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Abstract

This research paper proposes an analysis of the most important and most current forms of new diplomacy namely public diplomacy. Mainly, based on qualitative research methods, the authors turn their attention towards the „first digital revolution” in the Arab world through social networks – Facebook and Twitter, now recognized as important tools for social media, which managed to expose freedom of expression as a fundamental democratic principle of the revolution in Egypt. The final study of this paper emphasizes the role of public diplomacy in Egypt in the context of technology, especially the impact of the internet in the mobilizations which were aimed at changing the political and social life, relying on the challenges and opportunities of both social networks considered engines of information and communication mechanisms. This paper has attempted to highlight the roles played by the main actors on the stage of the revolution, research reaching the final point in the critical moment after the presidential election. The main limitation of this research is the lack of native Arabic, and a study of public diplomacy practiced in Egypt can be improved by interpreting Arabic script on social media platforms. The relationship between faith and diplomacy is becoming more visible and its role is growing in political and diplomatic contexts.
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Introduction

The main objectives pursued by this current study are to analyse public diplomacy in terms of digital diplomacy and social networks (mainly Facebook and Twitter), as crucial instruments having a major impact over the revolution in Egypt. Questions authors have tried to answer in this study are: When did public diplomacy appear and what subjects does it cover? Who are the actors and which are the ways through which digital diplomacy is realised? In what way did digital diplomacy influence the revolution in Egypt and the Egyptian public diplomacy through social networks? In order to answer these questions, causes and implications of the revolution in Egypt have been found, the analysis is constantly seeking not only theoretical elements of the new public diplomacy, but also aspects regarding traditional public diplomacy. 

Contemporary international relations record under the impact of globalization, a process of resizing, which leads to the removal of the state's monopoly over foreign policy. A range of non-state actors influence a country's image from the outside and informational technologies offer them multiple communication mechanisms. In this situation, diplomatic activities are accompanied by a process of communication, both in its internal and external dimension. More and more countries are launching information campaigns aimed at contributing to the priorities of foreign policy, but also to obtain their own society's support for them. 

In the context of participatory democracy, public opinion adherence to government policy is indispensable for the survival of a government. External strategies to amend or strengthen international public perception to a particular country are also part of these campaigns. In international relations, the term "public diplomacy" appeared in order to describe aspects of international relations, which manifests outside the interaction between states.

Public diplomacy: is the science which aims at measuring and managing public perception that the state and the nation have outside the country. In other words, p.d is the way through which a state's policies are presented as accurate and favorable outside the country in order to have a realistic perception and to influence public attitude on the formation and execution of foreign policies. Public diplomacy was initiated and developed by the United States in the mid ’60s, the term soon became useful for the US government, providing the theoretical foundation necessary to the external activity of the US Information Agency. The US State Department defines public diplomacy as US government-funded programs designed to inform or influence public opinion abroad. On the same note, Hans Tuch defines public diplomacy as a communication process of a country's government with foreign audiences, trying to explain its ideas and ideals to the given nation, its institutions and its culture and national interests and policies. Former diplomat John Brown describes US public diplomacy as a process involving three roles: information dissemination, education and cultural exchanges. Philip Taylor uses the term "perception management" to describe the informational role of public diplomacy in this regard by drawing a distinction between public affairs, public interest, psychological operations, media management and public diplomacy. Researchers in the field of cultural diplomacy, as Kevin Mulcahy and Harv Feigenbaum, emphasize the difference between public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy in that the first is oriented towards the dissemination of information on short term and promoting policies, and the cultural - to establish long-term relationships.

Literature Review

Many scientific papers deal with p.d. from the late 20th century and early 21st century where we find a series of definitions given by theorists and practitioners of p.d. They
offered comparisons to traditional diplomacy, propaganda and public relations in the context of strategic communication. (Murrow, E.) From academics to practitioners, most authors agree that p.d. differs from traditional diplomacy in that the first involves interaction not only between governments, but firstly, the interaction between non-state actors (Leonard, M.). Paradoxically, the Cold War is what made p.d. become important with the spread of democracy, the media explosion, the emergence of non-governmental organizations [13]. Storck [25] focuses on the uprisings in Egypt and explains how the inherent characteristics of social networks, especially Facebook and Twitter have played a crucial role in facilitating the Arab revolution. Storck carefully analyzes how Egyptian activists have used social media networks in order to show the international community that the Internet is an inherent dialectic force that should not be treated in an absolutist or oppressive way. Seib [22] examines the role of media in the context of global change on political behavior. Seib [24] also considers religion as being very important in a diplomatic context because it can influence and promote a state’s national interests. The author demonstrates that today the relationship between religion and public diplomacy is still underdeveloped, comparing religious policy and public diplomacy this being closely linked to the religious factor. Iskender [8] argues, rightly, that the use of social media is an example of transparency by the fact that "information, articles, films, images are constantly recorded and posted online thus creating an archive accessible to all citizens " [8], and this has the effect of honesty for a company operating under oppression and censorship.

Research Methodology

For the present study, the authors used theoretical methods such as analysis, synthesis, abstracting, streamlining and comparative method, latter being used in particular for defining public diplomacy. When analyzing ways to use social networks, it was pursued not just a quantitative enumeration, but also a qualitative analysis of these online platforms. Fulfilling the qualitative research involved implied analysis of different sources of information, such as speeches, statements, reports and deciphering and interpreting messages posted in the two social networks which were analysed, Facebook and Twitter. The wealth of collected data by this method complements the research’s theoretical framework being needed to confirm or refute the hypothesis of this paper.

The New Era Of Public Diplomacy - Diplomacy Digital

The Internet and its applications in alternative social networks (Twitter, Facebook) can represent what Joseph Nye called, in the late 1980s - soft power [14], a power that consists of a state’s culture and political ideals which is based on the ability to achieve the expected goal based on voluntary participation by allies, not using coercion [14]. Eytan Gilboa’s works are relevant in defining public diplomacy, stating that it includes "state and non-state actors using media and other communication channels to influence public opinion abroad" [53]. Kristin Lord believes that more attention should be given to public perception abroad, and given the history and culture of that country, so that messages can be sent quickly and successfully identified [11]. Riordan militates in favour of a diplomacy that reforms the traditional one by streamlining and adapting it to the 21st century informational society and media [19].

We are suggested the world lies in the fires of revolution, new social tools succeed in reviving and intensifying social activism. Internet, Facebook or Twitter, the traditional relationship between political authority and popular will has been enriched, which makes it easier for the powerless to collaborate, coordinate and voice its concerns. The Internet can be considered by government entities who use it as a diplomatic tool, as an
ally unique in its use, especially by using virtual applications made available by social networks, it can be made public not only the stand on various foreign policy issues, but can promote ideas worldwide. Such a function, committed correctly, becomes effective for any embassy and, in particular, for each state it represents with the intention of creating a positive image[18]. Interactive diplomacy has become a decisive tool with unprecedented impact on people, providing chances and opportunities never experienced and unknown until then.

Invented in 1999, the term "web.2.0." or social web", facilitating communication and online collaboration, quickly broke in P.D. leading to the emergence of the concept of public diplomacy 2.0., which has three fundamental characteristics [18]:

1) technology is the one that facilitates the formation of relationships around social networking and online community;
2) diplomacy is dependent on user generated content (feedbacks and comments on blogs);
3) information has a horizontal structure, people can freely listen and watch the news and world events.

In fact, before the advent of "interactive internet", governments sought to influence foreign audiences through written publications, radio or television, but these arrangements were a one-way monologue, missing feedback from the public and essence. Currently, citizens can not remain passive and governments are engaged in a dialogue with their representatives, which enables the understanding and obedience of public opinion. Indeed, the development of digital channels suitable for the foreign ministry requires understanding the current environment and the needs of citizens both locally and from all around the country. Technology and news from online platforms allow participation in a new kind of public sphere that cannot be controlled by the state [3]. The emergence of social networks has opened new paths for people with common interests to discover, share and communicate news to friends and colleagues. The internet is constantly evolving and it can be easily said that there are still many undiscovered things and the impact on society can cause effects that can be highlighted through the flow of information and the evolution of events. Through the channels of traditional news (newspapers, radio, television) decisions are made by publishers and publicists, and the flow of information goes in a hierarchical structure, but thanks to social media information flows directly from the source and gets to all who are interested [3].

Initially, governments were skeptical about the role of the internet in defining their policies, instead they relied on traditional methods. At the beginning of the 21st century, not only do many embassies not have their own website, but many of those that have websites not only do they not have internet access, but also their access is very limited, or websites are not updated or the information is very outdated [13]. The terrorist attack of September 11, 2001 represented a turning point in digitizing public diplomacy, and then the Facebook pages or Twitter, have contributed to the emergence of a new model of information among world media. Social media include new network information using interactive communication and political power is determined by creating a wave of news that can not be censured, as the revolutions in the Middle East, where, without social media, news may have been censored by the government [15].

Currently, more than three quarters (77.7%) of the world leaders have a Twitter account, which they use to communicate among themselves, to broadcast their daily activities to a growing audience, or to respond to comments and mentions of citizens. While China does not have an official Twitter account, the rest of Asia has improved connections with the world. These data also raise reflections on the role of diplomats
during the Web era: Has diplomacy changed substantially? First, it must be taken into account that nowadays it is more a matter of interaction than simply communication. We live in a world of instant communication, which means shorter, more direct messaging spot in a few words that attract public attention. Diplomats must be prepared to face the challenges of new ways of communication and embassies must introduce new media departments with specific equipment for the diplomacy digital era [31].

Table 1: Twitter Accounts Popular with World Leaders, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twitter accounts popular with World Leaders</th>
<th>Number (mil)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twiplomacy</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY Times</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Twiplomacy, term introduced the diplomatic language within the 2011 study focused on diplomacy within social networks (especially Twitter) is still developing and has still some weaknesses that should be taken into account [31]:

- Not all leaders are connected to the internet, and many leaders have just recently created an account.
- This social network is not as popular in all countries, and this is also the reason that many governments do not use Twitter or Facebook page.
- Thirdly, the same leaders do not know how to write messages: should they sound more political or more personal?
- Fourthly, politicians do not seem to have understood the main instrument of social networks: connectivity.

The Influence Of Revolts In Egypt On Social Networks

The theory of social movement explains how using social networks was influenced and what role they had in the appearance of the Revolution in Egypt, named by some critics as the Arab Spring. Not only activists but also false accounts of Hosni Mubarak played an important role, attracting a large number of audience and disseminated the image of a corrupt leader which should have led to the withdraw from the government. This was the main goal of the Revolution in Egypt. [9] This theory of social movement shows why people who seem quiet suddenly rose against their leaders in protest, revolt, and this revolt has intrigued and confounded leaders and researchers long before Niccolo Machiavelli to write his treatises on the tyranny of the 16th century. The theory of social movement suggests 3 interrelated causes that could rekindle resentment by a mass uprising: the threat, the possibility of limiting access to resources and unifying message [21]. In history, the Egyptian revolution, will remain Arab Spring. This recent wave of revolutions has achieved success and last but not least there were significant changes in the management regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen. One year after the revolution
In the 21st century, revolutions are not transmitted on TV, but are distributed on Twitter, posted on blogs, written and organized on Facebook. 6 years ago, massive protests have brought down President Hosni Mubarak, marking the greatness of the Arab Spring. Authorized access to sites social networks such as Twitter, Facebook and YouTube, protesters have organized uprisings in the Middle East and gathered impressions against oppression, everything to have hope and inspiration for a better and truly democratic future [3]. Arab Spring held the promise that social networks and the Internet are going to trigger a new wave of positive social changes. But the last 5 years have shown that freedom is not the only end for which these tools can be turned [12].

All images from the events have been uploaded on social networks. Barricades today are not made with bayonets and rifles, they are made with mobile phones. All commentators have tried to imagine the nature of the uprising and tried to appoint the event: as an Arabic version of revolution in Eastern Europe from 1989 or something like the Iranian Revolution that toppled the Shah dynasty in 1979. In most cases, reviewers tried to inform the public through
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the media, as a result of Wikileaks, as a revolution inspired by Twitter or Facebook [2]. It mattered very much how people communicated in those moments of historical crisis and transformation. How the message is transmitted, the shape of the message and the message itself is very important. The instantaneous nature of how social networks communicate and send ideas, unfettered limit for publication and dissemination of their news channels, explains the speed with which this revolution has evolved and how it became viral in some regions [16].

Table 2: Egypt – Internet Users (2009–2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Internet Users</th>
<th>Penetration (%)</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Non-Users (Internetless)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30,835,256</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>93,383,574</td>
<td>62,548,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29,844,708</td>
<td>32.6 %</td>
<td>91,508,084</td>
<td>61,663,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>28,396,755</td>
<td>31.7 %</td>
<td>89,579,670</td>
<td>61,182,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25,758,489</td>
<td>29.4 %</td>
<td>87,613,909</td>
<td>61,855,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>22,614,478</td>
<td>26.4 %</td>
<td>85,660,902</td>
<td>63,046,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21,449,634</td>
<td>25.6 %</td>
<td>83,787,634</td>
<td>62,338,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17,720,855</td>
<td>21.6 %</td>
<td>82,040,994</td>
<td>64,320,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>16,088,489</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>80,442,443</td>
<td>64,353,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/egypt/, accessed on 01.03.2017

Activists were able to organize and get mobilized in 2011 mainly because authoritarian governments have understood very well the use of social networks, but have not seen their increased potential [17]. Social networks haven’t removed governments but people managed to do so, despite the brave people who risked conviction and death, they wound up on the streets because they could not bear the situation. Rejecting the role of social networks in these events could be a big mistake because the speed of communication via digital channels offered unprecedented agility for activists during street raids [17].

The Influence Of The Media In The Egyptian Revolution

Regardless of opinions, the Arab Spring is a failed experiment or a democratic transition required for a region affected by authoritarianism, and it is hard to reject the influence that the media had on the events [7]. The media have helped to unite people and toppled governments, and today the relationship between media and the Arabic political world is much more complicated [20]. Interest in social media during the revolution caused a series of reflections in the last 6 years. The intent was to determine the position of social media as a tool and how this technology might affect the achievement of changing the regime. Enthusiasm for social media has provoked some researchers - so-called digital evangelists - to consider social media platforms as an indispensable tool for the rebels. On the other hand, other researchers are techno-realists who believe that social platforms are irrelevant gadgets, being useful only for the security forces that should supervise and ensure safety [20].
Both digital evangelists and techno-realists identify eight dimensions of using social media platforms in the revolution of Egypt with a direct impact on the Egyptian public diplomacy (Figure 2) [4]:

- **Ideology and planning** - digital evangelists believe that social media are a formidable tool to spread ideologies, doctrines and thoughts, and to limit the influence of the real media (the one controlled by the government) and to explain the philosophy and reasons underlying the protests. Unlike digital evangelists, techno-realists are skeptical about the use of social media to support and mobilize parts of the population who are not accustomed to using social media.

- **Training and implementing new tactics** - digital evangelists believe that social media are a tool for training rebels, paying particular attention to skills like coping with security forces using specific tactics and showing how repression teams

work. Techno-realists define this as a Western vision and naive of social media, and they say that it is unrealistic waiting to learn from online platforms how situations such as clashes with security forces should be handled.

- **Communication** - for digital evangelists, the movement's leadership through social media can be used to communicate quickly and safely with other cells or groups, and thus avoid exposure during meetings. Techno-realists believe that this is a negligible advantage due to low diffusion rate and reduced access to digital technology.

- **Installation and rapid response** - digital evangelists consider social media as a valuable tool for organizing mass mobilization without prior training and the deployment of protests in areas not protected by security forces. Thus, rebels may mislead the police with false advertisements for mobilization. Techno-realists believe
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that, if management uses social media to mobilize protesters, through social media monitoring, security teams can react quickly to sudden mobilization.

- **Costs** - in the view of digital evangelists, social media can reduce costs for the rebels's mobilization, and this can reduce dependence of protesters on foreign sponsors. Techno-realists talk about low costs as an advantage to governmental agencies and in their view social media are a tool with a low level of security for people who use these technologies.

- **Flexibility** - digital evangelists believe that using social media platforms to organize protests is flexible, the rebels having the possibility to always return to traditional forms to maintain the protest if the government acts. Techno-realists claim another conception, in their view security forces may adjust their monitoring activities.

- **Resilience** - digital evangelists believe that using social media increases the robustness of rebel movements by adopting technological tricks (secret IPs). Techno-realists take into account the dependency of social media as a risk for the rebels if the government chooses to stop the internet.

- **Propaganda** - digital evangelists believe that social media are an important tool for protesters in order to establish a connection between the rebels and the international public opinion. Techno-realists believe that the security forces and intelligence can use social media to spread false information to scare people and to manage public debate on the reasons behind the protests.

**The Practice Of Public Diplomacy In The Context Of The Arab Revolution - A Strategic Game Like A Game Of Chess**

By using social networks, activists have organized and promoted unprecedented protests revolution that gave birth to egipene or so-called Arab spring. After the escalation of the event and the Government's decision to discontinue the use of the Internet as a communication tool, 28% of Egyptians said that this decision has interfered with their efforts to communicate and organize themselves, while for 56% of Egyptians blocking Facebook platform has had a positive effect, motivating them to go further and to mobilize attracting other people [29].

Neither globally nor in the Arab world, growth of social media throughout 2012 showed no signs of slowing down. Globally, Facebook dominates the market with over 901 million monthly active users worldwide, of which 500 million users access Facebook via mobile phone platform. Twitter, on the other hand, has reached 500 million users in February 2012, of which 140 million users are "active" and generate 340 million tweets per day. About 60% of active users produce tweets, while the remaining 40% follow the platform just to get news and information [30]. Arabic language is the fastest growing language that has ever existed on Twitter, among other 25 different languages used on the site.

In the 21st century people and governments are very easily influenced, manipulation techniques getting a new shape. The Egyptian Revolution can be seen from the perspective of a strategic game, the two sides implement strategies conceived or acquired using all sorts of tricks. Chess is a game of strategy, played most often between 2 players, but on the whole, this game can be played between the two sides. The most important side are the CITIZENS of Egypt, the one who went out in the streets and had a say unable to bear the abuses and corruption. The other side is the black side represented by the Egyptian GOVERNMENT, who resorted to actions that
are unacceptable during the rule of the Mubarak family [30].

I believe the event in Egypt can be explained through a game of chess, the pieces being the actors trying to abase others. To demonstrate the applicability of the revolution within the game of chess we developed a presentation by depending on the actors's actions. This game of chess is not the best option, being possible to have other moves to checkmate much better from a strategic perspective [29].

The white chessboard pieces are the following actors: The Queen is represented by activists because it can capture any part (actor) opponent who is in the field where it is moved. It is the most powerful chess piece due to movements and mobility. Activists have played a central role in the revolution in Egypt, which is the voice of the street in 2008 and in 2011. Nothing would have changed if there weren't brave people who wanted to overthrow the regime.

The King is represented by the easily influenced citizens because they are the most important players for as long as government manipulation techniques are applied. The ultimate goal of a chess game is the simultaneous threat of the king by the opponent's pieces in a way that it can not avoid the target of attacks.

The Bishops are represented by all Facebook and Twitter users who have played an extraordinarily high in the organization and development of events, but did not have quite the most important role. Towards the end of the game, bishops are the strongest, and the same thing happened during the revolution, it was enough for people to be mobilized so they could later on transmit information through social platforms.

Knights are represented by the religious factor, religion is the main institution that guides people's lives, society and politics worldwide. The omnipresence of religion is due to the fact that it remains one of the fundamental organizing scheme for individuals and groups and it marks their actions. Religion has influenced the revolution in Egypt having a psychological role.

The rooks are represented by Al Jazeera, the most important actor on the
international stage, being the only television that suffered from repression of government Mubarak and which continued to show the world the reality that Egypt was stormed by insubordinate citizens. As a piece in the game, the rook captures adverse pieces that are on the field where they are moved, which is what Al Jazeera did, capturing all government actors creating a hard dismembered image.

- **Pawns** are represented by the participants in the 2008 revolution "Mahalla" and Youth Movement leaders, all these personalities being those who laid the first stone in the foundation of change. A pawn as a piece is considered the least valuable, being frequently „sacrificed" in order to get a higher position or to mask a subsequent attack on the opponent.

**On The Other Hand, The Black Chessboard Pieces Are The Following Actors:**

- **The Queen** is represented by the Muslim Fraternity, since it has played a leading role in the initial stages of the revolution and had a cautious attitude also taking into account the success of Mubarak, but also the failure. Because they are important players and have provided support to the revolution that has contributed indirectly, the Muslim Fraternity is considered to have the role of the Queen, being the most important piece from the other side.

- **The King** is represented by Mubarak, leader named after killing the former president. Mubarak's decisions from his reign led him slowly towards failure. If people would not have felt undermined with every decision taken by the government, Mubarak would have continued his mandate and could hand over power to his family.

- **The Bishops** are represented by state televisions and the National Democratic Party. These two actors were the main tools of Mubarak, most often being used to misinform and create a different opinion about the real situation. Towards the end of the game these pieces don't win power because activists impose themselves and stop providing false information.

- **Knights** are represented by the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces because they ruled the country after Mubarak's resignation and had an important role during the demonstrations. Even after the ousting of Mubarak, the country continued to be led by his close people, despite the fact that represented one of the largest and most powerful army in the Middle East.

- **The rooks** are the supporters of pro-Mubarak, who voiced their opinions whenever needed, most often the close people of Mubarak losing their life because in those situations no one could really take the side of the dictator.

- **Pawns** are represented by all government leaders who have been protected and supported over the years by Mubarak. Although in the early days of the revolution he sacked his entire cabinet, members of the government were only pawns in the game of chess, their dismissal masked other strategies, such as turning off the Internet, power and the invasion of Al Jazeera headquarters.

When the queen moves from f3 to f7 it's check-mate, King (black) is brought down and Mubarak leaves. Activists have won, and the revolution was successful.

**Conclusions**

Social media were not tools for the revolution, but they weren't the one who have not managed to break the system, but the main actors did. Force of the people was more powerful than the information distributed which soon became viral, simply because they did not surrender in front of the obstacles the government (power supply outage, telephony outage, mobile data outage) managed to prove that a speech transmits not only ideas but also emotion, and gets people together regardless of age or sex, beliefs being the most important aspect.

This paper has attempted to highlight the roles played by the main actors on the stage of the revolution, research reaching the final point in the critical moment after the
The main limitation of this research is the lack of native Arabic, and a study of public diplomacy practiced in Egypt can be improved by interpreting Arabic script on social media platforms. The relationship between faith and diplomacy is becoming more visible and its role is growing in political and diplomatic contexts. On the other hand, technological developments and new ways of communication have grown a lot and assiduously contributed to the formation of new public diplomacy. During the research we have identified a number of authors who considered that public diplomacy was practiced in Egypt through social networks, given that they were the main reason for the liberation of corrupt power. Studies have not followed other motivational factors and thus the main idea was created that the Arab Spring would not have existed if we didn’t have social networking. Indeed, social networks have been the catalyst, but manipulation was not made by video images, reports or interviews, manipulation having a religious character.

There is no standard model of public diplomacy, but what comes out clear from the literature and the results of this research is that an action is especially useful when their agents have detailed information about other countries, languages or cultures, thus being able to successfully transmit messages from their own country. By building bridges between science and correct information for state residents, but also harmonious social relations and credible national ideals public diplomacy is an unmistakable point, it generates guidelines for the 21st century, often based on research of the humanities and social – political sciences. Through social networks, public diplomacy has a direct impact on society. Using social media political changes were encouraged, they have become more widespread and influential within societies and communities in the Arab region. Usually, social media users have positive views about the platform’s impact and its potential to create social change. Finally, social media are seen and used as an agent of change.
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