

Journal of Community Positive Practices

Year XXII
Special Issue/
2022

- **Zhanna Bolat** – Legal, economic and social issues in CIS countries development
- **Vitalii I. Bocheliuk, Leonid K. Velitchenko, Taisiia O. Gaivoronska, Viktoriya L. Pogrebnaya, Tetiana V. Khitrova** – The influence of manipulations on individual and general memory: specifics of current life situation perception and interpretation of the future
- **Den Sik Kan, Leonid V. Chuprii, Volodymyr M. Vasylchuk, Victoriia D. Uriadova, Iryna Yu. Shepelska** – Regional political leadership in a sociological context: image, PR and media communications
- **Oleksandr M. Nepomnyashchyy, Oleksandra A. Marusheva, Yurii H. Prav, Andrii V. Havrylov, Oleg A. Diegtiar** – Amalgamated territorial communities as a basis for the introduction of decentralization of power in Ukraine
- **Vitalii Ye. Dankevych, Nataliia V. Bondarchuk, Anna Yo. Buchynska, Svitlana O. Kostenko, Vitalii A. Strilchuk** – European legal standards for local development: a community-oriented approach
- **Igor V. Horobets, Andrey Yu. Martyinov, Elena A. Braychevskaya, Irina M. Krupenya, Iryna Yu. Sliusarenko** – Political culture and identity politics in the ukrainian society
- **Tamara V. Berezianko, Oleh O. Sheremet, Ihor O. Halytsia, Antonina S. Zienina-Bilichenko, Marianna P. Marshalenko** – Socially responsible management and good practice
- **Khristina Mashtalir, Olha Kapitan, Roman Shai** – Gender equality as a component of the equality principle in society
- **Nataliia O. Aliushyna** – Spatio-temporal organisation of civil servants' work in the conditions of Covid-19
- **Yevhen M. Sulima, Liudmyla V. Onuchak, Olena V. Diachuk, Leonid V. Chuprii, Irina G. Verkhovtseva** – Value component of the dialogical approach in international relations
- **Natalia F. Serbina, Iuliia A. Tsyrfa, Artem P. Sapsai** – Understanding colombia – Ukraine relations: modern developments and a global perspectiv

EDITURA Expert

JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY POSITIVE PRACTICES

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Director
PhD. **Sorin CACE**, Catalactica Association, Research Institute for Quality of Life, Romanian Academy

Scientific Committee:
PhD, Professor **Cătălin ZAMFIR**, Member of Romanian Academy
PhD, Professor **Asher BEN-ARIEH**, Haruv Institute, Jerusalim, Israel
PhD, Professor **Gary B. MELTON**, University of Colorado, Denver, USA
PhD, Professor **John LUTZKER**, Georgia State University, Atlanta, USA
PhD, Professor **Michael J. PALMIOTTO**, Wichita State University, Kansas, USA
PhD, Professor **Jill KORBIN**, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA
PhD, Professor **Jimmy TAYLOR**, Ohio University, Zanesville, Ohio, USA
PhD, Professor **Andrea WIGFIELD**, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom
PhD, Professor **Elizabeth ECKERMANN**, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia
PhD, Professor **Renwu TANG**, Dean of School of Management, Dean of Academy of Government at Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
PhD, Professor **Amitabh KUNDU**, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
PhD, Professor **Claude MARTIN**, Research Director CNRS, Université de Rennes, France
PhD, Professor **Munyae M. MULINGE**, United States International University (USIU), Nairobi, Kenya
PhD, Professor **Manuel Antonio GARRETON**, University of Chile, Santiago de Chile, Chile
PhD, Professor **Renata FRANC**, Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, Croatia
PhD, Professor **Asun LLENA BERNE**, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
PhD, Professor **Nawab Ali KHAN**, Sarrar bin Abduaziz University, Al Kharj, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
PhD, Professor **Mihaela TOMIȚĂ**, Universitatea de Vest, Timisoara
PhD, Professor **Valeriu IOAN-FRANC**, Corresponding Member of Romanian Academy, National Institute of Economic Research, Bucharest, Romania
PhD, Professor **Corina CACE**, Academy of Economy Studies, Bucharest, Romania
PhD, Professor **Mircea ALEXIU**, Western University, Timisoara, Romania
PhD, Professor **Ştefan COJOCARU**, University Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iaşi, Romania

Editorial Board:
Andreia-Nicoleta ANTON, Catalactica Association
Daniela DANDARA-TĂBĂCARU, Catalactica Association
Vlad I. ROŞCA, Lecturer, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania
Cristina TOMESCU, Research Institute for Quality of Life, Romanian Academy

Editorial:
Paula NEACŞU – publisher
Luminița LOGIN – layout and editing
Nicolae LOGIN – cover

Editted by:

EDITURA Expert

Bucharest, Romania
CNCSIS: cod 045/2006
Editor-in-Chief: Valeriu IOAN-FRANC
Editor: Paula NEACŞU
Cover design: Nicolae LOGIN
Design and layout: Luminița LOGIN
Phone: 0040-21 318 24 38; Fax: 0040-21 318 24 32;
e-mail: edexpert@zappmobile.ro
License to the Ministry of Culture no. 1442/1992

ASSOCIATION FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION CATALACTICA
Str. Simetriei 18 A, Sector 2, Bucureşti, România
Tel/ Fax: 0040 31 4381006
Email: office@jppc.ro;
www.catalactica.org.ro;
cacesorin@gmail.com

ISSN 1582-9344 (printed version); ISSN 2247-6571 (electronic version), *indexed in*
Scopus; Google Scholar; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; CEEOL; ProQuest; Scipio; Questia; WorldCat

CONTENT

LEGAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ISSUES IN CIS COUNTRIES DEVELOPMENT.....3
Prof. Zhanna Bolat

THE INFLUENCE OF MANIPULATIONS ON INDIVIDUAL AND GENERAL MEMORY: SPECIFICS OF CURRENT LIFE SITUATION PERCEPTION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FUTURE.....5
Vitalii I. BOCHELIUK, Leonid K. VELITCHENKO, Taisiia O. GAIVORONSKA, Viktoriya L. POGREBNAYA, Tetiana V. KHITROVA

REGIONAL POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN A SOCIOLOGICAL CONTEXT: IMAGE, PR AND MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS.....18
Den Sik KAN, Leonid V. CHUPRII, Volodymyr M. VASYLCHUK, Victoriia D. URIADOVA, Iryna Yu. SHEPELSKA

AMALGAMATED TERRITORIAL COMMUNITIES AS A BASIS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER IN UKRAINE.....33
Oleksandr M. NEPOMNYASHCHYY, Oleksandra A. MARUSHEVA, Yurii H. PRAV, Andrii V. HAVRYLOV, Oleg A. DIEGTIAR

EUROPEAN LEGAL STANDARDS FOR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT: A COMMUNITY-ORIENTED APPROACH 47
Vitalii Ye. DANKEVYCH, Nataliia V. BONDARCHUK, Anna Yo. BUCHYNSKA, Svitlana O. KOSTENKO, Vitalii A. STRILCHUK

POLITICAL CULTURE AND IDENTITY POLITICS IN THE UKRAINIAN SOCIETY.....65
Igor V. HOROBETS, Andrey Yu. MARTYINOV, Elena A. BRAYCHEVSKAYA, Irina M. KRUPENYA, Iryna Yu. SLIUSARENKO

SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT AND GOOD PRACTICE.....82
Tamara V. BEREZIANKO, Oleh O. SHEREMET, Ihor O. HALYTSIA, Antonina S. ZIENINA-BILICHENKO, Marianna P. MARSHALENKO

GENDER EQUALITY AS A COMPONENT OF THE EQUALITY PRINCIPLE IN SOCIETY.....96
Khristina MASHTALIR, Olha KAPITAN, Roman SHAI

SPATIO-TEMPORAL ORGANISATION OF CIVIL SERVANTS' WORK IN THE CONDITIONS OF COVID-19.....112
Nataliia O. ALIUSHYNA

VALUE COMPONENT OF THE DIALOGICAL APPROACH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.....126
Yevhen M. SULIMA, Liudmyla V. ONUCHAK, Olena V. DIACHUK, Leonid V. CHUPRII, Irina G. VERKHOVTSEVA

UNDERSTANDING COLOMBIA – UKRAINE RELATIONS: MODERN DEVELOPMENTS AND A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE.....141
Natalia F. SERBINA, Iuliia A. TSYRFA, Artem P. SAPSAI

Journal of Community Positive Practices, XXII (Special Issue) **2022**, *126-140*
ISSN Print: 1582-8344; Electronic: 2247-6571

VALUE COMPONENT OF THE DIALOGICAL APPROACH IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Yevhen M. SULIMA[1],
Liudmyla V. ONUCHAK[2],
Olena V. DIACHUK[3],
Leonid V. CHUPRII[4],
Irina G. VERKHOVTSEVA[5]

DOI: 10.35782/JCPP.2022.SI.10

***Abstract**: In the modern, globalised world, international relations have expanded from traditional issues of war and peace, which were dealt with by heads of state and career diplomats mainly on a bilateral basis, to include economic, environmental, humanitarian, cultural, educational, scientific, religious relations with the establishment of international organisations that act as platforms for coordinating the interests of different countries. The development of production, education, science, and environmental problems increase the importance of international relations, given the interdependence of countries, the impossibility of development without broad international cooperation, which requires a high level of tolerance and humanisation of relations. The purpose of this study was to investigate the features of modern international relations, changes in their guidelines towards broad cooperation between countries, peaceful resolution of conflicts and disputes, which mainstreams the search for tools most suitable in this regard. In the course of the study, the following methods of scientific cognition were used: comparative historical method, generalisation method, idealisation method, and the method of systematic approach. The study defined dialogue as a universal way of communication between subjects of international relations,*

[1] Professor, Department of Philosophy and Political Science, University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine, e-mail: ye.sulima@tanu.pro
[2] PhD, Department for Modern European Languages, University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine, e-mail: lonuchak@nanyang-uni.com
[3] PhD, Department for Modern European Languages, University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine, e-mail: o-diachuk@nanyang-uni.com
[4] Full Doctor, Department of Philosophy and Political Science, University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine, e-mail: lv-chuprii@lund-univer.eu
[5] Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Political Science, University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine, Irpin, Ukraine, e-mail: verkhovtseva@toronto-uni.com

the role of which in modern international relations has considerably increased. The study noted that in modern dialogue, the role of personal, cultural, and other features of its participants increases. Since it is dialogue in its various forms and manifestations that constitutes a universal form of coordination of the interests of subjects of different countries, and its spheres and range of subjects have substantially expanded, the development of purposeful forms of dialogue will contribute to the search for effective regulatory, institutional, communicative, and other forms of conflict resolution and coordination of interests aimed at developing international cooperation.

Keywords: *international dialogue; international relations; subjects of international relations; conflicts; cooperation*

1. Introduction

There are many definitions of international relations. Some authors briefly define them as "relations between states, and in a broader sense – ... the generality of interaction within the International system" (Neborsky, 2020); as "the behaviour of states on the world stage, all forms of interaction between members of different societies..." (Mironov & Tsygankov, 1998); as "interaction of sovereign states in the international arena..." (Sulima, 2012). In general, modern international relations can be described as a set of political, economic, military, ideological, legal, cultural, and other ties and relations between states and systems of states, between the main social, economic, political forces, organisations and social movements operating on the world stage. International relations do not have a unified central core of power and governance and are built on the principles of poly-centrism and poly-hierarchy. Therefore, spontaneous processes and subjective factors play an important role in international relations. The key element of international relations is the external policy of states, as a continuation of internal policy, its extension to relations with other states. External policy connects national interests and values with universal interests and values, especially in matters of security, cooperation, peace consolidation, and solving global international problems. It is carried out by international organisations, which include the UN (United Nations) and its activities, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation), the IMF (International Monetary Fund) etc., as well as the institution of international law. Nations cannot completely ignore international law, treaties and contracts, because their violation can jeopardise politics. Almost all countries are also members of the UN. Its decisions and activities influence the external policy of many countries. For example, Communist China ignored international organisations for a long time and, consequently, could not ensure a proper position in the sphere of international relations. In 1971, it became a member of the UN, and this led to numerous changes in China's foreign policy (Determinants of foreign policy, 2018).

The main forms of international relations are cooperation, rivalry, and conflict. Modern international relations are described by the desire to humanise them, to minimise conflict zones and the dominance of the law of force, to develop cooperation between countries and the dominance of the power of law. However, "the world community today is increasingly faced with new, non-conventional forms of wars and conflicts,

which have become permanent attributes of the modern stage of international relations (Sulima, 2004). In many regions of the world, inter-state rivalry at the regional and local levels is increasing, which leads to an increased risk of a considerable number of violent conflicts, most of which take the form of armed confrontation. Local wars and military conflicts of various scales and intensity, which are increasingly becoming forms of forceful resolution of political, territorial, ethno-national, religious, economic, and other contradictions, pose one of the main threats to both national and international security" (Chuprii et al., 2020). In all definitions of international relations and factors influencing the development of foreign policy, as their key element, the emphasis is placed on the interaction of subjects of international relations, which corresponds to the communicative nature of the latter. Since international relations constitute a living network of feed-forward and feedback connections born and transformed during constant communication between the "I" and the "other" (each of the subjects of international relations acts simultaneously in their role), the most productive approach in analysing the interaction of subjects of international relations is a dialogical approach.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the features of modern international relations, changes in their guidelines towards broad cooperation between countries, peaceful resolution of conflicts and disputes, which mainstreams the search for tools most suitable in this regard.

2. Literature Review

Dialogue is usually referred to as "a conversation between two or more people" (Ozhegov, 1972), "a conversation between two or more interlocutors" (Comte-Sponville, 2012), "a form of speech interaction between two or more people" (Osipov, 2000) etc. It is on this understanding that the identification of dialogue as a literary genre is based, which has acquired a diverse embodiment in world literature – primarily in drama. The same understanding underlies reasoning about "philosophical dialogue" as "a special type of philosophical literature that covers a philosophical subject in a staged conversation between several people" (Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, 1989). "Political dialogue" is interpreted in a similar fashion: "a form of social communication, the search for objective truth in a lively exchange of opinions between interlocutors (individuals, groups, parties)" (Astakhova et al., 1993).

Philosophers of the 20th century, who expressed a particular interest in the phenomenon of dialogue, offered various interpretations of it, but the general essence did not go beyond the understanding of dialogue as "information and existential interaction between the parties that communicate, with the help of which understanding occurs" (World encyclopedia: Philosophy of the XX century, 2002); as "a special level of the communicative process, at which the personalities of the participants in communication merge" (Kemerova, 2004) etc. As proved by the researchers of dialogue (primarily literary critics and linguists) (Irgatoğlu, 2021), among whom a special place belongs to the philologist M.M. Bakhtin, a language communication that occurs throughout the life of each person, has an ontological significance. Dialogue is a way of being (existence) of a person in the human world. He states: "to be means to communicate dialogically. When the dialog ends, everything

ends. Therefore, the dialogue, in fact, cannot and should not stop" (Bakhtin, 1963). In other words, a person's being in a certain capacity is possible only due to the existence of other qualitatively defined subjects and communication with them. Without them "I" is no one and nothing as a human, as a personality.

The dialogue is built – and most researchers agree on this – as an alternate exchange of utterances between the participants in the conversation. Therewith, "utterance" is interpreted as "statement of the actor" (Gromyaka et al., 2007), "response, objection, remark to the words of the interlocutor" (Schlichting, 1997) etc. Such is the opinion of literary critics and linguists. Psychologists expand the content of the concept of an utterance, considering that "in a broad sense, a response in the form of an action, gesture, or silence is also considered an utterance" (Petrovsky & Yaroshevsky, 1990). This is confirmed by both life practice and world drama, which is a classic embodiment of dialogue. In general, without an exchange of actions between the participants in the dialogue (possibly hidden from external view) and/or their willingness to act, the exchange of statements loses its material basis and meaning. "The main feature of dialogic communication is mutual trust, openness, equality, mutual understanding, benevolence, and interpenetration. Interaction based on the principles of dialogue and cooperation includes the possibility of combining communication with the mutual development of the partners' personality, promotes mutual disclosure of partners, interpenetration, their personal and intellectual growth" (Khalansky, 2014). In modern scientific literature and journalism, there is a predominantly narrowed image of dialogue as a purposeful interaction of subjects, unambiguously focused on achieving a pre-set positive goal. Dialogue is considered from a purely instrumental perspective, namely, as a means of resolving conflicts, reaching agreement between the parties etc. This understanding extends primarily to political dialogue, which is considered as a process "aimed at identifying mutual interests, searching for a common political position, a modern solution to the problem (negotiations), coordination of intentions, goals, actions, etc." (Marchenko, 1993; Chuprii, 2018; Moshirzadeh, 2020).

3. Materials and Methods

Nevertheless, changes in positions occur because, according to G. Moshirzadeh, "an observed thought behaves differently from an unexpressed one. Moreover, dialogue, unlike other forms of argumentation, contains "influencing goals" – goals connected with the relationship between participants in disputes, as well as goals relating to the support of the interaction itself – they are as important as reaching agreement, and can even be considered as the main goal". The maintenance and development of international relations is impossible without changes in the psyche (primarily in the minds) of the people involved in them. These changes occur through directed and intermediate non-directed influence of actors (Sinyavsky &Sergeenkova, 2007) on each other representing different countries, cultures, and civilisations. And the mechanism for implementing such an impact is precisely the dialogue itself, supported in various forms at different levels. In the texts of international researchers (Prigozhin, 2004), the word "dialogue" is rather frequently. In the foreign policy of states, blocs, international organisations, other actors acting on the world stage, and politicians formed on its basis, in a live network of interactions that are developed between them and are called

international relations, there are omnipresent signs of dialogue as an alternate exchange of utterances – verbal and non-verbal – between their subjects. Despite the fact that the term "dialogue" is a concept of various sciences, literature on philology, literary studies, philosophy, psychology, sociology, political science, international relations was used for its analysis: dictionaries, encyclopaedias, monographs, scientific articles by Ukrainian and foreign authors. In particular, this literature analyses the role of dialogue and its significance in international relations to achieve foreign policy goals.

The comparative historical method was used to determine the current stage of development of international relations and dialogue in international relations. Preserving their essence, both international relations and international dialogue with the development of social relations and the globalisation of the world have expanded the scope of their application and the range of their subjects. This allowed noting such features of modern international relations as the hybridisation of conflicts with the use of non-military methods of aggression and confrontation, the expansion of the scope of participants in international relations representing relatively new areas of regulation – economy, humanitarian relations, ecology, culture, science, education etc., as well as various levels of international organisations. Technological advance and humanisation of international relations enable the civil society – from non-governmental organisations to individual citizens – to become their subjects to some extent. In addition, the dialogue itself has evolved in international relations from rather clandestine negotiations between heads of state, government representatives, and professional diplomats mainly in verbal form to increasingly transparent forms of dialogue – summits, conferences, exhibitions, exchanges in the field of education and science, involving an increasingly wide range of participants. Furthermore, non-verbal forms of dialogue are becoming more widespread in the context of increasing transparency of international relations, where every step can receive an adequate or inadequate response. An inadequate response to issues of coordination of interests and cooperation creates unnecessary tension in bilateral and multilateral relations between countries. Upon applying the comparative historical method, the methods of abstraction and identification were used to highlight the general properties and features of the subjects under study, namely international relations and dialogue in international relations. The application of a systematic approach was manifested in the consideration of international relations as an integral system, in the structure of which there are stable connections that ensure its integrity, namely dialogue. Forms of dialogue are developing and evolving, but dialogue between subjects of international relations remains a stable link that ensures the very existence of the system.

4. Results and Discussion

It should be clarified that most scientific papers discussing dialogue in international relations defend the view of it as a purposeful constructive bilateral or multilateral verbal interaction, coordination of positions of the parties aimed at resolving conflicts, bringing civilisations closer together, or even simply maintaining contacts between states and their representatives. Thus, dialogue in international relations is interpreted as a tool for ensuring peace and harmony between peoples, which should be applied as widely as possible. "Political dialogue, which is a kind of practice-oriented type of

dialogue of cultures, is capable of developing a strategy and tactics of harmonious coexistence at the level of consolidating the interests of various political actors" (Zaitseva, 2014).

In modern globalised world, with the development of human communications and the need to jointly solve global issues, along with the shaping and institutionalisation of the dialogue of cultures, there is a need for a dialogue of civilisations. Given the development of the dialogue of civilisations, "the search for a new world tradition – unity in diversity – has become even more necessary to protect all the diversity of world politics. In this context, the policy of understanding would already be a remarkable achievement" (Petito, 2009). Emphasising the growing role of science in international relations, one British researcher argued that over the next thirty years, foreign policy would be increasingly shaped by the challenges of global sustainability. Expected bottlenecks and constraints – in food, water, energy, and other important natural resources, infrastructure, and climate change – pose new geophysical, political, and economic challenges and create new and difficult tasks to manage instability (New frontiers in science diplomacy…, 2010). This requires an extensive dialogue to achieve common positions and interaction, and not just political, but also a scientific one. Practice shows that the interaction of subjects of international relations is different and, sometimes, more like fights in the boxing ring (with knockdowns and knockouts) than friendly conversations in search of peace and justice. There are many cases when tough disputes between the parties only pushed for the outbreak of hostilities and further accompanied them. However, confrontational interactions of subjects of international relations, built according to all the rules of dialogue, should not be excluded from the scope of their research.

The most productive approach to the interpretation of dialogue in international relations is an analytical approach that differs from the conventionally existing ones in science and journalism. The approach, according to which it is necessary to discuss not just dialogues in international relations, but these relations themselves, taken in their integrity and diversity of manifestations, are considered as a kind of dialogue (international dialogue), which, in turn, can be described as a way of existence of international relations. With this approach, all types of verbal and non-verbal interactions of their subjects, built in accordance with dialogical principles, would be considered as separate cases of international dialogue. There are three types of international dialogue that differ in scale and structure: global, multilateral, and bilateral. In real life, they do not exist in isolation from each other (some of them can be embedded in each other), and therefore the global dialogue should be described as a complex network structure that includes multilateral and bilateral dialogues and is thus an integral internally differentiated dialogue. It covers all countries of the world, regardless of their size, political, economic and other weight, authority, activity. This is natural: no country exists in isolation from others (even if they try to isolate it) and is not self-sufficient. No country is capable of solving the tasks that it faces without interacting with other countries (i.e., outside the dialogic context), and therefore is challenged with needs for communication with the "other(s)"). Admittedly, the difference in international "weight" cannot but affect the number and quality of

remarks submitted by different participants in the international dialogue, and the place of participants in the dialogue.

A peculiar form of dialogic communication is a monologue, as a kind of "dialogue – only with an invisible partner" (Gromyaka et al., 2007). Formally, the monologue may not be a direct "response" to any of the previous utterances and does not make provision for a direct response to them. In fact, the monologue hides traces of previous utterances and often contains a "response" to them, as well as new "challenges" to the participants of the dialogue. In speech (verbal) communication of subjects of international relations, the monologue appears in the form of detailed foreign policy programmes, declarations, statements of intent and goals addressed to participants in the international dialogue. A classic example of this kind of monologue is the doctrine of Dulles, Truman, Eisenhower, and other leaders of different countries. Such foreign policy monologues also include keynote speeches and addresses designed for international resonance. Such, for example, as Churchill's Fulton speech, which made a keynote for waging a cold war against the USSR, or V. Putin's speech at the Munich Security Forum (2007), in which he announced the intentions of Russia's dominance in the post-Soviet space and in Europe, without hiding their aggressive nature, which set the tone for the escalation of Russia's aggressive policy in all subsequent years in relation to the states of this region and more. The differences (and they are substantial) in the number, content, and meanings of monologues made by various subjects of international relations, and the global resonance that these monologues evoke, are one of the clearest indicators of differences in the international weight of these subjects and their position on the world stage.

The global international dialogue, which is mostly spontaneous, does not initially have a particular goal. It begins with the development of international relations and lasts – albeit with varying intensity – as long as they exist. Multilateral, and especially bilateral, dialogues may in some cases have an initial purpose, and the existence of their particular manifestations may be limited in time. One of the foundations of an international dialogue is the information interaction of its subjects. Over the long years of diplomacy's existence, such stable forms of diplomacy as the exchange of notes, declarations, and statements have been developed. During the Cold War, confrontational dialogue developed strongly in the form of ideological struggle, information and psychological warfare, the lines between which sometimes turned out to be very blurred. The end of the Cold War gave rise to the illusion that such dialogues are a thing of the past. However, the modern world sees an actual resumption of information and psychological warfare, and in some cases in tougher and more uncompromising forms than before. But even insufficient information interaction of subjects leads to an inadequate level of bilateral or multilateral international relations. An example of this is the European-Israeli dialogue. The lack of adequate dialogue "is not only due to mutual ignorance, prejudice, disinformation, distrust, and antagonism, but also causes these same factors to characterise European-Israeli relations" (Harpaz, 2011).

Classical forms of speech dialogue, namely international consultations and negotiations – bilateral and multilateral – continue playing a substantial role in international relations. The number of international conferences, round tables, and symposia covering the problems that are expanding and that more and more people in different

parts of the world have to face is growing. And such forums, which have become commonplace, and platforms for international communication such as the UN, UNESCO, OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe), are accompanied with new ones: G-7 (Big Seven) and then G-8 (Big Eight), the European Union with its parliamentary and executive structures, and now – BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa), SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organisation), African Union, NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) etc.

It is reasonable to assume that in the context of globalisation (a deeply contradictory phenomenon), in the context of an increase in the total number of international actors and limited opportunities to solve local, and even more so global problems by force, the role of verbal dialogue in international relations will increase. What it will be in formal and substantive terms is an open question. But the trends that have emerged in recent years suggest that the fate of confrontational interactions in this area (as a replacement for the "hot" war with the so-called hybrid one) will remain significant in the near future, and they will manifest themselves mainly in three areas: West – Russia, Islamic world – Christian world, North – South. Therewith, the role of the visual imagery in information exchange will grow. Unconventional or hybrid warfare is a war of intimidation rather than destruction, which is waged even without a declaration thereof and has many means other than purely military ones. The author of the Russian concept of "hybrid warfare", chief of the General Staff of the Russian Federation, General Valery Gerasimov, speaking at a meeting of the Academy of Military Sciences in 2013, described it as follows: "the emphasis of the methods of confrontation used is shifting towards the widespread use of political, economic, informational, humanitarian, and other non-military measures implemented through the use of the protest potential of the population. All this is complemented by covert military measures, namely the use of information warfare tools and the actions of special operations forces. The open use of force – often under the guise of peacekeeping and crisis response – is exercised only at a certain stage, mainly to achieve final success in the conflict" (Mironov & Tsygankov, 1998). This is a manifestation of the desire to dominate neighbouring states and other partners in international relations, violating the principle of equality of international dialogue and respect for the partner. Interestingly, the same principles are laid down in the UN Charter. Considering its aggressive foreign policy course, the presence of the Russian Federation in the UN Security Council with the right of veto actually blocks the activities of the UN as an international organisation to establish an international dialogue between states on security issues (Lyutken, 2010).

For Ukraine, against which the Russian Federation is waging a hybrid war, the development of international dialogue, especially on security matters, is extremely relevant. This is conditioned not only by the current situation, but also by Ukraine's place on the geopolitical map of the world, since, according to Z. Brzezinski, Ukraine is one of the five geopolitical centres of the world, next to Turkey, Azerbaijan, South Korea, and Iran (Brzezinski, 2000). Accordingly, the risks of becoming the centre of a regional conflict and not only for it are very high. These risks are growing. From Ye. Sulima's point of view, who believed that whoever rules Eastern Europe owns the Heart of the Earth; whoever rules the Heart of the Earth owns the World-Island; whoever rules the World-Island, owns the World (Sulima & Shepelev, 2018). The state

of hybrid warfare is highly dangerous for the very existence of the state – the object of aggression. "The state of 'military peace', that is, a state that is neither an armed conflict nor peace in the common understanding, not only has a destructive effect on statehood and basic social structures, but also creates a situation of permanent stress for individuals who become hostages of political contradictions".

An essential component of international dialogue is its non-verbal forms. In general, any important foreign policy act of a subject of international relations (conclusion of an international treaty, accession to an international union, intervention, demarche, conflict with a neighbor, provision of humanitarian assistance etc.) should be considered as a link in the chain of remarks that make up an international dialogue, that is, as a "response" to a certain "challenge". This approach to international relations helps identify something in this behavioural act of the subject that would remain hidden if considered separately. A striking example of this kind of dialogue is the Jackson – Vennick Amendment, which the US Congress adopted in 1974. This was official Washington's response to the Soviet Union's considerable restriction of emigration opportunities – both for Jews and for others who wanted to leave the USSR (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), and then to human rights violations in the USSR. This amendment substantially limited the possibilities of trade between the USSR and the United States. It prevented the Soviet Union from obtaining the most-favoured-nation status in trade, and also imposed a ban on the import of dual-use goods.

Unfortunately, both verbal and non-verbal forms of dialogue are not always aimed exclusively at coordinating interests, but also at aggravating the unsettled or conflicting situation, since one or more participants in such a dialogue violate one of the fundamental principles of its conduct – equality of its participants, respect for the dialogue partner, tolerance in demonstrating their interests towards the other party (or parties) – and try to dominate, ignoring the interests of dialogue partners. In such case, the dialogue, instead of coordinating the interests of the parties, develops into a verbal or non-verbal dispute and conflict. A classic example of a violation of the principles of dialogue is the behaviour of the USSR towards Korea after World War II. Thus, South Korean political scientist Kim Hak Joon wrote in his study "The Policy of Unification of South and North Korea" as follows: "the greatest responsibility is borne by the Soviet Union, which after World War II not only refused to cooperate to create a unified democratic government in Korea, but also actively tried to prevent this. The Soviet Union, which sought to dominate North Korea, was the most important factor in the country's split. Under such circumstances, the UN was practically deprived of opportunities for the unification of Korea" (Kahn, 1965).

It is not always easy to identify the "challenge" that gave rise to a particular "response" because they can be separated from each other by a considerable time interval, and because the "response" can be a reply not to one, but to several "challenges" at once. But this does not mean that the researcher cannot set such tasks for themselves and successfully solve them. In some cases, the dialogical nature of international processes is obvious. A typical example – the Cold War as a long-term total confrontation between two global military-political blocs, two superpowers, each of which sought to strengthen its positions in the world and weaken the position of the opponent, and if possible, eliminate the latter as such. In general, any adversarial relationship, any

confrontation, including war, in whatever form it is conducted, is of a dialogical nature, and it is possible to understand the history and internal logic of these processes only in the context of a complex network of "challenges" and "responses" of their direct participants and other subjects of international relations. Here is another example. In the mid-1960s, the then famous American futurologist H. Kahn proposed the concept of "escalation ladder" (Kahn, 1965), implying that the escalation of a military conflict occurs by moving from one of its steps to another. This kind of process, fuelled by the interaction of the parties to the conflict, is a clear example of international diplomacy. Among the areas of activity that have a clear dialogical nature, it is necessary to focus on the sphere of ensuring national security as the main goal of the foreign policy of any state. The steps taken by one or the other party (for example, the build-up of weapons) are given the most symmetrical response, which as a result can lead (as it was during the Cold War) to an arms race. But the reverse process, namely the restriction and reduction of weapons, is also a kind of dialogue, which the USSR and the United States demonstrated at the time by concluding a number of corresponding treaties. The dialogical nature of international relations can also be traced in the processes of forming alliances; forming blocs; developing political, economic, cultural, scientific, military, and other relations between countries; integration processes etc. Dialogue in international relations is a kind of game of chess: every turn of the white pieces is followed by the answer of the black pieces, which takes it into account, followed by– a new move of whites – as a response to it, and this goes on until the end of the game – with the difference, however, that sometimes many "chess players" take part in the international "game", it can take place on several boards at once, and some "games" last so long that it is impossible to track their completion.

Just as the so-called blitz is played in chess, so in international life from time to time there are dramatic processes that last for a limited time and develop according to the model of dialogue. These are the fleeting international crises: the Suez Crisis (October 1956-March 1957), the Berlin crisis of 1961, which peaked in June and November, and, of course, the Caribbean crisis that broke out in October 1962. The dialogic nature of international relations is clearly manifested in diplomacy, where the "challenge" of one party in relation to the other(s) is often accompanied by a more or less rapid – and often expected, since its formula is consolidated in international practice – "response" from the latter. When, for example, country A expels, as persona non grata, the diplomats of country B, a symmetrical response follows almost immediately. Another pattern is sanctions and counter-sanctions. Thus, for example, the introduction of sanctions against the Russian Federation by the European Union, the United States and some other countries in 2014, to which the latter responded with counter-sanctions. Non-verbal monologues are not a rare occurrence. These include actions of participants in the international dialogue that are performed unilaterally and are not designed to consider possible responses (objections) from partners, although in practice they can also take place (a typical example is the US invasion of Iraq in 2003). Monologues of this kind are usually the prerogative of international "heavyweights", although there are exceptions. The development and expansion of the spheres of international relations entails the development and expansion of the spheres of international dialogue as their integral attribute, and, accordingly, the expansion of the circle of their subjects. Representatives of various scientific schools of international relations – realists,

neorealists, liberal institutionalists, supporters of peace-system, psychological, and other approaches – define states, interstate and non-governmental organisations, TNCs, various movements, unions, blocs etc. as the main subjects of modern international relations (Sulima, 2004). This indicates a consensus institutional approach to the study of subjects of international relations and, accordingly, international dialogue.

However, the characterisation of dialogue as an attribute of human existence in general, and international relations in particular, would be incomplete if one does not outline the circle of people who represent the above-mentioned institutions in international relations, who are directly or indirectly involved in the development and reproduction of international relations and world politics. These are presidents, kings, emperors, princes, prime ministers, ministers, their deputies and advisers, highly professional experts, deputies, diplomats, generals and admirals, media leaders, political observers and journalists, major financiers and entrepreneurs, heads of international organisations, influential analysts, prominent scientists, and even popular artists. With the development of information technologies and global communications, even an ordinary citizen can join the development and implementation of international relations. The once narrow circle of subjects of international relations has now expanded drastically (Zonova, 2004).

All these people are the embodiment of those historically established constants, the totality of which is usually called "human nature", which inevitably affects human behaviour in all spheres of life – including in international life. And at the same time, these are people who differ from each other in their individual characteristics. People with different interests, abilities, moral foundations, different ideological orientations, different life and political experiences. Their ideas about themselves, their tasks (in some cases – about their "mission") and place in the world, their state of health and age, their social and biopsychic characteristics, their temperament, which manifests itself in belligerence or peacefulness, are directly or indirectly reflected in social relations formed with their direct or indirect participation, including in international relations. And the results of a particular dialogue often depend – even in similar situations – on who is personally involved in it.

Anatoly Dobrynin, who served as the Soviet ambassador to Washington under six US presidents and witnessed many dialogues conducted by Soviet and American politicians, recalls how two "extreme dogmatists" – Molotov and Dulles – communicated with each other. "The conversation was usually tough and more like a dialogue between two deaf people, although the external diplomatic boundaries of the conversations were observed" (Dobrynin, 1997). And then – an important conclusion: "... while they and similar ones were in power, the Cold War had no chance of warming, and Soviet-American relations could not move a single step forward "(Baulina, 2009). Yet another example is the Caribbean Crisis. People of a slightly different type were already in power in Moscow and Washington. And Dobrynin shows how they, not yielding to their principles and national interests, in many hours of multi-level negotiations, tried to find – and ultimately found – a compromise solution.

The course and effectiveness of international negotiations as a conventional form of international dialogue is also affected by the extent to which the parties consider the

specific features of the "national negotiating style". According to one of the researchers, it is described by "five main factors": "the main cultural values, customs, and rules that affect the behaviour of people in communication; mental features relating to the specific features of human perception and thinking; the specific features of non-verbal communications; the main models of decision-making, a measure of independence in decision-making; the most characteristic tactics and features of behaviour during negotiations" (Platt, 1958). Some researchers associate the national style of negotiations, as well as the specific features of conducting international diplomacy in a broad sense, with the "national character", which was discussed at different times by philosophers, political thinkers, diplomats, and military (primarily intelligence) officers (Tickner, 2006). Therewith, the specific features of the national character are superimposed on the features of the individual character and other personal features of the participants in the international dialogue. Gender specifics deserve special attention. Diplomats with considerable experience argue that men and women do not behave exactly the same in international communication (Melikhov, 2014), and this should also be considered in diplomatic practice (Maoz & Shayer, 1987; Determinants of foreign policy, 2018).

Thus, without denying the fact that international relations are a "cast" of social relations, one should also consider this phenomenon as a specific "cast" of human nature, which unites all people – a "cast" of those specific features that describe people of different eras, civilisations, cultures, national, racial-ethnic, gender, and other groups, as well as a "cast" of the personal features of individuals representing them.

5. Conclusions

Progress towards sustainable development of the world, the resolution of economic, environmental, confessional, and ethnic conflicts is possible precisely through a global dialogue based on respect for dialogue partners, respect for the principles of tolerance and justice, and a focus on ensuring human rights and achieving peace. Depending on the level and scale of the dialogue, it can be global, multilateral, or bilateral. Expanding the scope of subjects of the dialogue expands the boundaries of the dialogue itself, the scope of its application, and diversifies its forms. Dialogue in international relations acts as a form of communication, a form of joint activity, as well as as a process of mutual cognition and mutual understanding of their parties. Its application in all forms serves as the basis for joint international activities to develop global (for example, Agenda XXI) or regional (epy economy decarbonisation programme in the EU) or sectoral development strategies, search for effective regulatory, institutional, communication, and other forms of coordination of interests and conflict resolution between countries.

The desire to humanise international relations increases the role of international law and dialogue, during which legal provisions and legal procedures are developed, and disputes are resolved by legal means. So far, the use of force, including military methods, persists in international relations, but the process of creating mechanisms to overcome them and prevent them by legal methods continues. Expansion of the scope of subjects of international relations, and accordingly international dialogue, increases the role of the subjective factor and the requirements for all its participants regarding

respect for the other party (parties), tolerance, and adherence to the principle of equality. But if the fact of the existence of international relations in a dialogical capacity does not depend on us, then its quality itself does. It depends, in particular, on the timely organisation of targeted international interactions that pave the way towards a new, just world order, as well as on the quality of the subjects of international dialogue, which affects the quality of the dialogue itself.

Authorship

Ye.M.S. and L.V.O. conceptualized and designed the study. O.V.D. was responsible for data curation and formal analysis. L.V.Ch. and I.G.V. led manuscript preparation and contributed to manuscript drafting.

Acknowledgements

Nothing to declare.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors have no conflicting interests.

References

Neborsky, E.V. (2020). Today's tomorrow: global risks as a factor in the transformation of higher education. *Domestic and Foreign Pedagogy*, 1(4(69)), 62–74.

Sulima, Ye.M. (2012). *Geopolitics: Encyclopaedia.* Kyiv: Knowledge of Ukraine.

Determinants of foreign policy. (2018). *Political Science.* Available at: https:// www. politicalscienceview.com/determinants-of-foreign-policy/.

Sulima, Ye.M. (2004). *Global social order of post-industrialism.* Kyiv: Genesis.

Chuprii, L.V., Kan, D.S., Vasylchuk, V.M., Uriadova, V.D., Prorochenko, N.O. (2020).

Considerations of Solving the Korean Problem at the present stage (2018-2019). *ASTRA Salvensis*, 1, 193-209.

Astakhova, V.I., Danylenko, V.I., Panov, A.I., Yerigin, O.O. (1993). Dictionary of sociological and political terms. Kyiv: Higher School.

Project. Irgatoğlu, A. (2021). Analysis of language learning strategies and stereotypical thoughts of preparatory school students. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(1), 1-16.

Gromyaka, R.T., Kovalev, Yu.I., Teremko, V.I. (2007). *Literary dictionary-reference.* Kyiv: VC "Academy".

Schlichting, M. (1997). *Living books (educational software).* York City: Broderbund Software and Random House.

Chuprii, L.V. (2018). Peculiarities of solving regional conflicts in the context of current challenges: the experience of Ukraine, Syria and the countries of the Korean Peninsula. *Ukraine Diplomatic*, 19, 264–276.

Moshirzadeh, H. (2020). Idea of Dialogue of Civilizations and Core-Periphery Dialogue in International Relations. *All Azimuth,* 9(2), 211-227.

Sinyavsky, V.V., Sergeenkova, O.P. (2007). *Psychological dictionary.* Kyiv: Naukoviy Svit.

Prigozhin, A.I. (2004). Dialogue solutions. *Social Sciences and Modernity*, 3, 51-60.

Zaitseva, N.V. (2014). Political dialogue as the basis of foreign policy. *MGIMO Bulletin,* 3(36), 43-50.

Petito, F. (2009). *Dialogue of civilizations as a subject for global political discussions: some theoretical reflections. Novgorod: "Medina".*

New frontiers in science diplomacy. Navigating the changing balance of power. (2010). London: The Royal Society. Available at: https://royalsociety.org/~/media/ Royal_Society_ Content/policy/publications/2010/4294969468.pdf .

Gromyaka, R.T., Kovalev, Yu.I., Teremko, V.I. (2007). *Literary dictionary-reference.* Kyiv: VC "Academia".

Harpaz, G. (2011). The role of dialogue in reflecting and constituting International Relations: The causes and consequences of a deficient European-Israeli dialogue. *Review of International Studies, 37*(4), 1857-1883.

Lyutken, G.V. (2010). Some innovations in the interpretation of war in the West. *Bulletin of the Military University,* 2(22), 170-174.

Brzezinski, Z. (2000). *Big chessboard.* Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileya NV.

Sulima, Ye., Shepelev, M. (2018). Geohistory as a paradigm for understanding international relations. *International Processes,* 16(2), 49-59.

Kahn, H. (1965). *On escalation: metaphors and scenarios.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Zonova, T.V. (2004). *New problems of diplomacy. (Modern international relations and world politics).* Moscow: Education.

Dobrynin, A. (1997). *Strictly confidential.* Available at: https://libking.ru/books/nonf-/nonf-biography/372719-anatoliy-dobrynin-sugubo-doveritelno-posol-v-vashingtone-pri-shesti-prezidentah-ssha-1962-1986-gg.html.

Baulina, V.S. (2009). *The influence of national traditions on the style of political negotiations (on the example of China, Japan and South Korea).* Moscow: Science.

Platt, V. (1958). *Strategic intelligence information work. Basic principles.* Moscow: Inostrannaya literatura.

Tickner, J.A. (2006). *World politics from a gender perspective. Problems and approaches of the post-Cold War era.* Moscow: "Kulturnaya revolyutsiya".

Melikhov, I.A. (2014). *Personality factor in diplomatic practice. History and modernity*. Moscow: MGIMO.

Maoz, Z., Shayer, A. (1987). The cognitive structure of peace and war argumentation: Israeli Prime Ministers versus the Knesset. *Political Psychology,* 8(4), 41-576.