

# TRENDS IN THE FORMULATION OF INSTRUMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER: DIGITAL DIPLOMACY AS A FACTOR OF CHANGE IN MODERN DIPLOMACY

*Aleksandar M. Pavić<sup>1\*</sup>, Hatidža A. Beriša<sup>1</sup>, Nenad S. Stajković<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> University of Defense, Military Academy, Serbia, e-mail: [aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs](mailto:aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs), [hatidza.berisa@mod.gov.rs](mailto:hatidza.berisa@mod.gov.rs), [stajkovic.nenad.sky@gmail.com](mailto:stajkovic.nenad.sky@gmail.com)



**Abstract:** The realization of national interests through the concept of developing and using instruments of national power is one of the most widely accepted strategic approaches. Defining national interests, as well as the manner of using instruments of power, is a characteristic feature of each individual state. The generally accepted model based on four basic instruments of national power: diplomacy, information, military power and economy, or the DIME model, is increasingly subject to certain corrections that are a consequence of rapid changes in international relations, but also technological development. Contemporary trends in the formulation of instruments of national power, as well as the potential of digital diplomacy as a factor of change in modern diplomacy, point to the profound transformation that the digital era is bringing to international relations. By presenting changes in the definition of instruments of national power, the authors will analyze the impact of factors such as artificial intelligence and social networks on contemporary diplomacy. Defining potential challenges faced by digital diplomacy will serve as an example of the complexity of the development and implementation of instruments of national power in the contemporary international environment, which is faced with great technological progress and the growing power of artificial intelligence.

The methodological approach represented in the paper is based on the application of the content analysis method and the structural analysis of a large number of scientific and professional works, as well as other relevant public sources. Using the hypothetical-deductive method, the authors draw conclusions that should prove the hypothesis that the instruments of national power are constantly changing and in that process encounter various challenges, which are a consequence of digital transformation, technology, but also very turbulent changes in international relations and the strategic environment. The aim of the paper is to define contemporary trends in the development of the instrument of national power and to examine some of the challenges that this process faces. In addition to the above, a special aim of the paper is to use the example of the transformation of the diplomatic instrument of power to explain some of the challenges that digital diplomacy faces as a contemporary form of traditional diplomacy.

In order to better clarify the methods, ways and challenges faced by the scientific community, as well as strategists, in defining the instruments of power and changes in them, this paper offers an example of how and in what way digital diplomacy has emerged as a new factor of change in traditional diplomacy. The authors will define a number of challenges facing digital diplomacy in the 21st century, with a special emphasis on artificial intelligence and social networks.

**Keywords:** digital diplomacy, instruments of national power, technology, artificial intelligence, digital transformation, diplomacy.

**Field:** Social Sciences and Humanities

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Instruments of national power are the resources and means that a state uses to achieve its national goals. Contemporary trends, conditioned by the challenges dictated by technology, geopolitical changes, multipolarity, globalization, climate change, demography and other aspects, change, complement and promote some new concepts of instruments of national power. The concept of smart power is today an increasingly present model through which instruments of national power are realized. Smart power combines “hard” power, based on the military and economic coercion, and on the other hand “soft” power of cultural appeal, values and diplomacy in order to achieve an effective strategy. Hard power is synonymous with the strength of a nation and state, its importance has never been questioned, especially in international relations. However, in today’s complex international environment, soft power is equally important to study from the point of view of its impact on the realization of vital interests and the defense of statehood (Pavić, et al, 2024, p. 133). Joseph Samuel Nye Jr. described this approach as the ability to combine different instruments of national power in accordance with the situation. It is precisely from the previously mentioned facts that we must consider the instruments of national power as a changing system. In order to adequately implement it in accordance with the interests of states, it is necessary to

\*Corresponding author: [aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs](mailto:aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs)



apply new instruments of power, but also to understand the challenges that their implementation brings. As an example of the influence of certain important factors on the instrument of power, the example of non-strategic nuclear weapons of the Russian Federation can be considered. Namely, they considered this type of weapon in the context and coordination with the entire spectrum of their military and non-military instruments of power. And with the aim of deterring unwanted conflicts, shaping the operational environment for planning operations, limiting escalation within the zone of operations and as a factor in ensuring military superiority over enemies.

Digital diplomacy has undergone several different terminological changes during its development. The concept of digital diplomacy encompasses the way in which new communication technologies are used in contemporary international relations (Bjola, Manor, 2024, p. 4). Digital diplomacy also includes the terminological determinants of new public diplomacy (Manor, 2019, p. 15), virtual diplomacy (Brown, Studemeister, 2001), cyber diplomacy (Radanliev, 2024) and others. The emergence of the concept of digital diplomacy is directly conditioned by the digital transformation of modern society. Digital diplomacy is part of international, non-governmental and transnational organizations. Diplo foundation in one of research states that the digital transformation of diplomacy is happening in three main areas: (Kurbalija, 2024):

- Changes in the political, social and economic environment where diplomacy is conducted;
- The emergence of new political topics on the diplomatic agenda;
- Use of digital tools in the practice of diplomacy.

Whether diplomacy, military power, economic and information power will continue to remain the central instruments of power or will they be forced to adapt to new trends and tendencies in the process of digital transformation and smart power is a question of national importance for every sovereign state. Scientific considerations, assessments and proposed solutions are necessary to direct national capacities in the right direction and for the state to choose instruments of power that are commensurate with its interests and available resources. The professional work is composed of three main parts. The first part focuses on the transformation of instruments of national power, the second part discusses diplomacy as a critical infrastructure of the modern state, and the third part explains the challenges facing digital diplomacy.

## **2. INSTRUMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER IN THE CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT**

The formulation of instruments of national power in the contemporary environment faces numerous challenges arising from rapid technological change, the complexity of global relations and the increasing influence of non-state actors. In a world characterized by increasing interdependence, states must balance the protection of their own interests with the need for cooperation in addressing global challenges, such as climate change, migration and cyber threats. Traditional models of the use of power are increasingly losing their effectiveness as they can be easily manipulated through digital and information technologies (Frey, 2024, p. 107). On the other hand, the boundaries between economic, political and military dominance are becoming increasingly blurred, especially in the context of globalization, the coming multipolarity, and a large number of global crisis hotspots. In this environment, states must respond to challenges such as disinformation, hybrid warfare and the growing importance of soft power, with culture, education and technology becoming new battlegrounds of influence.

The speed at which information circulates puts traditional diplomatic structures under pressure, requiring rapid and well-coordinated responses. However, the acceleration of the process often comes at the expense of in-depth analysis, which can lead to impulsive or counterproductive decisions. There is also the challenge of reconciling national interests with international obligations, which requires a strategic vision that must be realistic, adaptable and long-term at the same time. Overall, the formulation of instruments of national power today requires states not only to understand the dynamics of the modern world, but also to ensure a coordinated approach that encompasses all elements of power – from economic and military, to digital and cultural resources.

In order to obtain adequate answers to the above-mentioned challenges, it is necessary to define the instruments of power from the point of view of current trends and tendencies. The most famous model of instruments of national power consists of four elements: diplomatic, informational, military and economic. The above model is better known as DIME (Diplomatic, Informational, Military, Economic). Although in principle the previous elements are taken as a basis, there is a significant tendency to expand to some other areas that are today of great importance for the implementation of the national security strategy. The elements of power are resources that are used to promote or advance national or group

interests. Resources are most often applied using instruments of power.

The four instruments of power listed do not fundamentally exclude the analysis and use of other means. Policymakers and strategists in the United States of America (USA) share a similar view, having long since realized that there are many more instruments involved in the development and implementation of national security policy, as stated in the document “Joint Doctrine Note 1-18, Strategy” (Joint Doctrine Note 1-18, Strategy, 2018). The creators of US strategic policy in the aforementioned strategy presented the concept of using MIDFIELD (Military, Informational, Diplomatic, Financial, Intelligence, Economic, Law, Development) instruments, which considers military, informational, diplomatic, financial, intelligence, economic, legal and developmental instruments of power. In this way, they provide a wider range of options that strategists and policymakers can use.

One of the current models that is adapted to the modern strategic environment is the so-called DIME-FIL (Diplomatic, Information, Military, Economic – Finance, Intelligence, Law enforcement). The model adds finance, intelligence, and law enforcement to the standard four instruments. This model is a product of the need to consider the broader picture of the strategic environment. The US military continues to focus primarily on kinetic engagement of the military, prioritizing the large military instrument of power, while minimizing and neglecting the value of other instruments. This often results in suboptimal use of resources and inefficiency. The emergence of a new strategic environment requires the use of more instruments of power. As a result, a group of authors, Rodriguez, Walton and Chu, have suggested that it may be time to move from the DIME to the DIME-FIL concept. As an argument for their proposal, they cite the fact that the main competitors, the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China, have developed alternative instruments of power. Within the proposed expanded model of instruments of power, artificial intelligence is represented in the intelligence segment. Given that the analytical capabilities of artificial intelligence are currently the most common application, it would certainly significantly affect the processing and analysis of large amounts of data that should be the basis of intelligence information. All states that plan to maintain primacy in their environment will have to use the intelligence tool to face the new strategic environment that is full of security challenges. Intelligence is of crucial importance for the functioning of the military and information instrument of power. Data superiority and artificial intelligence management are essential for making timely decisions (Rodriguez, et al, 2020).

Technology has always been a significant factor in the national security system. As a rule, nations that are technologically most advanced occupy leading positions in the regional and global environment. On the other hand, security challenges that are a consequence of the wide availability of technology to various non-state actors can be a significant source of threats. The contemporary security environment characterized by hybrid warfare is an environment in which advanced technologies can be a source of power for those who apply them. The above challenges require the adjustment of national security strategy and the use of all available instruments of power, among which technology is certainly one? An approach that extends the standard instruments of power to technology was proposed by the author Maria Constantinescu, or DIME-T (Diplomatic, Information, Military, Economy – Technology) (Constantinescu, 2021). Artificial intelligence is a technology that has enabled significant advances in the technological sphere. In doing so, it has provided a new connection between advanced weapons, improved command information systems, and the widespread use of robotic platforms. Its further advancement will produce potential implications, especially with advances in biotechnology, which have the potential to provide improved physical and cognitive performance.

Can artificial intelligence be an instrument of power? Some authors, such as Nicolas Mialhe, state that artificial intelligence is developing rapidly and is becoming a real instrument of power. As such, it manifests itself through both hard and soft power. The two global leaders, the USA and the China, dominate the global environment and dictate the directions of development and trends. On the other hand, Europe, which is technologically lagging behind, is trying to take the lead in defining regulations and establishing ethical norms (Mialhe, 2018).

The previously mentioned examples of expanded and modified instruments of power, adapted to the contemporary challenges faced by the modern state, provide the opportunity for nations to use all available resources for the purposes of achieving national interests. A nation that ensures superiority and follows the trends in the development of artificial intelligence has a great advantage over its competition and environment. It is certain that artificial intelligence can be an instrument of power for a nation that clearly regulates the areas and rules of use, follows development trends and significantly improves economic growth. Areas such as security and defense, administrative efficiency, economic growth, improvement of education, science and healthcare are key elements that enable the development of the nation and the state. Artificial intelligence in the above areas will improve the state's ability to provide security for all citizens, improve the economy and improve the standard of living. We will certainly find out soon whether

we will be able to have a DIME-AI (Diplomatic, Information, Military, Economy – Artificial Intelligence) model in the future, based on the examples of instruments mentioned above, because the development of artificial intelligence is exceeding all estimates (Pavić, Beriša, 2024, pp. 20-21).

### 3. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF NATIONAL POWER - DIPLOMACY

Changes in the definition of the instruments of national power have been induced, among other things, by changes occurring in contemporary international relations. The preservation of global peace and the transformation of the contemporary world order towards multipolarity perhaps more than ever place diplomacy in the critical infrastructure of the state as the main actor in international relations (Vevera, 2022, p. 41).

In the previous chapter, we have already indicated that one of the most important conclusions is that artificial intelligence has the potential to be an instrument of national power. The security dilemma and unpredictability are characteristics that stand in contrast to all the positive facts related to this revolutionary technology. However, the impact it has on diplomacy is certainly one of the important aspects of consideration. Until the moment when one of the states officially introduces a model in which artificial intelligence is an instrument of power, it is necessary to consider how and in what way it affects the capabilities of the DIME model. Analyzing various sources, the prevailing opinion is that diplomacy is the strongest and most important instrument of power. All other instruments have a narrower and more specialized application and, as a rule, must be synchronized with diplomacy. For the purposes of analyzing the possibility of using artificial intelligence in instruments of power, it is necessary to primarily determine its potential in diplomacy.

Henry Kissinger pointed out that "Diplomacy is the art of containing power". Diplomacy is a process that continues continuously, that is, before, during and after the use of military force. However, diplomacy also performs its functions in correlation with the economy, and its success is particularly conditioned by the information resources of the state, as well as military power. History has repeatedly confirmed that diplomacy can be the art of strengthening power. Kissinger was once the protagonist in one such diplomatic competition. In the period from 1971 to 1972, American diplomacy increased its global power in relation to the People's Republic of China with diplomatic resources. The advantage gained is still a political constant in international relations today (Scott, 2011). An example is the fact that diplomacy can be more powerful than any weapon and bring victory without a single life lost. For this very reason, the usefulness of artificial intelligence has potential only if it is applicable in support of diplomacy. Diplomacy is an instrument of power that must be synchronized with all others in order for a nation to be on the path to realizing its strategy and achieving its national interests.

Diplomacy is often confused with foreign policy, but the terms are not synonymous. Diplomacy is the main, but not the only, instrument of foreign policy deployed by political leaders. In their work, significant support is provided by military and intelligence officers who use other instruments of power such as military and information. The information they can provide can be of great importance in supporting diplomacy. Foreign policy establishes goals, prescribes strategy, and sets the means to be used in their achievement. Diplomacy is the main substitute for the use of force or covert means in statecraft; it is the way in which comprehensive national power is applied peacefully. Its primary tools are international dialogue and negotiations, primarily conducted by accredited envoys and other political leaders (Marks, Freeman, 2024). Diplomacy is a critical infrastructure in strategic competition. For this very reason, it has at its disposal all the resources of the nation and all other instruments of power. One of the basic ways of implementing modern diplomacy is the use of digital diplomacy. Digital diplomacy is the response of traditional diplomacy to modern technologies, the speed of change in international relations, but also the growing need for additional diplomatic effort in order to preserve global peace and protect the national interests of states.

### 4. CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING DIGITAL DIPLOMACY

Understanding the potential of digital diplomacy in contemporary international relations, as well as within the framework of a diplomatic instrument of national power, can also be analyzed through a wide range of challenges faced by states as the main actors in international relations. One of the basic characteristics of digital diplomacy is its evolutionary nature (Rashica, 2018, p. 77-79). This is primarily influenced by the dynamics of international relations, but also by the significant development of technology. By analyzing various research studies, scientific articles, national strategies, as well as other public documents of national importance of individual states and organizations, the authors have

identified the contemporary challenges faced by a sovereign state when defining national interests, and then the available instruments of national power, including the diplomatic instrument of power, and the challenges faced by digital diplomacy. The identified challenges can be defined according to the following:

- Use of artificial intelligence,
- Public diplomacy on social media,
- The soft power of digital diplomacy,
- Cyberspace as a security factor for digital diplomacy,
- Virtual meetings and summits,
- Information operations and disinformation,
- Electronic voting, technology and innovation and
- Digital inclusion and sustainable development, regulation and ethics in digital diplomacy.

The aforementioned challenges facing digital diplomacy as a branch of contemporary diplomacy imply both its potential applicability and its already widespread use on the international diplomatic agenda. Probably the two biggest challenges facing digital diplomacy today are the use of artificial intelligence and social networks. The two challenges facing digital diplomacy are important factors shaping contemporary society, social relations, and ultimately international relations.

#### Use of artificial intelligence

The seriousness of the use and rapid development of artificial intelligence in the international agenda has been recognized as a factor influencing the contemporary strategic environment. One of the widely accepted views is that modern diplomacy should adapt to the challenges of the twenty-first century. The aforementioned fact can be said to be a timeless constant and has been relevant since diplomacy appeared on the global stage as an instrument of national power. As an example of a serious consideration of contemporary challenges, the Scowcroft Center's project on diplomacy in the 21st century entitled "Diplomacy in the 21st Century: Strengthening American Diplomacy for the Challenges of Today and Tomorrow" can be cited. The project states that the global community is facing the greatest challenge since the end of the Cold War. The crisis hotspots located all over the planet, as well as the influence of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation, are a particular challenge for the United States. Cimmino and Rothschild argue that the military domain is only one dimension of this rivalry, and that the United States needs to strengthen its power in other areas, including diplomacy. They pay special attention to the challenges and opportunities that artificial intelligence presents in the practice of diplomacy in the twenty-first century. They also make recommendations on how to effectively use artificial intelligence to strengthen diplomacy. What is particularly interesting is that they consider general artificial intelligence, which is still in its infancy, rather than the narrow one that is most relevant today. The consideration of the second generation of artificial intelligence clearly implies that this technology will be one of the key ones in achieving national interests (Cimmino, Rothschild, 2024).

The aforementioned project generated five recommendations that could be of a universal nature, and not just a roadmap for US diplomacy, as follows (Cimmino, Rothschild, 2024):

1. Consider AI as a critical asset in engaging the information space;
2. Engage with allies and partners to shape norms for AI use and collaborate to dominate higher levels of this technology;
3. Leverage AI as a soft power tool;
4. Establish standards for transparency and ethical safeguards in the use of AI and refocus the United States Department of State's efforts on AI integration.

A more detailed analysis of the above recommendations can be concluded that artificial intelligence should ensure the full correlation of the activities of all instruments of power, both at the level of the nation and at the level of alliances and international partnerships. One of the possibilities provided by the above approach allows a single nation, such as the US, to maintain primacy and control among allies, partners and smaller states that do not have the technological capacity to independently develop artificial intelligence. In this way, technology permeated through various instruments of power allows a nation's diplomacy to globally control a large part of space and thus achieve its interest.

When it comes to the possibilities of artificial intelligence, the most important areas in the diplomacy sector would certainly be related to the analysis of international relations, forecasting trends and identifying strategic priorities in foreign policy. All of the above opportunities should be the product of the analytical capabilities of narrow artificial intelligence. Artificial intelligence analytics will enable the improvement of diplomatic efforts, fostering cooperation and solving global challenges in innovative ways. By using analytics driven by artificial intelligence, diplomats can gain deeper insight into complex geopolitical issues, identify potential areas for cooperation and optimize diplomatic strategies for greater effectiveness (Varela, 2024).

21st century diplomacy, like other instruments of power, has significantly digitized its activities. The Internet revolution has affected all aspects of life, including international relations. Today, it is almost impossible to separate the Internet from artificial intelligence. Diplomacy as a tool of foreign policy is also being transformed by this revolution. Digital diplomacy generally refers to the increasing use of social media platforms by a country to achieve its foreign policy goals and proactively manage its image and reputation. Digital diplomacy exists at two levels: at the level of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and at the level of embassies located around the world. By acting in this way, nations can quickly and easily adapt foreign policy performances that are tailored to the history, culture, values, and traditions of the other side. Digital diplomacy, with all its futuristic but also realistic characteristics, is the first significant aspect of the use of artificial intelligence in a diplomatic instrument of power.

Another important aspect of the use of artificial intelligence in a diplomatic instrument of power concerns the challenges within the framework of the possibilities of conducting diplomacy. As artificial intelligence enters all aspects of society, it will inevitably affect diplomacy. The more deeply it is integrated into society, the greater the effect it will have on the context in which diplomats carry out their duties. In one of the studies by the Diplo Foundation for the needs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, artificial intelligence was considered in the context of a tool. A topic and as an element that shapes the environment in which diplomatic practice is carried out (Höne, et al, 2019).

The field of diplomacy has been recognized as a zone in which no means are chosen to reach the desired end state. In this context, Andrew Moore used part of the tools available to everyone in the context of diplomacy tools, which is also the third significant aspect of the use of artificial intelligence. As a first example, he cited virtual translators, which would significantly reduce time and complete communication without hiring translators. Other tools such as "ChatGPT" can prepare diplomats before the activity, by giving them ready-made recommendations based on the analysis of a large amount of data, which would take humans an extremely long time. In this way, a wide range of recommendations and information can very simply and quickly prepare the agenda of the conversation or at least complete it. Also during negotiations, artificial intelligence can be a relevant virtual assistant. The examples given will gain relevance as partners and allies further compare the results of their own AI systems on the same topic. Today, individual nations continue to develop AI independently, but the development trends are moving towards joint projects. Increasingly sophisticated AI systems may one day reach the level of general artificial intelligence. Such systems could revolutionize our understanding of technology, allowing AI to become an independent agent in international engagements, rather than just a tool (Moore, 2023).

The fourth and last significant aspect of the use of artificial intelligence in the diplomatic instrument of power considered is strategic communication and the possibility of rapid spread of disinformation in cyberspace. The topic of strategic communication and artificial intelligence is extremely topical in the academic community, as discussed in a large number of professional papers and literature. Artificial intelligence in this segment can help the diplomatic instrument in various ways. The first option refers to content analytics and event prediction, which can provide diplomats with data on trends, behavioral patterns and predict certain events. This allows diplomats to make decisions based on certain assessments and analyses and thus adapt their strategies in accordance with changes in the environment. The second option is to adapt the content that should be placed at a strategic level to a specific party. The third option is the automation of certain processes in terms of planning activities and distributing information to users (Osei-Mensah, et al, 2023).

The possibilities of artificial intelligence in the diplomatic instrument of power are exceptional, this is supported primarily by the fact that the academic community is actively considering this topic and that it is very topical. A significant fact is that research is moving towards general artificial intelligence, which should be at the level of humans as we are today. All this implies that artificial intelligence could become a subject in diplomacy, and not just an object or a tool. At this stage of development, regardless of the technological connotation by the nature of its existence, the applicability of artificial intelligence in the diplomatic instrument of power does not lag behind that of economic, informational or military. Its capacities enable the synchronization of activities and significant acceleration in all domains of application.

#### Public diplomacy on social media

One of the hallmarks of the 21st century is certainly social networks. Individuals, states, international organizations, and many other actors in international relations are present on social networks. Public diplomacy on social networks has become a key tool for states and organizations in order to build a positive image, spread messages, and influence the international public. The speed of transmitting messages to individuals, target groups, but also at the regional and global levels is certainly one of the aspects why international relations are so accelerated today. Valentin Costa, in his 2017 research, states that the practice of public diplomacy has been significantly disrupted by the presence of 90% of United

Nations (UN) countries on social networks, along with the emergence of new technologies that make communication global and in real time (Costa, 2017, p. 139). An important statistic is that by October 2024, there were 5.52 billion internet users worldwide, accounting for 67.5 percent of the global population. Of this total, 5.22 billion, or 63.8 percent of the global population, were social media users (Petrosyan, 2024).

The examination of the manifestation of public diplomacy on social networks can be analyzed through various aspects, the methodology of information placement, the content of messages and narratives, communication platforms, target groups, and many others. However, the issue of platforms for transmitting messages from public diplomacy is perhaps the key factor for the need for this analysis. It is certain that each country has its own strategy for how to use social networks for the needs of its diplomacy. If we consider several major social networks, we can conclude that each has its own characteristics that are used in different contexts, but also by different actors.

An important aspect of the research is the selection of adequate platforms that are, among others, more suitable for public diplomacy. Publicly available statistical data, i.e. quantitative indicators, show that currently the social networks Facebook (3 billion users), YouTube (2.5 billion users), Instagram (2 billion users) and WhatsApp (2 billion users) are the most numerous. However, one of the platforms that is particularly adapted and accepted in the domain of digital diplomacy, i.e. public diplomacy, is the X platform. This platform has just over 600 million active users worldwide (Dixon, 2024).

The X platform or the former Twitter is mainly used for transmitting quick messages and current events, but it is particularly important on the diplomatic agenda because it is also used for official diplomatic statements. The importance of posts on this platform is also demonstrated by the fact that since 2012 there has been a platform dedicated to the "Twiplomacy" trend. The aforementioned platform follows the rise of digital diplomacy, which has become one of the most important forums for international relations. As already mentioned, digital diplomacy has evolved at the speed of light because it has created new direct channels of communication between the largest geopolitical entities and the people they serve around the world. Modern representatives of the diplomatic corps, as well as leaders of states, government institutions, diplomatic missions and diplomats have accounts on the X platform and use it to promote foreign policy goals and develop a positive image of the country (Dumčiuviene, 2016). Finally, when Swedish Foreign Minister Carl Bildt was unable to establish official contact with the Bahraini Foreign Minister through traditional means of communication, he invited him via the then-current Twitter account (Ritter, 2011). However, the above example is only one of a large number of diplomatic activities in public diplomacy, which has today become a completely regular way of communication between politicians, governments and states.

In addition to the above, for the past few years, the X platform has served as a public forum for domestic and global affairs. In a way, X has created its own form of diplomacy by engaging in an expansion of traditional diplomatic functions such as deliberation and negotiation. Research of ORF (Observer Research Foundation) Foundation positions the importance of the X platform almost equally with digital and traditional diplomacy. While the place where the frameworks of action of all three factors intersect is called "Twiplomacy" (Chhabra, 2020). The leading role of the X platform compared to others in the context of public diplomacy is highlighted by the following facts: simple communication, real-time information transfer and diversity of users. However, there are also negative effects such as polarization of users, bad and malicious information that distance certain public diplomacy actors to distant networks (Ong'ong'a, 2024). Other social networks such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, WeChat, SnapChat, Weibo and others play a significant role in digital diplomacy, however, the methods of content placement and the primary target group of users are significantly different from the X platform. The variety of tools available to attract a global audience is a huge incentive for digital diplomacy and undoubtedly moves it towards one of the most important tools of the diplomatic instrument of power.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In the contemporary international environment, the concept of national power is increasingly facing new challenges arising from global dynamics. Technology, globalization, demographic change, geopolitical tensions, and climate change all influence the formation and use of instruments of national power. Contemporary strategists and analysts recognize the need to adapt and expand traditional models of national power, which have long been based on economic and military force, in a rapidly changing world. One of the most important trends is the increasing influence of digital diplomacy as a tool in the instruments of national power. Digital diplomacy, which encompasses new communication technologies, social networks, and artificial intelligence, allows states to influence international relations and conduct diplomacy in a way that was previously not possible. These new features of diplomacy have resulted

in changes in classical strategic approaches and have demonstrated the importance of digital tools in shaping global politics.

Digital diplomacy as a modern diplomatic instrument faces a number of challenges related to the rapid development of technology and the dynamics of international relations. Key challenges include the use of artificial intelligence, public diplomacy on social networks, cybersecurity, information operations and disinformation, as well as ethical and regulatory aspects in the application of new technologies. Artificial intelligence plays an important role in the analysis of international relations and the prediction of diplomatic trends, but it also raises questions about privacy, transparency and the use of technology for strategic purposes. Digital diplomacy has empowered the use of platforms such as social networks to manage countries' image and diplomatic relations. Artificial intelligence can be significant in the preparation for diplomatic activities, as well as being used as a tool in negotiations, but at the same time it raises the question of how it will affect the context in which diplomats work, given the possibility of rapid and massive distribution of information in cyberspace. Ultimately, a successful strategic approach requires careful balancing of different aspects of power and the use of all available resources to achieve national goals, with the rapid and responsible use of new technologies as an important part of that strategy.

## REFERENCES

- Pavić A., Beriša A. H. (2024). Artificial intelligence impact assessment on national security strategy development. *Science International Journal*, 3(4), 19-27. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.35120/sciencej0304019p>
- Pavić A., Beriša H., Mihajlović D. (2024). Primena instrumenta meke moći Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva Velike Britanije i Severne Irske na Republiku Srbiju. *Baština*, 34(63), 133-143. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5937/bastina34-51291>
- Belinda Osei-Mensah, Elizabeth Owusu Asiamah, Rainbow Sackey. (2023). Strategic Communication and Artificial Intelligence: Reviewing Emerging Innovations and Future Directions. *Archives of Business Research*, 11, 85-102. doi:10.14738/abr.111.13616
- Rodriguez C. A., Walton T. C., Chu H.. (2020). Putting the "FIL" into "DIME": Growing Joint Understanding of the Instruments of Power. *Joint Force Quarterly*, 97.
- Chhabra, R. (2020). Twitter Diplomacy: A Brief Analysis. ORF Issue Brief No. 335, January 2020,.
- Constantinescu, M. (2021). The National Security Strategy in the Current Environment: from DIME to a DIME-T Approach. *International conference knowledge-based organization*, 27, 20-25. doi:10.2478/kbo-2021-0004
- Bjola C., Manor I. (2024). Digital diplomacy in the age of technological acceleration: three impact scenarios of generative artificial intelligence. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-023-00323-4>
- Costa, V. (2017). Shaping Public Diplomacy through Social Media Networks in the 21st Century. *Romanian Journal of History and International Studies*, 4(1), 139-154.
- Dixon, S. J. (2024, 7 10). Most popular social networks worldwide as of April 2024, by number of monthly active users. Retrieved 12 17, 2024, from Statista: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>
- Dumčiuvienė, A. (2016). Twiplomacy: the meaning of social media to public diplomacy and foreign policy of Lithuania. *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 35(92-118), 35. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/lfpr-2016-0025>
- Frey, C. (2024). Digital Diplomacy: The Impact of Technology on Modern Diplomacy and Foreign Policy. *Current Realities and Future Prospects*. *Romanian journal of european affairs*, 24(1), 107-126. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4864962>
- Cimmino J., Rothschild A. (2024, March 14). Twenty-First-Century Diplomacy: Strengthening US Diplomacy for the Challenges of Today and Tomorrow. Atlantic Council. Retrieved from Atlantic Council: <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/21st-Century-Diplomacy-PDF.pdf>
- Joint Doctrine Note 1-18, Strategy. (2018). Washington, DC: The Joint Staff.
- Höne E. K., Anđelković K., Perućica N., Saveska V., Hibbard L., Maciel M. (2019). Mapping the challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence for the conduct of diplomacy. Geneva, Switzerland: DiploFoundation.
- Kurbalija, J. (2024). Digital diplomacy. Retrieved 12 18, 2024, from Diplo: <https://www.diplomacy.edu/topics/digital-diplomacy/>
- Manor, I. (2019). *The digitalization of public diplomacy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miailhe, N. (2018). The geopolitics of artificial intelligence: The return of empires? *Politique étrangère*, 1, 105-117. Retrieved from <https://www.cairn-int.info/journal--2018-3-page-105.htm>
- Moore, A. (2023, March 21). How AI Could Revolutionize Diplomacy. Retrieved April 13, 2024, from Foreign Policy Magazine: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2023/03/21/ai-artificial-intelligence-diplomacy-negotiations-chatgpt-quantum-computing/>
- Ong'ong'a, O. (2024). Digital Diplomacy in Kenya: A Study on X (Twitter) Analysis and Communication Strategies of A Few Selected Diplomatic Actors. *Society & Sustainability*, 5(2), 1-14. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.38157/ss.v5i2.587>
- Petrosyan, A. (2024, 11 5). Number of internet and social media users worldwide as of October 2024. Retrieved 12 17, 2024, from Statista: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/617136/digital-population-worldwide/>
- Radanliev, P. (2024). Cyber diplomacy: defining the opportunities for cybersecurity and risks from Artificial Intelligence, IoT, Blockchains, and Quantum Computing. *Journal of Cyber Security Technology*, 1-51. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/23742917.2024.2312671>
- Rashica, V. (2018). The Benefits and Risks of Digital Diplomacy. *SEEU Review*, 13(1), 75-89. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2018-0008>
- Ritter, K. (2011, 5 26). Twitter diplomacy new face of foreign relations. Retrieved 12 17, 2024, from NBC News: <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna43185212>
- Marks S., Freeman W. C. (2024, February 16). Diplomacy. Retrieved April 13, 2024, from Encyclopedia Britannica: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy>

- Scott, A. (2011). The Nixon Shocks: The Opening to China and New Economic Policy. In A. Scott, *Allies Apart: Heath, Nixon and the Anglo-American Relationship* (pp. 50-79). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230348936\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230348936_3)
- Brown S., Studemeister M. (2001). Virtual Diplomacy: Rethinking Foreign Policy Practice in the Information Age. *Information & Security: An International Journal*, 7, 28-44. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.11610/isij.0702>
- Varela, D. (2024). Diplomacy in the Age of AI: Challenges and Opportunities. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General science (JAIGS)* ISSN:3006-4023, 98-109. doi:10.60087/jaigs.v2i1.p110
- Vevera, A. V. (2022). Critical Infrastructure Diplomacy – Tracing the Contours of a New Practice. *International Journal of Cyber Diplomacy*, 3, 41-49. doi:<https://doi.org/10.54852/ijcd.v3y202205>

