



# In the International Foreign Policy of Countries: Soft War of Satellite Networks in Fluidity

<sup>1</sup>Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR & <sup>2</sup>Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD,

<sup>1</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-5212> <sup>2</sup><https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9488-9036>

<sup>1</sup>Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>2</sup>International Science and Technology University.

\*Corresponding Author :Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR

“Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland”

Received: 09.07.2025

Accepted: 08.08.2025

Published: 16.08.2025

**Abstract:** Recent developments in global affairs and the growing influence of media have given rise to a new dimension in foreign policy—media diplomacy—which explores how media shape’s global public opinion and influences the foreign policies of states as a powerful tool. The significant impact of global television in resolving political conflicts and guiding public opinion, often as an instrument of soft war, inspires a fresh perspective on soft war in international relations by emphasizing the role of international communications in information exchange and political propaganda.

Some scholars argue that, in today’s turbulent world, the widespread dissemination of information via international television networks is essential. These global networks, by broadcasting world news and international events, capture public attention and embed their narratives and analyses in the minds of their audiences.

According to the author, the international flow of information allows countries with advanced information and communication technologies to craft myths, commercial messages, and political propaganda that target large audiences both nationally and internationally. Through this, they strategically convey political, economic, and cultural content aligned with their interests to influence global public opinion.

**Keywords:** *Soft war, international communications, international networks, foreign policy.*

## Cite this Article

Prof. Dr. M. Ekram. YAWAR, Dr. Mehmet. U, In the International Foreign Policy of Countries: Soft War of Satellite Networks in Fluidity (2025) *GRS Journal of Arts and Educational Sciences* , Vol-1(Iss-2),61-68

## Introduction

During the 1970s, the rapid development of information and communication technologies, alongside the expanded use of communication tools in international relations, marked a new phase in the study of international communication. This evolution attracted significant scholarly attention in the field. Initially, the dominant view was that international communication’s primary role was to accelerate the transmission of political messages (Molana, 2008: 124; Graber, 2005: 479; Richard, 2004: 339-359; Gilboa, 2005: 27-44). However, with the widespread adoption of communication technologies and the increased access to satellite services, new perspectives emerged. Scholars argued that international communications could play a broader role—not only in political messaging but also in political, economic, and cultural exchanges, information dissemination, influencing global public opinion, and even serving as a tool of dominance over other countries (Dadgaran, 2006: 21).

The expansion of international economic and social systems, combined with the rise of globalization fueled by satellite and Internet communications, introduced the concept of media diplomacy. This brought dramatic changes to international communications, particularly in the realm of international advertising. Today, the Internet and global television have become

central actors in political competition and foreign policy arenas (Larson, 1988: 68). These changes have transformed political negotiations from closed-door affairs into more open, public processes, with journalists, the press, and television—often supported by political actors—playing critical roles in swaying public opinion within rival societies and applying pressure on political leaders.

Media diplomacy, defined as the strategic use of communication tools in political negotiations, now occupies an important place in foreign policy (Gilboa, 2002: 736; Naveh, 2002: 211). Political leaders actively leverage the power of the press, television, and information dissemination to exert political pressure on opposing societies and assert dominance (Katz & Dayan, 1992: 111-121).

In today’s interconnected world, media diplomacy operates alongside formal political negotiations, and countries that skillfully employ this tool tend to achieve greater success on the international stage. Hamid Molana highlights those political messages are no longer primarily conveyed through traditional channels such as negotiations, letters, or telephone calls. Instead, they are broadcast via television networks directly to political leaders and global public opinion, proving far more effective than conventional methods (Molana, 2008: 130).

## Background

Hamid Molana (2005), in his analysis of global communication theories, categorizes four main approaches to international communication:

1. **The idealistic-humanistic approach:** Sees international communication as a means to bring nations and peoples closer within the global community.
2. **The neo-religious-political approach:** Views international communication primarily as propaganda and ideology conveyed through one-way communication.
3. **The economic power approach:** Considers information within the international system as a form of economic power.
4. **The political force approach:** Regards information as a political force influencing international communication (Molana, 2005: 67-71).

Livingston (1997), in his study on CNN's multifaceted impact on foreign policy, analyzed this influence under three categories: accelerating, inhibiting, and highlighting factors.

- The **accelerating factor** refers to CNN's global news coverage that leaves politicians little time for reflection or consultation. Transnational satellites rapidly broadcast news worldwide, and "live journalism" demands immediate analysis and response.
- The **inhibiting factor** is CNN's emotional and dramatic impact on public opinion, often shaping perception through intense coverage.
- The **highlighting factor** describes CNN's ability to frame specific issues according to the national and global interests of the U.S. government, shareholders, or international audiences.

Nye and on (2004) argue that global communications significantly influence public opinion and, alongside global trade, serve as a form of soft power in foreign policy and political developments.

Gilboa (2004) similarly notes that global television networks, by covering international news and events, attract public opinion and implant their own interpretations and analyses, a concept known as the **CNN effect**. This theory highlights CNN's major role in shaping foreign policy and contributing to the fluidity of international relations (Gilboa, 2005: 737).

The CNN effect is analytically understood through the three independent categories mentioned: accelerating, inhibiting, and highlighting influences. Thomas (2005) adds that global broadcasting is especially impactful in regions experiencing turmoil and chaos. During the Cold War, U.S. communication institutions like Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and others played vital roles in fomenting instability (Thomas, 2005: 28).

## Conceptual Framework and Theoretical Foundations

### Conceptual Framework

Many scholars emphasize the close relationship between the growth of communication tools, globalization, and the expansion of international communications in political, cultural, and economic spheres (Mohammadi, 1997: 3; Alleyne, 1995: 3). After World War II, advancements in communication and information technologies—especially satellite transmission, the Internet, and

global television—significantly accelerated news dissemination. These tools transformed political negotiations, shifting them from covert discussions to overt processes where aligning public opinion with foreign policy became crucial (Entman, 1991: 19).

A key focus of study in global communications is how communication tools are used in international relations, foreign policy, and diplomacy through the global dissemination of information. Three major areas dominate this field:

- Global television
- International radio broadcasting
- The Internet

CNN's rapid news coverage often directs global public attention to specific international events, making those issues focal points worldwide.

The conceptual framework of this article draws on the **CNN effect theory** in international relations and foreign policy, which portrays global communications as a tool of soft war. CNN, acting as an accelerating, deterrent, and highlighting factor, broadcasts crises and disasters worldwide, compressing news cycles and simultaneously creating public demand for solutions aligned with political agendas. Mary Ann Duane refers to this phenomenon as the **CNN deception** (Entman, 1991: 21).

### Theoretical Foundations: Historical Perspective of Soft War

After World War II, recognizing radio's powerful ability to distort events and influence public opinion, international communication planners sought to utilize other mass media to develop international communication strategies. Broadcasting foreign radio programs became a governmental responsibility for developed countries, serving either as a tool of **public diplomacy** or, from another perspective, as a form of **international propaganda**.

Mass media increasingly acted as intermediaries between the secretive world of diplomacy and the public sphere of conscious propaganda (Mohammadi, 1997: 6). The rise of peace and human rights journalists, often from developed imperialist countries and operating under UN sponsorships—approved by all nations—allowed journalists access to conflict zones where diplomats hesitated to go. Consequently, their reporting attracted significant public attention.

This media role aligns with what Lippmann termed "mapping"—media's capacity to shape perceptions of international events and prompt diplomatic alerts (Lippmann, 1931: 161-170). Since 1945, this period can be considered the "**golden age**" of **foreign news reporting** and marks the beginning of **modern soft war** in the era of communications and information technology (Tailor, 1999: 61-72). Soft war can be defined as follows:

*Soft war is the planned use of propaganda measures by governments during wartime or extraordinary situations to influence the opinions, feelings, positions, and behavior of foreign groups—whether friends, enemies, or neutrals—in a way that supports government policies and goals.*

It is an **intellectual and value-based war** fought with media as a weapon, targeting audiences sensitive to nuanced messaging, often unable to discern truth from falsehood due to cognitive asymmetry. Soft war represents a strategic deception of public opinion conducted through propaganda and misinformation by international propaganda agencies.

Television and the press are the main channels conveying soft war messages to targeted audiences, serving as primary tools for this form of influence. The emergence of international news and information networks after World War II, predominantly controlled by imperialist countries, marks the beginning of soft war within international communications. Media coverage through these networks introduced a new political actor into international relations. For example, the 1993 Group of Seven summit in Tokyo was covered by 11,000 journalists, reflecting the proliferation of part-time reporters and freelancers—sometimes referred to as the “media ghetto.” A senior diplomat observed in 1993 that media coverage of crises in Somalia and Bosnia produced public consequences unseen in the previous fifty years. Prior to World War I, distant conflicts like Sarajevo or the Horn of Africa received little American attention; however, this shifted dramatically after the war (Heffernan, 1991: 152).

Despite the existence of nearly a hundred news agencies and thousands of television networks worldwide, it is primarily the news agencies from imperialist countries (such as America, Russia, and England) and global networks like CNN and BBC that cover 95% of world news and events.

In the modern era, the grand strategy model focused on war has been largely replaced by a **public diplomacy model based on soft war** in international communications. This shift results from economic considerations, the bitter experiences of the World Wars, and the disapproval of international public opinion. In this new

model, propaganda and international media are essential components of soft war strategy on the global stage (Mor, 2006: 157).

The focus of soft war is to influence international public opinion in accordance with the policies and grand strategies of imperialist countries. The Velvet Revolutions in Georgia and Ukraine provide practical examples of international media’s soft power—especially the influence of global television—in shifting political power within sovereign nations.

Nye (2004) terms soft power as “**small power**,” while Krebs and Burstein (2005) call it “**cohesion power**.” Both view it as a political ideology promoting democracy from afar, aligned with the interests of imperialist states, primarily the United States.

In soft war, there exists a close relationship between governments and international media. States capable of directing and controlling media content possess a greater ability to conduct soft war and psychological operations on the international stage. For this reason, imperialist countries leverage the theory of press freedom—considered a democratic pillar—to dominate environmental information flows and disseminate messages through transnational projects. Information management plays a central role in soft war, overseeing information control and shaping public opinion.

Guillevois offers an analytical framework distinguishing **soft war** from **hard war**, summarized in Table 1.

Table No. 1 - Elements of Soft Warfare

Soft War	Hard War		Type
	Economy	War	
Attraction; Saliency; Dependence	Motivation; Threat	Coercion and Threat; Deterrence	Behavior
Values; Culture; Politics; Institutions	Order; Money	Force; Intimidation	Source
Public diplomacy; Bilateral or multilateral diplomacy	Financial support; Bribery	Coercive diplomacy; War; Violence	Government policies

Source: (Gilboa,2005)

Hard Power vs. Soft Power: Conceptual Distinction

In the table above, the elements of **hard power** and **soft power** are presented within a comparative framework, categorized into three main dimensions: **behavior**, **sources**, and **government policies**. **Hard power** relies on coercion — the use of **force, fear, intimidation, and economic threats** — to compel another state or actor to comply with a nation's interests. It operates through mechanisms of military strength, economic sanctions, or other forms of direct pressure aimed at achieving submission.

In contrast, **soft power** functions through **attraction and persuasion**, focusing on shaping preferences and values rather than imposing outcomes. It is exercised primarily through **public diplomacy, media tools**, and the strategic use of **international communication**. Soft power draws upon cultural affinity, shared norms, political values, and the appeal of a country’s policies to influence international public opinion.

Within the context of **soft war**, this type of influence goes beyond simple persuasion. It strategically **leverages the values, beliefs, and culture of the rival society** — not to destroy it, but to subtly

Dominate and redirect it. The goal is to **win hearts and minds**, shifting the perspectives of the targeted population in a way that aligns with the initiator’s political interests. Soft war, therefore, represents a **modern tool of international influence**, relying on advanced communication technologies, satellite networks, and transnational media to **shape narratives, set agendas, and control the flow of information** across borders.

Elements of Soft War in International Communications

Research indicates that the structure of international news and communication is largely dominated by five global news agencies that, by leveraging advanced communication technologies, control the **international flow of information** (Alleyne, 1995: 21).

Global news coverage, particularly through satellite networks, is expanding at a rapid pace. For example, CNN broadcasts news full-time in more than 82 countries worldwide. Political leaders, diplomats, and soft war strategists often collaborate with such international networks to transmit political, social, and cultural

messages—aiming to **influence international public opinion** and shape the global narrative in favor of their national interests.

In fact, 63% of politicians have rated the use of global television news in foreign policy decision-making as *very important* (Heffernan, 1991: 134). Television, as an instrument of **public diplomacy**, has become a key tool for imperial powers to influence the political orientation of global audiences and to legitimize their foreign policy objectives.

Accordingly, the key **elements of soft war** in the context of international communications include:

- **International Information Flow**
- **International Dimensions of Information**
- **International Propaganda**

## International Information Flow

Hamid Molana defines *international information flow* as the movement of messages across and within national borders between different cultural and national systems. These flows occur through individuals, groups, governments, and technologies (Molana, 2008: 221).

According to Molana, understanding these flows offers a new dimension to international relations—extending beyond diplomacy or trade to include diverse fields such as:

- Art and cultural exchanges
- Tourism
- Educational interactions
- Diplomatic channels
- Mass media (including radio, TV, and now digital platforms)

One of Molana's main concerns regarding these flows is their **impact on national sovereignty**. As vital data affecting national decision-making is increasingly stored and processed in foreign databases, nations with weaker infrastructure and technological capacity face significant disadvantages. This dependency undermines their ability to influence political, economic, and cultural developments (Molana, 2008: 224).

**Castells** (2006: 322), in his exploration of global governance, argues that communication technologies are gradually replacing national governments with **global networks**. As some states struggle to manage transnational issues, **civil societies and international actors** are assuming roles traditionally held by states. This shift leads to a **loss of credibility and legitimacy** among weaker states.

Similarly, **Mohammadi** (2008: 32–42) points out that the monopoly of information and global media reflects the beginning of a **new Cold War**, where control of information—not arms—is the primary tool of conflict.

## North-South Imbalance in Data Flows

The **flow of data is largely one-directional**, moving from developed nations (mainly the U.S. and Europe) to less developed nations. Technologically advanced countries dominate **data processing and distribution**, while developing countries largely act as suppliers of **raw data**. Developed countries export processed data to both the East and West, while **developing nations often receive filtered and politicized information** embedded with the values and interests of powerful countries.

The **Information Access Index** illustrates this imbalance:

- In 2003, **60% of internet users** belonged to the world's wealthiest economies.
- **No statistics** were available for internet users in 59 of the poorest countries.
- However, exceptions like **South Korea**, which ranked fourth globally in terms of digital advancement, show the possibility of transformation through focused investment and policy reform (Nejad Motamed, 2004: 176).

## Calls for Regulation

Due to this imbalance, many countries argue that **cross-border information flows** should be regulated by **governments**, especially for:

- National security
- Economic sovereignty
- Cultural preservation

It has been proposed that international institutions such as the **World Trade Organization (WTO)** oversee such regulations through frameworks like **GATT**. Some suggest the WTO offers **greater flexibility** than existing multinational treaties and can regulate digital trade and communication technologies more effectively (Nejad Motamed, 2005: 133–142).

The **1996 WTO Agreement on Telecommunications** marked a pivotal moment, legitimizing **private sector dominance** in global communications and shifting the control of information from public to private hands—an act many scholars interpret as the formalization of neoliberal control over international media infrastructure.

## Content Ambiguity and Surveillance Concerns

Despite numerous studies, it remains difficult to trace and assess **how much data flows**, where it goes, and what its exact **political, cultural, and economic impacts** are. A Japanese study in 1982 concluded that the empirical analysis of transnational data flows is nearly impossible, though newer technologies have provided more avenues for observation and analysis.

Today, two opposing perspectives dominate the debate:

1. **Optimists** argue that advancements in information technology will promote **balanced global development** and greater democratization.
2. **Skeptics** warn that unchecked data flows will only serve to **concentrate power among developed nations**, exacerbating the economic and digital divide.

Thus, to mitigate the negative effects of one-way information dominance, **developing countries must invest in**:

- ICT infrastructure (hardware and software)
- Digital literacy
- Regulatory legal frameworks
- Public and private sector collaboration

Only through such efforts can they hope to **reclaim control over their national information ecosystems** and resist being passive consumers in a media-driven soft war.

## International Dimensions of Intelligence

In pursuit of their national interests, states interact on the global stage through four core dimensions of engagement:

1. **Diplomatic Dimension** – involving bilateral or multilateral negotiations aimed at achieving mutually beneficial outcomes.
2. **Economic Dimension** – focusing on the exchange of resources, trade, and market access to advance national wealth and influence.
3. **Military Dimension** – which includes the actual or threatened use of military force to secure political or strategic objectives.
4. **Intelligence (or Covert) Dimension** – encompassing clandestine operations such as espionage, surveillance, and psychological warfare, which are often concealed but deeply influential.

While the **intelligence dimension** overlaps with the other three, it stands apart due to its covert nature and its unique emphasis on **gathering information, shaping public opinion, and managing perceptions** both domestically and internationally (Mohammadi, 1997: 18).

This fourth dimension—also referred to as the **psychological dimension**—relies heavily on modern **information and communication technologies** (ICT) to assess the ideological, social, and political attitudes of rival states. By analyzing foreign public opinion, states can **strategically craft public diplomacy initiatives and psychological operations** to influence the political behavior of both citizens and decision-makers in the target country.

In today's interconnected world, intelligence operations are no longer confined to traditional espionage. They now incorporate digital surveillance, social media monitoring, and the use of global media platforms to gather strategic insights—blurring the lines between intelligence gathering, propaganda, and foreign policy execution.

## International Propaganda

**Propaganda**, in its broadest sense, refers to the dissemination of ideas or narratives intended to **influence public behavior, beliefs, or attitudes**. It is fundamentally about **persuasion**—shaping how individuals or groups think about particular issues, especially in political and ideological contexts.

At the international level, **propaganda becomes a powerful tool of foreign policy**. Regardless of the nationality of the propagandist, international propaganda crosses national borders and is executed using **modern media technologies** such as:

- Satellite television
- Radio broadcasting
- Internet platforms

These tools form the backbone of international media systems used by states to **project influence** into foreign societies (Al-Awini, 1990: 21–26).

### Purpose and Timing

The primary objective of international propaganda is to **sway public opinion** in nations experiencing:

- Political instability
- Identity crises
- Economic collapse

During such vulnerable moments, societies are more receptive to **external ideological messages**, especially those that offer hope, solutions, or scapegoats. In such cases, propaganda may:

- Introduce foreign political ideologies
- Promote imported consumer goods and cultural values
- Destabilize governments or social norms
- Open the door to **regime change** or foreign economic domination

### Propaganda as a Political Actor

International propaganda is not merely a communication strategy; it becomes a **political actor** in its own right. Through messaging aimed at **masses, elites, and influential groups**, propaganda can shape elections, incite protests, and weaken national sovereignty. By controlling narratives, propagandists alter the **perceived legitimacy of domestic institutions**, often paving the way for external intervention or policy shifts favorable to foreign powers.

### Techniques of International Propaganda

The complexity of international propaganda arises from:

- **Cultural diversity**
- **Audience behavior variability**
- The challenge of **shaping collective consciousness** across borders

Key techniques used in international propaganda include:

1. **Manipulation through Group Association** – Steering public opinion by aligning it with a specific group's actions or worldview, which reinforces internal approval of the group's behavior.
2. **Repetition** – Reiterating key messages to enhance memorability and psychological influence.
3. **Exaggeration** – Amplifying the significance of events to provoke emotional reactions and foster urgency.
4. **Lying** – Though ethically questionable, falsehoods are a powerful weapon. For example, **Israeli propaganda** has historically used fabricated narratives on the international stage to shape global perceptions.
5. **Insinuation and Allusion** – Indirectly attributing blame or negative characteristics to individuals or movements, subtly shaping audience bias.
6. **Presenting Opinion as Fact** – Framing subjective viewpoints as objective truths to eliminate dissent and discourage critical inquiry.
7. **Credibility through Source Authority** – Using reputable or authoritative sources to legitimize the message and disarm skepticism.
8. **Clarity and Simplification** – Crafting messages in a clear and digestible format, even when the issues are complex or controversial, to ensure mass comprehension and adoption.

These techniques are not unique to authoritarian regimes or rogue actors; **democratic nations** also use them, particularly through global media platforms such as CNN, BBC, and social media networks.



## Section Conclusion

Understanding these **techniques of international propaganda** is essential for both scholars and policymakers. It enables:

- Better analysis of media content
- Recognition of foreign influence campaigns
- Strategic responses to mitigate propaganda's impact on national sovereignty

In an age where **information warfare replaces traditional military confrontation**, propaganda has emerged as the dominant tool in the arsenal of **soft war**—subtly reshaping societies without firing a single shot.

## Public Opinion Engineering in the Field of International Communications

The concept of **public opinion engineering** has become a strategic concern for technologically advanced nations since the First Persian Gulf War (1990–1991). In particular, the **United States and the United Kingdom** have employed **psychological operations (psy-ops)** and sophisticated media strategies to gain domestic and international support for their transnational policies. These operations were executed through the expansion of **transnational radio and television networks**, which played a crucial role in disseminating propaganda and manipulating global narratives.

The development of such international media infrastructure significantly enhanced the soft power capabilities of Western countries, allowing them to **undermine the legitimacy of national sovereignty** in targeted states. These efforts contributed to a series of political upheavals that later became known as the **Velvet Revolutions**, where pro-Western sentiments were nurtured through media influence rather than direct military intervention.

### Media as a Tool of Soft Power

**Global television networks**, particularly those like **CNN** and **BBC**, have emerged as powerful tools in the **psychological operations** of Western powers. By highlighting selective images and discourses, they amplify certain international events to serve specific political objectives. This strategic framing not only **pressures political leaders** but also acts as a **force multiplier**, complementing military and economic power by shaping the global perception of crises.

Through real-time coverage of international events, these networks break traditional diplomatic norms of secrecy and discretion. By publicly exposing negotiations and political disputes, they limit the maneuverability of states and **force politicians to react to publicized issues**—often under unfavorable conditions.

The presence of global television as a **new political actor** has drastically transformed the nature of international communications. Its influence extends beyond journalism; it now plays an **active role in constructing political narratives, engineering public opinion, and conducting psychological operations** against the governing systems of target countries.

### The CNN Model of Public Opinion Manipulation

According to **Gilboa (2002:739)**, CNN's approach to global news coverage is characterized by five distinct features that make it highly effective in influencing international public opinion:

1. **24-hour broadcasting**
2. **Instantaneous news updates**
3. **Worldwide accessibility and coverage**
4. **High dominance and saturation of news content**
5. **Dynamic and live presentation of global events**

These characteristics have allowed CNN to **frame global crises in real-time**, thereby acting as both a news outlet and a **political force**. By constantly exposing audiences to curated crises, the network **creates a psychological environment** in which the public feels compelled to seek solutions—often those implicitly or explicitly promoted by Western governments.

As **Mary Dwan** and **Mary Ann Doane** have argued, CNN employs techniques of **news compression and dramatization**, presenting everyday issues as urgent crises. This strategy, known as the "**CNN Effect**", plays a critical role in **shaping foreign policy decisions** by mobilizing public opinion and directing it toward desired political outcomes (Semati, 2006: 31–54).

### Stereotyping Developing Nations

Global media networks often operate under the guise of "supporting" underdeveloped and developing countries. However, their content typically presents a **distorted, negative image** of these nations. For newly independent or politically unstable states, global news coverage often focuses on:

- Coups and political unrest
- Natural disasters such as earthquakes, droughts, and storms
- Humanitarian crises and poverty

This selective focus contributes to the **construction of a global stereotype** that portrays developing countries as chronically unstable, helpless, and dependent. The implications are profound:

- **Domestic self-confidence and national identity** are undermined.
- **International investors** perceive these countries as politically risky but economically ripe for intervention.
- **Cultural and political values** are challenged by external norms presented as superior or necessary for "modernization."

In this context, global media serves not only to **inform** but also to **transform**—encouraging systemic change in political patterns, cultural values, and economic policies aligned with Western interests. This process constitutes a sophisticated form of **public opinion engineering** that transcends traditional diplomacy and relies heavily on soft power and media hegemony.

## General Conclusion

The emergence of the communication and information age has significantly reshaped traditional political and military paradigms. The strategic use of **international communication tools**, particularly global media, in **propaganda and public opinion manipulation**, has reinforced the theory that through **public diplomacy and psychological operations**, states can achieve objectives once pursued only through military force.

The experiences of the **Velvet Revolutions in Georgia and Ukraine** exemplify the efficacy of **media soft power** in executing

political transformations without the use of military intervention. These cases highlight how **international television networks** and transnational media outlets can **weaken the legitimacy and structural integrity of ruling systems** by shaping perceptions and redirecting public sentiment. The **speed and accessibility** of global media coverage, especially during times of domestic media censorship, further increases the reliance of local populations on **satellite television** and **foreign media sources**. This not only amplifies the persuasive power of external media narratives but also underscores the **psychological vulnerability** of censored societies to foreign influence.

As classified by Guillebois, the core attributes of global media that facilitate psychological operations include:

1. **24-hour broadcasting**
2. **Real-time news dissemination**
3. **Global accessibility and reach**
4. **High saturation and dominance of information**
5. **Dynamic and lively presentation of events**

These characteristics enhance the capacity of media to act as a **tool of soft power** in the international arena, influencing not only public sentiment but also the **strategic decision-making** processes of governments.

In light of this, **recognizing and analyzing the role of international media in psychological operations** becomes essential for policymakers. Understanding their influence on public opinion enables governments to adopt **countermeasures**, develop **media literacy initiatives**, and establish **regulatory frameworks** that preserve **national sovereignty** and **political independence** in the digital age.

## References

1. Al-Awini, M. A. (1990). *Imperialist Propaganda or International Propaganda*, Tehran: Islamic Propaganda Organization Publications.
2. Alleyne M. D. (1995). *International Power and International Communication*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Althaus, S., Tewksbury, D. (2000). Pattern of Internet and Traditional News Media Use in a Networked Community. *Political Communication*, 4(1), 21-45.
4. Altheide, D. L. (2004). Media logic and Communication. *Journal of Political Communication*, 21(4), 293-296.
5. Castells, E. (2006). *The Age of Information, Power and Identity*. Translated by Chavoshian, H., Senior Editor Paya, A., 2, Tehran: Tarh-e-No Publications.
6. Dadgaran, S. M. (2006). *Public Opinion and its Measurement Criteria*, Tehran: Morvarid Publications, Fourth Edition.
7. Davison, W. P. (1963). Political Communication as Instrument of Foreign Policy. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 27(1), 28-36.
8. Dayan, D., Katz, E. (1992). *Media Event: The live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge & MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Entman, R. M. (1991). Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6-27.
10. Gilboa E. (2002). *The Global News Networks and U.S. Policymaking in Defense and Foreign Affairs*, Cambridge & MA: The Shorenstein Center on the Press.
11. Gilboa, E. (2002). Global Communication and Foreign Policy. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 731-748. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2002.tb02571.x>
12. Gilboa, E. (2005). The CNN Effect: The Search for a Communication Theory of International Relation. *Political Communication*, 22(1), 27-44. doi: 10.1080/10584600590908429.
13. Gilboa, E. (2008). Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 55-77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207312142>.
14. Graber, D. A. (2005). Political Communication Faces the 21st Century. *Journal of International Communication Association*, 55(3), 479-507. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02682.x>
15. Larson, J. F. (1988). *Global television and foreign Policy*, New York: Foreign Policy Association.
16. Lippmann, W. (1931). The Press and Public Opinion. *Political Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 161-170.
17. Livingston, S. Bennet W. Lonce (2003). Gatekeeping Indexing, And Live Event News: Is Technology Altering the Construction of News?. *Journal of Political Communication*, 20(4), 363-380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600390244121>.
18. Mohammadi, A. (1997). *International Communication and Globalization*, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
19. Mohammadi, A. (2008). *Globalization and Colonialism*, Tehran: Ney Publications.
20. Mor, B. (2006). Public Diplomacy in Grand Strategy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2(2), 157-176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2006.00025.x>.
21. Motamednejad, K. (1383). *Global Inequality in Communication Development*, Communication, Tehran: Research Center Publications.
22. Motamednejad, K. (2003). *Global Information Society Outlook*, Communication, Tehran: Research Center Publications.
23. Naveeh, C. (2002). The Role of the Media in Foreign Policy Decision – Making: A Theoretical Framework. *Journal of Conflict and Communication*, 1(2). at: [http://www.cco.regeneronline.de/2002\\_2/pdf\\_2002\\_2/naveeh.pdf](http://www.cco.regeneronline.de/2002_2/pdf_2002_2/naveeh.pdf).
24. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power*, New York: Public Affairs.
25. O'heffernan, P. (1991). *Mass Media and American Foreign Policy*, New York: Ablex Publications.
26. Price, V. (2003). *Public Opinion*. Translated by Ali Rostami, A. and Mir-Tahami, E. Tehran: Publications of the Research Institute for Strategic Studies.
27. Richard, B. (2004). The Emotional Deficit in Political Communication, *Journal of Political Communication*, 21(3), 339-352.
28. Rogers, E. M. (1969). *Modernization among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston; First Edition.
29. Rumi, H. (2005). *Global Communications in Transition*, Tehran: Soroush Publications.
30. Rumi, H. (2005). *Global Information and Communication*, New Frontiers in International

Relations, Translated by Hassanzadeh, O., Tehran: Librarian Publications.

31. Samati, M. M. (2006). The Age of CNN and Hollywood. Translated by Brahui, N. K., Tehran: Ney Publications.
32. Tailor, P. (1999). Global Communication, International Affairs and The Media Since 1945, London: Routledge.
33. Thomas A.O. (2005). Image- National and Borderless Television, CA: SAGE.