

ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ СИСТЕМ ТА ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО РОЗВИТКУ

DOI 10.31558/2519-2949.2022.4.12

UDC 327(73).808.51

ORCID ID <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6416-5774>

Nagornyak T. L., Vasyl` Stus Donetsk National University, Ukraine

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7283-3528>

Polovyi M. A., Vasyl` Stus Donetsk National University, Ukraine

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3990-3667>

Bondarenko S. V., Vasyl` Stus Donetsk National University, Ukraine

ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8795-8910>

Osmolovska A. O., Vasyl` Stus Donetsk National University, Ukraine

THE DOCTRINAL NATURE OF THE POLICY OF PROMOTING THE STATE'S EXTERNAL IMAGE IN THE CONDITIONS OF A NEW WORLD ORDER FORMATION

Within the framework of the author's scientific research, three types of communicative models of the world's states were identified, which reflect the basic principles of building state information policy and reflect the key characteristics of the political system. Among them are subsidiary, vertical, and transitional models. The institutional method was used to prove the specifics of the state as a political institution that is the bearer of national images, as well as the role and degree of influence of public policy on the formation of ideas about the state in the external information space, on the policy of promoting and transforming these images, with an emphasis on the actions of those states that shape the global political discourse of today. The authors propose an integral model of state's public image formation, which provides for the synergy of actors of public diplomacy. The result of its implementation is the formation of the components of the state image (regional, multicultural, culinary, educational, expert) together with official products (national symbols, reputation characteristics, socio-economic development indicators, rating indicators and e-diplomacy products) «from below». Both the central government and local communities in the context of the implementation of «bottom-up» policy should be involved in the realization of a successful image formation policy. The authors emphasize that the policy of state's image formation in the external information space should be considered as a multifaceted component of the foreign policy of the state. The tools, channels and subjects of formation and adjustment of the state's image should be embedded in each of the vectors of foreign policy – in security, diplomatic, economic, social, legal, and directly information vectors.

Keywords: *international political subjectivity, state's image, information space, new world order, US foreign policy, Ukrainian-American relations.*

Introduction

Modern processes of forming a new world order are changing the structure and content of many processes in world politics. This statement fully applies to the promotion of state's external image within the framework of foreign policy activity of states. The aim of this article is to study modern trends towards a strong interrelationship of foreign policy to promote state's image with the doctrinal foundations of both state policy in general and foreign policy in particular. Primary examples of the research will be the USA and the Russian Federation.

It should be noted that since the last decade has seen a sharp expansion of foreign policy's informational component, this is also reflected in the topic under consideration. In recent years, the world has faced massive

use of hate speech, disinformation, "fakes", acts of psychological pressure and symbolic violence, information and psychological operations aimed at destabilizing and destroying modern political systems, forming and promoting a negative image of entire states, compromising public figures. Systematic examples of using «dirty» modern information technologies are provided by the Russian Federation (hereinafter – the RF), which produces many information drives with the aim of creating tension in certain territories – primarily in the border states, which are the bridgehead of the Russian Federation before the European Union (hereinafter – the EU) and North Atlantic Alliance (hereinafter – NATO), which pose a direct threat to its security and stability.

State's public image is understood by the authors as a product of constructed reality promoted through strategic narratives common to all (key messages, legends, plots), events, decisions and actions explaining the state's vision to target audiences, with regard to their interests and expectations.

State's public image is formed by strategic communication tools and state policy vectors (external and internal) with the aim of promoting a state's positive public image and established demand for it in certain areas for specific target groups and within a specific market of world economy. One of the tools for promoting state's public image is public diplomacy – a component of the state's strategic communications – a field where social attitudes towards loyalty to the state are formed outside of traditional diplomatic protocols. The program for promoting the public image of a state is supported by additional special programs:

- *personal image programs* of state's first persons and projects related to "personification of the territory";
- *program of state's strategic communications* and generation of its positive image;
- *event management program for state's promotion abroad*;
- *industry programs* (tourism, investment climate, education, etc.);
- *programs for coordinating the hierarchy of images* (cities, special zones, regions, subregions), etc.

The policy of forming the state's image, as a complex of real mechanisms and purposeful actions to form and promote a set of ideas (images, associations, interpretations) about it in the information space, is the result of effective international cooperation and internal consolidation of the nation. In modern conditions, information policy is a component of each state's national development strategy, an indicator of its worldview and implementation of the principle of cooperation between states to preserve their own traditions and global integration. Isolation of states from information flows and channels is impossible in conditions of global challenges and rapid technologies.

Group of researchers representing leading foreign scientific centers and schools in the field of public image, information space and communications, including those specializing in the issues of forming and promoting a positive image of the state, can include: S. Anholt [1], K. Keller, Aperia and Georgson [8], A. Sengupta [19], A. Scott [18], E. Sampson [16], F. Webster (2004), and others. Useful methodological approaches are presented by Ukrainian scientists and practitioners: Y. Hrytsak [26], D. Bohush [20], T. Vodotyka and Y. Mahda [28].

Strategic and socio-cultural potential makes the states a political institution and a social community at the same time. The interrelationship of socio-cultural, communicative, and power factors of regions' development is a necessary condition for the involvement of territorial communities in the information and communication environment and the opportunity to influence political decision-making as a full-fledged political actor. Thus, the states, performing the functions of aggregating and articulating the interests of local authorities, communities, and businesses, should rely on an effective communication model in the promotion of state policy at all levels.

Quality communications are a key factor in system functioning, including in a political system. The importance of communication and communicative interaction was indicated by K. Deutsch (Deutsch, 1966), J. Coleman [4], J. Habermas (Habermas, 1984) and others. It can be concluded that without ensuring effective communication, it is impossible to achieve the planned results. Especially when it comes to the existence of states in the information space in conditions of fierce competition for influencing population's opinion and perception of the surrounding world and the processes occurring around it.

The activation of strategic communications of states and their territorial administrative units, as political actors with constitutional right to manage the territory, are deeply connected with global shifts and crisis of political identity. The authors involved several vectors of political knowledge to study these strategic communications: hyper-globalism (R. Keohane [9], G. Nye [14], T. Friedman [6]; anti-globalism (D. Korten [10], M. Chossudovsky [3], J. Stiglitz [35]; urban studies (S. Sassen [17], R. Florida [40]).

Among the Ukrainian researchers studying the construction of media discourse are O. Zhrebko [29], L. Klymanska and H. Herasym [30], V. Kulyk [11], P. Lenio [31], Y. Turchyn [39]. Such researchers as V. Liaporov [32], V. Tarnavskiy [37], L. Shulhina [43], O. Shevchenko [42], Y. Tykhomyrova [38] devoted their scientific work to the research of strategic communications used by states.

Development of a modern information society is characterized by diffusion of state information boundaries, loss of production monopoly, and most importantly, monopoly on the interpretation of socially important information. This leads to increased competition for the attention and opinions of the population of certain states and their alliances.

Activization of globalization processes transformed the goal of forming the information space to the refutation of the political role of national states and vulnerability of citizens' national identity. Traditional values of national states are being eroded. Innovative progress has become a factor in reformatting traditional cultural contents. At the same time, the universalization of consumption standards strengthens the desire of national states to preserve and transmit cultural experience. Open information systems expand such opportunities. Information technologies, on the one hand, contribute to the identification of intercultural bonds, and on the other hand, fragment national cultures.

When examining political discourse as a special type of communication where participants create a communicative action, a political dialogue is provided by political institutions as a norm-forming dimension of politics. The main participants of such communication are the political elite, institutions, counter-elite, financial and industrial groups, public institutions, and the media. Through their opposition to the institutional discourse, they fill the official information space with those topics of political discourse that are paramount in country's political life.

Main body of the research

Globalization processes inherent in modern society create objective requirements for politics to go beyond political territories. This occurs not only due to the need to find resources (financial, natural, human, etc.). Such a recourse should be considered through the perspective of geopolitical processes. Development of means and technologies of information management in combination with the use of governing influences in the sphere of politics, economy and culture makes the information space a managed object, but only by those actors of international relations who have the levers of control over the world's information agenda. Sharing the views of the French sociologist and philosopher, P. Bourdieu (2005), the authors define the information space as a field where information is created, transmitted, and interpreted. The boundaries of such space are conditional, and the nature of functioning is dynamic and changeable.

In the context of the research, the work of German sociologist and political scientist, K. Deutsch, who considers the political system as a network of communications and information flows, a process of management and coordination of people's efforts to achieve set goals, is of particular interest. Political decisions are made based on two streams of information: external and internal [5]. Thus, the structural elements and the political system itself must interact in the internal and external system environment for their existence, receive information from the outside and produce their own one, distribute it, receive feedback to ensure stability and promote interests. Conventionally, the entire set of principles of development and functioning of the system's information component can be called its information policy. Using a synergistic approach when defining the information space, it can be represented as a system capable of self-organization and consisting of a set of information flows and fields that interact with each other.

To comprehend the information and communication essence of the political system, it is appropriate to review the theory of communicative action by J. Habermas [7]. Within the framework of this theory, such concepts as "system", "lifeworld", "communicative action", "communicative rationality", "instrumental rationality", "political rationality" are of special interest. According to the authors, the concepts describe the basic characteristics of interaction between structural elements during communication not only at the level of interaction of political institutions, but also at the level of a person who is the main element of any social system, including political one.

"System", according to J. Habermas, implies "processes that guarantee formalization of social interaction, stability and sustainability of these forms (status quo); it seeks to subjugate the world of senses and meanings created in intersubjective everyday communication ("lifeworld"), replacing the process of agreeing on common goals with the process of manipulation and subjugation" [25].

Based on the above mentioned, political system assumes several roles that ensure its functioning in various fields. One of the main ones, according to the authors, is the information space.

Information space is a field in which information is created by various categories of producers (both domestic and foreign), transmitted through communication channels to recipients and interpreted by them (purposefully under the influence of the owners of such channels or subconsciously), which is not limited by state borders. Such a field is formed at all levels of a state: from the local to the national level, but its filling is often influenced by actors external to the country – border states, leading states of the world, non-state actors of world politics. It can be noted that the information space of a state consists of such overlapping information fields as: 1) information field of territorial communities and local territories, 2) information field of regions and large cities, 3) official discourse of the state government and its central institutions; 4) field of influence of geopolitical subjects and external attractors [34].

Therefore, it can be concluded that the ability of modern political space to penetrate other spaces that are not inherent in the classical understanding of politics should be considered its uniqueness. It is flexible enough and intersects with other spaces, such as informational, imaginative, sensual, etc.

In a broad sense, informational space is understood as the whole set of actions and processes, the main purpose of which is to produce and distribute information that ensures the vital activity of the entire society, creates and spreads politically relevant knowledge [22]. Imaginative space should be perceived as a space in which symbolic systems function, and through which the objects are reflected. The sensual space implies a set of essential characteristics and ideas about the world [23].

The policy of forming the public image of a state in the internal and external information space is defined by the authors as a complex of real mechanisms and purposeful actions for the formation and promotion of a set of ideas in the information space (images, associations, interpretations, meanings) about the policy through local images and national identifications. Such a policy is the result of both effective international cooperation and internal consolidation of the nation. According to the country's strategic goal and place in world politics, the policy of forming its image can be considered at three levels of its functioning: global, national, regional.

Mechanisms for implementation of information policy for the formation of state's public image should be understood as a set of conceptual principles and practical tools aimed at developing and disseminating politically relevant knowledge about the state, ensuring the achievement of political, economic, humanitarian and other goals; establishing feedback with target audiences to clarify and secure support for national interests. Despite the diversity of strategic goals, ambitions of territories and their capabilities, the authors highlight the following mechanisms of information and communication activities that unite territories of different levels:

1. Public affairs – current activities of state authorities and local governments, the purpose of which is to provide target audiences with access to information (ability to independently obtain necessary information), dissemination of information about the territory through controlled communication channels (own websites, newsletters, meeting with target audiences as part of the activities of other bodies, etc.).

2. Public diplomacy – activity of the territories for dissemination of information and knowledge, establishment of direct contacts with "agents of influence" of target audiences for the purpose of promoting national interests, values, ideas, policy, and establishing positive emotional connection. In contrast to traditional diplomacy, public diplomacy uses the tools of conditionally informal communication by organizing and implementing various programs of professional, sports and cultural exchanges, learning territory's language, etc.

3. Mass media – interaction with the mass media as one of the powerful tools for spreading knowledge and information about the territories

4. New media – dissemination of information and knowledge about the territory through controlled communication channels, such as social networks and other online services for posting photo, video, and audio materials. The main feature is that it is an informal channel of communication, so free communication and expression of personal judgments and opinions is available.

5. Events – organizing, conducting, and participating in various kinds of events to spread knowledge about the territory and establish communication with target audiences in the "face-to-face" format.

6. Public-private partnerships – cross-sectoral interaction between representatives of public and private sectors, including non-governmental sector, for developing, disseminating and evaluating knowledge about the territory, establishing communications with target audiences and accumulating resources in the information space [21].

An effective branding strategy of the state together with the tools of public diplomacy is one of the main mechanisms of forming state's image and maintaining or building its positive reputational characteristics. For instance, the Public Diplomacy Strategy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine,

which was adopted in March 2021, defines the following areas of public diplomacy: cultural, economic, expert, culinary, scientific, and educational, sports and digital [36]. Each of these areas can be implemented "from below" to help Ukraine's public diplomacy. The synergy of directions – the so-called "network diplomacy" – is becoming a new form of strategic communications of states, which is designed to shape the public image.

The influence of some countries on the formation of information discourse of other countries is becoming one of the most common means of waging "hybrid wars", as well as a fairly effective way of putting pressure on geopolitical rivals, neighboring countries or strategic partners. At the same time, the appropriate activities of state or non-state institutions are used as technologies of political pressure, aimed, among other things, at undermining or changing the image of certain states and creating necessary discourse, presented and disseminated in the global information space in relation to countries, events, individuals etc. Thus, some states, and sometimes non-state actors, based on the presence of certain physical or mental resources of influence, replace the real image of another country with simulacra.

Conflictogenity of world political processes, vulnerability of countries' national interests, violation of national security in international relations as trends in world politics can be leveled at the expense of the implementation of the semi-periphery and periphery by countries based on the world-system analysis according to the American sociologist, I. Wallerstein [27], a balanced policy forming an image in the external information discourse and building a controlled (to the extent possible) internal information space that would coincide with a country's state borders. It is possible to locate the core and the periphery when one can specifically see the features of the production process – monopoly (for core countries) or free market (for peripheral countries). Understanding the degree of economic profit creates an understanding of the discourse that structures the system from the periphery to the center and vice versa. Translation and adaptation of the external information field occurs due to communication as a discourse practice that changes the boundaries in the system, setting priorities in already new centers (these boundaries do not necessarily coincide with the official boundaries of any state).

World political processes acquire qualitatively new meanings in conditions of formation of a new world order and diffusion of national identities and state borders. With the intensive development of information technologies and reduction of the level of impermeability of borders, the decision-making centers and formation of the information space are shifting from states to non-state actors.

The boundaries of information space are not clearly identifiable, and social life in the conditions of a systemic crisis is managed by actors (communicators) who are the first to receive information and interpret it in a way that is convenient for making and implementing necessary political decisions, which is stated in such theories as "Agenda Setting Theory" [13] and "Gatekeeping Theory" [12]. These decisions are not limited to the political system or government.

The role of global cities, "people of the world", non-governmental institutions, transnational corporations and influencers is increasing. The information field as a system is not localized only in a state. However, the image of the state in the internal and external information space, no matter how dynamic and uncontrolled this space may be, remains a key category. Despite the transformation of the state's content as a political institution (actor), adoption, implementation and control of political decisions remains with it, including functioning of the information space. Under these conditions, it is necessary to revise the principles and systems of state communication, both in global and regional, as well as internal information spaces.

The authors propose a definition of the concept of "*global information space*" as a set of all information fields of individual territories (state and supranational entities, regions, local territories) and all channels that disseminate information, official information discourses of states, and means of influencing these fields by various actors.

In the context of researching strategic communications and global information space, it becomes necessary to define the concept of "external information space". *External (in relation to a separate state) information space* is a field outside state borders in which information is produced, and for the transmission of which various communication channels are used. However, the content and interpretation of this information is not always controlled by the state. The external information space is a combination of: 1) information promoted by the state about itself; 2) information field in which messages are interpreted and presented by communication channels of other states; 3) informational influence of those states controlling information space not only on their territory, but also outside its borders, using various levers of such influence.

Regional information space, according to the authors, is a set of information fields of territories (within or outside their state borders) located within a separate region, with regard to geographical and historical

distribution, as well as channels of information dissemination operating in this region, official information discourses of the states in this region, as well as the means of influence on these fields by various actors located within or outside the boundaries of this region. Regional aspects of forming the information space are: 1) alliances of states or organizations in the region and their interaction; 2) socio-economic development of the region; 3) influence of the region in international relations or influence on the region by other states or regional entities; 4) political intentions of the influential countries in the region and vector of their foreign policy. For Ukraine, such region is Europe, because it is a geographical part of this continent (Eastern Europe).

Internal information space implies the entire set of information phenomena and processes occurring within a certain political territory (state), and aimed at ensuring its stable existence, stability through the production and dissemination of information for the inviolability of borders and preservation of information sovereignty. In this context, it can be argued that the stronger is the state, the more it controls its own (internal) information space and is able to ensure expansion into other information spaces.

Modern information space is a field of struggle between competitive states for recognition, respect, and influence over other countries or alliances of countries. In the era of multipolarity, world's leading countries determine the vector of global development, the rest either adapt and look for ways to preserve their own national interests, or are forced to give in to their regional ambitions in favor of the scenarios of strong actors, so as not to lose their territorial integrity and informational sovereignty. In modern conditions, the leading states combine their development strategies (economic, political, social) with mechanisms of influence on world processes, including through channels of information transmission to consolidate their influence on global information space. Such influence becomes especially dangerous in times when national processes lose in favor of local interests of cities or territories, the activities of individual corporations and deuterocrats, the "economy of impressions".

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the "Cold War", such key actors of geopolitics as the USA and the Russian Federation have moved from the concept of "holding back each other's influence" to the concept of "spreading their influence" in their foreign policies. However, in this process, it becomes relevant for the leading states to spread their influence through the control over the global information space, or the information spaces of individual states.

In international relations, new centers of power are being formed, which may have a powerful political influence in the near future, for example, the Asian region. In such conditions, Russia seeks to keep the territory of the former USSR in its sphere of influence. Information technologies and influence, first of all, on the information space of these countries become the most convenient levers of influence. The USA is expanding its economic and military-political ties with countries that were part of the Soviet Union's sphere of influence, including Ukraine. Thus, formation of a stable model of international relations, which would be based on the principles of international law, mutual assistance, and cooperation, should not be expected in modern world politics. Regional crises, hybrid wars, information blockades are becoming attributes of modern international politics.

The main general trends of world development are following: globalization processes obscure the borders between states, provoking the differentiation of states and territories, or their individualization (struggle for preservation of national identities); the modern world order must respond to new technological challenges, including information as a weapon; structure of international relations is no longer based on interstate relations and international governmental organizations – global cities, media and their owners, non-state entities are becoming key actors; formation of a multipolar world after the end of the "Cold War" increasingly appears to be a simulacrum – confrontation between the USA and Russia continues with the simultaneous strengthening of regional centers, which eventually fall under the influence of one of the two states.

When addressing the communication theory of the German political scientist Karl Deutsch [5] and his approach to the political system of society as a communication structure, one can indicate the so-called information investors, or states on the world stage, which form the information space of today, which goes far beyond their state borders, obscuring national identities. It should be noted that information space in a state is not equal to its state borders but may be smaller than them (e.g. in Ukraine) or, on the contrary, larger (e.g., the USA, the Russian Federation).

The concept of direct influence of a geopolitical factor on the policy of formation and external perception of state's image in the information space of other states is the basis of this research. The information space, for example, of Ukraine, is not controlled by the state, which makes it a field of struggle for spheres of influence. The national interests of the state and integrity of its territory are under threat in this struggle.

This is evidenced by the images of Ukraine in the discourse of border countries (for example, Poland and Hungary) and the discourse of a strategic partner country (for example, the USA) and an "enemy" country (for example, the Russian Federation), as different image models that are not formed by Ukraine (tabl. 1).

Table 1

**Ukraine in the external information space
(compiled by the authors)**

<p>USA: Ukraine is not Russia, it is a bridge between East and West, an independent state with democratic institutions that are ineffective due to bureaucracy and corruption; resource-rich country that produces shale gas, but is still dependent on the Russian Federation for gas; authentic and has a great cultural heritage, local disagreements of an ethnic and religious nature.</p>	<p>Russian Federation: Ukraine is a fraternal nation, which is engulfed by violence, the arbitrariness of illegitimate authorities and planting of artificial heroes; Ukraine is a young country rewriting history, demonstrating anarchy under the guise of economic reforms.</p>
--	---

"The share of Ukraine's presence in the media space of the two groups of countries, according to the results of the monitoring of English-language online publications, indicates an interest in the Ukrainian issue, taking into account the common border between the states, close cultural and national ties, when it comes to Poland and Hungary, as well as a special political discourse and issues of national security in the case of the USA and Russia. The images of Ukraine produced by foreign online publications are contradictory and depend on the context.

Thus, the news media space of the USA contains positively colored narratives that reveal peculiarities of Ukrainian identity. "Today, Ukraine is forming a separate identity after centuries of Russian rule, strengthening ties with the European Union and the United States," writes The New York Times. "The post-Soviet national identity of Ukraine characterizes it as a peaceful, pluralistic society that feels the taste of freedom."

Unlike the USA, Russia sees Ukraine through political and economic perspectives, leveling out the cultural factor. The image of Ukraine as a territory of war is actively promoted in the Russian information space. However, this war, based on semantic analysis, has a completely endogenous (internal) character and this rhetoric has not changed since 2014.

Russia's influence on Hungary's information space is noticeable. Polish publications demonstrate a more loyal position towards Ukraine, and a negative one towards Russia, as an enemy country of its Eastern neighbor" [15].

Thus, the USA, as a strategic partner, and Russia, as an aggressor state, produce different views of Ukraine. This, in turn, shows the unconditional influence of the key players in the international arena on the messages in the global information space and in the information discourse of those countries that are under the influence of their foreign policy.

Contradiction of the images of Ukraine in the mentioned media fields is the result of the lack of effective public diplomacy and strategic communications of Ukraine. Inability of political institutions to form a purposeful strategy of information policy in terms of strengthening the state's positive image leads to the formation of Ukraine's image by external actors [33].

In the conditions of information competition and the desire to absorb the information spaces of some states by others, arises the question of finding optimal communication models of states.

As part of the author's scientific research, three types of communication models of states were identified, which reflect the basic principles of building information policy and reflect the key parameters of political system. They are the following: subsidiary, vertical and transitional one [2].

The subsidiary model is characteristic of the so-called "developed" democracies. They focus on horizontal information and communication interaction between structural elements of political system. Its goal is to create an extensive network of process participants who can independently counter threats and ensure the implementation of the policy of protecting national interests.

Involvement of the maximum range of interested parties in the development and implementation of policy ensures not only an understanding of the basic parameters of national interests, but also participation in their formation. One of the features of this approach is the strategic priority of creating horizontal

communication channels at different levels. This ensures the adaptation of information policy to the needs of target audiences and a more flexible response to information and communication influences. Achieving a compromise and alignment of the interests of the center and the basic elements of the system allows to reduce the level of influence of destructive factors on the vital activity of the entire system, and to have the opportunity of equal response to threats, both from the "center" and the elements of the system.

The vertical model is characteristic of states with a totalitarian or authoritarian form of government, where everything is concentrated around power. The participation of a wide range of interested persons in its development and implementation is limited.

The basic structural elements of the system are the government, ministries and agencies controlled by the mass media, civil society institutions implementing the agenda developed by the decision-making "center". Powerful control over the information infrastructure (control over the "Internet", social networks, mass media, etc.) creates conditions for making it impossible to promote alternative opinions and information. External influences are blocked and neutralized through a system of censorship, extensive networks of "trolls" and professional "commentators".

The transitional model is characteristic of states that are in transit. Considering the transformations occurring in them, paradigmatic changes in the principles of formation and implementation of state policy indicate a transition from a vertical to a subsidiary model, or vice versa [2].

Despite the differences in principles and approaches in the above models, the key and common task for each of them is to form, promote and maintain one's own positive image to influence internal and external audiences.

Ukrainian and foreign researchers have concluded that the state policy in the field of information is becoming an integral part of ensuring national security. In Ukraine, the implementation of state policy in the field of information occurs at three levels: national, regional, and local.

The authors propose a model of the formation of state's external image, which is based on the vision of integral indicators of the policy of forming state's image, as a component of its foreign policy course. Image components include forms, the formation of which can happen based on purposeful cooperation of all interested branding subjects. Institutions of state power, territorial communities, narrow-profile experts, diplomats, journalists, political technologists, public sector, etc. should become the key actors of the policy of forming and promoting a positive image of Ukraine in the external information space.

State of country's democratization, success of decentralization practices, reputational characteristics and economic development can be reflected and formed with the help of international ratings, expert opinions, digital diplomacy. Government's image is most often presented via sociological surveys of the country. The country's image in the information space of foreign countries, as a set of images produced in foreign information discourse, is the result of monitoring foreign mass media.

In the above-mentioned model, the authors suggest adjusting the policy of formation and promotion of the state's image at different levels (global, national, regional, local) with the help of various tools (diplomatic activities, official speeches at international events, audio and video products, tourist facilities) and involvement of various agents (diasporas, diplomatic missions, politicians, business circles, civil society, creative teams, athletes, etc.). The policy of forming state's image should not concentrate only on local images but use them as mosaic elements of the general image. According to the authors, the effective use of the potential of local images in the formation of state's image is possible only with the existence of smooth communication along the line "state – region – district".

Thus, the policy tools for shaping the state's image should be: diplomatic activity, including cultural and digital diplomacy; international cooperation within universal or regional organizations and unions; participation of the state in scientific, educational and cultural projects; attraction of foreign investments, the latest technologies and management experience; protection of national interests; preservation of national identity, cultural heritage and historical memory; maintaining relations with the diaspora; legal instruments (compliance with the norms of international law, formation of a stable legal system in the country). According to the proposed tools, the subjects of promoting and correcting the state's image through appropriate channels should be: 1) diplomatic missions abroad and of foreign states in the country, whose official representatives would comment on the events occurring in the state; 2) political figures, country's representatives in international organizations, members of official delegations on international visits, who would give qualified assessments, form an expert environment, comment on international ratings; 3) educators, scientists, representatives of higher educational institutions participating in international scientific and educational projects; 4) experts in culture, art and sports who participate in international festivals, sports events; 5) representatives of the diaspora, who preserve their national identity through the activities of creative teams

abroad, institutions for the promotion of language, culture and traditions, and formation of the places of compact residence abroad. In turn, the information policy of the state in terms of strengthening its image should be aimed at developing the above-mentioned tools and supporting these entities by attracting budget funds, supporting external stakeholders, and cooperating with business and civil society.

Based on the integral model of image formation, part of the components of the image is formed "from below" in the context of the decentralization policy, the other part is formed mostly by the central government, and the remaining components (reputational) are the result of indicators of international ratings, the dynamics of socio-economic development, expert assessments and digital diplomacy. To implement a successful policy of image formation, both the central government and local communities should be involved in the implementation of the policy "from below".

Conclusions

Currently, the main principles of foreign policy information policy, which would allow forming the state's image, consist of doctrinal tools for understanding foreign policy, which were formed during the middle – second half of the 20th century. At the same time, there are almost no doctrinal attempts to combine foreign policy with the state policy of regional development. Such a process becomes especially relevant for the implementation of decentralization policy.

Measured control of the state over internal and external information spaces through mass media, including official websites of state authorities and local governments, websites of civil society institutions, social networks, personal blogs, as well as technical means of monitoring and analytical evaluation of the information space, can become an effective mechanism of forming the country's image in the external information space, which would be a collection of forms collected from local territories.

Thus, in the modern conditions of decentralization of the communication field, the approach to building an effective information strategy and policy regarding the formation and promotion of the state's public image must be fundamentally changed: it is necessary to give local authorities the right to perform the role of a kind of communication concentrator (hub) between the national and local levels of information politicians. They should perform the functions of aggregating and articulating state's interests, local authorities, communities, and business. Such an information concentrator is designed to collect and process information "from below" and "from above", creating a powerful and effective system with requests from the population "at the entrance" and informational messages with key topics for promoting the public image of the state.

Formation of state's image, and especially its components, forms, should begin with local territories and an effective state policy of regional development. Positive perception of the state among external stakeholders establishes when authentic values, historical memory, images of national heroes, national holidays, symbols, tourism, economic well-being, and political stability are united in the state at the local level. Based on interrelationship of the components of foreign policy course and due to the internal cooperation of the government, the community and business, successful images, associations and interpretations will be formed as components of the state's image, namely images of local territories, socio-cultural images, government's image, and international reputation. Economic indicators will start to develop. State of society's democratization, decentralization based on the principle of subsidiarity will be successfully implemented, and effective information products will be created.

References:

1. Anholt S. *Competitive identity: The new brand management for nations, cities and regions*. Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 134 p.
2. Bondarenko Sergii, Nagorniyak Tetyana & Polovyi Mykola. Modern Information Models of the National Interests' Protection Policy of the World Countries. *European Journal of Transformation Studies*, 6(1), 2018. pp. 44-55.
3. Chossudovsky M. *The Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order*. 2nd ed. Quebec : Global Research, Center for Research and Globalization (CRG), 2003. 376 p.
4. Coleman, J. S. Social Theory, Social Research, and a Theory of Action. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(6), 1986. pp. 1309-1335.
5. Deutsch, K. W. *The nerves of government : models of political communication and control with a new introduction*. New York: The Free Press, 1966. 316 p.
6. Friedman T. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005. 488 p.
7. Habermas, J. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the rationalization of society (T. 1)*. Beacon Press : Boston, 1984. 465 p.
8. Keller, K., Aperia T., Georgson M. *Strategic Brand Management: A European Perspective*. London : Prentice Hall, 2008. 856 p.

9. Keohane R. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1984. 312 p.
10. Korten D. *Change the Story, Change the Future: A Living Economy for a Living Earth*. Oakland : Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2015. 200 p.
11. Kulyk V. National identity in Ukraine: impact of Euromaidan and the war. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 68, (4), 2016. pp. 588-608.
12. Lewin, K. Frontiers in group dynamics II: channels of group life; social planning and action research. *Human Relations*, 1(2), Human Relations, 1947. pp. 143-153.
13. Maxwell McCombs & Donald Shaw. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 1972. pp. 176-187.
14. Nye J. Jr. *Soft Power: The Means To Success In World Politics*. New York : PublicAffairs, 2004. 208 p.
15. Osmolovska A. Tendencies of Ukraine`s Image Formation in Polish Information Space. *Evropský politický a právní diskurz*. Czech Republic, 6 (6), 2019. pp. 77–82.
16. Sampson E. *The Image Factor: A Guide to Effective Self-presentation for Career Enhancement*. London: Kogan Page, 1994. 128 p.
17. Sassen S. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. 1st ed. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1991. 447 p.
18. Scott, A. *The image of the state and the expansion of the international system*.
URL : <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:56853ff2-c5f0-4102-9b5a-e88f42d54edf>.
19. Sengupta A. *Symbols and the image of the state in Eurasia*. Singapore : Singapore Springer, 2017. 152 p.
20. Богущ Д. *10 секретів політичних кампаній : навч. посіб.* Вид. 1. Київ : Міжнародний республіканський інститут, 2016. 168 с.
21. Бондаренко С. Інформаційний компонент політики брендингу територій в умовах нелінійних процесів. *Політичне життя*. 1-2 (2017), С. 21-26.
22. Бондаренко, С. *Інформаційний напрям політики захисту національних інтересів держави*. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата політичних наук. Вінниця: Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса, 2017. 254 с.
23. Бондаренко, С. Інформаційний напрям політики захисту національних інтересів держави. Т. Л. Нагорняк, М. В. Примуш, М. А. Польовий та ін. (Eds.), *Сучасні суспільно-політичні процеси у світі та Україні*, Вінниця. 2019. С. 95-115.
24. Бурдые П. *Социальное пространство: поля и практики*. Пер. Н.А. Шматко. Санкт-Петербург : Алетейя, 2005. 146 с.
25. Вербилович, О. Теория коммуникативного действия: ключевые категории и познавательный потенциал. *Публичная сфера: теория, методология, кейс-стади*, 2013. С. 35-52.
26. Грицак Я. *Куди рухається світ*. Київ : Грані-Т, 2015. 192 с.
27. Валлерстайн И. *Миротемный анализ: введение*. Пер. Н. Тюкина. Москва : Издательский дом «Территория будущего», 2006. 245 с.
28. Водотика Т., Магда Є. *Ігри відображень. Якою бачить Україну світ*. Харків : Віват, 2016. 352 с.
29. Жеребко О. Сучасний стан та тенденції розвитку українських телефільмів. *Курбасівські читання*. Науковий Вісник Національного центру театрального мистецтва імені Леся Курбаса, 12, 2017. с. 18.
30. Климанська Л.Д., Герасим Г.З. Медіа як ретранслятор соціальних проблем. *Соціальна робота в Україні: теорія і практика*, 1-4, 2015. С. 77-87.
31. Леньо, П. Ю. Образ “Іншого” та формування колективних ідентичностей у Європі. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету : Серія: Історія*, 2 (31), 2013. С. 186–187.
32. Ляпоров В. Бренд-политика как основа внешнеполитической стратегии. *Власть*, 7, 2007. С. 66-70.
33. Нагорняк Т.Л., Осмоловська А.О. Присутність України в інформаційному просторі прикордонних держав після 2014 року. *Політологічний вісник КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка*, 85, 2020. С. 226–236.
34. Осмоловська А. *Політика формування іміджу України в інформаційному просторі закордонних держав після 2014 р.* Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора філософії з політології. Вінниця: Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса, 2021. 252 с.
35. Стігліц Дж. *Глобалізація та її тягар*. Пер. А. Іщенко. Київ : Видавничий дім «КМ Академія», 2003. 252 с.
36. Стратегія публічної дипломатії МЗС України 2021-2025. (2021). *Міністерство закордонних справ України* : офіційний портал. URL : <https://mfa.gov.ua/storage/app/sites/1/Стратегія/public-diplomacy-strategy.pdf>
37. Тарнавський В. Країна як бренд. *Новий маркетинг*, 12, 2002. С. 55–62.
38. Тихомирова Є.Б. Стратегічні комунікації ЄС: інституціональний вимір. *Політичне життя*, 4, 2016. С. 103–112.
39. Турчин Я. Електронна дипломатія як важлива складова зовнішньої політики держави. Інформація, комунікація, суспільство 2014 : матеріали 3-ої Міжнародної наукової конференції ІКС-2014. Львів : Національний університет «Львівська політехніка», 2014. С. 104–105.
40. Флоріда Р. *Криза урбанізму. Чому міста роблять нас нещасними*. Пер. І. Бондаренко. Київ : «Наш Формат», 2019. 320 с.

41. Уэбстер Ф. Е. Л. Варганова (Ред.) *Теории информационного общества*. Пер. М. В. Арапов, Н. В. Малыгина. Москва : Аспект Пресс, 2004. 400 с.
42. Шевченко О.Л. Нові реалії брендингу. *Збірник наукових праць Черкаського державного технологічного університету. Серія : Економічні науки*, 32(2), 2012. С. 118-122.
43. Шульгіна, Л.М., Лео, М.В. *Брендинг: теорія та практика (на прикладі об'єктів комерційної нерухомості)* : монографія. Київ-Тернопіль : Астон, 2011. 267 с.

Бібліографічний список:

1. Anholt S. Competitive identity: The new brand management for nations, cities and regions. Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 134 p.
2. Bondarenko Sergii, Nagornyak Tetyana & Polovyi Mykola. Modern Information Models of the National Interests' Protection Policy of the World Countrie. *European Journal of Transformation Studies*, 6(1), 2018. pp. 44-55.
3. Chossudovsky M. The Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order. 2nd ed. Quebec : Global Research, Center for Research and Globalization (CRG), 2003. 376 p.
4. Coleman, J. S. Social Theory, Social Research, and a Theory of Action. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 91(6), 1986. pp. 1309-1335.
5. Deutsch, K. W. The nerves of government : models of political communication and control with a new introduction. New York: The Free Press, 1966. 316 p.
6. Friedman T. The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century. New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005. 488 p.
7. Habermas, J. The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the rationalization of society (T. 1). Beacon Press : Boston, 1984. 465 p.
8. Keller, K., Aperia T., Georgson M. Strategic Brand Management: A European Perspective. London : Prentice Hall, 2008. 856 p.
9. Keohane R. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1984. 312 p.
10. Korten D. Change the Story, Change the Future: A Living Economy for a Living Earth. Oakland : Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2015. 200 p.
11. Kulyk V. National identity in Ukraine: impact of Euromaidan and the war. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 68, (4), 2016. pp. 588-608.
12. Lewin, K. Frontiers in group dynamics II: channels of group life; social planning and action research. *Human Relations*, 1(2), Human Relations, 1947. pp. 143-153.
13. Maxwell McCombs & Donald Shaw. The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 1972. pp. 176-187.
14. Nye J. Jr. Soft Power: The Means To Success In World Politics. New York : PublicAffairs, 2004. 208 p.
15. Osmolovska A. Tendencies of Ukraine's Image Formation in Polish Information Space. *Evropský politický a právní diskurz. Czech Republic*, 6 (6), 2019. pp. 77-82.
16. Sampson E. The Image Factor: A Guide to Effective Self-presentation for Career Enhancement. London: Kogan Page, 1994. 128 p.
17. Sassen S. The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo. 1st ed. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1991. 447 p.
18. Scott, A. The image of the state and the expansion of the international system.
URL : <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:56853ff2-c5f0-4102-9b5a-e88f42d54edf>.
19. Sengupta A. Symbols and the image of the state in Eurasia. Singapore : Singapore Springer, 2017. 152 p.
20. Bohush D. 10 sekretiv politychnykh kampaniy : navch. posib. Vyd. 1. Kyiv : Mizhnarodnyy respublikans'kyi instytut, 2016. 168 s.
21. Bondarenko S. Informatsiynny komponent polityky brendynhu terytoriy v umovakh neliniynykh protsesi. *Politychne zhyttya*. 1-2 (2017), ss. 21-26.
22. Bondarenko, S. Informatsiynny napryam polityky zakhystu natsional'nykh interesiv derzhavy (dysertatsiya na zdobuttya naukovooho stupenya kandydat politychnykh nauk). Vinnytsya: Donets'kyi natsional'nyy universytet imeni Vasylya Stusa, 2017. 254 s.
23. Bondarenko, S. Informatsiynny napryam politykzakhystu natsional'nykh interesiv derzhavy. T. L. Nagornyak, M. V. Prymush, M. A. Pol'ovyy ta in. (Eds.), *Suchasni suspil'no-politychni protsesy u sviti ta Ukrayini*, Vinnytsia, 2019. Ss. 95-115.
24. Burd'ye P. Sotsial'noye prostranstvo: polya i praktiki. Per. N.A. Shmatko. Sankt-Peterburg : Aleteyya, 2005. 146 s.
25. Verbilovich, O. Teoriya kommunikativnogo deystviya: klyuchevyye kategorii i poznavatel'nyy potentsial. *Publichnaya sfera: teoriya, metodologiya, keys-stadi*, 2013. S. 35-52.
26. Hrytsak Ya. Kudy rukhayet'sya svit. Kyiv : Hrani-T, 2015. 192 s.
27. Vallerstain I. Mirosystemnyy analiz: vvedeniye. Per. N. Tyukina. Moskva : Izdatel'skiy dom «Territoriya budushchego», 2006. 245 s.
28. Vodotyka T., Mahda Ye. (2016). *Ihry vidobrazhen'*. Yakoyu bachyt' Ukrainu svit. Kharkiv : Vivat, 2016. 352 s.

29. Zherebko O. Suchasnyy stan ta tendentsiyi rozvytku ukraiyins'kykh telefil'miv. Kurbasivs'ki chytannya. Naukovyy Visnyk Natsional'noho tsentru teatral'noho mystetstva imeni Lesya Kurbasia, 12, 2017. s. 18.
30. Klymans'ka L.D., Herasym H.Z. (2015). Media yak retranslyator sotsial'nykh problem. Sotsial'na robota v Ukraini: teoriya i praktyka, 1-4, 2015. S. 77-87.
31. Len'o, P. Yu. Obraz "Inshoho" ta formuvannya kolektyvnykh identychnostey u Yevropi. Naukovyy visnyk Uzhhorods'koho universytetu : Seriya: Istoriya, 2 (31), 2013. S. 186–187.
32. Lyaporov V. Brend-polytyka kak osnova vneshnepolytycheskoy stratehyi. Vlast', 7, 2007. S. 66-70.
33. Nagornyak T., Osmolovska A. Prysutnist' Ukrainy v informatsynomu prostori prykordonnykh derzhav pislya 2014 roku. Politolohichnyy visnyk KNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenka, 85, 2020. Ss. 226–236.
34. Osmolovska A. Polityka formuvannya imidzhu Ukrainy v informatsynomu prostori zakordonnykh derzhav pislya 2014 r. (dysertatsiya na здobuttya naukovooho stupenya doktora filosofiyi z politolohiyi) Vinnytsya: Donets'ky natsional'nyy universytet imeni Vasylya Stusa, 2021. 252 s.
35. Stihlits Dzh. Hlobalizatsiya ta yiyi tyahar. Per. A. Ishchenko. Kyiv : Vydavnychy dim «KM Akademiya», 2003. 252 s.
36. Stratehiya publichnoyi diplomatiyi MZS Ukrainy 2021-2025. Ministerstvo zakordonnykh sprav Ukrainy : ofitsiyyny portal. URL : <https://mfa.gov.ua/storage/app/sites/1/Стратегія/public-diplomacy-strategy.pdf>
37. Tarnavs'ky V. Krayina yak brend. Novyy marketynh, 12, 2002. S. 55–62.
38. Tykhomyrova Ye.B. Stratehichni komunikatsiyi YES: instyutsional'nyy vymir. Politychne zhyttya, 4, 2016. S. 103–112.
39. Turchyn Ya. Elektronna diplomatiya yak vazhlyva skladova zovnishn'oyi polityky derzhavy. Informatsiya, komunikatsiya, suspil'stvo 2014 : materialy 3-oyi Mizhnarodnoyi naukovooyi konferentsiyi IKS-2014. L'viv : Natsional'nyy universytet «L'viv's'ka politekhnika», 2014. S. 104–105
40. Florida R. Kryza urbanizmu. Chomu mista roblyat' nas neshchasnymy. Per. I. Bondarenko. Kyiv : «Nash Format», 2019. 320 s.
41. Uebster F. Ye. L. Vartanova (Red.) Teorii informatsionnogo obshchestva. Per. M. V. Arapov, N. V. Malykhina. Moskva : Aspekt Press, 2004. 400 s.
42. Shevchenko O.L. Novi realiyi brendynhu. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' Cherkas'koho derzhavnogo tekhnolohichnoho universytetu. Seriya : Ekonomichni nauky, 32(2), 2012. S. 118-122.
43. Shul'hina, L.M., Leo, M.V. Brendynh: teoriya ta praktyka (na prykladi ob'yektiv komertsiyanoi nerukhomosti): monohrafiya. Kyiv-Ternopil' : Aston, 2011. 267 s.

Нагорняк Т. Л., Польовий М. А., Бондаренко С. В., Осмоловська А. О. Доктринальність політики просування зовнішнього іміджу держави в умовах формування нового світопорядку

У рамках авторських наукових пошуків було виділено три типи комунікативних моделей держав світу, що відображають базові принципи побудови державної інформаційної політики та віддзеркалюють ключові характеристики політичної системи. Серед них – субсидіарна, вертикальна та перехідна моделі. За допомогою інституційного методу була доведена специфіка держави як політичного інституту, що є носієм загальнонаціональних образів, а також роль і ступінь впливу саме державної політики на формування уявлень про державу в зовнішньому інформаційному просторі, на політику просування і трансформацію цих іміджів, з акцентом на дії тих держав, що формують глобальний політичний дискурс сучасності. Автори пропонують інтегральну модель формування публічного іміджу держави, що передбачає синергію суб'єктів публічної дипломатії. Результатом її має стати формування «знизу» частини складових іміджу держави (регіональних, полікультурних, кулінарних, освітніх, експертних) разом з офіційними продуктами (державними символами, репутаційними характеристиками, соціально-економічними показниками розвитку, рейтинговими індикаторами та продуктами цифрової дипломатії). Для реалізації успішної політики формування іміджу слід задіяти як центральну владу, так і локальні громади в контексті впровадження політики «знизу». Автори наголошують на тому, що політика формування іміджу держави в зовнішньому інформаційному просторі має розглядатися як багатоаспектна складова зовнішньополітичного курсу держави. Інструменти, канали та суб'єкти формування і коригування іміджу держави мають бути закладені в кожному з векторів зовнішньої політики, а саме в безпековому, дипломатичному, економічному, соціальному, правовому та безпосередньо інформаційному.

Ключові слова: міжнародна політична суб'єктність, імідж держави, інформаційний простір, новий світопорядок, зовнішня політика США, україно-американські відносини.