



Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology

Journal home page: geology-dnu.dp.ua

ISSN 2617-2909 (print)
ISSN 2617-2119 (online)

Journ. Geol. Geograph.
Geology,
32(2), 426-435.

[doi:10.15421/112338](https://doi.org/10.15421/112338)

O.Y. Vysotskyi, I.K. Holovko, O.Y. Vysotska

Journ. Geol. Geograph. Geoecology, 32(2), 426-435

Theory of geocultural technologies in international relations

Oleksandr Y. Vysotskyi¹, Ivan K. Holovko¹, Olha Y. Vysotska²

¹*Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine, vysalek@gmail.com*

²*Communal institution of higher education «Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education» of Dnipropetrovsk Regional Council, Dnipro, Ukraine*

Received 17.07.2022;

Received in revised form 05.11.2022;

Accepted 26.12.2022

Abstract. The development of the theory of geocultural technologies is an attempt to integrate various theories and practices of foreign policy cultural activities of states on the world stage within the framework of a generalizing scientific vision, as well as to rethink international relations on the basis of geographical and cultural determinism, as well as the technological

approach. The constitutive basis of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations is the idea that the subordination of social actors to power is determined by its cultural attractiveness for them and leads to their further internalization, immersion in the cultural and symbolic interpretive matrix that justifies and justifies power in its geocultural originality. The complementary application of geographical, civilizational, cultural, deterministic, communicative and technological approaches has made it possible to outline the contours of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations, to interpret effective practices of cultural engagement in the local, regional and global dimensions as geocultural technologies. Today, the problem of global cultural governance is increasingly coming to the fore among scholars. By actively participating in global cultural governance, states can not only realize their national interests, but also build the world of the future in accordance with their long-term strategies and culturally determined ideals of coexistence in the context of further increasing interdependence between peoples. In this sense, geocultural technologies are effective means of global cultural governance. The multidimensional nature and manifestations of geocultural technologies as effective practices in the international arena for the dissemination of geocultures allows them to be considered as means of international communication, as tools for public diplomacy, as means of cultural diplomacy, as soft power, as propaganda, and as legitimization. Thanks to geocultural technologies, a global transculture is being formed, which is a synthesis of ideas, images, and material things from different geocultures. Geocultures are defined as historically ordered sets of symbols, values, ideals, ideas, language practices, religious traditions, technologies of reproduction and transformation of social relations that embody the spirit of a particular geographical part of the world. Geoculture is inherent in any civilizational community or national-political entity.

Keywords: culture, geography, regionalism, technologies, international relations, public diplomacy, soft power, cultural diplomacy, international communication, global governance.

Теорія геокультурних технологій в міжнародних відносинах

О.Ю. Висоцький¹, І.К. Головка¹, О.Є. Висоцька²

¹ *Дніпровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара, м. Дніпро, Україна. vysalek@gmail.com*

² *Комуніальний заклад вищої освіти «Дніпровська академія неперервної освіти» Дніпропетровської обласної ради», м. Дніпро, Україна.*

Анотація. Розробка теорії геокультурних технологій є спробою інтеграції різноманітних теорій та практик зовнішньополітичної культурної діяльності держав на світовій арені в рамках узагальнюючого наукового бачення, а також переосмислення міжнародних відносин на основі географічного та культурного детермінізму, а також технологічного підходу. Конститутивною основою теорії геокультурних технологій в міжнародних відносинах є ідея про те, що підпорядкування соціальних акторів владі визначається її культурною привабливістю для них та обумовлює їх подальшу інтеріоризацією, занурення в культурно-символічну інтерпретаційну матрицю, яка обґрунтовує та виправдовує владу в її геокультурній своєрідності. Взаємодоповнює застосування географічного, цивілізаційного, культурницького, детерміністського, комунікативного та технологічного підходів дозволило окреслити контури теорії геокультурних технологій в міжнародних відносинах, інтерпретувати ефективні

практики культурного залучення в локальному, регіональному та глобальному вимірах як геокультурні технології. Нині серед вчених все більше виходить на перший план проблема глобального культурного управління. За рахунок активної участі у глобальному культурному управлінні держави можуть не лише реалізовувати свої національні інтереси, а й будувати світ майбутнього у відповідності зі своїми перспективними стратегіями та культурно обумовленими ідеалами співіснування в умовах подальшого посилення взаємозалежності між народами. У цьому значенні геокультурні технології виступають як ефективні засоби глобального культурного управління. Багатоаспектність природи та проявів геокультурних технологій як ефективних практик на міжнародній арені з розповсюдження геокультур дозволяє їх розглядати як засоби міжнародної комунікації, як інструменти здійснення публічної дипломатії, як засоби культурної дипломатії, як м'яку силу, як пропаганду та як легітимацію. Завдяки геокультурним технологіям формується глобальна транскультура, що є синтезом ідей, образів та матеріальних речей різних геокультур. Геокультури визначаються як історично упорядковані сукупності символів, цінностей, ідеалів, ідей, мовних практик, релігійних традицій, технологій відтворення та перетворення суспільних взаємовідносин, які втілюють дух певної географічної частини світу. Геокультура властива будь-якій цивілізаційній спільноті або національно-політичному утворенню.

Ключові слова: культура, географія, регіоналізм, технології, міжнародні відносини, публічна дипломатія, м'яка сила, культурна дипломатія, міжнародна комунікація, глобальне управління.

Introduction

The existence of geocultural diversity in the modern world is a factor in the development of international relations and a prerequisite for the struggle for dominance on a global and regional scale between states on the world stage. A prerequisite for the existence of different geocultures is the civilizational characteristics of different regions of the world. The geocultural peculiarity of states is associated with the civilizational space, the determining factors of which are geographical and cultural development. In other words, the civilizational affiliation of states as subjects of international relations on the world stage largely determines their geocultural peculiarity. Geoculturalism is a complex concept that denotes, firstly, the unity of the geographical and cultural space of a nation's life, and secondly, the diversity of phenomena that arise from the intersection of geography and culture. Such phenomena include worldview ideas, values, ideals, ways of social interaction and transformation of the world, determined by the history and traditions of a particular region. The interdependence and inequality of states in the modern global world makes the geocultural space an arena for the struggle for power and influence in the international arena. States are fighting for the dominance of their geocultural models in the world as a prerequisite for access to the opportunity to realize their interests in global decision-making. In essence, this is a competition for participation in the global governance of soft means.

These soft means include geocultural technologies that states use in the international arena to spread their cultural influence, participate in shaping global culture, and bring it as close as possible to their own geocultural models. On the one hand, cultural pluralism is intended to counteract the aspirations of various states as civilizational agents to cultural imperialism, to the absorption of weak

cultures by strong ones, and on the other hand, geocultural technologies are instruments of soft power that quietly convince global society that one geoculture is more attractive and expedient – in terms of modern challenges – than others. Wallerstein was inclined to single out only one geoculture, calling it liberal or liberalism (Wallerstein, 1999, p.1, 39). Obviously, he understood it to be the Western, Atlantic geoculture with its values of liberal democracy (Wallerstein, 1999, p.19, 39). However, this is only a purely ideological dimension of this culture, which does not fully describe and determine it, although it does indicate it in a certain way. At the same time, it is impossible to characterize Chinese or Turkic geocultures, which are increasingly becoming factors in international relations, in ideological terms. Attempts to do so using Wallerstein's templates only lead to the division of geocultures into liberal and other geocultures – illiberal. Wallerstein believed that the constitutive core of the dominant liberal geoculture is Eurocentrism (Wallerstein, 1999, p.168). However, this position confuses things. The German Nazi geoculture, with its desire to establish itself in Europe in the second half of the 1930s and first half of the 1940s, hardly has anything to do with liberalism. The same applies to Italian and Spanish fascism, whose fate was linked to the development of Europe and, of course, to the Eurocentric worldview. Wallerstein's conceptual and methodological mistake was to identify geoculture with a stable structure and to try to comprehend the global nature of the world through a limited understanding of the term geoculture as a tool for methodological analysis. Wallerstein's methodology is inadequate for objective research due to the exaggeration of class and formation Marxist reception of the world and the underestimation of the civilization approach. The civilization approach assumes the existence of a diversity of geocultures in the world. Wallerstein's

methodological approach actually assumes the existence of only different versions of a single liberal Eurocentric geoculture associated with the geopolitical order (Wallerstein, 1999, p.21). However, I. Wallerstein tried to reduce the consequences of exaggerating the liberal Eurocentric geoculture by talking about its collapse in recent times (Wallerstein, 1999, p.1). However, strangely enough, postulating the collapse of this geoculture is not entirely correct. It is simply changing. At the same time, the statement about liberal geoculture as a determinant of the modern global world is an exaggeration. Rather, we should talk about the interaction of different geocultures that determine modern international relations. Moreover, these geocultures are not just a set of ossified social models, rituals, and values. They are active factors that determine the realization by states of their national interests in the international arena. Geocultures even determine the formulation and strategies for realizing national interests. In turn, this determines the use of geocultural technologies by states in the international arena as effective practices for promoting and protecting their national interests. A significant difference between geocultural technologies and other foreign policy technologies is their predominantly soft nature. Undoubtedly, the use of geocultural technologies by state actors provides them with opportunities to manage global and regional processes in their national interests. Therefore, the development of the theory of geocultural technologies is an attempt, firstly, to integrate various theories and practices of foreign policy cultural activities of states on the world stage within the framework of a generalizing scientific vision, and secondly, to rethink international relations on the basis of geographical and cultural determinism, as well as the technological approach.

The aim of the article is to study the peculiarities of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations and to apply it as a methodological matrix for specifying the types and role of such technologies in the context of achieving the goals of states in the international arena.

Review of previous research

Contemporary scholars of international relations pay due attention to the cultural specificity of geographic space, culture as an important factor in interstate interaction, cultural diplomacy as a special kind of international communication, and technologies that are increasingly becoming a sign of a more perfect structuring of knowledge and human practice not only

in the field of material and information production, but also in the field of social relations. This created the preconditions for building a theory of geocultural technologies in international relations. The basis of this study is the work of scholars who have studied culture in the context of international interaction. Some scholars studied culture as a tool of propaganda in the international arena (Fayet, 2010; Barghoorn, 1960; Higham, 2001). Other researchers have considered culture in the context of public diplomacy (Scott-Smith, 2020; Zaharna, 2020). A significant number of scholars have paid attention to various aspects of cultural diplomacy as a practice of using culture to realize the national interests of the state and ensure its participation in global governance (Cull, 2010; Espada, 2020; Constantinou, 2018; Bulur, 2016; Murray, 2018; Banikamal & Ra'ees, 2018; Turchetti & Lalli, 2020; Brown, 2020; Berrin, 2021; Kuri, et al, 2020; Winter, 2017; Rockower, 2020; Dubé-Sénécal, 2022; Hjorthén, 2023; Kaya & Drhimeur, 2023). An analysis of the works on the role and place of culture in international relations has made it possible to state the lack of research on the technological dimension of cultural global governance.

Research methodology

The basis of our study is a combination of geographical, civilizational, cultural, deterministic, communicative, and technological approaches to explaining international relations. The geographical approach allowed us to comprehend international relations in the spatial-territorial and regional-cultural dimensions. The civilizational approach led to the study of international processes in the world as conditioned by their civilizational roots and local peculiarities. The culturalist approach has led to a methodological focus on the cultural preconditions and factors of influence on global society. The deterministic approach focused research attention on the geographical and cultural determination of foreign policy practices of states on the world stage. The communicative approach made it possible to distinguish various practices of meaning transmission within the global society. The technological approach made it possible to identify and describe specific geocultural technologies used in the field of international relations.

Material

The constitutive basis of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations is the idea that the subordination of social actors to power is determined by its cultural attractiveness for them and leads

to their further internalization, immersion in the cultural and symbolic interpretive matrix that justifies and justifies power in its geocultural originality. In other words, geoculture creates the basis, the cultural context for the legitimization of power, which is realized in accordance with its models, values, ideals, ways of acting and peculiarities of perception of the world. It follows that a strong state actor is interested in the effective dissemination of its geoculture in the global world in order to strengthen its power position in the international arena and ensure the realization of its national interests. Every state that claims a leadership role in the region or in the international arena resorts to the practices of cultural imperialism, to the technologies of imposing its culture as more developed and perfect on other participants in international relations.

The complementary use of geographical, civilizational, cultural, deterministic, communicative, and technological approaches allowed us to outline the contours of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations, and to interpret effective practices of cultural engagement in the local, regional, and global dimensions as geocultural technologies.

Geographically determined cultural space allows us to distinguish various geocultural technologies (Vysotskyi, et al., 2022). From a purely functional point of view, geocultural technologies are effective information, communication, and infrastructural practices of symbolic and value attraction and involvement of participants in international relations in the relevant geocultural space.

States use geocultural technologies to compete for power among themselves. The political-geographical paradigm, complemented by globalization ideas about international relations, assumes that each national unit is an integral part of the global whole (Vysotskyi, et al., 2022). At the same time, to claim regional or global leadership, any state needs to carry the constructive potential of a geocultural alternative, to offer its own geocultural project for the further development of the world as opposed to the existing one. In this context, geocultural technologies can be viewed as legitimizing technologies that condition the acceptance of power and influence of a particular state by global or regional society. Due to this, a state that is successful in implementing geocultural technologies can more easily realize its national interests in the international arena.

In general, the purpose of geocultural technologies is to promote and impose a certain civilizational model of the world that can be accepted globally or regionally, that is, potentially by all or most participants in global or regional society. A state that claims

to be a global or regional leader acts as an agent of a certain civilizational community with its own history and culture. That is why geocultural technologies are always effective tools for transmitting culture as attractive practices of successful, perfect and fair organization of life in certain territories.

Results

The concept of geoculture can be defined as a historically ordered set of symbols, values, ideals, ideas, language practices, religious traditions, technologies of reproduction and transformation of social relations that embody the spirit of a particular geographical part of the world. Geoculture is a specific and unique culture that is inherent in any civilizational community or national-political entity. Differences in the geoculture of different peoples and countries allow us to distinguish between Western and Eastern cultures (Vysotskyi, et al., 2022).

Western culture is considered dominant. Accordingly, states that represented the Western geocultural identity imposed their culture on weaker countries as more developed and perfect. This was done due to the inequality of information exchange, which was the result of the technological and infrastructural backwardness of the countries of the Eastern geocultural identity. The modernization of the states of the Eastern geoculture was seen mainly as westernization, i.e., the transition to the models of the Western geoculture. As a result, each Western state tried to offer its own version of geoculture, which gave it the opportunity to spread its political and economic influence in the world through geocultural technologies. The states of the Eastern geocultural identity were not inclined to spread their own culture on a global scale. Only a few countries of Eastern geoculture have been able to fully realize and appreciate the soft power of geocultural technologies. China certainly belongs to those countries.

The mechanism of action of geocultural technologies can be schematically described using a two-phase model. The first phase is when a state creates its cultural attractiveness among active representatives of the regional or global public, including young people, opinion leaders, entrepreneurs, and politicians. The second phase of geocultural technologies begins when active representatives of the foreign public, having mastered the cultural practices and worldview models of the non-mother geoculture, become ardent supporters, voluntary defenders of the national interests of another state and its political allies. Thus, successful geocultural technologies provide the state

with an influx of investments, labor force and its support at international forums and during voting in the governing bodies of international organizations.

The geographical determinism of geocultural technologies is especially evident in tourism geocultural technologies, in particular, the construction of tourist attractiveness, preservation of the pristine specificity of territories by creating nature reserves, providing unique opportunities for tourist recreation (Imrani, et al., 2022), promoting tourism through the concept of sustainable development (Imrani, et al., 2021), fitting geocultural preferences, values, ideals and the prevailing way of life of the country into the global trend of green consumption culture and the formation of ecological consciousness (Vysotska, et al., 2021; Vysotska & Vysotskyi, 2022).

A rather peculiar geocultural technology is outbound tourism diplomacy, which aims to expand international relations (Zhu, et al., 2022). We also consider heritage diplomacy as a geocultural technology, as it draws the attention of the international community to historical heritage, thereby including it in the global game of national interests in the international arena (Lahdesmaki & Ceginskas, 2022). This ensures tourist flows, funding for international projects, and recognition of the country's geoculture as a source and part of the world's cultural treasure trove.

The multidimensional nature and manifestations of geocultural technologies as effective practices in the international arena for the dissemination of geocultures requires their consideration in at least six dimensions. Firstly, geocultural technologies are means of international communication, as they provide intercultural dialogue and exchange of meanings. Secondly, geocultural technologies are a variation of public diplomacy, as they involve interaction with foreign audiences and focus on their support. Thirdly, geocultural technologies are tools of cultural diplomacy, as they are implemented through culture, through the offer of culture in the form of experience, meanings, symbols, developed ways of transforming the world, cultural and artistic objects. Fourthly, geocultural technologies are soft power, as they involve the realization of state interests in the international arena by mobilizing the desires of the world public, rather than using violence, pressure, fear or threats. Fifthly, geocultural technologies are propaganda, as they are ways to disseminate values that are beneficial to their initiator. Sixth, geocultural technologies are a legitimization of claims to cultural distinctiveness and at the same time a justification for the expansion of power to realize such distinctiveness on a global, regional, and national scale.

Geocultural technologies as a means of international communication. The external influence of some nations on others has always been exercised through communication. Communication has always been and remains a space of interaction through which mutual understanding is achieved and power is imposed. It is no coincidence that any diplomacy is essentially communication. Geocultural technologies ensure intercultural dialogue and exchange of meanings, firstly, at the level of creating preconditions, secondly, at the level of communication and technology, and thirdly, at the level of content.

The level of preconditions involves, in particular, the creation of infrastructural opportunities for the foreign public to learn the language of another geocultural community. The Alliance Française (since 1884), the British Council (since 1934), the Goethe-Institute (since 1951), the Cervantes Institute (since 1991), the Confucius Institute (since 2004), and other geocultural centers for the dissemination of language and culture have been working very hard on this. If an international actor wants to be understood and supported as a bearer of a particular geocultural identity, he or she must ensure that as many foreign audiences as possible speak his or her language. The linguistic and symbolic construction and interpretation of the world is no less important than ideas and values.

The communication and technology level covers effective means of communication and engagement. These can include educational and scientific exchanges, academic conferences, summer schools, trainings, art exhibitions, cinema, and translations of literature that represents the values, traditions, ideals, and lifestyle of a particular geocultural community. At this level, we can distinguish cultural diplomacy as an institutionalized practice that is well understood in the scientific literature (Mark, 2010; Gienow-Hecht & Donfried, 2010; Goff, 2020). Within cultural diplomacy, there are music diplomacy (Espada, 2020), cinema diplomacy (Cull, 2010), visual diplomacy (Constantinou, 2018), fashion diplomacy (Dubé-Sénécal, 2022; Bulur, 2016), arts diplomacy (Brown, 2020), sports diplomacy (Murray, 2018), educational diplomacy (Banikamal & Ra'ees, 2018), science diplomacy (Turchetti & Lalli, 2020), exhibition diplomacy (Berrin, 2021; Hjorthén, 2023), tourism diplomacy (Kuri, et al., 2020), heritage diplomacy (Winter, 2017), religious diplomacy (Religious soft diplomacy..., 2021; Kaya & Drhimeur, 2023), gastrodiploamcy (Rockower, 2020).

The substantive level ensures the result in the form of institutionalized relations, constant cooperation, systematic visits, the formation of appropriate geocultural tolerance among the foreign public, and the

legitimacy of the realization of the national interests of the state as an actor of the geocultural community on the world stage. Here we can talk about the regional leadership of the state within a certain geocultural region or its claims to increase its role in global processes. The symbolic and conceptual construction of geocultural space in the minds of the foreign public is also the result of geocultural technologies. For example, Turkey uses the concept of Turkic unity as a geocultural technology to legitimize its claims to a leadership role in the region, which includes part of the territory of the Russian Federation, where Turkic peoples live.

Geocultural technologies as effective means of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy encompasses a wide range of different means of a state's foreign policy that are used to influence the foreign public. In fact, according to one of the leading versions, the name of public diplomacy comes from its focus on the public. For example, H. Tuch defined public diplomacy as the process of government communication with the foreign public in an attempt to gain an understanding of the ideas and ideals of their country, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and policies (Tuch 1990, p.3). However, within the framework of understanding public diplomacy as communication with a foreign public, which acts as a «discreet» and «gentle» tool for managing the policies of another state, any technologies that work on this principle can be combined. From this point of view, any digital or cultural diplomacy is public because it is aimed at a foreign public. When we focus on the mechanism of influence of foreign policy practices aimed at the public, we call it public diplomacy. When we emphasize the specifics of the means that prevail in this mechanism, we define this practice based on the nature of such means.

Geocultural technologies as tools of cultural diplomacy. The purpose of geocultural technologies is to expand new geographical spaces through the spread of geographically and politically determined culture. For example, the consumption of things, which mainly depends on the country of their production, indicates the successful implementation of the geocultural technology of national branding. As a result, the public, wanting to consume and consuming goods from a particular country, is accustomed to a certain geoculture. It would seem that this is something insignificant. However, it is an unconscious cultural choice. The public refuses its national product in favor of someone else's. Visual diplomacy plays a significant role in imposing the consumption of things of a certain geoculture, thus acting as a geocultural tech-

nology. Visual diplomacy includes the dissemination of any images that affect the emotions and feelings of the public. These can be advertising billboards, music videos, movies, TV series, whose characters influence the public's impressions and invisibly offer them to become part of a higher reality of a happy life through the consumption of prestigious things. Therefore, it can be argued that visual diplomacy as a geocultural technology first captures the mental space of the foreign public, and then the geographical and political area of its residence.

Geocultural technologies of literary translations involve the foreign audience in the world of spiritual mastery of the reality of a particular geoculture, its ideals, myths, symbols, holidays, traditions, and rituals. Holidays set the rhythm of life, myths explain the subconscious of a cultural community, rituals normalize social expectations, and symbols structure, designate, and subordinate the world around us to meanings and strategies of mastery. The United States and China are the actors that have been most active in implementing this technology.

Geocultural technologies of gastrodiplomacy through unique dishes of national cuisine change geocultural tastes and principles in food consumption. For example, McDonaldization has changed the process of eating, putting speed first.

The rapid spread of high-tech innovations in mechanical engineering, robotics, microelectronics, computer equipment, and mobile communication devices is a manifestation of technological diplomacy and geocultural struggle in the international arena. In this regard, Taiwan's victory in the future confrontation with China may be due to its technological diplomacy.

Thanks to geocultural technologies, a global transculture is being formed, which is a synthesis of ideas, images, and material things of different geocultures. The fate of each geoculture in this synthesis will determine the prospects for participation in global governance by its agents. Thus, if the functioning of a state is based on imitation of technological and socio-political achievements of other geocultures, its leadership in the world is not guaranteed. Various versions of fundamentalism, with their desire to return to the sources and purify geoculture from external influences, are opposed to global transculturation. However, they have no prospects in the modern world of cultural global governance. The world of the future is the world of the transcultural person.

Geocultural technologies as soft power. In contrast to coercion, violence, intimidation, and pressure in international relations, geocultural technologies act

by influencing the emotions, feelings, desires, and impressions of the foreign public. They rely on voluntary involvement, openness, and readiness for new and interesting experiences. It can be argued that geocultural technologies as a soft power shape the international emotional image of a state. If a state is associated with aggressive warfare, attacks on neighbors or threats with nuclear weapons to the whole world, outright lies at the diplomatic level, clumsy propaganda in films and books, persecution of prominent representatives of its cultural elite, then the sympathies of the foreign public will not be on the side of such a state, as it becomes a threat to global security and discredits those associated with it. If such a state tries to reduce the negative effect through the use of geocultural technologies, they are likely to fail for various reasons.

Geocultural technologies as propaganda. Geocultural technologies are the means of spreading persuasive and mobilizing meanings of a certain geoculture beyond its traditional geographical space of existence in order to promote the dominance of some international players on the world stage by narrowing the influence of others.

F. Barghoorn believed that cultural diplomacy is the manipulation of cultural materials and personnel for propaganda purposes, and a branch of intergovernmental propaganda (Barghoorn, 1960, p.10-11). R. Higham defined cultural diplomacy as «self-interested national-propaganda» (Higham, 2001, p.138). Some scholars disagree with the idea that cultural diplomacy is a type of propaganda at the current stage of its development (Mark, 2010; Goff, 2020). In justifying their position, these scholars refer to Melissen's reception of propaganda, who distinguishes between propaganda and public diplomacy (Melissen, 2005, p.8). To favorably position public diplomacy against propaganda, J. Melissen calls the latter primitive, crude, manipulative, and aimed at short-term effects and narrowing the horizons of others (Melissen, 2005, p.8). However, none of the propaganda researchers would agree with Melissen, as this is an obvious oversimplification. Propaganda is eternal and remains an important power force for regulating social relations as long as it is invisible and effective. O. Vysotskyi & D. Pavlov note that the essence of propaganda is to spread its space as a constant process of constructing and intensifying persuasive and mobilizing values for society in order to ensure the victory of some political forces over others in the processes of gaining power, making certain socially important decisions, as well as implementing the interests of international players on the world stage»

(Vysotskyi & Pavlov, 2020). Based on this understanding of propaganda, geocultural technologies are subtle tools for expanding the geocultural space to include speakers of other geocultures in order to involve them in the process of cultural global governance as their staunch allies.

Geocultural technologies as a means of legitimizing cultural uniqueness and claims to power in international relations. Legitimation plays an important role in international relations. Its tools are quite diverse. Geocultural technologies create a cultural space that serves as a cognitive and normative mediator for understanding and evaluating the policies of states in the international arena. The struggle for the preservation of cultural identity is one of the effective geocultural technologies that paradoxically ensures the formation of global transculturality. The coexistence of different cultures in the world is possible only on the basis of mutual respect between their speakers. Victory in the geocultural confrontation in the international arena is possible only on the basis of the attractiveness of the ways of comprehending the world and reproducing social relations, a freer and fairer organization of human life offered by them.

Geocultural discourse is an important instance of legitimizing power in the international arena. It ensures the prevention of cultural discrimination, ethnocide, linguocide, and genocide. The struggle for the rights of representatives of different cultural communities is undoubtedly a geocultural technology, the skillful use of which provides great opportunities for diasporas to exert geocultural influence beyond their geocultural region.

The activities of diasporas in lobbying for the interests of their homeland through the institutions of the host state are also an important geocultural technology that ensures the realization of national interests of states in the international arena. For example, pro-Israeli lobbying organizations in the United States provide the Jewish state with bipartisan support in the form of annual financial assistance.

Discussion and conclusion

Today, the problem of global cultural governance is increasingly coming to the fore among scholars (Wang, et al., 2021). By actively participating in global cultural governance, states can not only realize their national interests but also build the world of the future in accordance with their long-term strategies and culturally determined ideals of coexistence in the context of further increasing interdependence between peoples. In this sense, geocultural tech-

nologies serve as effective means of global cultural governance. The large-scale Russia-Ukraine war has demonstrated that violent means of imposing a state's geoculture on other peoples leads to the opposite consequences. In the perception of the foreign public, the geoculture of which such a state is a carrier turns into a threat to global security and is interpreted as Nazi (Marayev & Guz, 2022), which naturally legitimizes the practice of rejecting it, banning it as hateful and violent (Snyder, 2022; Russophobia, 2023). In Ukraine, which has become a victim of Russian aggression, any monuments and place names associated with Russian or Soviet culture are being dismantled and renamed (Russophobia, 2023). This can be called a policy of symbolic and conceptual destruction of the geoculture associated with the Russian world. The geoculture of the Russian world has traditionally identified itself through Kyiv as its original civilizational center, as the mother of Russian cities, from where the Christianization of the «Russian world» was carried out. Therefore, on a symbolic level, the Ukrainian policy of refusing to identify with the geoculture of the Russian world means its «decapitation.» This is already leading to a crisis in the geocultural identification of the Russian Federation, to its weakening and subordination to the geocultural influence of China and Turkey. Therefore, violence, coercion, intimidation, pressure, blackmail as instruments of hard power are opposed to geocultural technologies as means of soft power that operate effectively and invisibly. An important point that is inherent in geocultural technologies is their connection with emotions, feelings, desires and impressions. In fact, thanks to emotions, geocultural technologies influence the unconscious of the foreign public, which imperceptibly turns into an ally or an enemy. According to one of the leading laws of propaganda, geocultural technologies are only effective when they act unnoticed by the object of influence.

The development of the theory of geocultural technologies is an attempt, firstly, to integrate various theories and practices of foreign policy cultural activities of states on the world stage within the framework of a generalizing scientific vision, and secondly, to rethink international relations on the basis of geographical and cultural determinism, as well as a technological approach.

The constitutive basis of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations is the idea that the subordination of social actors to power is determined by its cultural attractiveness for them and determines their further internalization, immersion

in the cultural and symbolic interpretive matrix that justifies and justifies power in its geocultural originality. Geoculture creates the basis, the cultural context for the legitimization of power, which is realized in accordance with its models, values, ideals, modes of action and peculiarities of perception of the world. It follows that a strong state actor is interested in the effective dissemination of its geoculture in the global world in order to strengthen its power position in the international arena and ensure the realization of its national interests. Every state that claims to be a leader in a region or on the planet as a whole resorts to the use of technologies to impose its culture as more developed and perfect on other participants in international relations.

The complementary application of geographical, civilizational, cultural, deterministic, communicative and technological approaches allowed us to outline the contours of the theory of geocultural technologies in international relations, to interpret effective practices of cultural engagement in the local, regional and global dimensions as geocultural technologies. From a purely functional point of view, geocultural technologies are effective information, communication and infrastructure practices of symbolic and value attraction and involvement of participants in international relations in the relevant geocultural space. Geoculture is a historically ordered set of symbols, values, ideals, ideas, language practices, religious traditions, technologies of reproduction and transformation of social relations that embody the spirit of a particular geographical part of the world. Geoculture is inherent in any civilizational community or national-political entity.

The multidimensional nature and manifestations of geocultural technologies as effective practices in the international arena for the dissemination of geocultures allows them to be considered in six dimensions: 1) as a means of international communication; 2) as tools of public diplomacy; 3) as tools of cultural diplomacy; 4) as soft power; 5) as propaganda; 6) as legitimation.

Thanks to geocultural technologies, a global trans-culture is being formed, which is a synthesis of ideas, images and material things of different geocultures.

The theory of geocultural technologies in international relations has made it possible to identify a number of technologies that have proven to be effective in influencing foreign audiences. We distinguish these technologies based on the specifics of different types of cultural interaction in the international space. These are tourist geocultural technologies, visual diplomacy technologies, fashion diplomacy technologies, educational diplomacy technologies, scientific

diplomacy technologies, sports diplomacy technologies, literary translation technologies, film diplomacy technologies, religious diplomacy technologies, gastronomic diplomacy technologies, heritage diploma-

cy technologies, music diplomacy technologies, art diplomacy technologies, exhibition diplomacy technologies, renaming toponyms technologies, and symbolic integration of cultural space.

References

- Banikamal A., Ra'ees, W. (2018). Iran's Educational Diplomacy in the Muslim World: Activities of Al-Mustafa International University in Malaysia and Afghanistan. *Insight Turkey*, 20,1, 165-188. DOI: 10.25253/99.2018201.10.
- Barghoorn, F. Ch. (1960). *The Soviet cultural offensive; the role of cultural diplomacy in Soviet foreign policy*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.
- Berrin, K. (2021). *Exhibiting the Foreign on U.S. Soil: American Art Museums and National Diplomacy Exhibitions Before, During, and After World War II*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Brown, J. (2020). Arts Diplomacy: The Neglected Aspect of Cultural Diplomacy. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / ed. by N.Snow & N. J. Cull, 2nd edition*. NY: Routledge. 79-81.
- Bulur, Ö. (2016). Fashion diplomacy: More than simply a wardrobe choice. Retrieved from: <https://www.dailysabah.com/feature/2016/10/24/fashion-diplomacy-more-than-simply-a-wardrobe-choice>.
- Constantinou, K.M. (2018). Visual Diplomacy: Reflections on Diplomatic Spectacle and Cinematic Thinking. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 13 (4), 387-409. DOI: 10.1163/1871191x-13030014.
- Cull, N.J. (2010). Cinema diplomacy is alive and well...for the time being. *Cultural diplomacy in India and Pakistan, 1(3)*. Retrieved from: https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/pdin_monitor_article/cinema-diplomacy-alive-and-well%E2%80%A6-time-being.
- Dubé-Sénécal, V. (2022). Fashion's diplomatic role: an instrument of French prestige-based commercial diplomacy, 1960s–1970s. *International Relations*. DOI: [10.1177/00471178221123506](https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178221123506).
- Fayet, J.-F. (2010). VOKS: The third dimension of Soviet foreign policy. *Searching for a cultural diplomacy*. NY; Oxford: Berghahn, 33-49.
- Gienow-Hecht, J.C.E., Donfried M.C. (2010). The Model of Cultural Diplomacy: Power, Distance, and the Promise of Civil Society. *Searching for a cultural diplomacy*. NY; Oxford: Berghahn, 13-33.
- Goff, P.M. (2020). Cultural diplomacy. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / ed. by N.Snow & N. J. Cull, 2nd edition*. NY: Routledge. 30-37.
- Higham, R. (2001). The World Needs More Canada. Canada Needs More Canada. *Jean-Paul Baillargeonm (ed.), The Handing Down of Culture, Smaller Societies, and Globalization*. Ontario: Grubstreet Editions, 134–142.
- Hjorthén, A. (2023). U.S. Art Museums and Exhibition Diplomacy, *Diplomatic History*, 2. DOI: [10.1093/dh/dhad002](https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhad002).
- Imrani, Z., Mammadova, S., Hadjiyeva, N., & Vysotskiy, O. (2021). The main directions of sustainable socio-economic development of the Caspian littoral areas of the Republic of Azerbaijan and the existing environmental problems. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 30(4), 652-665. DOI: 10.15421/112160.
- Imrani, Z., Zeynalova, K., Mammadova, G., & Vysotskiy, O. (2022). Opportunities and prospects for the development of speleotourism in Azerbaijan. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 31(2), 293-301. DOI: 10.15421/112227.
- Kaya, A., Drhimeur, A. (2023). Diaspora politics and religious diplomacy in Turkey and Morocco. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*. 2 (23), 317-337. DOI: 10.1080/14683857.2022.2095703.
- Kuri, B., Islam, S., Sadia, A. (2020). Tourism Diplomacy: A Feasible Tool of Building Nation's Image through Tourism Resources. A Study on Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12, 24. DOI: 10.7176/EJBM/12-24-10.
- Lahdesmaki, T., Ceginskas, V.L.A. (2022). Conceptualization of heritage diplomacy in scholarship. *International Journal of Heritage*. 28 (5). 635-650. DOI: 10.1080/13527258.2022.2054846.
- Marayev, V., Guz, J. (2022). Rashism or why russians are the new Nazi. *VoxUkraine*. Retrieved from: <https://voxukraine.org/en/rashism-or-why-russians-are-the-new-nazi>.
- Mark, S.L. (2010). Rethinking Cultural Diplomacy: The Cultural Diplomacy of New Zealand, the Canadian Federation and Quebec. *Political Science*, 62, 1, 63. DOI: [10.1177/0032318710370466](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032318710370466).
- Melissen, J. (2005). The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice. *The new public diplomacy: soft power in international relations / edited by Jan Melissen*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 3-27.
- Religious soft diplomacy and the United Nations: religious engagement as loyal opposition*. (2021) / edited by Sherrie M. Steiner and James T. Christie. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Rockower, P. (2020). A Guide to Gastrodiplomacy. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / ed. by N.Snow & N. J. Cull, 2nd edition*. NY: Routledge. 205-212.
- "Russophobia" Term Used to Justify Moscow's War Crimes in Ukraine, Historian Tells Security Council. (2023). United Nations Security Council. 9280th Meeting. 14

- March. Retrieved from: <https://press.un.org/en/2023/sc15226.doc.htm>.
- Scott-Smith G. (2020). Exchange Programs and Public Diplomacy. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / ed. by N.Snow & N. J. Cull, 2nd edition*. NY: Routledge. 38-49.
- Snyder, T. (2022). We Should Say It. Russia Is Fascist. *New York Times*. 19 May. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/05/19/opinion/russia-fascism-ukraine-putin.html?smid=tw-share>.
- Tuch, H. (1990). *Communicating with the World: US public diplomacy overseas*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Turchetti, S., Lalli, R. (2020). Envisioning a "science diplomacy 2.0": on data, global challenges, and multi-layered networks. *Humanities and social sciences communications*, 7 (144). DOI: 10.1057/s41599-020-00636-2.
- Vysotska, O., Rieznikov, S., Rohova, E., Vysotskyi, O., Vatkovska, M. (2021). Philosophy and Practice of Education for Sustainable Development in Ukraine: On the Example of Secondary Education in the Dnipropetrovsk Region. *European journal of sustainable development*, 2, 10, 256–266. DOI:10.14207/ejsd.2021.v10n2p256.
- Vysotska, O., Vysotskyi, O. (2022). Green consumer culture as a factor of sustainable development of society. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 31(1), 171-185. DOI: 10.15421/112217.
- Vysotskyi, O., Vysotska O. (2020). Technologies of Public Diplomacy: Methodological Principles and Practical Potential. *Epistemological studies in philosophy, social and political sciences*, 3, 1, 139-147. DOI: 10.15421/342015.
- Vysotskyi, O., Deviatko, N., & Vysotska, O. (2022). Theory of technologies of geographical determinism in international relations. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 31(3), 554-565. DOI: [10.15421/112252](https://doi.org/10.15421/112252).
- Vysotskyi, O., Pavlov, D. (2020). Spaces of Propaganda as Structural and Functional Dimensions of its Deployment in Domestic Politics and in the International Arena. *Philosophy and Political Science in the Context of Modern Culture*, 12(1), 114-122. <https://doi.org/10.15421/352013>.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1999). *The end of the world as we know it: social science for the twenty-first century / Immanuel Wallerstein*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wang, Y.W., Uzodinma, C.G., Niu, C.Y. (2021). The path, value and limits of the Confucius Institute in carrying out public diplomacy. *Economic and Political Studies-EPS*, 9 (2), 217-229. DOI: 10.1080/20954816.2021.1914416.
- Zaharna, R.S. (2020). Communication Logics of Global Public Diplomacy. *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy / ed. by N.Snow & N. J. Cull, 2nd edition*. NY: Routledge. 96-111.
- Zhu, J.S., Siriphon, A., Airey, D., Mei-lang, J. (2022). Chinese Tourism Diplomacy: A Chinese-style Modernity review. *Anatolia-International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 33 (4), 550-563. DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2021.1978515.