

УДК 341.7(485+481)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2022.41.17>

COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTITUTIONS OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY OF THE KINGDOMS OF SWEDEN AND NORWAY

Iryna Klymchuk

*Lviv Polytechnic National University,
Institute of the Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of Political Science and International Relations
Metropolitan Andrey str., 5, Lviv, 79013, Ukraine*

Iryna Sukhorolska

*Lviv Polytechnic National University,
Institute of the Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of Political Science and International Relations
Metropolitan Andrey str., 5, Lviv, 79013, Ukraine*

Today, public diplomacy is seen as one of the important tools for achieving the country's foreign policy goals. Many countries focus their efforts on bringing their own agenda, building an attractive image, raising their awareness and seeking to be heard and perceived by foreign audiences abroad. Public diplomacy functions as a reverse mechanism, the essence of which is not only to study or inform foreign audiences, but also to receive feedback. This type of non-traditional diplomacy includes cultural, educational, sports, media, scientific and other projects aimed at interacting not only with foreign elites, but also with society as a whole.

The urgency of this topic is due to the dynamic development of the modern system of international relations against the background of intensifying globalization processes. The implementation of this trend in the foreign policy of both the world's leading powers and small countries is gaining momentum and becoming common practice.

The public diplomacy of the Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway has become a shining example of success among the Nordic countries, which have managed to occupy their niche in this field of non-traditional diplomacy.

Thus, the article examines the peculiarities of the functioning of the institutions of public diplomacy of the Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway. In particular, a comparative analysis of models of public diplomacy of selected countries. Also, common and different strengths and weaknesses in the functioning of the institutions of public diplomacy of the Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway were identified.

It is concluded that the common features of both countries are the presence of clearly defined principles and strategies for the development of public diplomacy in specialized documents or in the overall foreign policy strategy as a whole. However, the Kingdom of Norway lacks the longevity of cultural institutions such as the Swedish Institute, while a number of agencies, foundations and departments with narrow functions have been identified. It has been established that the Kingdom of Norway takes a centralized corporate approach to the functioning of public diplomacy, and their model has a rather fragmented structure. Regarding the formation of a positive image of both countries, the common features are "eco-friendly" direction, tourism, respect for democratic values and freedoms, priority in the development of education, science and culture, intensive implementation of Web 2.0 Internet technologies as well as peacebuilding support. However, in some places the image of Norway loses to the image of Sweden in the absence of flagship projects or brands that can have a significant impact or evoke emotions in people abroad.

Key words: public diplomacy, Kingdom of Sweden, Kingdom of Norway, institutions, instruments, image policy, values.

Public diplomacy of the state is carried out through a system of institutions inside or outside the state. In addition to government bodies and government agencies specifically set up for public diplomacy, they include relatively independent, albeit state-affiliated organizations, as well as individual independent non-governmental actors.

At the highest level, the leadership in this area, as well as in foreign relations in general, belongs to the competence of parliaments and heads of state. However, the main tasks in the field of public diplomacy are assigned to the executive branch with the central role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry manages an extensive network of foreign affairs bodies, whose tasks include the implementation of various public diplomacy projects. Elements of public diplomacy are present in many events organized by Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Central foreign agencies usually act as coordinators, involving other ministries, special bodies accountable to various government agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Among other public authorities engaged in certain areas of public diplomacy, it is worth noting the Ministries of Culture (carrying out various cultural activities, including the representation of the country abroad – cultural diplomacy), the Ministry of Education (implementing educational and scientific exchange programs), the Ministry of Defense (most often in cases of implementation of reasonable power strategies), broadcasting authorities, information policy, etc [4].

Analyzing the characteristics of the formation and functioning of the institution of public diplomacy on the example of Sweden and Norway, we can identify their common features.

Swedish public diplomacy is developing within the framework of a concept that considers it as a component in the creation of a national brand. This type of diplomacy became popular in Sweden in the middle of the XX century. It should be noted that the concept of Swedish public diplomacy as a separate document does not exist, but the principles of public diplomacy are enshrined in the strategy papers of the Committee for the Promotion of Sweden Abroad, the Swedish Institute and the overall foreign policy strategy approved in 1995 creating an attractive image of the state. The latest strategy of the Committee for the Promotion of Sweden Abroad was approved in April 2017 [5].

Norwegian public diplomacy dates back to 1897 at the end of the XIX century. As you know, this country has not always been independent, so for a long time it was perceived as an "invisible" state among the Scandinavian countries. The Kingdom of Norway developed its latest strategy for the development of public diplomacy together with the London Center for Foreign Policy in the early 2000s. They also lack a normative document on the development of the principles of public diplomacy.

The Ministries of Foreign Affairs of both countries have played a key role in shaping the institution of public diplomacy.

Important institutions for the development of public diplomacy in Sweden include the Swedish Institute, which actively cooperates with Swedish embassies and consulates around the world or conducts its work through the Center for Swedish Studies. This public body is headed by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The main function of this institution is to disseminate information about Sweden in order to increase the attractiveness of the state in the world. In addition, the Swedish Institute was tasked with organizing international cooperation (primarily exchanges) in several areas: culture, education, science, entrepreneurship. In parallel with the Swedish Institute, since 2015 there is a Team Sweden Agency, focused on increasing the competitiveness of Swedish companies abroad, which is responsible for the information component.

An important feature of the Swedish model of public diplomacy is that not only officials but also entrepreneurs are directly involved in representing the country abroad.

More specific functions of the Swedish Institute are: administering visits to Sweden by foreign academic groups, overseeing bilateral student exchanges and organizing lectures by Swedish professors at foreign universities.

As you can see, the peculiarity of the Swedish Institute is that its charter fully allows for functional dualism: the organization works in both cultural and economic spheres.

The organizational structure of the Swedish Institute consists of four groups of bodies, divided by industry principle. The first group of bodies is engaged in building intercultural dialogue, external communications of the country. It also includes a branch of the Swedish Institute in Paris. The second group of bodies is responsible for the international programs of the Swedish Institute and includes departments of partnership and leadership programs, as well as academic mobility programs. The other two groups are responsible for technical and organizational support and are responsible for managing and allocating the budget.

Analyzing the structure of the Swedish Institute, it should be noted that from the very beginning of its activities, the organization was empowered to exercise a wide range of powers in various fields in order to provide public diplomacy with the widest arsenal of tools. Moreover, with the development of the Swedish Institute, the scope of these powers only expanded: if at the initial stage the organization was engaged only in the administration of state cultural projects abroad and publishing specialized literature on Swedish society for foreign audiences, then later the Institute began to carry out its own academic, cultural and economic projects with foreign countries. Thus, Sweden has taken into account the experience of similar organizations previously established in other countries such as the Goethe Institut, the Confucius Institute, the British Council, the Alliance Française and others [1].

Norway relies on a centralized corporate approach in coordinating its public diplomacy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in general, is the leading agency that coordinates what should be presented abroad as "Norwegian". At the highest level, the leadership in this area belongs to the competence of legislative, executive bodies and heads of state. In Norway, the head of state is King Harald V. The head of government since 2013 is Erna Solberg.

Compared to the Swedish model of public diplomacy, Norwegian looks rather structured and fragmented. The institutional dimension of Norwegian public diplomacy covers a number of ministries, departments, agencies and foundations in various areas of cooperation. In particular, these include: the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Department of European Affairs and Trade Policy; Department of Internal and External Services; United Nations Department of Peace and Humanitarian Policy; Promotion and Logging Department; Department of Internal and External Services; Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad); Norwegian Peace Corps; Norfund Investment Fund [2].

Some organizations that are subordinated directly to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is in particular Innovation Norway, established on 1 January 2004, which promotes Norway as an attractive tourist destination; is engaged in realization of innovative potential of Norwegian enterprises and industry; the rise of the competitiveness of Norwegian companies in domestic and international markets; development of relations between enterprises, professional communities and research institutes.

The second important organization is the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NOARAD), which is involved in the Norwegian International Initiative for Equality, Peace and the Environment. It has a wide network of contacts and mechanisms for cooperation with various Norwegian NGOs and research institutions operating internationally.

The Norfund Investment Fund helps developing countries to fight poverty, support economic growth, create jobs and transfer technologies. Investments are made on commercial terms

directly in companies or through local investment funds. Norfund makes strategic choices in favor of East and South Africa, Central America and Southeast Asia.

Equally important is the Norwegian Peace Corps, which conducts bilateral staff exchanges between Norwegian companies and organizations in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

As we can see, in Norway there is no classic prototype of a cultural institute like the Swedish one, but instead there are a number of agencies, foundations and departments with narrow functions in one area or another. Norway relies on a centralized corporate approach in coordinating its public diplomacy. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in general, coordinates what should be presented abroad as "Norwegian". It is also important to emphasize the humanitarian orientation of the Norwegian model of public diplomacy.

If we focus on the image policy of both countries, it should be noted that in Sweden there is a Council for the Promotion of Sweden Abroad. The ideological guidelines of Sweden's image abroad are that the country is associated with European values and European integration; with the development of industry and free trade; with peace; support for democratic values and freedoms, protection of the environment.

In the Kingdom of Norway, there is no special organization responsible for the country's image policy, but the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs entered a contract with the London Foreign Policy Center to develop a public diplomacy strategy for Norway. Thanks to this cooperation, a common platform of visions and values has been developed, around which a full-fledged image of Norway has been created. As a result of painstaking work, four images and value platforms were presented, around which an understanding of how to present Norway to the world should be formed: – humanitarian superpower / peacemaker; – a society that lives in peace with nature; – a society with a high level of equality; – an international society / a society full of adventure [3, p.16]. However, it is worth emphasizing the peacekeeping image of Norway, which hospitably agrees to act as a platform for discussion and resolution of misunderstandings between the conflicting parties. A striking example is the invitation of the delegations of Israel and Palestine to Oslo, which culminated in the signing of a peace agreement in 1993.

It is also important to note the Nordic Council of Ministers (1971), which is a joint inter-governmental consultative organization for both countries. Members of this organization are: Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Finland, Sweden. The Faroe Islands, Åland Islands and Greenland participate in the work of the Council. The aim of the Nordic Council of Ministers is to develop and strengthen regional cooperation and maintain contacts with central and local authorities. The Council conducts seminars, cultural events, coordinates scholarship programs and is involved in projects to study Scandinavian languages. Thanks to it, there is a cultural exchange and strengthening of ties within the region of Northern Europe, as well as a common instrument of influence of the Scandinavian countries in the world.

In the field of cultural diplomacy and academic cooperation, both countries equally bring their cultural values to the world, in particular in the field of cinema, art, education, gastronomy, tourism and international events on a global scale.

The common features of both countries in forming a positive image of the state abroad are "eco-friendly" direction, tourism, respect for democratic values and freedoms, diversity, peace and yet in some places the image of Norway loses the image of Sweden, which is more recognizable among foreign audiences. Also common in the field of public diplomacy of both countries is the lack of specialized legislation that would regulate this area of diplomatic activity and the use of the concept of "soft power".

The above analysis shows the success and example of the Swedish experience in this field. After all, the Kingdom of Sweden is a good example of a small Scandinavian state with actively

developed public diplomacy and a special approach to its implementation. The understanding of public diplomacy in Sweden is linked to the country's national branding to promote its own values, way of life and traditions of the country abroad. In this regard, the formation of the Swedish brand and the image of the country abroad thanks to a number of organizations and agencies can be considered as a successful project. Over the past seventy-five years, the country's image has experienced many ups and downs. If in the post-war period the vector of Swedish public diplomacy was aimed mainly at working with foreign press, covering the activities of Swedish politicians, as well as promoting the socio-economic model, then from the late 90's of the twentieth century to the present Swedish public diplomacy has shifted its focus to the peculiarities of cultural and social life, virtually avoiding the current political context. Thus, it can be argued that Swedish public diplomacy has become one of the most progressive in the world due to the rapid application of new concepts in practice, such as the concept of digital diplomacy 2.0.

As for the geographical coverage of the implementation of the principles of Swedish public diplomacy – it has become much wider. If in the 1940s the main recipients were the United States and Western Europe, Sweden is now promoting its national brand in almost every region of the world, while developing cooperation with geographically remoted countries such as China and South Africa.

It is also worth noting that the institutional structure of public diplomacy in Sweden has not changed critically: the Swedish Institute has been and remains the central body that ensures the implementation of public diplomacy programs. It is important to highlight more narrowly focused institutions dealing with economic cooperation (Team Sweden) or cultural issues (National Council of the Arts, Astrid Lindgren Foundation), as well as involving Swedish corporations in promoting the national brand – such as H&M, Ericsson, IKEA and others.

Summarizing the above mentioned, it should be noted that public diplomacy occupies a special place in Swedish foreign policy, as the issue of promoting a positive image of the state has become acute since the 40s of the twentieth century. The original goal of public diplomacy was to deprive Sweden of the negative effects of its policy of neutrality during World War II, and now its main goal is to make the country more visible in the international arena by promoting national characteristics and interests.

Thus, the strengths of Swedish public diplomacy are: convenient geographical location; membership in international organizations (UN, Nordic Council, EU); democratic style in decision making; the presence of successful international corporations that promote their products and services associated with Swedish quality and standards (IKEA, Flippa K, H&M, Spotify, Ericsson, COS); great cultural heritage (music, cinema, literature, design, fashion, cuisine); active academic mobility and cooperation, intensive implementation of Web 2.0 Internet technologies; attractive tourist infrastructure.

On the other hand, weaknesses include a weak migration policy, which has led to a large influx of immigrants from southern Europe and the Middle East, which affects the country's economic and social climate and, most importantly, blurs national identity; lack of a clear long-term strategy for the development of external relations.

Compared to the Swedish model of public diplomacy, Norwegian has more disadvantages, including:

– the lack of a comprehensive integrated strategy in foreign policy (Norwegian public diplomacy cannot maximize its influence in any area, in particular due to fundamentally different strategic approaches);

– fragmentation of institutions and budgets in the field of public diplomacy;

– lack of clear guidelines for staff or criteria for success and evaluation;

– lack of flagship projects that can have significant international impact or evoke emotions in people. (While Norwegian public diplomacy consists of a "scattered collection" of quality micro-projects, it will not be able to achieve significant influence on the world stage);

– lack of understanding of the criteria for evaluating and analyzing the strategies for the development of public diplomacy;

– lack of a systematic picture of Norway's perception of the world. Knowledge about Norway is surprisingly low. Norway is often confused with Sweden. It is difficult to describe Norway and "Norway" compared to "Scandinavia".

At the same time, the strengths of the Norwegian model of public diplomacy include:

– first, Norway's image as a peacemaker: UN peacekeeping missions include, active thinkers and practitioners who are at the forefront of the soft power debate with a keen understanding of global security; reliable partners, facilitators and mediators of peace negotiations.

– secondly, the ecological orientation of the country: innovative ideas for conservation and coexistence with nature, along with responsible economic development and use of resources.

– thirdly, strengthening cooperation with the countries of Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Central and Latin America, in particular by providing assistance to Norwegian organizations and with the support of international organizations to affected citizens of the above countries.

– fourth, priority in education, protection of women's rights, gender equality, promotion of democratic freedoms, etc.

– fifth, the rapid use of Internet technologies Web 2.0 in traditional and public diplomacy.

As we can see, the traditional strengths of the Norwegian model of public diplomacy are its transformation into a Norwegian identity in order to coexist harmoniously with the rest of the world.

Список використаної літератури

1. Зольнова М.Г. Общественная дипломатия Швеции. *Тренды и управление*. 2014. № 2. С. 137–146.
2. Трофименко М. В. Публічна дипломатія Королівства Норвегія. *Вісник Маріупольського державного університету Серія: Історія. Політологія*. 2017. Вип. 18. С. 381–388.
3. Batora J. Public Diplomacy in Small and Medium-Sized States: Norway and Canada /Jozef Batora. Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael", 2005. 16 p.
4. Pamment J. *New Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century: A comparative study of policy and practice*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 184 p.
5. Strategi för arbetet med Sverigebilden i utlandet – en vägledning. Sverige. – (April 2017). URL: <https://sharingsweden.se/app/uploads/2017/04/Strategi-2.0-f%C3%B6r-arbetet-med-Sverigebilden-i-utlandet.pdf> (дата звернення: 24.03.2022).

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКА ІНСТИТУТІВ ГРОМАДСЬКОЇ ДИПЛОМАТІЇ КОРОЛІВСТВА ШВЕЦІЇ ТА НОРВЕГІЇ

Ірина Климчук

*Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»,
Інститут гуманітарних та соціальних наук,
кафедра політології та міжнародних відносин
вул. Митрополита Андрея, 5, м. Львів, 79013, Україна*

Ірина Сухорольська

*Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»,
Інститут гуманітарних та соціальних наук,
кафедра політології та міжнародних відносин
вул. Митрополита Андрея, 5, м. Львів, 79013, Україна*

Громадська дипломатія сьогодні розглядається як один з важливих інструментів реалізації зовнішньополітичних цілей держави. Багато країн спрямовують свої зусилля на донесення власної повістки дня, формування привабливого іміджу, підвищення власної впізнаваності та прагнуть бути почутими і сприйнятими іноземною аудиторією за кордоном. Громадська дипломатія функціонує як реверсний механізм, суть якого полягає не лише у вивченні чи інформуванні зарубіжної аудиторії, а також у отриманні зворотнього зв'язку. Даний вид нетрадиційної дипломатії включає в себе культурні, освітні, спортивні, медійні, наукові та інші проекти, орієнтовані на взаємодію не лише з іноземною елітою, але й з суспільством в цілому.

Актуальність даної тематики зумовлена динамічним розвитком сучасної системи міжнародних відносин на тлі інтенсифікації глобалізаційних процесів. Втілення цієї тенденції у зовнішньополітичному курсі як провідних світових держав, так і малих країн набуває обертів та стає звичною практикою.

Громадська дипломатія Королівств Швеції та Норвегії стала яскравим прикладом успіху серед нордичних країн, які спромоглися зайняти свою нішу у даній сфері нетрадиційної дипломатії.

Таким чином у статті досліджено особливості функціонування інститутів громадської дипломатії Королівства Швеції та Норвегії. Зокрема здійснено порівняльний аналіз моделей громадської дипломатії обраних країн. Також, виявлено спільне та відмінне, сильні та слабкі сторони у функціонуванні інститутів громадської дипломатії Королівства Швеції та Норвегії.

Зроблено висновок, що спільними рисами обох країн є наявність чітко прописаних засад та стратегій з розвитку громадської дипломатії у спеціалізованих документах чи у загальній зовнішньополітичній стратегії в цілому. Втім, прослідковується відсутність у Королівства Норвегія тягlosti культурних інститутів на кшталт Шведського інституту, натомість виявлено ряд агенцій, фондів та департаментів з вузькими функціями. Встановлено, що у питанні функціонування громадської дипломатії Королівство Норвегія застосовує централізований корпоративний підхід, відповідно їхня модель має доволі подріблену структуру. Щодо формування позитивного іміджу обох держав спільними ознаками є «екофрендлі» напрямки, туризм, повага до демократичних цінностей та свобод, пріоритетність у розвитку освіти, науки та культури, застосування Інтернет технологій Web 2.0, а також миротворча підтримка. Втім, подекуди образ Норвегії програє образу Швеції відсутністю флагманських проектів чи брендів, які можуть мати значний вплив або викликати емоції у людей за кордоном.

Ключові слова: громадська дипломатія, Королівство Швеція, Королівство Норвегія, інститути, інструменти, іміджева політика, ціннісні орієнтири.