

CYBER-DIPLOMACY: FRAMING THE TRANSFORMATION

By:
Nejra Hodžić

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of International Relations

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Alexander V. Astrov

Word Count: 13 358
Budapest, Hungary
2017

ABSTRACT

Cyber-diplomacy has emerged as one of the terms used to describe the transformation in the conduct of states' foreign policies as well as the growing importance of cyberspace for global relations. Despite the fact that the scholarship has begun to incorporate cyber-security themes, it remains underexplored from the perspective of international relations theory. This research aims at constructing a new frame for interpreting cyber-diplomacy that will reveal different aspects of the change in inter-state relations facilitated by the development of technology. It sets out to analyze diplomacy from a standpoint of theory on diplomacy and to identify cyber-specific conditions by conceptualizing cyberspace as an environment that stimulates certain forms of relations over others. The frame that comes as a synthesis of the two analyses is finally applied to interpret cyber-diplomacy on the case of Russian interference in the U.S. election. The findings of this study reveal that cyber-diplomacy, aside from being an adaptation to new technology and new areas of foreign policy, is crucially about negotiating constantly changing identities under the conditions of increased ambiguities. These ambiguities consist of a redefined approach to power and identity and are brought out by cyber virtual capacity, networking extensiveness and environment pervasiveness.

With gratitude to my supervisor, professor Astrov, for asking the endless *why*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. DIPLOMACY.....	5
1.1 Diplomacy: The Art of Executing State's Foreign Policy.....	6
1.2 Diplomacy: The Practice of Identity Negotiation.....	8
1.3 Diplomacy's Rivals: Diplomatic Pathology and Anti-Diplomacy.....	11
1.4 Concluding Remarks.....	14
2. CYBER.....	16
2.1 Cyber-Specific Conditions: Virtuality, Pervasiveness and Networking.....	17
2.2 Cyber-Transformations: Identity, Power and Diplomacy's Rivals.....	21
2.3 Concluding Remarks.....	24
3. CYBER-DIPLOMACY.....	26
3.1 On the Other Side of Technology.....	26
3.2 The Russia Investigation.....	29
3.3 Framing and Reframing the Russian Hacker.....	31
3.4 Concluding Remarks.....	37
CONCLUSION.....	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	42

INTRODUCTION

The term cyber-diplomacy is being used increasingly by major actors in global politics to describe a transformation in the conduct of diplomacy in the digital age. In 2009, the United States of America incorporated cyber-diplomacy as an extension of the public diplomacy run by the Department of State and launched its first campaign to advance U.S. interests in cyberspace.¹ In 2015, the European Council published a report on cyber-diplomacy deeming “essential and crucial the further development and implementation of a common and comprehensive EU approach for cyber diplomacy at global level.”² Both of these examples illustrate the growing importance of the cyber-dimension for foreign policy and suggest a change in the ways it is executed. The evolution of diplomacy, under these frameworks, revolves around the utilization of new social media, the orientation towards public actors, and the establishment of cyber-threats and cyber-conduct as new areas in international politics. However, these strategies do not point at a broader interpretation of what these changes mean for the nature of inter-state negotiation and representation. They only open the space for further questioning - what actually happens with diplomacy once it enters the cyber-realm?

As a relatively recent phenomenon, cyber-diplomacy has not been studied extensively by international relations scholars. Most discussions on the topic of adjusting states to the new cyber-environment focus on how technology has altered the work of ministries of foreign affairs, embassies, and officials who are dealing with the growing importance of globally accessible information.³ A substantial amount of work has also been produced on how the role of the diplomats has changed from that of espionage to more overt information gathering via social

¹ Andreas Sandre, *Digital Diplomacy: Conversations on Innovation in Foreign Policy* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2015).

² The Council of European Union, *Draft Council Conclusions on Cyber Diplomacy*, 6122/15 (Brussels, February 11, 2015), <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-6122-2015-INIT/en/pdf>.

³ Jeffrey, Cooper, "New Skills for Cyber Diplomats." *TheWorld Today* 55 (1999): 20-22.

networks and public-oriented image building.⁴ International relations theory has mostly focused on the security aspects of the cyber-realm and the challenges brought by the new conduct of warfare rather than exploring its conditions and implications for mediating the coexistence of social groups through diplomacy.⁵ Consequently, not much has been said on the ways in which the nature of diplomacy has been impacted by the cyber-sphere. In other words, it is quite apparent that the complexities of information exchange in the cyber-sphere have identifiable consequences for the way diplomacy is practiced, as well as for the designation of the arenas in which it is used. What is not as obvious is that these innovations are saying something more about the ways in which states represent and negotiate their identities. It is significant to explore what kind of broader implications cyber-diplomacy exemplifies in terms of social relations in a globalized world. In order to achieve this, is also important to interpret diplomacy outside the commonly assumed framework of foreign policy execution. Understanding it in different ways might illuminate how states are being represented or identified in the international system and how they communicate their conflicts.

Therefore, an analysis of cyber-diplomacy fits broadly into the literature on the crisis of state sovereignty and the new grounds on which identities are shaped and represented. Jef Huysman identifies this crisis as the “new condition of world politics,” where national sovereignty has been undermined by new technology, non-state actors, and regionalization.⁶ Hedley Bull uses the term “neo-medievalism” to describe the erosion of state sovereignty in the increasingly globalized world where political power is spread to a range of non-territorial actors – comparable to the medieval times when these actors were city-states or religious bodies.⁷ John Ruggie makes a similar parallel when claiming that de-territorialization is bringing about far-reaching developments that have not

⁴ Harold Nicolson, *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method* (Leicester: University of Leicester, 2001).

⁵ Manuel De Landa, *War in the age of intelligent machines* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992).

⁶ Jef Huysmans, “James Der Derian: The Unbearable Lightness of Theory,” In *The future of international relations: masters in the making?*, ed. IverB. Neumann and Ole Wæver, (London: Routledge, 1997): 348.

⁷ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977).

been experienced since the Renaissance.⁸ Thus, simply outlining what types of communicative novelties are being used in the world today without linking them to this new condition does not fully demonstrate the implications that are involved for diplomacy. Exploring whether and what kind of diplomacy is taking place in the cyber-sphere is consequently relevant not only for the purposes of informing foreign policy conduct, but also for understanding an aspect of the potentially new ways in which relationships between the actors in the system are being built and sustained. Answering these questions may diversify analytical positions on the phenomenon.

This work aims at contributing to the exploration of the transformations implied in the concept of cyber-diplomacy. In order to achieve this purpose, the research has to explore both the existing theory on diplomacy and the literature on cyber. The first chapter is therefore dedicated to exploring different understandings of diplomacy and setting defining points that will help trace the more fundamental aspects of its transformation. The second chapter attempts to specify the conditions of the cyber-environment and explore the outcomes of new technological developments by relating them to social relations, or more precisely, the definitions of diplomacy from the previous section. The last part synthesises the individual discussions on diplomacy and cyber into an interpretation of cyber-diplomacy that moves beyond utilization of social media or concern with cyber-related issues. Here, an example of Russian interference in the U.S. election is analysed to demonstrate how the theoretical interpretation of the concept applies to the reality of international relations. By building extensively on the theoretical background, this research contributes to the understanding of cyber-diplomacy in terms that tell more about the broader changes in the relations between states. It also expands the usage of the term in the analysis of international relations. Finally, this research aims to show how the proliferation of the technological connotations that are

⁸ John Gerard Ruggie, "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations," *International Organization* 47 (1993): 147.

added to diplomacy such as e-diplomacy, digital-diplomacy, public diplomacy 2.0⁹ or cyber-diplomacy signify important developments for the substance of the negotiation of international relations and not just the form of their execution.

⁹ Jan Melissen, “The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice,” In *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations*. ed. Jan Melissen (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

1. DIPLOMACY

The departing point for any analysis of the linkages between the concept of diplomacy and the interactions in a technologically transforming social reality is to outline a frame in which diplomacy can be conceptualized. In order to see diplomacy in cyber, an understanding of what it denotes outside of cyber has to be captured. For such a frame to be representative, it ought to involve a set of commonly held assumptions about the term, reflecting the continuity of the characteristics used to describe it, and still have a degree of flexibility in its application to encompass the contextual changeability. As there is a risk of exaggerating the fluidity of the concept when trekking too far from its basis, this work will attempt to integrate elements of what could be understood as the two major theoretical approaches in the discussions on diplomacy: 1) the art of managing the foreign policy of states and 2) the practice of negotiating identities under the conditions of plurality. To consolidate these frames, an examination of diplomacy's negatives and derivations could be beneficial. Although it is hard to escape what Costas Constantinou refers to as thinking in the familiar frameworks when interpreting diplomacy in modern scholarship, there have been attempts in social theory to deconstruct the process of diplomatic frame-making that will serve to illustrate a more expansive take on the concept.¹⁰ The underlying premise is not to engage in discussions on the alternatives to the framing of the concept, but rather to identify different ways of understanding what type of actions/relations diplomacy is used to describe, as well as what its perversions are, and apply these insights to the presumably different social context of cyber – thus laying grounds for the construction of a new frame for cyber-diplomacy.

¹⁰Costas Constantinou, "Diplomatic Representations... or Who Framed the Ambassadors?," *Millennium*, 23 (1994): 322.

1.1 *Diplomacy: The Art of Executing State's Foreign Policy*

In 1959, Avalon Hill, a US company specialized in the production of strategic board games, released *Diplomacy*. The objective of the game was to take control of the supply points across the territory of pre-WW1 Europe through negotiation, by “forming and betraying alliances” and shaping “beneficial strategies”, without the random effect of the dice.¹¹ The representation of diplomacy as the rational, calculated conduct of state conquest through negotiation, illustrates several important aspects to the concept's meaning. However, when situated in the realist-dominated international relations theory of the period, such an approach reveals only a certain degree of overlap with what diplomacy was conceived as in academic literature. One of the most prominent examples is Morgenthau's interpretation of the purpose of diplomacy being the promotion of rational interests by peaceful means - balancing between persuasion, compromising and threat of force, and reflecting the survivalist nature of the relations between states.¹² Nevertheless, Morgenthau makes an important distinction: setting victory or defeat as the end goals is detrimental to diplomacy as its aim should be to create circumstances for permanent peace.¹³ Victory and defeat are absolute categories whereas diplomacy supports peace through accommodation.

This assumption is omitted in the earlier work of Harold Nicholson and his use of the Oxford dictionary definition: “Diplomacy is the management of international relations by negotiation, the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys, the business or art of the diplomats.”¹⁴ Here, the focus slightly shifts on the agency and the execution - diplomacy thus becomes ordered and organized. According to him, this occurs particularly in the aftermath of the Congress of Vienna in 1815 that established diplomatic service as

¹¹ David Parlett, *The Oxford History of Board Games* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999): 361–362.

¹² Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 3rd edition, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966): 540.

¹³ Ibid., 542.

¹⁴ Harold Nicolson, *Diplomacy* (Georgetown University: Institute for the study of Diplomacy, 1988): 4.

a profession different from that of a statesman or a politician and put forth specific diplomatic rules, conventions, and prescriptions.¹⁵ Even without defining the ultimate aim of diplomacy in the way Morgenthau does, both authors frame diplomacy as the art of implementing the foreign policy of states. Diplomats, ambassadors, and envoys are vested with the task of carrying out instructions from ‘home’ – these instructions reflecting the national interests - while operating in accordance with the ‘extraterritorial’ body of rules common to every participant in the relations. In this way, the management of state-centric international relations is introduced as one of the crucial aspects of modern diplomacy.

The formality of the agency in diplomacy is further stressed in Bull’s later theory of diplomacy as he references the symbolic importance of the historical letters of credence.¹⁶ Although he supports the similar line of thinking whereby diplomacy manages the difference between the common and the particular interests of states, he also uses the term to describe the management of friction between these interests by any other “political entity with standing in the world politics” – potentially referring to international organizations or non-governmental bodies.¹⁷ By bringing other entities into diplomatic agency he therefore challenges the state-centric definition of diplomacy, but still remains bound to the world politics where a friction of interests occurs in the realm of foreign policy. Diplomacy, in his work, is still about managing this friction under the structural conditions of anarchy. In this setup, the mutual recognition of rights and obligations sustains the international order through diplomacy. Hence, diplomacy is not only ordered in itself but reflective of a broader international order. Ultimately, order ensures peace – an implication comparable to Morgenthau’s assertions.

¹⁵Ibid., 12.

¹⁶ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977): 158.

¹⁷Ibid., 158.

Thus, the structural conditions observed in the friction of interests in the international realm, official state actors acting to minimize it, and the ultimate objective of peace remain commonly referenced defining points of the term. Understanding diplomacy as something other than the management of international relations described in this way would consequently expand these definitions without necessarily contradicting them. By looking at diplomacy as “the working of a social collective which strives to maintain its boundaries to the outside”, Martin Wight establishes a broader frame that does not exclude all the previous notions.¹⁸ Rather, he refers to it as “a master institution”, but fails to specify the “key respects” in which it encompasses other institutions.¹⁹ For this reason, Iver Neumann recognizes Wight as one of the theorists who opens the door to studying diplomacy as something more than state-to-state relations, but does not walk through that door.²⁰ The basis for a somewhat different conceptualization is found in the interpretations of diplomacy that focus on broader social relations and the idea of identity negotiation that could, but does not have to, be reflected in the management of foreign policy interests.

1.2 *Diplomacy: The Practice of Identity Negotiation*

Diplomacy is therefore almost imminently associated with the operative verbs - mediating, negotiating, stabilizing, conducting, managing – which, above all, constitute it as a practice. The practice then requires the existence of subjects whose relations ought to be made functional, and certain conditions in which it can be manifested. Instead of describing these conditions as anarchy, Paul Sharp refers to a “plural fact” of people living in groups, but separately.²¹ He associates these “necessarily and generally plural conditions” of human presence with the relations of separateness or, put simply, the lack of readiness to sacrifice the self for strangers under the imperative of living

¹⁸ Martin Wight. *Systems of States*, (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977): 33.

¹⁹ Ibid., 33.

²⁰Iver B. Neumann. “The English School on Diplomacy,” In *Diplomacy, Volume I: Theory of Diplomacy*, ed. Christer Jönsson& Richard Langhorne (London: Sage Publications, 2004): 92-116.

²¹ Paul Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 10.

together peacefully.²² The introduction of the self and the strangers in the discussion on diplomatic theory exposes the perspective of identity. Understood in this way, diplomacy is not by necessity an outgrowth of the modern state system, but rather a continuous characteristic of social relations. The “conduct of the relations of separateness” is therefore a permanent, dialectical feature of social life whereby the apparent fading of identities is followed by an emergence of new ones.²³ Sharp draws on Constantinou to explain the ambiguity of these identities which are necessarily incomplete representations of the selves as they are the results of continuous framing and adaptation.²⁴ Here, diplomacy becomes a practice of permanent negotiation of the self in relation to the other. Interests are derived from the constitution of these identities and equally subject to change. The only fixed aspect is the necessity of their ambiguity. Sharp, however, maintains that this is too broad of a basis to think about diplomacy. Instead, he distinguishes between diplomats and people acting diplomatically by claiming that the former resides in the space between the communities. This “tragedy of distance” develops an array of outside perspectives that further helps to achieve a consensus on elements of the diplomatic culture – a specific kind of framework for negotiating identities.²⁵ His answer to the separation of the diplomatic from the less diplomatic is to look for parallels with the rules of diplomatic culture of a given time - this is where diplomacy can be connected to state relations again. The rules that are operating in official diplomacy have been agreed on by states, to go back to Nicholson, at the Congress of Vienna - establishing a turning point in the diplomatic profession. Nevertheless, for Sharp, diplomacy is still about negotiation with the foreign whereas for Nicholson it is an execution of state foreign policies.

Diplomatic culture is also one of the important aspects needed for framing or narrowing down the appearance of diplomacy in James Der Derian’s account on estrangement. He describes it

²² Ibid., 10.

²³ Ibid., 122.

²⁴ Ibid., 79.

²⁵ Ibid., 102.

as a neutral bridge, or a discursive space between estranged people organized into states that interact in the system.²⁶ The ‘universality’ of this culture forges a trust that is crucial for the mediation of “mutually alienated selves” to start in the first place.²⁷ Without the guaranty of reciprocity, diplomatic culture – a recognition of joint values and interests – takes on the role of a normative insurance for mutual preservation. Diplomacy in this understanding is still related to mediation of mutually estranged identities. If interpreted broadly, this baseline definition does not exclude the possibility of any human relations to be deemed diplomatic: “In this world, diplomacy, a peaceful reciprocal mediation of estrangement has an important role to play. It must negotiate the meaning and values that constitute identity out of difference in order to make it possible to live in difference.”²⁸ Yet, Der Derian also refers to the identities of states since “pure” diplomacy – one absent of any prefixes – is a characteristic of the modern state system in his genealogy. Practices that share the function of mediating alienation, but do not depend on states for execution, are represented as alterations of the concept. For example, mytho-diplomacy is used to describe mediation between God and man as well as mediation between tribes through sacred symbols, while proto-diplomacy is linked to mediating estrangements of city-states from empires - both are one-sided rather than mutual²⁹. On the other hand, pure diplomacy emerges in conjecture with the state system – it is neither constitutive nor reflective of it. The accumulation of power in states, the balance of power among them as a structural condition, and the emergence of diplomatic culture observable through international law are necessary for diplomacy in this understanding as much as diplomacy is necessary to self-preservation of the states. Such a notion stands in contrast to Sharp’s argument that diplomats and diplomacy developed “a refined system of relations of separateness –

²⁶ James Der Derian, *On Diplomacy a Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1987): 43.

²⁷ Ibid., 41.

²⁸ James Der Derian, *On Diplomacy a Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1987): 165.

²⁹ Ibid.

international society of states” to facilitate their efforts.³⁰ For Sharp, diplomacy is permanently present across history, as the plural condition of human existence is unchangeable; everything else represents “an iteration of this general condition.”³¹ For Der Derian, on the other hand, the changes are critical junctures in the genealogy of diplomacy that might lead to something that looks like diplomacy, but not diplomacy in its proper meaning, as it is specific to the context of the state system. However, if the prevailing diplomatic culture – the one from which it is possible to establish the extent of diplomacy in the relations according to Sharp’s line of thinking – is negotiated by states (as established earlier), it is possible to find an agreement between the two views.

1.3 Diplomacy’s Rivals: Diplomatic Pathology and Anti-Diplomacy

When building a frame of diplomacy, it is important to consider the practices that might appear as diplomatic, but are often identified as detrimental to it. In order to avoid the conflation of these practices with the actual concept in the later analysis of cyber, a brief exploration of the ways in which these have been defined in diplomatic theory will be offered. Listening for the sake of acquiring an advantage over the other and pursuing one’s own interests rather than understanding the self and the other is, in Jose Calvet De Magalhaes’ terminology, a form of diplomatic pathology.³² Although he identifies several forms of abnormalities in diplomatic practice³³ within the broader pathology, a distinction is made between the deviations from the ‘normal’ means and the general ends of diplomacy. Deviations from normal means could be compared to the deviations from the ideal characteristics of Nicholson’s diplomat,³⁴ which imply obtaining secret information or any

³⁰ Paul Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 109.

³¹ Ibid., 109.

³² Jose Calvet De Magalhaes, *The pure concept of diplomacy* (New York: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1988): 79.

³³ Namely: backchannel diplomacy, combat diplomacy, diplomatic intelligence and counter-intelligence. Ibid., 79.

³⁴ Drinkwater identifies the characteristics Nicholson uses in his work: Truth, accuracy, calm, patience, good temper, modesty, loyalty, intelligence, knowledge, discernment, prudence, hospitality, charm, industry, courage, and tact. Derek Drinkwater, *Sir Harold Nicholson and International Relations: The Practitioner as Theorist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005): 95.

information in illicit ways or ways outside the official channels. The concern with diplomacy's ends is more present in the previously analyzed attempts to define it, however, a comparison with the antipode makes some defining points more apparent.

According to Nicolson, these ends are “the maintenance of amicable relations between sovereign States,” and he draws on Henry Kissinger to explain its adversary: “When diplomacy is employed to provoke international animosity, it ceases to be diplomacy and becomes its opposite, namely war by another name.”³⁵ Winning by defeating, to go back to Morgenthau, is at odds with the purpose of diplomacy – it cannot be a game or a competition because the outcome is not to coexist by learning about the other, but to maximize gains in relative terms. The context of political revolution is particularly illustrative of these deviations as it breeds replacement of one mode of existence with the other rather than continuous adjustments. A further tendency towards universalism exhibited in an act of revolution distorts diplomacy - which demands plurality. Wight observed that “revolutionary politics tend to break down the distinction between diplomacy and espionage,” adding subversion and propaganda as perversions of ‘pure’ goals of informing, communicating and negotiating: “diplomacy is an attempt to adjust conflicting interests by negotiation and compromise: propaganda is the attempt to sway the opinion that underlies and sustains the interests.”³⁶ Der Derian takes the idea a step further through a notion of anti-diplomacy that, as a dialectic of diplomacy, transcends rather than mediates estranged relations.³⁷ He also finds anti-diplomacy in utopian and revolutionary thought or, more specifically, in the practices mediating the universal alienation of mankind, thus being “agents for the destruction of segmentation.”³⁸ What all of these authors show is that anti-diplomatic practices, even when resembling diplomacy, are

³⁵ Henry Kissinger, *The White House Years* (Boston: Little & Brown, 1979): 39.

³⁶ Martin Wight. *Power Politics* (London: Penguin Books, 1979): 89.

³⁷ James Der Derian. *On Diplomacy a Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1987): 136.

³⁸ Ibid., 135.

fundamentally different in the goals they strive to achieve. Whereas diplomacy aims for sustaining plurality through negotiation, its negatives tend to represent challenges to its sustainability.

The question that arises from this understanding of diplomatic pathologies is whether or not the growth in transnational connections today could be framed as anti-diplomatic. However, the pluralism of civil society, even when embedded in global relationships with radiating networks, does not establish an anti-diplomatic threat as long as it does not seek universality or breed exclusion. The existence of foreignness, a plural condition, or simply the Other, combined with a need to coexist peacefully will subsequently necessitate diplomacy. The discussion of diplomacy's negatives could be linked to Constantinou and Der Derian's proposal on how to make diplomacy sustainable in the current age. In their view, diplomacy has to be able to transform "those aspects of public imagination that engender difference and lead to exclusion,"³⁹ not out of a desire to reach "a consensus based on universal reason," but rather out of a necessity to "continually articulate, not just mediate, reasons for the importance of maintaining a logic of cohabitation and critical dialogue."⁴⁰ Similarly, Anthony Deos and Geoffrey Allen Pigman maintain that widening the understanding of public diplomacy beyond bi-directional communication of governments and foreign publics towards a more constructive listening and informing of identities should counter diplomatic deviations.⁴¹ Constantine frames this idea in terms of mutually constitutive subjectivities: "The mission is not only the knowledge and the control of the Other, but fundamentally the knowledge of the Self - and crucially this knowledge of the Self as a more reflective means of dealing with and transforming relations with Others."⁴² Such an approach to diplomacy could consequently

³⁹HuseinBanai. "Diplomacy and Public Imagination," In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 46-66. (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010): 61.

⁴⁰ Costas Constantinou and James Der Derian, "Introduction: Sustaining Global Hope: Sovereignty, Power and the Transformation of Diplomacy." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 1-22. (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010): 18.

⁴¹ Anthony Deos and Geoffrey Allen Pigman. "Sustainable Public Diplomacy: Communicating about Identity, Interests and Terrorism." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 151-172. (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010): 19.

⁴² Costas Constantinou. "Diplomacy, Spirituality, Alterity." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 67-85. (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010): 68.

coexist with the anti- or para-diplomatic phenomena in the heteropolar and multicultural world. What remains a challenge, to echo Sharp again, is identifying which of these processes and relations are more diplomatic/anti-diplomatic than the others.

1.4 Concluding Remarks

After exploring multiple approaches to defining diplomacy, its deviations, and potential for transformation, several points can be termed innate to the concept. One of the major structural requirements is the diversity of interests and identities that ought to be mutually mediated in order to peacefully coexist. This mediation can occur through both state and non-state agency but each side needs a legitimate representation. The extent through which their efforts are deemed diplomatic can be judged not only in terms of the objectives and agents behind it, but also in accordance with the diplomatic culture of the given time. The combination of the identity-oriented approaches to defining diplomacy, in addition to the traditional foreign policy-executive understandings, opens several strands of thinking about the ways in which diplomacy can be framed. What is central to all of them is the positioning of states in relation to their views of each other – either in terms of adjusting foreign policies or adjusting representations of the selves. Diplomacy is therefore, a practice of negotiating this positioning. However, when looking for these practices in cyber, the question is not whether they will be found. Rather, the question is how the ambiguities of cyber are transforming their core. As Neumann claims: “The kinds of tasks that diplomacy tackles – information gathering, communication of a polity’s position and negotiation – remain fairly constant across time and space. It does not follow, however, that diplomacy itself remains constant. Since the specific tasks to be tackled as well as the institutional setting in which they occur are infinitely variable across time and space, diplomacy is in fact forever changing.”⁴³ Thus, the fundamental features of diplomacy are being situated in the context that slightly differs from that of the modern

⁴³Iver B. Neumann. *Diplomatic Sites* (London: Hurst & Company, 2013): 147.

state system. The next chapter attempts to explore the specifics of this context in order to show how they are transforming the practice of negotiating continuously changing identities and interests among the states.

2. CYBER

A decade ago, news about cyber was mostly associated with the technological developments of the Internet and communication advancement. Today, most of the news about cyber is related to the cyber-capabilities of states, security, and defense. Aside from pointing at the increasing importance of cyber for everyday life and politics, these trends also show that a common representation of cyber is mostly technologically-based - denoting an artificial space to which activities such as communication or war are being transferred. They also reflect a common approach to defining it: “*Cyberspace* is the formless, nonphysical realm that theoretically exists as the result of the links between computers, computer networks, the Internet, and other devices and components involved in Internet use.”⁴⁴ This is perhaps linked to the first use of the term conjointly with “space” in 1982 by William Gibson to describe “a graphic representation of data abstracted from the banks of every computer in the human system.”⁴⁵ Consequently, cyber, as a prefix, is used descriptively to imply an association with computers, information technology, and virtual reality. It denotes something abstract, yet linked to the reality of the physical world.

The question that the use of this prefix very often fails to address, however, is more that of substance. Is there something more specific to these nouns than the association to technology? How are they actually transformed by this association? Why are these particular words associated more often with cyber rather than others? Going beyond a conceptualization of cyber as a space, and exploring it as an environment instead, might provide different answers to these questions. The reason for approaching it in this way is the nature of the environment – it implies the existence of conditions more conducive to some forms of relations than others and, above all, an impact on the subjects or the activities present in it. Rather than thinking “where” something is happening, it

⁴⁴Jack Lasky, “Cyberspace,” Salem Press Encyclopedia of Science, 10 April, 2016, accessed May 21, 2017, <http://demo.stacksdiscovery.com/eds/detail?db=ers&an=93787497>. Salem Press Encyclopedia of Science. *Emphasis added*.

⁴⁵ William Gibson, *Neuromancer*, (New York: Ace, 1984): 51.

would be more revealing to think what is specific to this activity given the conditions of the new environment. Thus – if seen as more than a qualification of dimensions, cyber would stand not only for the association with technology and Internet, but the impact this association has on the latter part of the compound. This chapter will focus on examining cyber-specific conditions and the resulting nature of its relations while simultaneously linking the implications of both to the understandings of diplomacy proposed earlier.

2.1 Cyber-Specific Conditions: Virtuality, Pervasiveness and Networking

The development of cyber technology is propelled by the human desire to interact faster, easier, cheaper, more effectively, or, in other words, to contend with the limitations of a physical presence in conveying and exchanging knowledge. The transcendence of distance has, however, been a purpose of communicative technologies even before cyber. The distinctive aspects of the new environment it generates are extensive virtual capacity, unmatched pervasiveness, and networking complexity. The earlier definition of cyberspace might offer a good starting point for the analysis of the first of these features – it is nonphysical in a more complex way. With cyber, the virtual is not merely the abstraction of a phone conversation or a video recording – it allows for creation and representation on a greater scale and in multiple ways.

In his attempt to develop a virtual theory of war and peace, Der Derian contrasts the idea that new technology is capable of creating the effects of reality with the notion, embedded in the history of philosophical thought, that “reality has always been inflected with virtual.”⁴⁶ The difference, according to him is that the new networked technologies have “taken virtualization to a qualitatively new place, the no place of cyberspace.”⁴⁷ Virtualization, directly linked to the condition of non-physicality, is specific to cyber in its extensiveness and self-perpetuation. In contrast to other

⁴⁶ James Der Derian, *Virtuous war: Mapping the military-industrial-media-entertainment-network*, (London: Routledge, 2009): 217.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 217.

media, the ability to create in the cyber environment is supplemented with the speed of interaction and the complexity of feedback loops - reinforcing the ambiguity of the virtual. Thus, when an identity or an interest is represented through a cyber environment, there are multiple ways of shaping it further because of the multiplicity of the responses – all coexisting in time rather than being territorialized. Mediating estrangement between these identities, which was established as fundamental to diplomacy by Der Derian, becomes equally complex. Similarly, negotiating necessarily ambiguous identities, as Sharp suggested, is complicated by this condition of virtuality that multiplies uncertainties. Since even the smallest inputs in such a networked surrounding have unpredictable consequences, establishing a focal point or deciphering how something acquired a certain meaning and what the original message was, is increasingly difficult.

Important layers to the differentiating conditions of cyber from other media environments can be identified in Huysmans' analysis of the Der Derian's earlier work that touches upon virtual - cyber is more real in time than in place and breeds more pervasive techniques under what appears to be a transparent structure.⁴⁸ Two examples can be used to illustrate this. The relevance of time over place can be observed in the act of simulation that works through an exchange of signs, not goods,⁴⁹ or, as Jean Baudrillard maintains, everything is a hyper-reality composed of references with no referents.⁵⁰ What becomes more real for the exchange of these references is the time, as they are occurring in a nonphysical environment. Being able to learn fast from the signs comprising the simulation increases the momentous capacity to receive information, but prevents the long-term storage because it simultaneously leads to faster forgetting.⁵¹ This is how cyber creates ambiguities

⁴⁸Jef Huysmans, "James Der Derian: The Unbearable Lightness of Theory," In *The future of international relations: masters in the making?*, ed. Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver, (London: Routledge, 1997): 349.

⁴⁹Ibid., 352.

⁵⁰ Jean Baudrillard. *Simulacra and Simulations*, (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994): 56.

⁵¹Jef Huysmans, "James Der Derian: The Unbearable Lightness of Theory," in *The future of international relations: masters in the making?*, ed. Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver, (London: Routledge, 1997): 352.

and potential for what Constantinou terms ‘framing of appearance from non-existence.’⁵² The act of creation in cyber is subject to recreation in many directions and this makes the representation of states heterogenous. Often, conflicting views are easily formed and continue coexisting despite negations and deflections at the same time forcing states to continuously reframe and invert them in order to negotiate the identities that are altered in the whirl of networks, feedback loops, simulations and interpretations.

The pervasiveness of the new environment, on the other hand, is best observed in the power of surveillance that works through “distribution of certainty and uncertainty.”⁵³ Often compared to Bentham’s panopticon, it works through the notion of a feeling of being watched rather than evidence of this action being executed. However, in cyber – there is no certainty of the physical tower in the center from which the actions are being monitored. Rather, the “feeling of being watched” is constructed virtually by the awareness of the possibility that whoever coded the environment, or has the skill to shape it, also has the power and access to monitor it. This particularity of cyber makes anti-diplomacy or diplomatic pathologies less detectable. It is not debatable if surveillance fits these deviations, since it represents a form of spying and an illicit means of acquiring information that also contrasts diplomacy’s ends by giving one side an advantage without an actual adjustment of identities or interests. What becomes problematic for diplomacy in cyber, however, is coping with the uncertainty of whether one has been watched when there is a narrative about it, but no evidence. Diplomacy thus confronts the virtuality of its rivals, rather than the proven manifestations. This uncertainty is further complicated by the impression of the abundance of information about these potentially dangerous others – creating the appearance of transparency. This has serious implications for the trust between actors representing themselves in

⁵² Costas Constantinou. “Diplomatic Representations... or Who Framed the Ambassadors?,” *Millennium* 23 (1994): 19.

⁵³ David Lyon, “An electronic panopticon? A sociological critique of surveillance theory,” *The Sociological Review* 41 (1993): 657-8.

cyber because of the difficulty to tell whether an act of positioning in the system is built on anti-diplomatic moves or is a genuine attempt at negotiation through addressing the previously shaped frames. Ronald J. Deibert refers to the effects of these conditions as taking “plural worlds and multiple realities to the extreme in digital simulations and images.”⁵⁴ Consequently, the willingness to negotiate with an inconsistent and potentially dangerous ‘foreign’ stands in opposition to the image of knowing more about it.

In such an environment, it seems that the other is close and approachable, thus less separated from the self. However, there is a parallel level of separation that occurs between each respective self and the cyber. One may then ask – how is this different from separation that occurs when making a representation of any kind, since every representation in itself is an act of creating oneself? As noted earlier, separation through cyber is specific in its extent and complexity. The alternative realities comprising alternative identities, which are constantly transformed between physical reality and the cyber environment, add new layers to human interaction and diplomacy. When physical ‘presence’ is not required to engage with the other, the speed of the process increases significantly and so does the amount of knowledge about the other, but the possibility for surveillance follows these developments as well. Ironically, this “death of distance”⁵⁵ or “collapse of distance”⁵⁶ stimulates a distance of another kind – a more complex and potentially dangerous one as its mediation might not be able to redress for its pervasiveness. As Virilo maintains: “This passage from an extensive to an intensive time will have considerable impact on all the various aspects of the conditions of our society: it leads to radical reorganization both of our social mores and our image of the world. This is the source of the feeling that we’re faced with an epoch in many ways

⁵⁴ Ronald J. Deibert, "Hyper-realities of world politics: Theorizing the communications revolution," In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002): 49.

⁵⁵ Gordon Smith and Allen Sutherland, "The New Diplomacy: Real-Time Implications and Applications," In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002): 151.

⁵⁶ Jef Huysmans, "James Der Derian: The Unbearable Lightness of Theory," In *The future of international relations: masters in the making?*, ed. Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver, (London: Routledge, 1997): 375.

comparable to the Renaissance: it's an epoch in which the real world and our image of the world no longer coincide."⁵⁷ Although there is some risk in making predictions of this scale, they do illustrate an important point for this research – the impact of the changes in complexity of social relations brought on by the discussed conditions of the cyber environment is important to explore as it might signal something more for the way people live together than just a communication advancement.

Therefore, it is necessary to identify the relations that are being transformed or made more visible, the actors who acquired more power given cyber conditions, as well as the implications for diplomacy as a practice negotiating the positioning of states' identities and interests in the system. Once these are discussed, it will become possible to categorize the approaches to interpreting the meaning of the prefix of cyber in relation to diplomacy.

2.2 *Cyber-Transformations: Identity, Power and Diplomacy's Rivals*

“Actual genesis of social forces and ideas ultimately reflects a multiplicity of factors that cannot be reduced to a single, overarching, master variable. The existing stock of social forces and ideas will flourish or wither depending on their fitness or match with the new communications environment.”⁵⁸ The underlying premise is that technology, both as a medium and an environment, depends on the reality it is simultaneously detached from through its virtual manifestation. The forces and ideas that flourish in cyber are very often associated with the de-territorialization of identities and the emergence of global society. Deibert, for example, maintains that the forces of global society grow under the lack of strictly delineated political space.⁵⁹ The Cyber-environment supports and reinforces the shared structures within which the globally integrated community operates – international economy, finance, security, communication. It also fits well within the

⁵⁷ John Armitage, *Virilio Live – Selected Interviews* (London: SAGE Publications, 2001): 114.

⁵⁸ Ronald J. Deibert, "Hyper-realities of world politics: Theorizing the communications revolution," In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002): 39.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 9.

discussions of the rising global social movements driven by causes transcending national boundaries or what Evan H. Potter refers to as - “transnational coalitions of like-minded individuals.”⁶⁰ These are a match for the cyber-environment and prosper there because they are linked to the presence in the moment where territory, national regulations or identities do not play a definitive role. Potter connects these trends with the growing role of the public dimension in political life that is encouraged by the usage of “profoundly democratic” new technologies.⁶¹ Cyber-relations are, according to him, public-oriented and democratic because of the availability of information (leading to the transparency of governmental activities) and the relative ease of access and engagement. This proliferation of actors impacts the ways states, as traditional actors in diplomacy, execute and negotiate their positions. They ought to adapt not only to other states, but calibrate their foreign policies and representations to account for both internal and external pressures that easily assume a transnational character.

Hence, the cyber environment, aside from making diplomacy more complex through the ambiguity of the virtual, also increases the multitude of the directions states must consider when negotiating their statuses. Several discernments can be made from this. Initially, there seems to exist a structural distinction between the cyber-environment and the states system in a way that it is difficult to follow a universal order of sovereignty when categorizing actors and their relations or establishing the meaning of “the foreign”. The forces of global society and the involvement of the public in political struggles might in this way be interpreted as a larger question of the transforming social order that is manifested with more ease in the structurally different environment of cyber. These forces would, however, have to be understood as coming out of the continuous transformation of social relations that, as mentioned at the beginning, cannot be reduced to a single

⁶⁰ Evan H. Potter, “Introduction,” in *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002): 8.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 16.

cause – but their particular manifestations in the moment, as well as their implication for diplomacy, can be explored and studied.

A more specific outcome of the cyber-environment for these relations is a change in power dynamics between states. Franklin Kramer, Stuart Starr, and Larry Wentz define cyber power as “the ability to use cyberspace to a strategic advantage to influence events in other operational environments and across the instruments of power.”⁶² One of the requirements of cyber power is thus an access to a cyber environment – which primarily means access to technology. On a state-level, it is best illustrated through the maintenance of national security that increasingly rests on the cyber domain – producing a “dependence which is not universal across all nations within the international system and therefore fostering a fundamentally asymmetric quality.”⁶³ However, these relations of asymmetry and dependence have to be situated in a broader context. Although access to technology can limit the ability to take an active role in the cyber-environment, it does not exclude social groups completely from this realm as the input that is used for virtual creations and representations is an outcome of the greater socialization in a physical environment. Having less power in these terms means having less control over or the ability to actively create images and representations and consequently negotiate them – even when they are created by the others. If interpreted in security terms, it also implies an asymmetry in the way actors conceive of the threat and danger from the foreign as relative to cyber capabilities. The resulting relations between cyber-powerful and less powerful might be haunted with suspicion, mistrust, and amplified perception of danger. This adds to the complexity of mediating relations transformed by engagement with the new environment. When attempting to negotiate power positioning, diplomacy is not only using cyber for representation, but builds on the cyber environment as a force shifting power capabilities.

⁶² Franklin Kramer, Stuart Starr and Larry Wentz, *Cyberpower and National Security*, (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press and Potomac Books, 2009): 255.

⁶³ Aaron Franklin Brantly, *The Decision to Attack: Military and Intelligence Cyber Decision-Making*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2016): 42.

Finally, the requirements for cyber power are not only limited to technology access and the ability to influence representations, but the expertise of cyber-creators. Cyber is a partially engineered environment where its manufacturers, no matter how dependent on state regulations and market forces, still possess an expertise knowledge that, at a high level, becomes a source of power. Aaron Brantly's argument that the vulnerability of the states towards this type of power "largely originates out of the sheer complexity of the systems on which the national security infrastructure depends for its operation across all the pillars of national security"⁶⁴ demonstrates an emergence of a new type of uncertainty. States, as well as individuals, are vulnerable against the expertise knowledge of the code behind the cyber – breeding conditions for the social relations in a way parallel to the notion of surveillance discussed earlier. Hacking serves as a good example of this - an individual or a group of individuals with specific knowledge can disproportionally influence aspects of social life, such as brining down networks and computer systems, harvesting massive amounts of personal data or influencing the internal politics of a country. If attributed to identities or foreign policies of states, these actions can influence their estrangement and facilitate the perception of a dangerous other. Consequently, this new class of power creates more uncertainty for diplomacy, as cyber-expertise can be used both to establish the legitimacy of the claims made by a state, generate confusion about them or to support anti-diplomatic activities.

2.3 Concluding Remarks

Gibson, the architect of the term cyberspace, claimed in his later work that there are not two separate realities, but one merged reality where interactions between cyber and the physical world occur continuously and influence one another.⁶⁵ In other words, interactions that happen in cyber are virtual but they have implications for daily lives in the ways opinions and decisions about

⁶⁴ Ibid., 39.

⁶⁵ William Gibson, "Google's Earth," *The New York Times*, August 31, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/01/opinion/01gibson.html>. Accessed May 31, 2017.

coexistence are made and in determining how to manage conflicts or divergences in interests. The degree of separation is increased through the virtuality of cyber as the capacity for creation is larger, but this does not suggest that a completely different world is entered when interactions in the cyber environment occur. Rather, both are connected and depend on each other: the regulations of states, multilateral and unilateral, set the grounds for technologies produced and set the norms of the behavior allowed – but also, images and representations in cyber impact the reality in a way that influences decisions made on both individual and state-level. This is comparable to Ruggie’s discussion on de-territorialization as a “specific expression of a reconfiguration in social space-time experiences to a degree not witnessed since the Renaissance”⁶⁶ and builds on Virilio’s vision of the cyberenvironment’s transformative capacity. This chapter served as an exploration of the environment specifics that could help analyze the framing of cyber-diplomacy. It suggested that, when approached as an environment rather than a space, it becomes more visible how the cyber-specific conditions of virtuality, pervasiveness, and networking influence the proliferation of certain relations and power distributions in the system, demanding adaptations in the ways states negotiate positioning towards each other’s representations and foreign policies. Understanding what is different about the cyber environment and how it can impact diplomacy was necessary for generating interpretations to the meaning of cyber-diplomacy. The final chapter builds on the synthesis of the arguments made on diplomacy and cyber so far and attempts to analyze it through an example of one of the most recent international cyber-affairs.

⁶⁶ John Gerard Ruggie, “Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations,” *International Organization* 47 (1993): 147.

3. CYBER-DIPLOMACY

The previous analysis has demonstrated the ways through which the cyber environment is transforming the nature of the ambiguities diplomacy is coping with, as they are created and resolved in a more complex and non-fixed manner. The cyber environment has thus not changed the fundamental aspects of diplomacy. This chapter will discuss different angles of these changes based on the interpretations of diplomacy developed in the theoretical discussions of the previous two sections. They are not mutually exclusive, but rather show different ways of looking at what the conditions of the cyber environment transform in diplomacy. Finally, an example of Russian “interference” in 2016 U.S. Presidential Elections will be analyzed to demonstrate how the major premises behind this transformation materialize in international relations.

3.1 *On the Other Side of Technology*

When observed as an art of conducting the foreign policy of states by official representatives, cyber changes diplomacy in two ways - by stimulating shifts in power distribution and bringing new methods to the execution of the diplomatic tasks. As states gain comparative advantages with cyber technology, their positioning in the system also has a potential to assume a new form. A cyberattack does not require the same resources as traditionally conceived hard power does nor does cyber representation require resources invested in embassies abroad. The changes in power dynamics do not challenge Morgenthau’s and Nicholson’s understanding of diplomacy as a way to manage state relations through foreign policies. However, it does challenge the exclusivity of their power, since cyber-capabilities and expertise have to be accounted for when engaging in diplomatic relations. The predominance of states in foreign policy conduct is also challenged by transnational actors, private companies, and publics who gain in visibility and status – they are to be negotiated with internally, holding states more accountable, and externally, responding to global

causes transcending the interests of one state. Although a feature of public diplomacy rather than specific to cyber-diplomacy itself, this proliferation of actors has a different dimension in cyber. When seen as managing the friction of state interests, as Bull would propose, diplomacy in cyber does not only manage local, national, non-territorial, and global domains in “a montage of virtual flows and cyberspaces”⁶⁷ or their growing ability to set the agenda. Cyber-diplomacy has to manage the complexities and ambiguities arising from these new power shifts and capacities for reframing. However, this notion is often overlooked in the representation of cyber-diplomacy as purely a change in the execution of foreign policy or a technological alteration in diplomatic communication. For example, in his analysis of a Greenpeace campaign against French nuclear testing, Andrew F. Cooper describes this power asymmetry created by the use of the cyber environment by a non-governmental actor as a “distinctive component of a technologically oriented diplomacy – cyber-diplomacy.”⁶⁸ The specifics that he outlines revolve around the utilization of technological capacities and networked communication. In this way, he supports Potter’s claim that diplomacy is centrally about how actors exchange, seek, and target information, that is, how states conduct their foreign policy.⁶⁹ Although his analysis shows how the practical aspects of diplomacy are transformed in cyber and how it empowers agents others than states, it still remains captured in the understanding of diplomacy in executive terms. Cyber-diplomacy, in this first approach, is therefore about the different methods of managing international relations and executing foreign policies that depend on different power relations coming from new actors and new technological resources.

From a different point of view, however, cyber redefines the terms of estrangement among the mutually changing identities in the system of states. These identities are, according to Sharp,

⁶⁷ Ronald J. Deibert, “Hyper-realities of world politics: Theorizing the communications revolution,” In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002): p.44.

⁶⁸ Andrew F. Cooper, “Snapshots of an Emergent Cyber-Diplomacy,” In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002): 128.

⁶⁹ Evan H. Potter, “Introduction,” in *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002): 7.

necessarily ambiguous because they are constantly renegotiated to allow for common and particular interests to coexist in the plurality of human condition.⁷⁰ Der Derian argues that diplomacy serves to mediate the estrangement that ensues given this plurality⁷¹ and Wight terms it as a master institution created to enable social collectives to maintain their boundaries to the outside.⁷² In cyber, the features of virtuality, networking, and pervasiveness impact the complexity of this estrangement and consequently, its mediation. Cyber-diplomacy is thus distinctive in that it has to mediate these estrangements under more ambiguous conditions. Because of the effects of these conditions, discussed in the previous chapter, it also becomes difficult to distinguish the acts of diplomacy from its negatives. Negotiating identities by creating certain images in cyber or positioning oneself in the power system through cyber capabilities might at occasions resemble anti-diplomatic “propaganda” or a form of Maghalhaes’ diplomatic pathology. The reason for this hybridity might be sought in the absence of certainty as the ways of negotiating identities in cyber are less institutionalized and less dependent on the diplomatic culture. What both Sharp and Der Derian refer to as a set of commonly agreed norms used to guide the negotiation of coexistence – does not fully exist for the cyber environment. Moreover, governments cannot even agree on how to refer to the new environment and its implications – the U.S. government talks about cyber security strategy, the European Union adheres to the concept of information and network security, while Russia exclusively employs the notion of information security when discussing policies to regulate cyber conduct. The absence of global agreement, and consequently the cyber-diplomatic culture that would serve as a distinct framework for negotiating necessarily ambiguous identities in cyber, further limits out ability to denote some relations and actions as more diplomatic than the others.

⁷⁰ Paul Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

⁷¹ James Der Derian. *On Diplomacy a Genealogy of Western Estrangement* (Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1987).

⁷² Martin Wight. *Power Politics* (London: Penguin Books, 1979).

Nonetheless, using solely the framework of diplomatic culture or solely the technological transformation of the way diplomatic communication is managed often fails to show how diplomacy is never just about regulating state relations or, in his terms, relations with foreigners, but what Constantinou and Der Derian suggest when they analyze the sustainability of diplomacy in the current age - “it crucially involves identification, representation, and interpretation of foreignness.”⁷³ Interpreted in this way and in the absence of regulation, cyber-diplomacy might appear as virtual as the identities it serves to mediate. Given this reason, the next section will try to show how the latter interpretation of cyber-diplomacy applies to the relations between states. Illustrating the ways in which the identification, representation and interpretation of the other takes place under the conditions of virtuality, networking and pervasiveness might shed more light on the implications cyber-diplomacy has for international relations.

3.2 *The Russia Investigation*

Cyber-diplomacy is thus a form of virtual negotiation of necessarily ambiguous identities under complex and largely uncontrollable conditions. Negotiation here does not only encompass the use of new communication technologies to further foreign policy goals, but stands for any peaceful act positioning an actor in the broader systems of identities composed of actors who share the desire to coexist but also to realize different interests coming from the specifics of their identities. Given the breath of activities that can be characterized in this way, cyber-diplomacy can appear as furthering both anti-diplomatic and traditionally diplomatic forces. One of the ways to illustrate how cyber-diplomacy has been approached in this research is to identify its elements in practice. The aim of the case exploration is to show whether cyber-diplomacy, as a distinctive concept, has more

⁷³ Costas Constantinou and James Der Derian, "Introduction: Sustaining Global Hope: Sovereignty, Power and the Transformation of Diplomacy." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 1-22. (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010): 13

implications for diplomacy than that of technological improvement, and consequently support the analytic generalization of the theory behind it.

One of the most prominent cyber-affairs recently has been the alleged Russian interference in the U.S. 2016 elections. The interference has revolved around the accusations for hacking and leaking the Democratic National Committee emails.⁷⁴ It prompted an extensive reaction from the U.S. government - former CIA acting director Michael Morell referred to this incident as “the political equivalent of 9/11,”⁷⁵ presidential candidate Hilary Clinton reacted with strong accusations towards Russia and opposing candidate, Donald Trump. President Obama used the red telephone line⁷⁶ to talk directly to President Putin and warn him against meddling in the voting outcome and, eventually, the U.S. government furthered the sanctions on Russia and expelled their diplomats in the course of the elections. U.S. intelligence agencies issued a report starting 2017 assessing Russian activities and intentions in the US elections concluding that:

“We assess with high confidence that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election, the consistent goals of which were to undermine public faith in the US democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.”⁷⁷

⁷⁴Summary of the events: In July 2016, WikiLeaks published approximately 20,000 e-mails circulated among the functionaries of the Democratic National Committee, including the unofficial communication with the press. The emails revealed the attempt to sabotage Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign. Soon after, the manager of Clinton’s campaign publicly placed the guilt for the leaks on the Russian hackers who were tasked to help Donald Trump win the election. U.S. intelligence agencies, starting with the FBI, got involved in the investigation of these allegations in the following days. Over the course of the election campaign, allegations of Russian cyber-attacks continued to spread. By October 2016, the Department of Homeland Security and The Office of the Director of National Intelligence officially stated that Russia was responsible for the leak. President Obama reacted first by warning the President Putin about this incident and then by expelling certain Russian diplomats as well as furthering the sanctions on the country. In January 2017, The Office of the Director of National Intelligence released a report on the investigation behind the interference whereby Russia was still held liable. David French, “Answering the most frequently asked questions about Trump, the Kremlin, 2016, and beyond,” *National Review*, March 31, 2017, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/446339/donald-trump-russia-2016-election-controversy-explained>.

⁷⁵ POLITICO STAFF, “Morell calls Russia’s meddling in U.S. elections ‘political equivalent of 9/11,’” *POLITICO*, December 12, 2016, <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/12/michael-morell-russia-us-elections-232495>.

⁷⁶ The Cyber-channel is one of the cyber-related confidence-building measures created to handle the need for secure and reliable communication about cybersecurity issues of national concern.

⁷⁷U.S. National Intelligence Council - Office of the Director of National Intelligence, *Background to “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections”: The Analytic Process and Cyber Incident Attribution*, ICA 2017-01D (Washington, DC, January 6, 2017), 1, https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/ICA_2017_01.pdf.

However, what makes this process, especially over the last quarter of the Presidential campaign, relevant for the analysis of cyber-diplomacy, is exactly the ambiguity of the virtual that allows for a particularity of cyber-diplomacy to take place: the reframing of the Russian identity from both the stance of the self and the other. Additionally, the power of media, public, and popular culture that grows in cyber influences this framing and illustrates the complexities of negotiating identities. The effect of the networked exchange of these frames was the emergence of the “Russian hacker” narrative. Russian election hacking kept coming up in the online news headlines, Facebook discussions, YouTube shows, tweets, and general social media meme culture. The implication of the election hacking would be an attempt to change the outcome of the vote counts - for which there was no evidence. The narrative of the ‘election hacking’, however, illustrates an identity claim – it suggests Russia is working against the democratic nature of the U.S. system. Although hacking can be seen as an act of anti-diplomacy, there is no evidence suggesting certainly that it happened – particularly given the latter WikiLeaks statements that the blame might be with the U.S. companies,⁷⁸ again pointing to the reframing power of non-state actors and the importance of engaging with them. This uncertainty allowed Russia a degree of separation from the accusations, as reflected in the statements denying such activity – but also a place to position itself in terms of power. Thus, Russian activities in exchanging the information regarding this narrative, can be interpreted as attempts to negotiate an identity under the conditions of the cyber environment – or acts of cyber-diplomacy.

3.3 Framing and Reframing the Russian Hacker

The CIA report published in January 2017 described what has been continuously framed as the Russian intent with the election meddling: to undermine public faith in the US democratic

⁷⁸Ewen MacAskill, Sam Thielman and Philip Oltermann, “WikiLeaks publishes biggest ever leak of secret CIA documents,” *The Guardian*, March 7, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2017/mar/07/wikileaks-publishes-biggest-ever-leak-of-secret-cia-documents-hacking-surveillance>.

process and attack the reputation of the country.⁷⁹ This statement has been echoed by former Secretary of State Clinton on multiple occasions and by former President Obama, but was also very prominent in online news media and public opinion expressed on social networks. The extensiveness of networking and cyber pervasiveness facilitated the spread of this image of Russia, as undermining fundamentals of the U.S. identity, from the official statements to news and popular culture. The latter is an important feature of cyber as it shows how framing takes place from various perspectives. Some of the examples include the YouTube show Saturday Night Live where Russia is ridiculed for having an autocratic President, a lack of freedom and transparency, a weak economy, but also having control over President Trump – claiming “we’re in this together, America, don’t worry.”⁸⁰ A similar image is presented in John Oliver in Last Week Tonight, where an episode on the relations between Trump and the very authoritarian Putin regime opens by saying “Russia, a country that gave the world Tetris....and potentially the 45th president of US.”⁸¹ The changes in power dynamics are also applicable for states in this case – Russia, usually portrayed as weaker to the US is now seen as powerful enough to change the outcome of the elections. Furthermore, cyber-experts have been called on throughout the process as a source of credibility demonstrating an emergence of a new set of powerful actors. Particularly susceptible to the reframing was the continuous tweeting of President Trump that was at moments compatible with the major idea behind the hacking accusations – he is supporting and being supported by Russia. One of the tweets published before the January 2017 report states: “The Intelligence briefing on so called Russian hacking was delayed

⁷⁹U.S. National Intelligence Council - Office of the Director of National Intelligence, *Background to “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections”*: *The Analytic Process and Cyber Incident Attribution*, ICA 2017-01D (Washington, DC, January 6, 2017), https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/ICA_2017_01.pdf. Accessed May 21, 2017.

⁸⁰ “Vladimir Putin Cold Open,” YouTube video, 4:05, posted by “Saturday Night Live,” January 22, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LNK430YOiT4>. Accessed May 21, 2017.

⁸¹ “Putin: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver,” YouTube video, 20:05, posted by “LastWeekTonight,” February 19, 2017, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0utzB6oDan0>. Accessed May 21, 2017.

until Friday perhaps more time needed to build a case. Very strange!”⁸² Finally, the May 2017 cover of online Times magazine is an image of the White House being transformed half-way into Moscow’s Kremlin⁸³ indicate how active the narrative still is. The framing of the interference in the elections as the “Russian hacking” confirms several inferences on cyber-diplomacy made earlier. First, with no standard to turn the allegations into facts on an international level and the virtuality of the interaction, it has an immense potential for reframing. Second, as in cyber everything happens through networking – the reproduction and representation of this narrative was made possible to a far-reaching extent. Third, as hacking is a form of cyber-crime it is anti-diplomatic, but used for diplomatic purposes to represent or reframe the identities of states in relation to each other’s response. However, cyber-diplomacy as identity negotiation becomes even more visible with the Russian response.

President Putin, as well as the Russian government officials, responded to the notion that Russia is undermining US democracy with denial on both official MFA and Kremlin websites, social media profiles and online news - claiming Democrats should know how to “lose with dignity” and focus on the internal problems of the system rather than outsourcing them.⁸⁴ The message was transformed to mean – “you” are not functioning because of yourself, not because of “us”. This was possible because of the ambiguity of cyber leaving room for the question – could it still have been Russia that interfered? Lavrov’s response to the CNN interview contrasts this uncertainty of cyber

⁸² Donald Trump, Twitter post, 3 January, 2017, 5:14 p.m., Available at: <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/816452807024840704?lang=en>. Accessed: 21st May 2017.

⁸³ Brobel Design, “Inside Russia’s Social Media War on America,” *TIME Magazine*, Vol. 189, No. 20, May 29, 2017, <http://time.com/magazine/us/4783906/may-29th-2017-vol-189-no-20-u-s/>. Accessed: 21st May 2017.

⁸⁴ Full Statement: “First, about the interference. I already responded to one of your fellow journalists from the United States. The defeated party always tries to blame somebody on the outside. They should be looking for these problems closer to home. Everybody keeps forgetting the most important point. For example, some hackers breached email accounts of the US Democratic Party leadership. Some hackers did that. But, as the President-elect rightly noted, does anyone know who those hackers were? Maybe they came from another country, not Russia. Maybe somebody just did it from their couch or bed. These days, it is very easy to designate a random country as the source of attack while being in a completely different location.”

“Vladimir Putin’s Annual News Conference: Interview with Vladimir Putin.” by Steven Rosenberg, *BBC News*, December 23, 2016, <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53573>. Accessed: 21st May 2017.

to the facts necessary to prove cyber activity and positions Russia as powerful enough to act in such a way but keeping the legitimacy of international conduct:

“Well, it’s flattering or course to get this kind of attention for a “regional power” as President Obama called us some time ago. Now everybody in the United States is saying that it is Russia which is running the United States presidential debate. It’s flattering, as I said, but it has nothing to be explained by the facts. We have not seen a single fact, a single proof and we have not seen any answer to the proposal which, almost in November 2015 the Russian Prosecutor General’s Office conveyed to the Department of Justice to start professional consultations on cybercrime.”⁸⁵

Due to the argument on the difficulty of tracing the hacking, the official government response triggered a feedback loop that further spread the idea of the paranoid U.S. that is blaming the internal problems on its external enemy. In a way, this is a response to the feeling of surveillance that cyber breeds and the constitution of others as dangerous. Some of the Russian Twitter accounts have used meme culture to convey this message, so that statements such as “The Russian’s did it”, “I’m not saying it’s the Russians, but it’s the Russians” or “Russians, Russians everywhere” were often combined with popular meme images and published on social media. This goes back to Potter’s claim that the public uses “profoundly democratic” new technologies⁸⁶ to represent aspects of social life, including the satire. Cyber-diplomacy in this example is thus equally public-oriented. The element of ridicule, strongly present in cyber relations between both countries, combined with the potential to network the memes, illustrates how the reframing of the Russian hacker identity was not limited to official relations but aimed at broad public reach. For example, the tweets of the Russian embassy in London are cited for “repurposing crude memes from Reddit, 4chan and other dark corners of the Internet to make a point and tagging Western journalists to ensure the message

⁸⁵Sergei Lavrov, “Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov’s Interview with Amanpour Program on CNN International, Moscow,” by Christian Amanpour, *CNN International*, October 12, 2016, http://www.mid.ru/en/web/guest/meropriyatiya_s_uchastiem_ministra/-/asset_publisher/xK1BhB2bUjd3/content/id/2497676. Accessed: 21st May 2017.

⁸⁶Evan H. Potter, “Introduction,” In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, ed. Evan H. Potter (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002): 16.

is spread.”⁸⁷ Another example is the Russian diplomats marking April Fool’s Day with an election hacking gag by developing an answering machine recording for Russian diplomatic missions abroad with the following content: “To arrange a call from a Russian diplomat to your political opponent, press 1. To use the services of Russian hackers, press 2. To request election interference, press 3.”⁸⁸ Thus, the capacity to create that comes from cyber virtuality, as well as the ease with which statements are being made and reproduced, have important consequences for the state’s ability to construct its image and identity in the system.

This creative potential is a part of Der Derian’s suggestions on virtualization being taken to a qualitatively new place in the cyber environment. The estrangement that comes out of it is more layered and resembles a simulation: U.S. is alienating Russia by labeling its actions as hacking, Russia is separating itself from this identity by denying it but also recreating a new one based on a partial internalization of this narrative that positions it as more powerful – as is made clear from Lavrov’s statement. Once these images are exchanged and networked, the allocation of responsibility is difficult – is it the tensions in the U.S. domestic system that are to blame or is it Russian response – is their meddling in elections real and how can one tell in the absence of clear international frameworks for cyber-conduct? Due to this ambiguity, cyber-diplomacy is more complex and the acts that are defined as anti or non-diplomatic can be framed as diplomatic. If Wight’s understanding of diplomacy as an attempt to adjust conflicting interests by negotiation and compromise is opposed to his understanding of propaganda as having the sole purpose of swaying the opinion that underlies and sustains those interests, the cyber-diplomacy of Russia in this case can be said to incorporate both, since it is almost impossible to distinguish the real from the framed. When U.S. media dismiss

⁸⁷Adam Taylor, "Analysis | How the Russian Embassy in London uses Twitter to undermine the West," *The Washington Post*, April 12, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/12/how-the-russian-embassy-in-london-uses-twitter-to-undermine-the-west/?utm_term=.b80b15fc5728. Accessed May 21, 2017.

⁸⁸Russian Foreign Ministry Facebook Page МИД России, accessed May 21, 2017, <https://www.facebook.com/MIDRussia/videos/1008139769285464/>.

Russian embassies for “using Twitter to undermine the West,”⁸⁹ the Russian response to this is to redirect the attention to the controversies of the U.S. identity – which can be interpreted as both an attempt to negotiate the Russian position in terms of identity in these circumstances, or an attempt to sway the public opinion.

Thus, the most important trait of cyber-diplomacy, the one enabled by the environment of cyber and its conditions, is the ability to reframe information, images, and ideas, extending the nature of the ambiguities it is contending with. This is additionally facilitated by the absence of a cyber-diplomatic culture that would delineate more diplomatic relations from the others. In this way, any attempt to peacefully position oneself towards a common issue through the understanding of the position of the others can be interpreted as cyber-diplomatic. Ultimately, a distinction between cyber-diplomacy and the traditional one be seen on an example that involves Russia positioning towards cyber but not through it. Russia has been strengthening its attempts over the past couple of years in calling for a universal framework for cyber-sphere conduct through the UN auspices and regional organizations.⁹⁰ Whereas this can also be interpreted as a Russian attempt to position itself as a powerful state in a system that is “negotiating meaning and values that constitute identity out of difference to make it possible to live in difference,”⁹¹ it is an act of classical multilateral diplomacy operating through established international institutions. In other words, the information given at the meetings is official and diplomats are held accountable for them – there is no potential for reframing as in the virtual realm, nor is the representation dependent on networks for consolidation and, finally, it is not as pervasive towards other platforms and groups to such an extent.

⁸⁹ Adam Taylor, "Analysis | How the Russian Embassy in London uses Twitter to undermine the West," *The Washington Post*, April 12, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/12/how-the-russian-embassy-in-london-uses-twitter-to-undermine-the-west/?utm_term=.b80b15fc5728. Accessed May 21, 2017.

⁹⁰“The foreign policy dossier: Working Materials on Cyber Security,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, accessed May 25, 2017, <http://www.mid.ru/en/web/guest/rabocie-materialy>.

⁹¹ Paul Sharp, *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 165.

3.4 *Concluding Remarks*

The examples offered in the case of the Russian investigation show how diplomacy is being transformed through the cyber environment to account for increased complexity and ambiguity beyond the technological change in its execution. Cyber-diplomacy consequently implies new ways of creating and mediating estrangement and a redefined approach to power, which further determine how states position themselves in relation to each other. Since the cyber environment changes “how the reality is seen, framed, read and generated in the conceptualization and the actualization of the event,”⁹² the case of Russian election hacking is an event particularly suitable for demonstrating these adaptations. It points to the fact that reality is seen and framed by actors for an extended network of actors under a condition of inconclusiveness. The way states deal with this is important to explore as it translates into the physical world where a misrepresented identity or intention can label the other, not simply as the other – such as an authoritarian Russia that interferes in the affairs of other states, but also as dangerous – that is, a powerful Russia capable of threatening a democratic system of the USA or the European Union. It is thus necessary to expose the distinctiveness of cyber-diplomacy, as the simple technocratic analysis of the tools it uses might overlook more serious implications of the phenomenon.

⁹² James Der Derian, *Virtuous war: Mapping the military-industrial-media-entertainment-network*, (London: Routledge, 2009): 217.

CONCLUSION

Framing the transformation of diplomacy under the predicaments of cyber, from a theoretical standpoint, brought a somewhat different understanding of what it entails and what its implications are. This research attempted to expand the dominant interpretation of cyber-diplomacy that entered the international politics just recently as a term describing an extension of public diplomacy to social networks. More specifically, this dominant approach focuses on the executive aspects of foreign policy that are being adapted to social media capacities and cyber-security threats. In this way, a proliferation of terms describing the change in diplomacy - such as e-diplomacy, digital diplomacy or techno-diplomacy – describe only the transformation is taking place on the surface. What separated cyber-diplomacy from these terms was the association with the threats coming from the securitization of the cyberenvironment. Nevertheless, all of them only indicate that there is a certain change taking place in the inter-states relations, but do not reflect what it is essentially about.

In order to analyze the specifics and implications of naming this transformation called “cyber-diplomacy,” this work started from differentiating approaches to defining diplomacy. A distinction has been made between foreign policy implementation and an identity-oriented stance. The traditional prevalence of state agency, the relevance of diplomatic culture, and the conditions of plurality as well as non-diplomatic practices have been identified as important to the analysis of the transformations of the concept. The central notion was framed in a way to portray diplomacy as negotiating the positioning of the states in relation to the views of each other – either in terms of adjusting foreign policies or adjusting the representations of the selves. This interpretation was further situated in the cyber-environment.

The analysis of the cyber-specific conditions focused on demonstrating how virtuality, pervasiveness, and networking change the nature of ambiguities diplomacy is facing when

negotiating the positioning of states. In particular, the representation of the identities and the perceptions of the foreign became dependent on the extended capacity to create in virtual, but less capacity to trace the creator. Redefined power structure, that forces states to be more accountable to other actors having access and control of cyber, but also changes the distribution of capabilities among states themselves, is a further condition impacting diplomacy. In addition, the possibilities of surveillance and the absence of cyber-diplomatic culture, combined with a networked framing and reframing of the messages, add to the ambiguities of the identities in the cyber environment and make it more difficult to distinguish diplomatic from anti-diplomatic - even allow for anti-diplomatic to be cyber-diplomatic.

Given these interpretations, cyber-diplomacy was interpreted as a negotiation or a mediation of more complex ambiguities specific to the cyber environment, that impact how the foreign is identified, represented, and interpreted - on top of a technological change in the conduct of foreign policy and the work of diplomats. These two approaches are not mutually exclusive, but build of each other and point to different realities. These theoretical findings have been applied to the case of Russian interference in the U.S. elections to demonstrate how the capacity for reframing, power redefining and usage of anti-diplomacy for diplomatic goals is increasingly complicating the positioning of the states.

Although limited to the example of the Russian hacker in this work, the same theoretical assumptions could be applied to other cases of cyber-relations in further research. Some of them might generate more theoretical insights and expand further the interpretations of the term. One of the suggestions for further research is to approach cyber-diplomacy from the standpoint of traditional international relations theories. In this way, a realist outlook might discover more about the role of states in this transformation, liberal interpretation could further address the power shifts towards non-state actors and the position of international institutions in the new environment while

the constructivist cut could focus on the emerging norms of cyber-conduct and offer explanations for how the change occurred.

The conclusions of this study, combining the theory of diplomacy and the research on the cyber-environment, have several implications for the international politics. Conceived as more than a novelty in means, cyber-diplomacy reflects a broader change in the international system that is questioning the dominant order where states use multilateral institutions and embassies to position themselves. Adaptations to a new power structure, a different way to negotiate one's representations with an increased capacity to reframe and address the foreign as more dangerous in the uncertainties of virtual, imply that further considerations on the changing order can be observed in cyber-diplomacy. Such notions open the possibility of a new form of rationality emerging with these technological developments that fundamentally challenge the established ways of managing social relations. Despite the conclusion that cyber-diplomacy remains about the same practices, that is, negotiation of identities and interests between states, the transformations that take place show that it is becoming different. When situated in the "new condition of world politics", they demonstrate how the interactions in the system are growing increasingly complicated and multifold. They also show the difficulty of regulating and predicting their outcomes and the easiness of merging diplomacy with unconventional approaches to mediating state existence.

Finally, as the literature on the specific subject has been scarce and primarily oriented to the technological aspects of the change, this research contributes to the broader scholarship on the transformations of the world order and the implications of the globalizing technologies for the societies. It demonstrates one way to address the manifestations of this change. It also stimulates further exploration of cyber-diplomacy as reflective of such transformations. As being fundamentally about the social relations and negotiating the "necessarily ambiguous identities" under the conditions of plurality – it can tell us more about the ways to cope with this change in practice as

well as inform the current state of international relations. By limiting policies and strategies to purely technological aspects, rather than developing a deeper understanding of what cyber-diplomacy transforms in human relations, more space is left for breeding a dangerous other and facilitating the threat coming from the uncertainty of the cyber-environment. By exploring the concept of cyber-diplomacy, some of the concerns emanating from the studies of cyber-security in international relations, can be explained through a deeper understanding of what happens between states once they enter this environment. Learning how to cope with this transformation through delving into cyber-virtuality, networking and pervasiveness, can thus assist the continuous understanding of the self via the other – a purpose given to diplomacy by Constantinou at the beginning of this work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armitage, John. *Virilio Live – Selected Interviews*. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Banai, Husein. "Diplomacy and Public Imagination," In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 46-66. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010.
- Baudrillard. Jean. *Simulacra and Simulations*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Brantly, Aaron Franklin. *The Decision to Attack: Military and Intelligence Cyber Decision-Making*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2016.
- Brobel Design. "Inside Russia's Social Media War on America." *TIME Magazine*. Vol. 189, No. 20. May 29, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. <http://time.com/magazine/us/4783906/may-29th-2017-vol-189-no-20-u-s/>.
- Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan, 1977.
- Constantinou, Costas. "Diplomacy, Spirituality, Alterity." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 67-85. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010.
- "Diplomatic Representations... or Who Framed the Ambassadors?." *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 23 (1994): 1-23.
- Constantinou, Costas and Der Derian, James. "Introduction: Sustaining Global Hope: Sovereignty, Power and the Transformation of Diplomacy." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 1-22. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010.
- Cooper, Jeffrey. "New Skills for Cyber Diplomats." *The World Today* 55, no. 3 (1999): 20–22.
- Cooper, Andrew F. "Snapshots of an Emergent Cyber-Diplomacy." In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, edited by Evan H. Potter, 128-150. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- De Landa, Manuel. *War in the age of intelligent machines*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- De Magalhaes, Jose Calvet. *The pure concept of diplomacy*. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1988.
- Deibert, Ronald J. "Hyper-realities of world politics: Theorizing the communications revolution." In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*. Edited by Evan H. Potter, 27-47. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Deos, Anthony and Pigman, Geoffrey Allen. "Sustainable Public Diplomacy: Communicating about Identity, Interests and Terrorism." In *Sustainable Diplomacies*, 151-172. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010.
- Der Derian, James. *Virtuous war: Mapping the military-industrial-media-entertainment-network*. London: Routledge, 2009.
- *On Diplomacy a Genealogy of Western Estrangement*. Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1987.

- Drinkwater, Derek. *Sir Harold Nicolson and International Relations: The Practitioner as Theorist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005: 95.
- Facebook. "Russian Foreign Ministry/МИД России Facebook Page." Last modified April 1, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. <https://www.facebook.com/MIDRussia/videos/1008139769285464/>.
- French, David. "Answering the most frequently asked questions about Trump, the Kremlin, 2016, and beyond." *National Review*. March 31, 2017. Accessed May 31, 2017. <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/446339/donald-trump-russia-2016-election-controversy-explained>.
- Gibson, William. *Neuromancer*. New York: Ace, 1984.
- Gibson, William. "Google's Earth." *The New York Times*. August 31, 2010. Accessed May 31, 2017. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/01/opinion/01gibson.html>.
- Huysmans, Jef. "James Der Derian: The Unbearable Lightness of Theory." In *The future of international relations: masters in the making?*. Edited by IverB.Neumann and Ole Wæver, 337-358. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Kissinger, Henry. *The White House Years*. Boston: Little & Brown, 1979.
- Kramer, Franklin, Starr, Stuart and Wentz, Larry. *Cyberpower and National Security*. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press and Potomac Books, 2009.
- Lasky, Jack. "Cyberspace." *Salem Press Encyclopedia of Science*, 10 April, 2016. Accessed May 21, 2017. <http://demo.stacksdiscovery.com/eds/detail?db=ers&an=93787497>. Salem Press Encyclopedia of Science.
- LastWeekTonight. "Putin: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver." *YouTube* video, 20:05. February 19, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0utzB6oDan0>.
- Lavrov, Sergei. "Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's Interview with Amanpour Program on CNN International, Moscow." By Christian Amanpour. *CNN International*. October 12, 2016. Accessed May 21, 2017. http://www.mid.ru/en/web/guest/meropriyatiya_s_uchastiem_ministra/-/asset_publisher/xK1BhB2bUjd3/content/id/2497676.
- Lyon, David. "An electronic panopticon? A sociological critique of surveillance theory." *The Sociological Review* 41 (1993): 653–678.
- MacAskill, Ewen, Thielman, Sam and Oltermann, Philip. "WikiLeaks publishes biggest ever leak of secret CIA documents." *The Guardian*. March 7, 2017. Accessed May 26, 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2017/mar/07/wikileaks-publishes-biggest-ever-leak-of-secret-cia-documents-hacking-surveillance>.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia. "The foreign policy dossier: Working Materials on Cyber Security." Accessed May 25, 2017. <http://www.mid.ru/en/web/guest/rabocie-materialy>.

- Melissen, Jan. "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice," In *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations*. Edited by Jan Melissen, 3-23. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 3rd edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.
- Neumann, Iver B. *Diplomatic Sites*. London: Hurst & Company, 2013.
- "The English School on Diplomacy." In *Diplomacy, Volume I: Theory of Diplomacy*. Edited by Christer Jönsson & Richard Langhorne, 92-116. London: Sage Publications, 2004.
- Nicolson, Harold. *Diplomacy*. Georgetown University: Institute for the study of Diplomacy, 1988.
- *The Evolution of Diplomatic Method*. Leicestershire: University of Leicester, 2001.
- Parlett, David. *The Oxford History of Board Games*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Putin, Vladimir. "Vladimir Putin's Annual News Conference." By Steven Rosenberg. *BBC News*. December 23, 2016. Accessed May 21, 2017. <http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/53573>.
- POLITICO STAFF. "Morell calls Russia's meddling in U.S. elections 'political equivalent of 9/11.'" *POLITICO*. December 12, 2016. Accessed May 21, 2017. <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/12/michael-morell-russia-us-elections-232495>.
- Potter, Evan H. "Introduction," In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*, edited by Evan H. Potter, 3-27. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations." *International Organization* 47 (1993): 139-174.
- Sandre, Andreas. *Digital Diplomacy: Conversations on Innovation in Foreign Policy*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2015.
- Saturday Night Live. "Vladimir Putin Cold Open." *YouTube* video, 4:05. January 22, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LNK430YOiT4>.
- Sharp, Paul. *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Smith, Gordon and Sutherland, Allen. "The New Diplomacy: Real-Time Implications and Applications." In *Cyber-diplomacy: Managing foreign policy in the twenty-first century*. Edited by Evan H. Potter, 151-176. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.
- Taylor, Adam. "Analysis | How the Russian Embassy in London uses Twitter to undermine the West." *The Washington Post*. April 12, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/04/12/how-the-russian-embassy-in-london-uses-twitter-to-undermine-the-west/?utm_term=.b80b15fc5728.

The Council of European Union. *Draft Council Conclusions on Cyber Diplomacy*. 6122/15. Brussels, February 11, 2015. Accessed May 21 2017. <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-6122-2015-INIT/en/pdf>.

Trump, Donald. Twitter Post. January 3, 2017, 5:14 p.m. Accessed May 21, 2017. <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/816452807024840704?lang=en>.

U.S. National Intelligence Council - Office of the Director of National Intelligence. *Background to "Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent US Elections": The Analytic Process and Cyber Incident Attribution*. ICA 2017-01D. Washington, DC, January 6, 2017. Accessed May 21, 2017. https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/ICA_2017_01.pdf.

Wight, Martin. *Power Politics*. London: Penguin Books, 1979.

——— *Systems of States*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977.