

Towards Effective Use of Digital Diplomacy in Executing Foreign Policy in Tanzania

By

Mayasa Hamad Mkubwa¹ Humphrey Mwasongwe²,

& Abbas Abdul Mwalimu³

Abstract

This article evaluates the use by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation of Digital Diplomacy for the execution of Tanzania foreign policy. The study used qualitative research approach in gathering data. Interviews and documentary reviews were used to collect data which was analysed through content analysis. The findings disclose that the necessary political will for employing digital diplomacy in the execution of foreign policy is there. The study found that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation is already actively using different digital platforms in its communication. Nevertheless, the government is yet to formulate a specific policy on the use of digital diplomacy, particularly social media, to pursue foreign policy goals. Even the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation does not as yet have a proper desk handling digital diplomacy. This paper recommends that the government devise Digital Diplomacy Policy in order to reinforce implementation of foreign policy. In order to reach its objectives, the government should also establish a unit responsible for the management of digital aspects of foreign policy.

Keywords: diplomacy, digital diplomacy, foreign policy

1.0 Introduction

Digital diplomacy has become a major topic in modern foreign policy implementation Madu et al. (2017). Digital diplomacy brings in changes in a unique manner which, in due course, affects the very character of diplomacy both domestically and internationally. Stanzel (2018) explain that, "Diplomacy, like so many areas of public administration, is affected by the radical changes of the 21st century". In other words, contemporary issues around the world have been widely discussed in terms of a new, faster and louder mode of diplomatic

¹ Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim Centre for Foreign Relations, Tanzania. (mshamad79@gmail.com)

² Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim Centre for Foreign Relations, Tanzania. (hmwasongwe@gmail.com)

³ Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim Centre for Foreign Relations, Tanzania. (abbasabdulmwalimu@gmail.com)

conversation as opposed to the traditional approach of diplomacy which is seen as slow-paced archaic and unsuccessful (Seib, 2016). In line with this, countries are struggling to go hand in hand with this kind of advancement in technology in order to achieve their national interest goals against other states. For example, since 2014, Germany has undertaken intensive steps to improve and modernize the exchange of information between its ministry of foreign affairs, embassies located in Germany and foreign ministries of European Union (EU) member States. Similarly, China has executed a number of reforms in dealing with the question of modern diplomacy. The advancement in technology, the increase in interconnectedness of global aspects plus the need for states to pursue their foreign objectives necessitate governments to undertake reforms that accommodate application of digital diplomacy.

In December 2011, the United States of America (USA) inaugurated Virtual Embassy in Tehran (Iran) to enable the country intermingle with Iranian citizens online despite severance of diplomatic relations between the two countries since 1979 (Manor, 2015; Madu, 2018). Such innovation has created impetus for other entities having embassies in Iran to exchange information with USA regardless the absence of physical representation of United States in the so called hostile state. On the other hand, the revolution in Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and its associated force resulting from social media has not only been a major issue in Europe and America but also in Africa. The general community is increasingly becoming aware of foreign policy matters and at the same time seeks to engage diplomacy through social media and other platforms therefore altering the traditional way of conducting diplomacy (Stanzel, 2018).

African countries like Egypt, and Tunisia were brought into intriguing moments at different times when the social media became a stage to disseminate unrestricted public information amongst users in the wave of the Arab Spring (Kassim, 2012). Embassies, their citizens and others in host countries have been connected through social media and other internet-based tools. Countries have managed to promote their foreign policies and provide information to people on various issues while engaging with their followers using platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and YouTube (Stanzel, 2018; Summa, 2020). Jiang (2017) noted that “social media is an effective way for embassies to communicate to

target groups, more so than conventional (offline or traditional) public diplomacy.” The use of digital diplomacy facilitates governments to curtail disinformation and misinformation and at the same time broaden the scope of appropriate information towards the public both domestic and international.

Diplomats are now using social media to circulate countries’ positions and update the community based on their national interests during multilateral conferences. Similarly, Heads of States and Governments exchange messages of congratulations, indictments and sometimes threats on Twitter thus responding to journalists and the public in general when people demand instant answers and reactions (Golan et. al, 2019). In this respect, it is obvious that digital diplomacy is becoming an even more crucial aspect of diplomacy as Madu (2018) asserted in saying “digital diplomacy has played a significant role for today’s foreign policy, including the role and influence of the internet and new technologies on the objectives, tools and structures of diplomacy.”

However, according to Adesina (2017) “one major factor that has affected diplomacy in this modern age is the revolution in ICTs. ICTs have revolutionized the way people communicate and exchange information, changing political, social and economic landscapes across the globe.” In this case digital diplomacy is expected to be an essential tool for states’ prosperity in various areas of interest and seems to be among the important factors which define the power of a state in penetrating and influencing cotemporary international relations.

Tanzania, as part of the global system, has experienced drastic changes in the implementation of foreign policy due to evolution of technology. The adoption and exploitation of digital diplomacy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation (MFAEAC) and embassies abroad is inevitable since execution of foreign policy conforms with changes in the international system. This fact brings the need for a comprehensive investigation on how digital diplomacy can be employed in the MFAEAC and more particularly in the implementation or execution of foreign policy.

2.0 Research Problem

Several studies have found that digital diplomacy plays vital role in influencing,

facilitating, accelerating and safeguarding foreign policy objectives of various countries globally (Madu, 2018; Digital Diplomacy, 2021). Stanzel (2018) noted that, “changes in the structure of the international community have made continual adaptations in diplomacy tactics necessary” while Verrekia (2017) unveiled that, “during her time as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton made social media an integral part of many of the programs run by the Department of State (DOS), seeking to utilize this popular new trend as a tool for statecraft.” Nonetheless, the role of digital diplomacy in influencing, preventing and promoting foreign policy goals of Tanzania is understudied despite being a critical contemporary foreign policy implementation issue.

For instance, Mujwahuzi & Kajerero, (2020) and Kajerero & Mujwahuzi, (2021), examined the nexus between digital diplomacy and the manner in which diplomacy is applied in Tanzania by considering digital economy only. At the same time Ndimbwa and Emanuel (2013) scrutinized the role of ICT in the delivery of diplomatic services. Their studies focused more on the link between offline diplomacy and modern technology while giving little attention to foreign policy accomplishment. Against this fact, this study therefore, assessed the extent of the employment of digital diplomacy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and East African Cooperation (MFAEAC) particularly for Tanzania foreign policy execution.

3.0 Literature Review

Diplomacy as a method by which states manage their relationships with one another and try to achieve their national interests, operates in an environment which is highly influenced by technological development (Amacker, 2011). The ever changing hi-tech atmosphere has resulted in the evolvement of digital diplomacy as a means of solving foreign policy problems using the internet (Adesina, 2017). Hanson (2012) defines digital diplomacy as the use of the internet and new ICTs to help carry out diplomatic objectives, including its related goals. It is modern way of pursuing foreign policy which was defined by Frankel (1968) as “consisting of decisions and actions, which involve to some applicable extent relations between one state and others. In the contemporary international relations, digital diplomacy is seen as an important tool in furthering a nation’s foreign policy as it enables direct interaction and engagement with foreign publics.

The use of new methods and forms of carrying out diplomacy cast impact on the current diplomatic performance and international relations at large, putting the internet and ICT at the centre of achieving foreign policy objectives. Application of websites by governments, foreign ministries, embassies and international organisations is now a standard practice. Adesina (2017) points out to social media as diplomacy's significant and powerful tool providing ultra-fast communication thus enabling actors to interact swiftly. However, the author argues that, social media offers both opportunities and challenges to states and international organisations as they search for connections with latest policy gaps mounting within the scope of internet. Through digital diplomacy, governments can engage with foreign and domestic publics anywhere instantaneously, thereby fast tracking achievement of intended foreign policy goals.

The study by Madu (2018) indicates that, the US geopolitical interests have been largely shaped by building public opinion on foreign policy matters through the internet. Further, the use of internet has increasingly democratised diplomacy by expanding entry to it by both state and non-state actors therefore manipulating the manner in which diplomacy is carried out among countries. On the other hand, Bjola and Holmes (2015) found that the United Kingdom (UK) established an official Office of Digital Diplomacy within its government in order to accelerate realization of its foreign policy ambitions globally. Again, Sweden, France, and Poland incorporated digital tools into their statecraft for similar reasons, while at the same time, Africa has not yet shown much progress in employing digital diplomacy. Evidences from US, UK, Sweden, France and Poland portray specific attention given by the governments to digital diplomacy as a significant apparatus in pursuing foreign policy targets (ibid).

Further, the study by Andrew et al. (2008) pointed towards globalisation, regionalisation and localization being major drivers of digital diplomacy. According to the study, such aspects together, created a structure that involves greater social connectivity in performing different activities to attain foreign policy goals. In the same line, Metzl (2001) maintained that, at the same time the aforementioned features challenge the traditional supremacy of the country in diplomacy, they amplify interdependence at various levels of foreign policy execution as well, and consequently increase the complexity of foreign policy issues. As such, interdependence connects both state and non-state actors, and in

that way produces novel relationships among them making collective action easy in dealing with global challenges. In that regard, execution of foreign policy is shaped by developments in technology (Bjola & Holmes, 2015).

Another study by Hocking et.al (2012), disclosed that contemporary Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs) are no longer made up of elite diplomatic actors but rather a networked multi-stakeholder diplomacy is applied. As a result, the use of digital diplomacy to achieve foreign policy aims is paramount. On the other hand, the role of non-state actors in influencing states' decision making has shaped foreign policy-formulation process (Kelley, 2010), therefore turning them into essential participants in digital diplomacy. Nonetheless, digital diplomacy is allegedly limited during bilateral engagements as most of the countries resort to traditional diplomacy (Schmidt, 2014). Despite such drawbacks, digital diplomacy remains imperative in realizing foreign policy ends (Madu et.al, 2017). This study borrows a leaf from these arguments.

In connection to this view, Kerry (2013) argues that, digital technologies broadly, and social media in particular, facilitate advancement of states' foreign policy aspirations, while linking and fitting into one place diverse people from around the world. The author concludes that digital diplomacy meets the similar fundamental diplomatic purpose of generating discourse among the broadest potential audience. In that regard, notwithstanding a number of factors that have created impetus for digital diplomacy, giving it additional networked, interdependent and multifaceted characteristic, still states continue to be the main actors in international relations (Schmidt, 2014) and so their roles in formulating, promoting and safeguarding foreign policy objectives remains paramount. This study explores the use of digital diplomacy in an environment where the state still dominates international relations.

Christodoulides (2005) had the same opinion about the impact of digital diplomacy, but the scholar examined such significance in relation to the presence of internet for pursuing foreign policy goals. According to this author, the governments of the world may regard internet as an exceptional diplomatic tool they can use to establish their positions on a range of issues and promote their thoughts internationally. In the same vein, Adesina (2017) believes that, appropriate use of digital diplomacy enables the diplomatic mission and state it

represents to build a positive image in the receiving state, and eventually permits achievement of a sending state's foreign policy aims. This body of literature provides the basis for this paper.

4.0 Theoretical Framework

The study adopts the soft power theoretical framework as expounded by Nye (1990) who defined soft power to mean “the ability to set the agenda in world politics through persuasion, enticing and attracting others through the force of one's beliefs, values and ideas, and not through military or economic coercion.” In his assumption, Nye distinguishes hard from soft power while showing the relevance of the later. Again, according to Nye (2011), hard power is “the ability to get others to act in ways that are contrary to their initial preferences and strategies.” The concept of hard power connotes hard the ability to coerce, through threats and inducements (“sticks” and “carrots”). Unlike hard power, Nye (2004) defines soft power as the ability to get “others to want the outcomes that you want.”

Kelley (2010) stresses that, soft power reflects “the ability to achieve goals through attraction rather than coercion. In the end, Nye (2005) brings in the concept of smart power as the “balance of hard and soft power” and finds soft power akin to hard power in international relations. He also believes that soft power surpasses hard power in achieving foreign policy goals in the international arena. Basing on that premise, the MFAEAC can benefit enough by bring into play the digital diplomacy which acts as soft power to convince and create a center of attention towards other actors in international relations, as compared to hard power which is more sophisticated in terms of financial resources, technology and personnel. According to Nye, governments should aspire to positively interact with the citizens of foreign nations in order to advance their interests by means of the attractiveness of their countries' culture, values, institutions and foreign policy, rather than coercion or payment – the traditional tools of *hard* power. This study correlates digital diplomacy to soft power in examining its impact in carrying out Tanzania foreign policy.

5.0 Methodology

The population of the study involved government officials from Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar, members of Parliament of the United Republic of

Tanzania as well as members of the House of Representatives of Zanzibar. The sample of the research was obtained from the study population by non-probability sampling technique. Purposive sampling was applied in deciding respondents for incorporation into the sample. Case study design was used to advance the information-gathering process with facts being gathered using primary data through two methods namely, a survey using a semi-structured questionnaire, and an interview using key informant interview guide. The data gathered were analysed using content analysis. The questionnaire and interview results were presented in narrative quotations and complemented using thematic analysis. The study was conducted in Dar es Salaam, Dodoma and Zanzibar.

6.0 Findings and Discussion

The study found that the Ministry of Information, Communications and Information Technology (MICIT) formulated National ICT Policy in 2016 which mainly supported the government ministries including MFAEAC to achieve success in service delivery to the public as well as execution of foreign policy. The data collected from the interviews and questionnaires revealed that the government was yet to formulate a definite policy on the use social media to pursue foreign policy objectives. Also, the researchers observed that the New Foreign Policy of 2001 did not cite digital diplomacy mechanisms, although there were mentions of technological advancement being causative of policy change from traditional foreign policy to the new one. Further, the study found that the MFAEAC was in the process of reviewing the 2001 foreign policy, nonetheless, there was no any mention of the focus on digital diplomacy in the reviewed policy.

The research findings substantiate the study made by Bjola and Holmes (2015) who also found that Africa, including Tanzania has not yet shown much improvement in using digital diplomacy as compared to US, UK, Sweden, France and Poland. The abovementioned countries have given special attention to digital diplomacy as important paraphernalia in pursuing foreign policy goals and thereby benefiting from it.

From the data collected, it was found that, despite having no exact policy on digital diplomacy, there were electronic devices used by MFAEAC for video conference meetings between the government and other entities all over the

world – particularly during the peak of Covid-19 pandemic. The devices were also used for communication between the Minister and country representatives abroad to date. Furthermore, e-Government Authority (eGA) had developed a system for e-meetings for all government ministries including MFAEAC. The E-meetings system required users to login using their cheque numbers in order to enhance security and deter misuse of digital devices.

The study validates the general thinking that the usage of websites by foreign ministries, embassies and international organisations has become a normal practice. Similarly, Bjola and Holmes (2015) argued that, digital diplomacy has currently become an extremely regular tool for embassies and consulates which have interactive online websites. Basing on the study, digital diplomacy, through the use of social media has become diplomacy's momentous device that affords a stage for unrestricted communication with the foreign and domestic citizens, and has become a communicator's most influential instrument, therefore facilitating attainment of foreign policy purposes. The same was reported in (Adesina, 2017). Moreover, the study revealed that, the available devices were used for negotiation and communication between MFAEAC and the governments of other East African countries during East African Community (EAC) summits.

The Heads of State were involved in the signing of the final negotiated documents digitally. In order to mitigate the ever looming risk of cyber-attacks the devices and systems were to be checked on a daily basis. The analysis confirms findings of the study done by Verrekia (2017) who discovered that, lately, diplomats and political leaders have begun to understand the means in which they can capitalize on the reputation of technology in this digital age, to improve their engagements in international relations, and ultimately further the foreign policy ends of their countries. However, MFAEAC was yet to submit a bill on digital diplomacy to the Parliament of the United Republic of Tanzania which is the pillar responsible for making laws that affect the implementation of policies. Besides, the study discovered that there was no department or unit responsible for digital diplomacy at MFAEAC as much of the activities were done by the ICT Department in the Ministry. This could be regarded as failure to take advantage of ICT and the internet as explained by Bjola and Holmes, (2015).

However, the study found that, the MFAEAC had its official website, Twitter, Facebook accounts and a blog which were used to disseminate information in a steady manner, on time and without delays. Despite the fact that digital platforms eased the engagement between the Ministry and foreign and domestic publics on time, the Ministry was yet to develop mechanisms to determine the effectiveness of such platforms and therefore the Ministry was not able to give details on the extent of efficiency the platforms had in connection to the execution of foreign policy. The study by Friedman (2005) unveiled that, the use of internet enables an ever more efficient international division of labour to take details of the comparative advantage of different markets. Thus MFAEAC can effectively pursue economic diplomacy and achieve its foreign policy objectives through the use of digital diplomacy.

Also, the study found that, the MFAEAC used other traditional mechanisms such as Dubai Expo to pursue foreign policy objectives as well. Nevertheless, the mechanisms were allegedly less efficient as compared to digital platforms that would enable the Ministry to reach a huge number of people worldwide within a short time. Expressly, the research verified the studies done by Hocking & Melissen (2015), Madu et.al (2017), and Lovez and Murray (2013), who divulged that, digital diplomacy is a supplement to traditional diplomacy which can help a state to promote its foreign policy goals, expand international reach, and influence people in any other side of the world by using internet or other digital mechanisms to conduct relations between states or other international entities. Therefore, digital diplomacy may be applied to complement traditional diplomacy and foster attainment of foreign policy aims.

In addition, the study discovered that, eGA as the authority mandated to assist government institutions to access shared ICT, facilitates and supports implementation of all sector specific ICT systems and services by preparing standards and guidelines that enhance efficiency of the mentioned platforms following requests from particular ministries. Nonetheless, the MFAEAC was yet to request for such support from eGA. Additionally, MFAEAC was engaging in the use of video conferences as alternative to traditional meetings. By considering the role of eGA and activities of MFAEAC, the circumstance calls for reforms to coordinate the activities of the two institutions to attain the same goal as the case of Germany testifies. It has been reported that, Germany was

struggling to go hand in hand with advancement in technology in order to achieve its foreign policy goals against other states. Stanzel (2018) noted that, the country undertook intensive reforms to influence the exchange of information between its ministry of foreign affairs, embassies located in Germany and foreign ministries of EU member States. Further, the study was informed that, the Committee for Foreign Affairs, Defence and Security (PCFADS) of the Parliament of the United Republic of Tanzania took into account the situation and was determined to direct the MFAEAC to start developing a specific policy on digital diplomacy. As shown earlier, China has also executed a number of reforms in dealing with the question of digital diplomacy. Therefore the need for reforms in the MFAEAC is critical.

The broad picture portrayed from the findings reveals the significance of applying digital platforms to achieve institutional and national goals. Several other studies found that digital diplomacy plays vital role in influencing, facilitating, accelerating and safeguarding foreign policy objectives of various countries globally. For example, Madu (2018) established that, “digital diplomacy allows countries to project their soft power beyond their borders.” Nonetheless, on the practical level, the study informs that there is no specific policy on digital diplomacy that would help to accelerate the accomplishment of foreign policy goals. This statement by Madu is a clear justification of the role of digital diplomacy in influencing attainment of foreign policy aims of any country in the world, including Tanzania.

The study sample from MFAEAC, MICIT, the Parliament, the House of Representatives, eGA and Tanzania Communications Regulatory Authority (TCRA) was used to investigate if there was a specific policy established by the government directing the MFAEAC to use social media to disseminate information, protect and promote foreign policy goals in its relation with other entities, the extent by which foreign policy objectives were reached through the use of digital diplomacy and the measures that could be taken by MFAEAC to ensure that digital diplomacy is fully utilized to win the public and promote foreign policy goals against other entities. Through a combination of answers, the study identified that the country has neither specific policy nor department responsible for digital diplomacy. This means that the country faces some challenges in the execution of foreign policy aspirations given the present-day

situation which requires countries to engage more in the use of digital platforms to interact with various stakeholders both domestic and foreign.

Furthermore, the challenges associated with application of digital devices at MFAEAC indicated that lack of a specific desk, unit or department for digital diplomacy was impeding the achievement of targets planned by the Ministry. As such, its absence was further infringing the activities in the Ministry especially in pursuing economic diplomacy. Studies by Manor (2015) and Madu (2018) maintained that the use of digital apparatus facilitates countries to achieve their foreign policy goals. Further, the study by Bjola and Holmes (2015) denotes that the United Kingdom managed to advance its foreign policy ends by setting up Office of Digital Diplomacy within its government. Besides, the efforts undertaken by Sweden, France, and Poland to include digital tools into their statecraft, is evidence that indicates potentiality of digital diplomacy for achieving foreign policy targets. Therefore, this study is of the view that, the presence of digital diplomacy policy would boost the performance of economic diplomacy policy⁴ at MFAEAC.

Additionally, the study identified challenges in cooperation between the MFAEAC and eGA that to some point obstruct the execution of the Ministry duties effectively, more particularly on the issues related to support on the use of ICT. This problem further infringes the establishment of the department accountable for digital diplomacy and consequently impacting achievement of the mission and vision of the Ministry and the government as well. To put it clear, in one scenario the respondent from MFAEAC asserted that the devices for video conferencing were much secure while the respondents from MICIT, eGA and TCRA warned on the risk of cyber security attack. These contradicting statements imply that there is absence of cooperation in terms of sharing information regarding the devices or systems.

Other researchers found that even world leaders and diplomats now use social media, and Twitter in particular; to speak and engage directly to the audience they seek to influence on particular issues. Also, Internet tools ease diplomatic activities nowadays as they assist diplomats to offer their standpoints or positions regarding policy issues. Christodoulides (2005) noted that “the Internet

⁴ Tanzania’s new foreign policy puts emphasis on economic diplomacy

can be considered by governments as a unique diplomatic instrument; through its proper use they can “advertise” not only their positions on different issues, but also promote their ideas worldwide. Such a function, if used in the right way, helps the embassy, and as a result the state that it represents, to create a positive image in the host state” Conversely, this has not been the case in Tanzania where the Tweets posted by leaders are not directly referred to as the position of the government on certain concerns because of absence of the mentioned policy.

On the other hand, the research could not authenticate that the study conforms to soft power theory. Soft power as defined by Nye means the ability to set the agenda in world politics through persuasion, enticing and attracting others through the force of one’s beliefs, values and ideas, and not through military or economic coercion. But, lack of capacity to scan the number of impressions and engagements on social media platforms facing the ICT department entailed difficulties for the study to determine the degree of influence the MFAEAC has on foreign policy issues. The study is of the opinion that, if MFAEAC would be using digital diplomacy it could cater for angles of influence that would enable the country to pursue its goals effectively vis a vis other states in the international arena. Further, digital diplomacy would add to country’s competitive and comparative advantages against other entities in promoting and safeguarding national interests underlined in the New Foreign Policy.

7.0 Conclusion

Revolution in ICTs and its combined force coming out from social media has influenced the way States conduct their relations with one another in Europe, America and Africa. The community is increasingly becoming aware of foreign policy subjects and at the same time seeks to press diplomacy through social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Clubhouse, YouTube and other platforms.

Scholars show that digital diplomacy is not only effective in safeguarding, promoting, protecting and execution of foreign policy objects but also noteworthy enough in projecting the position of Tanzania internationally. Furthermore, digital diplomacy acts as a form of soft power in directing the influence of the country on specific issues or range of issues in the international system.

However, governments have to be careful over cyber-attacks. Information systems at national level are normally prone to attack if such systems are not secure enough and being checked frequently. People have much confidence in digital diplomacy which means that more research and development (R&D) needs to be done. Since the ICT department is incapacitated to inspect the number of impressions and engagements on social media platforms, this confirms the information rendered by Bjola and Holmes (2015) that MFAEAC lags behind in exploiting the benefits of digital diplomacy. This impacts negatively on the achievement of foreign policy goals. MFAEAC has no explicit policy on digital diplomacy despite the fact that it is phenomenon in achieving foreign policy goals and projecting the position of the country over diverse aspects in the global community. The nonexistence of such policy limits the Ministry and the country in general in finding an angle of influence through digital diplomacy which is unquestionably a soft power too. Looking for areas of influence is one of the strategies stipulated in the foreign policy of Tanzania.

Also, absence of a desk, department or unit responsible for digital diplomacy at MFAEAC puts a burden on the shoulders of the ICT department which means some of the objectives might be challenged by lack of personnel to support ICT issues while at the same time supporting the other departments. This comes out from the fact that countries like United Kingdom have gone some steps ahead by establishing Office of Digital Diplomacy which has been very effective since its inception.

8.0 Recommendations

The fact that modern diplomats such as Heads of States, Heads of Governments and Ambassadors use social media to communicate countries' positions and update the public based on their national interests makes digital diplomacy incontrovertibly central in achieving a country's foreign policy targets. This aspect becomes even more imperative to the MFAEAC which is the Ministry in charge of foreign policy purposes in the Tanzania. To that end, the study recommends that the Ministry make reforms and formulate Digital Diplomacy Policy in order to reinforce implementation of the New Foreign Policy of 2001. Further, the Ministry should consider establishing a unit to be designated for ensuring that ambitions of the government are reached through the use of social media to influence country's decisions and position in the world. This may also

be done by restructuring the ICT unit of the MFAEAC. The government should extend cooperation to closely working with the eGA to make sure that its ICT devices are properly secured. One of the steps should be to fast track presentation of a bill on Digital Diplomacy at the Parliament of the United of Republic of Tanzania in order to propel the operation of Digital Diplomacy Policy as part of the New Foreign Policy of the country.

References

- Adesina, O.S (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3: 1297175.
- Amacker, C (2011). The Functions of Diplomacy. *E-International Relations Students*, <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/07/20/the-functions-of-diplomacy>.
- Bjola, C., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Christodoulides, N. (2005). The internet & diplomacy. *American Diplomacy*, http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2005/0103/chri/christo_net.html.
- Digital Diplomacy, (2021). Virtual relations: Foreign ministries are getting the hang of social media. <http://www.economist.com/node/21563284>
- Frankel, J. (1968). *The Making of Foreign Policy: An Analysis of Decision Making*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41231166?seq=1>
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century* (1st ed). New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Golan, G. J., Manor, I., & Arceneaux, P. (2019). Mediated Public Diplomacy Redefined: Foreign Stakeholder Engagement via Paid, Earned, Shared, and Owned Media. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 63(12), 1665–1683.
- Hanson, F. (2012). *Baked in and Wired: eDiplomacy@State*, Foreign Policy Paper Series no 30, Washington D.C., Brookings Institution.
- Hocking, B. & Melissen, J. (2015). *Diplomacy in the Digital Age*. Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.

- Hocking B., Melissen J., Riordan S., & Sharp P (2012), *Futures for Diplomacy: Integrative Diplomacy in the 21st century*, Netherlands Institute of International Relations
- Jiang, Y. (2017). *Social Media and E-Diplomacy: Scanning Embassies on Weibo* (1st ed) Routledge
- Kajerero, J & Mujwahuzi, L. (2021). Sustainable Education and Development. DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-68836-3_42
- Kassim, S. (2012). *Twitter revolution: How the Arab Spring was helped by social media*.
- Kelley, J. R., (2010) The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution, *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, vol. 21.
- Kerry J. (2013). Digital Diplomacy: Adapting Our Diplomatic Engagement *U.S Department of State*, Belgrade initiative.
- Lovez, K. & Murray, A. (2013). The digital diplomacy potential, *K M World*.
- Madu, L., Sugiarto, T., & Amiri, A.M, (2017). Indonesia's Public Diplomacy in the Internet Era, Bringing the State Back. *Dialogo Journal*, (4)1: 37 – 42.
- Madu, L (2018) Indonesia's Digital Diplomacy: Problems and Challenges, *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*. (7) 1.
- Manor, I. (2015). Between Digital Diplomacy and Diplomacy 2.0, *Public Diplomats*
- Metzl, J (2001) Network Diplomacy, *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, (2) 1, 77-87.
- Mujwahuzi, L. S., & Kajerero, J. (2020). Digital Diplomacy Apparatus: Awareness and Usage for Digital Economy in Tanzania.
- Ndimbwa, T. & Emanuel, M. (2013). The Role of Information and Communication Technology in Delivering Diplomatic Services for growth and development of Tanzania International, *Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*

Journal, (3)12.

Nye, J. (1990). Soft power. *Foreign Policy*, 80, 153–171.

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York, Public Affairs.

Nye, J. (2005). On the Rise and Fall of American Soft Power, *New Perspectives Quarterly*, (22) 3, 75-77

Nye, J. (2011). *The Future of Power*, New York, Public Affairs

Schmidt, J. (2014). *Between Irrelevance and Integration? New Challenges to Diplomacy in the 21st Century and the Role of the EEAS*. *EU Diplomacy Papers 8/2014*, Bruges, Belgium

Andrew F. C, Brian, H. & William, M.(2008) *Global Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart?*, Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan.

Seib, P. (2016). *The Future of #Diplomacy*. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* (13)1-3

Stanzel. V., (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. German Institute for International and Security Affairs, SWP Research Paper.

Summa, G., (2020), *'We the People' in the Twitter Age: Digital Diplomacy and the Social Legitimacy of the United Nations*, Media@LSE, London School of Economics and Political Science ("LSE"), Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE.

Verrekia, B. (2017). *Digital Diplomacy and Its Effect on International Relations*. Independent Study Project (ISP).