільнота. Управління*, 27-38.

References

Bafoev, F. (2016). *Kul'turna dyplomatiya v systemi mizhnarodnykh zv'yazkiv na postradyans'komu prostori* [Cultural diplomacy in the system of international relations in the post-Soviet space]. *Molodyy vchenyy*, 6, 662-667. (in Ukrainian)

Cummings, M. (2009). *Cultural Diplomacy and the United States Government: A Survey*. *Americans for the Arts*, 1-15.

Holovko, I. (2017). *Protsesy hlobal'noyi rehionalizatsiyi yak komponent hlobalizatsiynykh protsesiv postbipolyarnoyi doby* [Processes of global regionalization as a component of globalization processes of post-bipolar dope]. *Hileya: naukovyy visnyk*, 121, 195-199. (in Ukrainian)

Holovko, I. (2018). *Teoretychni osnovy doslidzhennya paradiplomatiyi yak formy mizhnarodnoho spivrobotnytstva* [Theoretical foundations for studying paradiplomacy as a form of international spontaneity]. *Slovak international scientific journal*, 21, 66-71. Retrieved December 18, 2023 from <http://sis-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Slovak-international-scientific-journal-№21-2018.pdf> (in Ukrainian)

Holovko, I. (2020). *Spivvidnoshennya defynitsiy “rehion”, “rehionalizatsiya”, “paradyplomatiya” v konteksti doslidzhennya zovnishn'oyi diyal'nosti subnatsional'nykh odynyts'* [Correlation of the definitions “region”, “regionalization”, “paradiplomacy” in the context of the study of the external activity of subnational units], in: *Research, challenges and development prospects in the area of social sciences: Collective monograph*. Riga: Izdevnieciba “Baltija Publishing”, 107-124. (in Ukrainian)

Hrachevs'ka, T. (2014). *Paradyplomatiya yak skladova protsesiv rehionalizatsiyi na suchasnomu etapi* [Paradiplomacy as a component of regionalization processes at the current stage]. *Hrani*, 12, 77-82. (in Ukrainian)

- Keating, M. (2008). Paradiplomacy and regional networking. *Forum of Federations: an International Federalism*. Retrieved November 15, 2023 from: <http://www.forumfed.org/libdocs/ForRelCU01/924-FRCU0105-eu-keating.pdf>.
- Kincaid, J. (2001). Foreign Relations of Constituent Units: Working Paper. *Forum of Federations. Winnipeg*. Retrieved May 5, 2024 from <http://www.forumfed.org/libdocs/ForRelCU01/924-FRCU0105-int-kincaid.pdf>
- Lecours, A. (2002). When Regions Go Abroad: Globalization, Nationalism and Federalism. *Globalization, Multilevel Governance and Democracy: Continental, Comparative and Global Perspectives*. Retrieved November 11, 2023 from https://www.jura.fu-berlin.de/fachbereich/einrichtungen/oeffentliches-recht/lehrende/bolewskiw/dokumente/5_Para_diplomacy/Lecours_When_regions_go_abroad-1.pdf
- Lecours, A. (2016). Paradiplomacy and Stateless Nations: a Reference to the Basque Country. *Spanish National Research Council (CSIC)*. Retrieved May 29, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/28100099_Paradiplomacy_and_stateless_nations_a_reference_to_the_Basque_Country
- Lutsenko, A., Piskors'ka, A. (2011). *M"yaka syła v suchasniy heopolitysi* [Soft power in modern geopolitics]. K. (in Ukrainian)
- Nye, J. (2004). Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics. *New York: Public Affairs*, 4-6.
- Nye, J. (2004). Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. *Public Affairs*, 26-27.
- Oleshko, S. (2017). Dyplomatiya i kul'tura, abo Onukh rozumnishyy za mene [Diplomacy and culture, or my grandson is smarter than me]. Retrieved May 25, 2024 from <http://culture.pl/ru/article/diplomatiya-i-kultura-abo-onuh-rozumnishiy-zamene> (in Ukrainian)
- Shemayeva, H. (2018). Mistse kul'turnoyi dyplomatiyyi v mizhnarodnykh vidnosynakh [The place of cultural diplomacy in international relations]. *Visnyk Kharkivs'koyi derzhavnoyi akademiyi kul'tury. Seriya: Sotsial'ni komunikatsiyi*, 52, 71-79. Retrieved December 18, 2023 from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/haksk_2018_52_7 (in Ukrainian)
- Shlapeko, E. (2015). Konstruyuvannya rehional'noyi identychnosti u Pivnichniy Yevropi: instytuty ta instrumenty [Construction of regional identity in Northern Europe: institutions and tools]. *Lyudyna. Spil'nota. Upravlinnya*, 27-38. (in Ukrainian)
- Wendt, A. (2000). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press, 8-15. Retrieved May 15, 2024 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239065011_A_Social_Theory_of_International_Politic