

3. SOFT POWER AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

3.1 EU Soft Power concept and its features

3.2 Cultural and educational attractiveness of Europe as a component of "soft power" of the EU

3.3 The main features of the EU Public Diplomacy

3.4 EU diplomatic structures implementing Public Diplomacy

3.5 EU Public Diplomacy after Lisbon

3.6 Main directions of the EU Public Diplomacy

3.7 Role of EU Delegations in Public Diplomacy

3.1 EU Soft Power concept and its features

The concept of "soft power" appeared at the end of the twentieth century in the United States in a changing world, values, the concept of power and the tools for its implementation. In general, the policy of the European Union is based precisely on the basis of the American concept of "soft power", which is viewed as a way to achieve the foreign policy goals of the state mainly through persuasion. The tools of "soft power" are embodied in culture, diplomacy and political values. Within this concept, the importance of military coercion, violence and pressure is reduced.

If it were necessary to fit the concept of "soft power" in just two words, then we can say that it is "the ability to attract". This expression fully shows the essence of "soft power". According to J. Nye, the concept of "soft power" is a derivative of the state's three resources: culture, political ideology and foreign policy.

Experts identify the following tools of "soft power": information flows; political PR, which is aimed at a foreign audience; global marketing; country position in the international hierarchy; language and its popularity in the world; public diplomacy; tourism and cultural exchanges; sport; educational exchange; ability to wage information wars; migration policy; national diasporas; dialogue of cultures.

The European Union has all conditions to develop the tools of "soft power" within its policy to achieve foreign policy goals. In the first place, the EU certainly has the very attractiveness. An example would be crowds of tourists who want to visit European countries, as well as the fact that, according to the public opinion of EU citizens, actively contributes to solving global problems such as international terrorism, poverty, unemployment, and human rights violations.

The European Union is perhaps the most successful "peaceful" structure in the history of mankind, thanks to which various conflicts and wars within the region were put an end. With each subsequent EU enlargement, the zone of peace and stability also expanded. This is one of the reasons why countries are so eager to join the EU. However, "soft power" does not always ensure the achievement of the desired results, as well as hard. But their combination, the so-called smart power, just can contribute to the implementation of foreign policy goals.

European approaches to understanding the “soft power” of the EU deserve special attention. Some European researchers propose to change the very “soft power” of Europe and replace it with something that is characteristic only for the EU as an integration unit with a unique supranational component. Thus the concept of “civilian power” of Europe appeared, which was formulated by Francois Duchêne and highlighted in 1998 in the journal *European Integration*. He asked the question, "why did the European integration idea, contrary to political events and unlike other regional integration ideas, remain and have continued in institutionalization?". Responding to this question, F. Duchêne noted that Europe proposes to replace the very measurement of force from military-technical criteria with civilian ones and assess the degree of influence of an actor of world politics not by the availability of military means, but by the presence of value-oriented and civilian influence. The importance of this issue lies, on the one hand, in Europe's growing international aspirations (especially in the economic and security fields), and on the other, in the diminishing legitimacy of American power.

F. Duchêne believed that the EU could become another superpower, relying not on military power, but on civilian force, which, in his opinion, should include economic elements, as well as the approval of such moral and legal norms as rule of law, market economy, democratic governance, human rights. But the important difference from the concept of soft power lies in the fact that the deductive concept of F. Duchêne was not widely supported. Of course, his concept has become in some way the forerunner of the concept of soft power, but we cannot talk about direct continuity.

Another European concept of non-force influence is “normative force”, which is a product of the realities of its time. It was formulated and used in a study of European integration processes by Ian Manners, a Danish expert on international relations. The essence of this concept is that the “normative force” is neither military nor economic, it comes from the generation of ideas, opinions and approaches, it forms ideas about the “right” things, concepts and phenomena.

In contrast to the approaches of “soft power” and “civilian power”, “normative power” does not offer an opposition to the military component of the state's foreign policy, because military power is the guarantor of compliance with the norms and rules. Such a departure from a clear separation between “military” and “civilian” power is characteristic of the liberal-idealistic paradigm, which implies an expansion of the number of actors in world politics due to the absence of state centrism, and also the rejection of world political processes exclusively in the antagonism of war and peace. This paradigm is most relevant to the object of study, due to the fact that the European Union is not a state entity, but claims the role of a political unit using military and non-military governance mechanisms.

A key element of the concept of the normative power of Europe was the assertion that the EU in international relations seeks to determine and establish the category of norm and normality based primarily on the law, as well as on a number of ethical norms relying on common humanity. Moreover, the rules are understood not only legal rules recorded in various documents. Legal regulations in the case of regulatory force are only the basis, the foundation for the promotion of normality

in the EU version in the economic, political, social, cultural and other spheres. The specific character of a number of these spheres is such that not all of them accept written, legally fixed norms. Nevertheless, the EU has succeeded in promoting its standards in a number of areas, primarily in the countries of the former Warsaw Pact organization. Thus, the signing of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe in 1990 marked a sharp increase in the promotion of European regulatory force. It was the analysis of the results of the spread of European normality in various fields that enabled Manners to inductively formulate the concept of the normative power of Europe.

The principal difference in the context of the emergence of the concept of the normative power of Europe from the context of the emergence of the concept of soft power is the importance not of the methodological discussions, but of the political and ideological consequences of the deepening of the European integration project undertaken by J. Delors after the multi-year stage of “euro sclerosis”. And it was the next round of integration, coupled with the clear prospect of EU expansion due to the collapse of the USSR and, as a result, the elimination of ATS, allowed European regulatory expansion, which, in turn, led to the emergence of the results of EU regulatory expansion in the post-communist space, and this allowed inductively come to the concept of the normative power of Europe.

In addition, for a number of reasons, primarily historical, as well as the peculiarities of the institutional structure of the EU, there was practically no component of what could be considered as a rigid or traditional force. Therefore, the emergence of the concept of normative force did not lead to the emergence of an opposition similar to the opposition “hard power - soft power”. The idea of Manners and his supporters turned out to be aimed at how to incorporate the small potential of the EU hard power into the concept of normative power. Thus, the idea of the absence of contradictions between military force and normative force in favor of the supremacy of the latter was designated. Moreover, the normative force allows the use of traditional, rigid force to the extent that the object of the action of force continues to understand the primacy of normativity. Thus, it is important that military pressure does not become an indispensable condition for the acceptability of European normality, since in this case the abnormality would promote itself, namely traditional military force or economic sanctions.

Also, unlike soft power, the concept of the normative power of Europe has never been understood simply as a tool. This concept formed the basis of the EU identity as an actor in international relations. According to T. Diez, the EU seeks to promote the norms that seem to be EU indisputable and universal so that it turned out to be possible to fix them legally, which was done in the Copenhagen Declaration on EU Identity, which was later many times significantly supplemented by a number of European Council statements. Moreover, the EU, like no other actor, seeks to sign with its foreign policy partners binding declarations of adherence to common values. And, as a rule, EU values become common values.

At the heart of such a commitment to EU standards are, above all, 1) a common market, 2) integration experience that allowed its creation, and 3) European law arising from them or the *acquis comunitar*. These three phenomena constitute the essence of the EU, therefore promoting them as normality, a set of norms determines the EU, and the EU practically cannot afford the instrumental use of normative force, since this would be detrimental to the EU itself. Nevertheless, the problem of the normative force of the EU is connected with the idea of its universality. So, if the European integration experience is really widely replicated around the world, including the European experience, the European common market lies at the heart of Eurasian integration, then the European common market with all its economic, social and other norms, as well as European law with its political and legal standards on Today remains the exclusive feature of the EU.

So, as was shown above, unlike soft power, normative power is inductive in nature, does not contribute to the formation of opposition of the kind “hard power - soft power”, is not a tool, but constitutes the core of the EU’s foreign policy identity. In addition, the normative power of Europe has a limited and clearly marked number of components or ways of implementation. These are: 1) persuasion and argumentation; 2) calling for normality; 3) the formation of an appropriate discursive order; 4) a demonstration of the EU and its policies as a model sample; 5) encouraging or giving prestige or discrediting. The use of these forms of regulatory impact in relation to certain actors is determined by EU institutions, carried out both by EU institutions and EU member states, their institutions, and non-state actors. It is natural that Manners himself clearly stated that the mode of influence of the normative power of Europe is discursive in nature and for it is fundamental to endow individual institutions both within the EU and member countries and outside the EU, in the international arena, to carry out a discourse on European normality and, accordingly, control this discourse.

An important difference from soft power is that the results of the influence of the normative force are the influence of the normative force, a derivative of it, the construct of a rational, formulated strategy that implies a clear, limited set of tools and a clearly defined mode of influence.

The diversity of concepts of non-force influence of actors of world politics suggests that there are no clearly defined approaches to determining the degree of non-military influence of non-state entities, such as the EU. The choice of the concept for studying the non-force influence of the EU comes from the need to study external or internal factors. According to T. Diez and I. Manners, the concept of “normative force” is suitable for studying internal political processes in the EU, studying social processes and the legal framework, while “soft power” is the external political tools of EU influence in the world.

The political determinant of European “soft power” is the dual nature of the problem at hand. On the one hand, European countries retain the status of nation-states, each of which can have its own potential of both “hard” and “soft” forces, on the other hand, by joining the European Union (EU), countries have confirmed their consent to integration over several directions, including economic and

cultural-humanitarian. The question of at what level of analysis (national or supranational) the actual European “soft power” manifests itself remains open.

As for the indicators of “soft power” of individual European states, here Europe has good chances to claim the leading position. The ratings of the use of the soft power factor by the leading countries of the world are compiled by several agencies at once - American, British, French, Russian. One of the reports “Global ranking of Soft Power”, published by the English Independent Institute for Government, presented the rating of countries of the world on the use of soft power tools (see Table 1).

Table 1

Rating of countries of the world by use soft power tools

№	Country	Coefficient
1	USA	7.41
2	Great Britain	6.78
3	France	6.21
4	Germany	6.15
5	Australia	5.64
6	Sweden	5.35
7	Japan	5.08
8	Switzerland	5.07
9	Canada	4.91
10	Netherlands	4.90

Source: Institute for Government. The New Persuaders. A Global Ranking of Soft Power. P. 15.

In general, for the EU, “soft power” is a very active and effective lever for expanding and deepening its own zones of influence. Today, the EU has a rather attractive tool of “soft power”, due to which it becomes desirable for many countries.

The soft power of the European Union is the strength of the attractiveness of its lifestyle, well-being, social and economic prosperity, the embodied social and legal state, the democratic structure of national and supranational policies, which attract all new countries and regions through its policy of expansion and good neighborliness, severe strength test. First of all, European soft power was defined as normative power (the term of Z. Ledi), which meant the universality of the norms and rules underlying the success of the union of European states and the attraction to this orbit of success of all new members ready to share with the Europeans , *acquis communautaires*.

3.2 Cultural and educational attractiveness of Europe as a component of "soft power" of the EU

The cultural identity of Europe has always been one of the factors of its uniqueness in world history. Economist and sociologist A. Weber (the brother of world-famous Max Weber) noted: “The European cultural spirit plays a

revolutionizing role - do we want to explain this with the rebellious impulses inherent in Faust, or, in fact, more severe conditions of becoming on the lands around the Rhine, on the bridge between the European south and north, east and west”.

In the twenty-first century the concept of cultural identity of individual European countries fades into the background. Firstly, the cultural diplomacy comes that European leaders are trying to conduct on behalf of the EU. According to the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs Federica Mogherini: “European culture is a common resource of EU foreign policy. It plays a key role in the development of the EU as an integration association and reflects European material and spiritual values. Investments in cultural diplomacy of the EU help to strengthen the economic position of Europe, as well as establish links with other regions of the world, help prevent radicalization”.

In 2016, the European Commission appealed to the European Parliament and the EU Council with a proposal to adopt the document “Directions of the EU Strategy on International Relations in the Field of Culture”. The new document aims to preserve the cultural diversity of Europe and consolidate efforts in the field of promoting conflict resolution. It outlines the main principles of cultural diplomacy of the EU: promoting cultural diversity and respect for human rights, developing mutual respect and intercultural dialogue with other countries, guaranteeing respect for all cultures, complementarity in decision-making in the field of culture, an integrated approach to cultural values. It is proposed to consider the European cultural potential, which is relayed externally, not as the potential of individual countries, but as the consolidated strength of the EU. The reason for changing the source of cultural diplomacy of the EU from the national level to the supranational was the failure of the idea of European multiculturalism and the migration crisis in Europe.

Past successes of multiculturalism in Europe in the twentieth century consisted of several factors: the geographical location of states, goals and objectives of foreign policy. However, even at that moment, European countries understood differently the goals of migration policy. Germany invited migrants exclusively for temporary work; it was not supposed to integrate them into German society. France, on the contrary, offered migrants various preferences, including the granting of French citizenship. But both Germany and France readily accepted on their territory migrants, mainly from Muslim countries, providing them with the necessary social conditions and work.

It is noted that the waves of migration passed through Europe throughout the twentieth century, constantly growing in parallel with the processes of globalization. It cannot be said that the policy of multiculturalism was a priori doomed to failure. It is likely that European politicians and researchers did not suggest that there is a fundamental possibility of crowding out traditional European culture because of the increasing influence of a new, immigrant culture spreading over a small territory of Europe very intensively. Why did this happen? Not because European culture turned out to be stronger or weaker than the cultures of other regions of the world - rather, because with each new wave of migration to

Europe, the visitors put less and less effort into integrating into European society. Demanding more rights, they often prefer to live a separate life, forgetting about the duties that all citizens of European countries must fulfill: work, comply with the laws of the host country. As a result, foreign cultures enclaves and large communities (diasporas) were formed in the territory of European countries. These communities have their own political agenda and seek to preserve their cultural heritage, rather than assimilate the European.

The most acute problem is Islamization of Europe. Until recently, European Muslims did not intervene in political processes in Europe, now most of them lobby their interests through existing political institutions, support left-wing parties that advocate for liberal migration policies and the expansion of a multicultural environment, which can have negative consequences. From the point of view of the theory of international relations, religious actors of world politics cannot passively observe this and draw strength from the changing global balance of confessions; they seek to politicize or, conversely, reduce the risk of existing interfaith differences. This is complicated by the fact that the number of Muslims in Europe is gradually increasing and the problems of multiculturalism are replaced by the problems of Islamization of Europe. Studies conducted by the Pew Research Center in 2015 showed that “if the current upward trend in the number of Muslims in Europe persists, then by 2050 the number of Muslims will be comparable to the number of Christians around the world”. In turn, Western culture is focused on continuous technical and technological development, on non-stop progress. This leads to the fact that there is another problem of the cultural attractiveness of Europe - the aging of the European population. The devastating consequences of this tendency are that Europe will generally stop producing products that attract the world community, the middle class of society, and finally lose its cultural attractiveness, and this will be followed by a decrease in tourist flows, which constitute a considerable part of the budget of European countries.

But the constant threat of the Islamization of Europe is the result of illiterate migration policies. The main problem of the policy of multiculturalism is the discord between the interests of the EU political establishment and the interests of European society as a whole. Political leaders tried to create an image of a prosperous Europe, attractive to the work force. But the migration process turned out to be difficult to control, which resulted in the consequences of the overpopulation of Europe by peoples of other cultural and religious affiliations. But the failure of multiculturalism did not force Europe to move to a more closed model of interaction with migrants: after the destabilization of the situation in the Middle East and North Africa, a new wave of migration crisis overtook Europe. In order to change the situation, it is necessary to change the image of the EU, to focus on compassion for refugees. On the one hand, it will justify the preservation of Germany's immigration policy on the admission of refugees on its territory, and on the other, it will make this policy all-European and will force the EU countries to accept the new waves of migrants on their territory.

Now, when the most developed European countries have to bear the brunt of migration problems, the idea of joining forces in this direction seems quite sensible

and can become quite an effective tool for “soft power” of the EU. In March 2016, Austrian Foreign Minister Sebastian Kurz proposed to make the migration issue an element of EU foreign policy. In an interview with Bild, he stated the need to create special centers to accommodate refugees outside the European Union under the direction of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees in Egypt, Georgia and in the west of the Balkans. If the proposed Austrian ministerial scenario is implemented, the EU, as in the case of Turkey, will offer countries monetary compensation for the maintenance of refugees in their territory. At the same time, Europe will retain the image of a guarantor of stability and security and will get rid of the undesirable consequences of an increase in the number of migrants.

In addition to the cultural aspects of “soft power,” the educational process is used as an effective component of this concept. For 2013, the World University Web Ranking news agency published a ranking of European Universities, where the first and second places were taken by English universities of the University of Cambridge and University of Oxford, respectively. Therefore, the face of European education is the UK, which no other European country has so far managed to overtake in the educational segment of “soft power”. This is evidenced by a study conducted by the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI), on the impact of European education on world processes. It was revealed that 55 leaders of 51 countries of the world received higher education in British higher educational institutions. And this, according to British researchers, is the main aspect of “soft power”. But this force is, above all, national in nature, and the views of graduates of British universities reflect the Anglo-Saxon vision of the world.

Against this background, it is necessary to create a pan-European educational element that would become part of the “soft power” of the EU. Today, several programs have taken over this function, such as Erasmus and Erasmus +. They are aimed at the exchange of students and teachers. In the early stages, the Erasmus and Erasmus + programs were aimed at the intra-European segment, but then began to spread to other regions of the world, mainly in the CIS, countries of Latin America and Asia. According to the programs, students and teachers from different countries come to European Universities and study for a certain period (from semester to several years). Funding for these programs is partially borne by EU institutions.

Another common aspect of cultural and educational policy, which is the “soft power” of the EU, is the funding by EU institutions of cultural centers for the spread of European culture in the world, promoting European cultural diversity. There are cultural exchanges that allow students from different regions of the world to be trained on a non-commercial basis. Of course, the European Union cannot yet finance the same number of students as, for example, the United States, but the indicators are increasing every year. The European Commission initiated the Culture 2000 framework program: “The total program budget is € 236.5 million. All European countries participated in the program”. This pan-European program is aimed at raising the image of the EU through cultural exchanges in the fields of art, literature, theater and music. It is designed to help expand intercultural dialogue. Another important common factor is the positioning of the European

Union as a mainstay of a conflict-free future, which is attractive from the point of view of the modern turbulent world.

In general, we can say that the “soft power” of the EU at the supranational level is only beginning to take shape. But we can already say that the cultural and educational components of attractiveness play a special role. Since the end of the twentieth century - beginning of the twenty-first century, Europe’s cultural identity has been seriously threatened with possible crowding out of world cultural diversity. Mistakes of multicultural policy have played a negative role in this process. In order not to lose cultural diversity, the EU had to embark on a consolidation of efforts to disseminate cultural values and make them an element of “soft power”. This is confirmed by educational programs under the auspices of EU institutions, and the financing of cultural projects by institutions. The new legal acts adopted in the EU indicate the readiness of EU member states to delegate part of their “cultural sovereignty” to supranational bodies. At the same time, there is an obvious tendency that the greater the potential of “soft power” in a European state, the less it is interested in transferring the potential of “soft power” to the Brussels bureaucracy. For example, the UK does not support some EU initiatives in this direction. But the loss of the British potential of “soft power”, including due to Brexit, will negatively affect the European indicators of “soft power”. However, the potential of European “soft power” at the institutional level has good prospects for strengthening in the future.

3.3 The main features of the EU Public Diplomacy

The public diplomacy of the European Union is one of the main components of its diplomatic activities: “Public diplomacy consists in influencing the position of the public. It aims to promote the interests of the EU, seeking their understanding, by informing. A clear explanation of the goals, policies and activities of the EU is required, and an understanding of its goals is achieved through dialogue with citizens, groups, institutions and the media».

The EU public diplomacy differs in a number of ways from the public diplomacy of the foreign affairs agencies of the EU countries. Indeed, the historically integrated public diplomacy was mainly aimed at the “internal” audience, at the formation of the so-called European identity, and the EU’s value orientations were addressed to the Europeans. Consequently, in the process of establishing European institutions, attention was paid, first and foremost, to citizens of European countries.

Over time, especially as a result of the information revolution and the ability of any member of the world community to access official EU information, it became increasingly difficult to distinguish between internal and external aspects of politics. Therefore, in expert assessments, the term intermestic more often sounds, i.e. a policy that combines both internal and external aspects. This is also reflected in the nature of public diplomacy.

In the post-bipolar period, the conductors of EU public diplomacy aimed at countries that are not members of the Union have made the propaganda of the development patterns of European integration as an example to follow, a leitmotif

of their activities. In Lisbon, they stressed the need to emphasize the inherent desire of member countries to resolve conflict situations peacefully, to celebrate their living standards, and to emphasize the necessity of recognizing "human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights". It was necessary to show how the EU's policy contributes to the improvement of people's lives, the creation of new jobs and development, and what contribution it makes to solving global problems of peace and security, as well as problems related to climate change and ensuring sustainable growth.

There are five priorities in the EU-based public diplomacy based on common values:

- 1) promoting the image of the EU as the main partner in democratic transit, especially in the EU's neighboring countries;
- 2) promoting the image of the EU as the most important donor in the field of cooperation and development;
- 3) promoting the image of the EU as a global economic association, finding answers to the challenges of the crisis and using trade as a means of change;
- 4) promoting human rights through high-level dialogue with EU partners and strategic cooperation, including lobbying for the abolition of the death penalty;
- 5) promoting the image of the EU as a security guard responding to global threats.

It was assumed that greater consistency, efficiency and visibility in the external activities of the EU will help increase the level of public diplomacy of this integration association. On behalf of the European Commission, the definition of public diplomacy of the European Union as an instrument of projection of the EU image was repeatedly clarified: "Public diplomacy aims to promote the interests of the EU by achieving understanding, information and influence. That is, its task is to clarify the objectives, policies and activities of the EU. Understanding of this is achieved through dialogue with every citizen, group of citizens and with the media". At the same time, special importance was constantly attached to the complex of norms, rules, laws and obligations that the candidate country is called upon to integrate into its legal, economic and political system (the so-called *acquis communautaires*).

The concept of the transformational (transformation) nature of EU public diplomacy with a focus on promoting European values is currently being promoted. All this distinguishes EU diplomacy from traditional diplomacy, whose conductors put at the center of the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, as indicated in Art. 41 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. In this regard, it is possible to draw a conclusion on the rapprochement of European diplomacy with US diplomacy, which for the first time adopted the principles of transformational diplomacy.

According to the leaders of all-European diplomacy, it should have the special character of "quiet diplomacy" (quiet diplomacy), which implies such a line of diplomatic activity, which, unlike open diplomacy, confesses confidentiality, but is not a secret diplomacy. Silent diplomacy does not appeal to world public opinion in order to exert pressure on the conflicting parties, its task is to create conditions

under which the parties can calmly assess the situation, weigh all the pros and cons of any actions, listen to independent and impartial opinion . It is believed that the EU delegation, multicultural in composition and not pursuing a particular national interest, is an ideal tool for such diplomacy, capable of preventing conflicts and unleashing Gordian knots of politics.

A significant step towards improving the institutions of the Community's foreign policy activities was the provision of the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) on the creation of a new post of High Representative on CFSP; The powers and budget of the High Representative were significantly expanded in 2009, thanks to the combination of this post with the post of Vice-President of the European Commission.

3.4 EU diplomatic structures implementing Public Diplomacy

The Treaty of Lisbon, which entered into force on 1 December 2009, also provided for the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS) as a kind of ministry of foreign affairs of the European Union in its relations with the outside world. The service is headed by the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign and Security Policy. The Service does not have a special department for public diplomacy, but its activities in this area are coordinated by the Foreign Policy Instruments division. The decision to create a unit was made by the Commission in 2010. Public diplomacy is the responsibility of this unit, which, using audiovisual media, Internet sites, printed materials, as well as through other means of communication and information initiatives, implements it. The High Representative's competence also includes election observation missions as a European instrument for democracy and human rights. The Strategic Communication Division is also engaged in public diplomacy.

A certain role in public diplomacy is played by twelve EU Special Representatives operating in crisis regions. True, they are appointed by the Committee on Political and Security Issues and are not employees of the EEAS.

Experts note that before Lisbon, public diplomacy of the European Union was very fragmented. Basically, foreign policy and security policy were concentrated in the framework of the second "pillar". Its conductors were, first of all, the Secretariat of the Council represented by the High Representative on CFSP, its employees and the General Directorate for Communication, Information Policy and Protocol. The Commission was also involved in foreign policy, and coordination between the High Representative's office and the Commission was clearly insufficient.

The content of public diplomacy, carried out by the Commission, became mainly outreach work aimed at citizens of both the EU and the whole world. To this end, as early as the 1960s, a network of EU Information Centers was established, operating in accordance with instructions received from the General Directorate for External Relations. More than 500 such centers were established in different countries of the world, and there could be several such centers in the EU's strategic partner country. Public diplomacy was coordinated by the Information Committee. He met once a month, and was attended by representatives of the

general directorates of development, trade, aid, humanitarian aid, EU enlargement, the press, the economy and finance. An important component of the Information Committee was to ensure that the policy of the Commission as a supranational institution was pursued within the framework of public diplomacy. Difficulties arose in coordinating the actions of the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. Another obstacle to the development of public diplomacy became the resources available to the Commission. The commissioners focused on politics within the Union, while the Common Foreign and Security Policy received very limited funding. Given that in the EU every state has the right to an independent foreign policy and diplomacy, certain tensions arise in making joint decisions. European foreign policy actors (foreign ministers, diplomats) play a dual role, being, on the one hand, national actors, and on the other - acting as agents of the Common Foreign and Security Policy.

In an effort to preserve national foreign policy priorities, EU members tried to enlist support in the EU's rotating presidency or directly request such support from the High Representative for the Action and Security Policy. At times, this situation created additional problems. Experts lamented the lack of a strategic vision of the priorities of the EU foreign policy, which included the fight against terrorism, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, problems of sustainable development. The difficulty lay in the fact that the conductors of public diplomacy of the European Union in a dialogue with third countries focused on the values of the EU and its regulatory principles. As a result, in the EU's relations with most Asian countries and with Russia, discrepancies in interpretations of values and principles became an obstacle to the desire of many EU member states to develop cooperation, in particular, to ensure the supply of energy raw materials from these regions.

3.5 EU Public Diplomacy after Lisbon

With the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon, public diplomacy was no longer the prerogative of the Council or the Commission. With the advent of a permanent EU president and the acquisition of a legal entity by the EU, the national interests of the chairing country changing every six months were not put more into the foreground and therefore hopes arose for a more consistent EU foreign policy.

In this context, the European External Action Service (EEAS), established by Lisbon, has become a significant foreign policy structure of the EU, carrying out public diplomacy. Officially responsible for public diplomacy is the High Representative for European Union Foreign and Security Policy, who heads the EEAS. In the framework of the EEAS, it was decided to establish a special Department for Information and Public Diplomacy. It was emphasized that the EEAS is designed primarily to provide professional, strong and meaningful activities of round-the-clock media as a link in interaction with stakeholders and public opinion. The service should establish a dialogue with civil society, non-governmental organizations, and other non-state actors. In the early 2010s, the EEAS, having completed the process of formation, began to act actively. Only in

2011, the High Representative and the Service itself made 593 statements on many issues of foreign policy and diplomacy.

Public diplomacy has also become one of the areas of the Foreign Policy Instruments division established under the EEAS in 2010. This unit is in the statement of the High Representative, the Commission is responsible for the financial side of the issue. The European election campaign for democracy and human rights is responsible for election observation missions. 12 EU Special Representatives are also engaged in public diplomacy, some of whom live in their countries of origin, the rest are in Brussels. Their task is to liaise with member countries, and they operate within the framework of the Committee on Political and Security Issues. Such fragmentation, according to observers, does not contribute to the effectiveness of actions on public diplomacy.

Public diplomacy aimed at domestic consumption is carried out by the General Directorate of Communication. The EEAS External Relations Information Committee coordinates them under the authority of the EEAS Strategic Communication Unit. Its task is to supply all heads of EU missions, the press and officials involved in information with relevant daily instructions.

3.6 Main directions of the EU Public Diplomacy

Public diplomacy offered external actors certain models-symbols to testify to the attractiveness of the EU, for example, the “unity in diversity” brand was very successful, emphasizing the possibility for member states to pursue a common policy, while maintaining their identity enriched by culture, language and traditions. With regard to countries wishing to join the EU, diplomats aggressively promoted the idea of “more for more”, which meant: who will undertake more decisive political reforms, i.e. democratization, will ensure the protection of human rights and reform the judicial system, and will receive great help and recognition from the European Union. A slogan testifying to the EU’s ability to provide “money, markets and mobility” has also become popular. A positive response was received by the initiative “Acting with women”. The International Day for the Prohibition of Violence against Women, or the International Women's Day on March 8, was widely celebrated on websites, conferences, polls, cultural events. Significantly contributed to improving the image of the EU awarding him the Nobel Peace Prize (2012) "for the role played by the EU in preventing wars between European countries, for promoting democracy and human rights".

Successfully projects the image of the European Union its diplomatic protocol. A third country’s foreign ministry (i.e. not a member of the EU), establishing diplomatic relations with the European Union or changing its ambassador, sends to the protocol service of the European Commission (directly or through its representation at the EU) a request for an agrément (in the form of a note verbale to which non-titled paper is attached (ambassador’s curriculum vitae). As a rule, it takes about two months to respond, and it may take even longer to leave, since the ambassador’s candidacy must be approved by the European Commission, the Council of the European Union and the governments of the member states. When this procedure is successfully completed, the result of the

MFA of the accrediting country shall be notified by note verbal. On this occasion, the General Secretariat of the Council of the EU usually distributes a press release.

In anticipation of the ambassador, the Commission's protocol service appeals to the Belgian Foreign Ministry with a request to grant privileges and immunities to the ambassador and notify the customs and border guards. The details of the ceremony emphasize the dual nature of integration, which is being built at the same time both at the interstate and at the supranational level. The third-country ambassador accredited to the EU, arriving in Brussels for the first time, carries with him not one, as is customary in world diplomacy, but two credentials. Upon arrival of the ambassador, copies of them are transferred to the protocol department of the European Commission for the presentation of certificates. Thus, one credential is intended for the President of the European Council as the head of the institution building its activities on the basis of interstate coordination, the other is for the Chairman of the EU Commission, the supranational institution. Similarly, in both cases, revocation letters of the previous head of the mission are handed over. Before the final departure from Brussels, the ambassador sends farewell letters to both the head of the European Council and the head of the Commission.

The direct transfer of information to various countries of the world and the establishment of necessary contacts with their leaders and the public is carried out primarily in one of the most numerous diplomatic corps of the world - in the diplomatic corps under the EU in Brussels. There are accredited 164 missions and representative offices, 36 international organizations and a number of other actors.

The symbolic message that focuses on the Christian roots of European civilization is that the doyen of the diplomatic corps under the EU invariably becomes the papal nuncio.

His deputy is the ambassador, who assumed his duties earlier than other ambassadors to the EU. The importance of integration diplomacy is also expressed in emphasizing the seniority of the EU ambassadors, when at a reception organized by a member of the EU diplomatic corps, the ambassadors accredited to the EU have seniority in relation to the heads of other missions.

The EU Protocol pays tribute to memorable dates of a pan-European and national character. According to a well-established custom, a diplomatic mission accredited to the EU, on European Day, on May 9, hangs its national flag on the mission building, and optionally, on the residence building of the head of mission. Missions in Brussels hang out their flag also on Belgium Day on July 21 and on the Day of the Royal Dynasty of Belgium on November 15.

Special attention is paid today to digital public diplomacy. The EEAS recognized the growing role of the media and registered on social media as an organization. The EEAS Guide encourages delegations to be active on the Internet. It is recommended to go online in the language of the host country.

It is believed that this will provide them with great opportunities in carrying out communication strategies in relation to a particular population group. Diplomats say: "If we strive for the successful outcome of our efforts to provide an understanding of our public life and our policies to the population of other

countries, we must understand the culture, history and psychology of the people with whom we want to communicate”.

In countries where the Internet is widespread, heads of delegations rely on electronic communication, minimizing the distribution of printed materials or discarding them entirely. This allows you to constantly and quickly update information on the websites of embassies and the European Union. In addition, digital diplomacy makes it possible to practice multi-level diplomacy and directly address citizens in real time, bypassing government channels. Through networks, links are established with people who form public opinion, with influential bloggers, journalists and representatives of civil society. It is obvious, however, that the often limited amount of information supplied to social networks does not allow for a comprehensive analysis of complex and difficult problems to be solved and to start a fruitful dialogue.

Often the terms public diplomacy and cultural diplomacy are interchangeable. Thus, culture is undoubtedly an important component of public diplomacy. Cultural associations and organizations of cooperation are the most important partners in the implementation of the diplomacy of “soft power”. The EU declarations emphasize readiness for dialogue with civil society within the framework of Friendship Associations, NGOs, trade unions, etc. It is noted that dialogue with those who disagree with EU policies is absolutely necessary, for example, when discussing trade agreements concluded by the Union. The European Parliament is actively engaged in the promotion of public diplomacy in the field of culture, seeks to “increase interest in European values”.

In 2016, the Commission approved a new “EU Strategy for the Development of International Cultural Relations”. Its developers note the role of culture as a valuable resource, contributing to overcoming emerging challenges, for example, resolving the problems of integrating refugees and migrants, fighting radicalization of violence, protecting cultural heritage. In order to successfully implement the provisions of this Strategy, it is proposed to support culture as an engine of social and economic development. Culture is seen as the central element of a new creative economy, innovation, computerization and access to knowledge. The cultural and creative industry represents 3% of global GDP and provides 30 million jobs, of which 7 million in EU countries.

The Strategy pays special attention to intercultural dialogue, including interreligious dialogue, as a key way to create peace-loving and inclusive societies that preserve the value of cultural differences and respect human rights. The dialogue is intended to be carried out through the cooperation of cultural associations, youth and student exchanges, exchange of scientists, researchers and teachers. The preservation of cultural heritage will contribute to the expansion of tourism and will be a major support for economic growth.

The Commission undertakes to undertake a legislative initiative aimed at regulating the import of cultural goods in the EU. She also suggests that the European Parliament and the EU Council should turn 2018 into the Year of Cultural Heritage. The main thing that should be done is to ensure the synergy of the main actors of cultural policy, i.e. government organizations, cultural

associations, civil society. In this context, a special role belongs to the EEAS and the EU delegations, which have already gained experience in holding a significant number of cultural events in their host countries. They should further promote cooperation between cultural institutions, foundations, private and public enterprises.

The Platform for Cultural Diplomacy, proposed in February 2016, is designed for strategic partners and is implemented jointly by the Consortium of Cultural Institutions of the EU countries. The task of the Consortium is to advise the European Commission and the EEAS on cultural policy issues, develop network cooperation, interact with stakeholders in the field of culture and deploy training for cultural workers.

A specific example in this area was a pilot project for creating a network of young entrepreneurs in the field of culture. The creative European program, the main instrument for financing culture, is open to neighbors and candidate countries for EU membership. Prepared by the Commission Program 2014-2020 designed for a group of African and Caribbean and Pacific Basin countries, represented by the Ambassadors' Committee of these countries. It aims to support the contribution of the cultural industry to socio-economic development. An initiative of intercultural dialogue between local authorities, funded by the EU Cooperation Development Tool, is being developed.

The EU also declares support for the Anna Lindh Foundation and the "Voices of the Arab Youth" program aimed at countering extremism and radicalization of violence. The implementation of the second stage of the Cultural Program in relation to the creative groups of the humanitarian, social and economic development of the Eastern Partnership countries continues. A draft Strategy for the Development of Historic Cities, including the cities of Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine, has been developed. Currently, the possibility of cultural cooperation with Iran, the opening of the House of European Culture in Tehran is being studied, a similar project is being prepared for Ukraine. Delegations are seen as the main conductor of cultural policy outside the EU.

Undoubtedly, media diplomacy, including the concept of propaganda, has become part of EU public diplomacy. The media bring new moments to the diplomatic process. Public opinion is becoming more aware of the speed of information transfer. Diplomats can greatly benefit from the fact that the media has a lightning impact on public opinion, which allows it to use its potential to achieve its goals. The European External Action Service considers it its top priority to work with the international press accredited in the capital of Belgium. An example of such interaction is the discussion that took place in 2016 with the participation of members of the European Parliament and officials of the European External Action Service. Representatives of the press were invited to the event. It was about the French military operations in Mali and the problems of the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU. The discussion was covered in the press of EU countries, as well as in the mass media of other countries.

Currently, all significant European conferences, summits, forums, as a rule, immediately acquaint world public opinion with information on the progress of

work posted on the respective websites. However, in the conditions of continuous improvement of information technologies that ensure real-time communication on a global scale, public opinion can be deliberately misled. For diplomats, there is also the danger that mass media can push aside professional diplomatic institutions and replace traditional diplomatic channels of communication, all of which threaten to significantly complicate diplomatic relations.

Following the media, foreign policy is deprived of the possibility of an innovation course; it, as a rule, will limit itself to a reaction to incoming messages. It is also indisputable that at times the public diplomacy of the EU, politicizing its propaganda, resorts to stereotypes in the popular consciousness. Sarcastically, these stereotypes are ridiculed by Bulgarian artist Janko Tsvetkov living in London. The "maps of Europe» had drawn by him fix the current perception by Europeans of this or that country. Thus, Russia is depicted as a solid gray territory, over which Gazprom hangs.

The EEAS operates in close coordination with the foreign policy actors of the member countries. The projection of the EU image is carried out both in a passive way (through websites, blogs or publications of various materials and research results), and actively (during visits of EU officials to countries of the world or EU embassies in these countries).

Given the increased role of non-governmental organizations in international politics, the EEAS attaches great importance to the synchronization of its public diplomacy with that of NGOs. This greatly increases the effectiveness of EU diplomacy. Such interaction in the research literature is called "diplomacy-catalyst".

At times, public diplomacy pursued by the EU and public diplomacy of member countries pursues different goals. EU officials often show dissatisfaction with the coverage of their actions by the press of EU Member States. So, Margot Valström, when she was vice-president of the European Commission, complained that "national governments like to emphasize the credibility of the EU policy, which has a positive response from citizens, but when it comes to unpopular measures, they blame Brussels for everything". Public diplomacy of EU Member States, as a number of experts believe, is more often aimed at promoting the image of their own country, while EU policy is left out of the bracket.

Many observers believe that the effectiveness of integration diplomacy is declining due to the fact that European foreign policy actors are in an ambivalent position. After all, foreign ministers and diplomats under them are by their very nature national actors. However, for a limited time, they act as actors in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). In fact, diplomats and third-country politicians cannot always clearly imagine the difference between the role of a minister as a representative of his state and his role as a representative of EU interests.

Delegations are also called upon to support and protect the activities of national broadcasts that have access to a wide world audience, such as BBC, French International Radio, Deutsche Welle. In the framework of the WTO, EU

countries are facing the requirement to liberalize the cultural property market. It is in their interest to coordinate the activities of European countries in this direction.

The EU's public diplomacy should for some reason use a forgotten radio, the broadcasts of which can reach even more people than the Internet. For a significant number of people in sub-Saharan Africa and its other regions, radio is still the main media outlet. Delegations can participate in creating programs in the local language with the help of local hired personnel, and this will not be expensive.

3.7 Role of EU Delegations in Public Diplomacy

The network of EU offices far exceeds the network of bilateral embassies of the majority of EU members. Today, the EU delegations (139 delegations³¹) are accredited with heads of state and international organizations, in particular with the UN, WTO and OSCE. In New York, the representation of the European Commission to the UN was established back in 1964. After Lisbon, the status of this representation has been greatly enhanced. Previously, in the General Assembly, the European Union was represented in turn by those countries that every six months headed the European Council. Today, representation is carried out by the President of the European Council and the EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The delegation in Vienna represents the EU at the UN, with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and with other international organizations residing in the capital of Austria. In the past few years, the network of EU delegations has been expanded to Malaysia, Singapore, Saudi Arabia, Cambodia, Laos, Nepal, Paraguay and Taiwan. Thus, an ever-expanding network of diplomatic structures is established, which are closed in Brussels. In general, more than 700 EU diplomats and functionaries and about 1,600 local contract workers are employed in EU offices.

The importance of integration diplomacy is also emphasized by changing the status of a third country mission to the EU to a higher status of the embassy if the country becomes a member of the Union. All this, of course, turns the EU into a rather privileged actor of international relations, and his delegation into an active conductor of public diplomacy.

Common European offices appeared more than half a century ago. A start was made by the opening of representative offices of the European Coal and Steel Community (EOC). In the USA, an information bureau first appeared, which published the bulletin "Our goal is the federal government of Europe", in 1954 the bureau turned into a representative office. In 1972, the delegation of the Commission became the first representation of the European Communities in the United States. It was accredited in Washington and, in accordance with the law adopted by Congress, acquired full diplomatic status. Uniting Europe practiced passive diplomacy. In 1952, an English liaison office was opened at the ECSC, and the United States soon established a representative office. In 1956, the British Embassy received accreditation in Brussels.

The first EU representations were actually small offices; they did not represent the entire Community, but rather only one of the departments of the Commission that dealt with external relations. The turning point came in 1973 in

connection with the accession of Great Britain to the EU and the signing in 1975 of the Lomé Convention with forty-six developing countries. In this Convention, the EU representative is called the head of the delegation, and his appointment and accreditation occur in accordance with generally accepted diplomatic procedures. By 1980, there were fifty delegations in the world with the functions of a diplomatic mission. In the subsequent period, an average of five new European representative offices opened each year. By the early 1990s, in eighty delegations, the number of diplomatic staff reached 440 staff, and there were almost 1,500 local contract workers.

The task of the delegations is defined as “participation in the conduct of a common foreign and security policy and involvement in the decision-making process on these issues, the implementation of public diplomacy, information gathering and preparation of analytical reports, and close cooperation with the embassies of EU member states”.

Heads of delegations can take part in meetings of the Council on Foreign Policy and relevant parliamentary committees, as well as facilitate the work of the President of the European Council. When appointing a new ambassador, special attention is paid to his ability to reach consensus in resolving controversial issues, his flexibility and ability to work in a multicultural environment, to be a successful mediator in resolving conflicts. He should show these qualities, first of all, in the conditions of arising interstate or inter-ethnic conflicts. Along with this, since the delegation includes both European officials and EU-seconded diplomats, the ambassador’s task is to smooth out objective contradictions and find mutually acceptable solutions within the delegation itself.

Among the tasks of the delegation, the need for cooperation to promote the development of relations and building a partnership based on common principles is highlighted. The public diplomacy of the delegation in Vienna, which helps to establish contacts and exchange information, is aimed at “achieving greater understanding from international organizations of EU policies and values and their role in the global arena, its firm adherence to the provisions of the UN Charter and respect for international law”.

For public diplomacy it is very important that the delegations now represent the European Union, and not the Commission, as it was before Lisbon. On behalf of the European Union, the implementation of information campaigns in relation to third countries takes place and the EU in the World program is launched. This involves sending invitations to visit the EU, distributing foreign policy publications, audio and video materials, developing online media, and supporting journalists who influence public opinion. Local delegations also organize cultural events, media relations, and information campaigns. Currently, about 15 million euro are allocated annually for this activity. About 10% of these funds are sold within the EU.

The Strategic Communication Unit of the EEAS daily sends to the heads of the delegations and their press attaché instructions. In 2012, the EEAS jointly with the General Directorate of the Commission on Communication issued a Guide on Information and Communication to delegations. Delegations are required to focus

on five priority areas reflecting European values and the pursuit of peace, security and prosperity. It is about nominating the EU for the role of the main partner in promoting democracy; underlining the role of the EU as the largest donor for cooperation and development programs; representation of the EU as a powerful economic actor, using the development of trade relations as an instrument of change; promoting human rights through high-level political dialogue; the EU as an indispensable actor responding to global security challenges.

Delegations are also required to develop a public diplomacy strategy in conjunction with representations of EU member states. Sometimes it is very successful, as, for example, in Brazil or Mexico. On the contrary, criticism is heard from Brussels about the situation in North Africa, where “only EU delegations are engaged in the promotion of democracy and human rights, while national representations pursue their own interests”.

After Lisbon, the General Security and Defense Policy (JSA) is included in the framework of public diplomacy, which was not previously covered by the EEAS. The need to coordinate their speeches necessitated the creation of a “Handbook for UIAS Officials” involved in delegations. The tasks of the heads of delegations in the field of public diplomacy have also become complicated due to the need to devote a lot of time to the financial management implemented in their responsibilities, which is also happening in individual EU member states.

It is obvious that the tasks of public diplomacy carried out by delegations vary considerably from country to country. The website of the EU delegation in Washington states: “The mission of public diplomacy is a key priority, since the partnership between the EU and the US is of strategic importance. Interaction at all levels of our societies is important for maintaining the foundations of our relations and for the ever increasing productivity of our partnership. It is important that we learn more about each other, about how our political, economic and social systems function and how we make decisions that allow us to go towards a common goal. ”

The proposed programs include work with young people, joint activities with embassies and consulates of EU member states, and the media. The program “Rendezvous” received a big response, during which the leaders of the EU and the USA discuss complex issues of transatlantic relations. On Europe Day, ambassadors and consuls of EU countries travel around the United States, explaining the problems facing the EU, the political line and issues concerning both parties. During the celebration of Victory Day on May 9, all embassies of EU member states hold open doors, which are attended by tens of thousands of Americans. The EU also opened a dozen Centers in well-known American universities. In 2010, the European Parliament established a liaison office in Washington aimed at strengthening ties at all levels with US congressmen and expanding the transatlantic policy dialogue.

The EU delegation in Moscow has a press and information department, in Tokyo - the press, cultural and public relations, in Beijing - the press and information. Delegations from the department of strategic communication deliver daily instructions to the delegation, including information from the Commission. At the end of important meetings, such as the Council, the heads of delegations

will be informed by telephone about the main results, especially if they were talking about their host country or the region. Audio and video materials and notices about upcoming events come from Brussels.

This is of particular importance for delegations located near conflict zones or in countries emerging from crisis. It is there that the tasks of the European missions, their goals and the duration of their stay should be particularly clarified. In these cases, the members of the delegation are called upon to establish contacts with significant heads of civil or military missions in the region, and the special representative is to bear a significant part of the burden of public diplomacy. The challenge for the delegation is not only financial or human resources, but also the ability to conduct consistent public diplomacy aimed at a specific country or region, but also maintaining consistency for the EU as a whole. In the host country, it is necessary to identify significant interlocutors, which is obvious when it comes to government or other official contacts, but less obvious if it is contacts with civil society. Introduction of outsourcing to design a “unified campaign” (this was the case in Indonesia and Brunei). The risk in this case is that branding and public relations, which may be part of public diplomacy, will distract from what should be the essence of public diplomacy, i.e. from building and maintaining long-term relationships.

EU delegations should work closely with the diplomatic services of the member states. At the same time, from 2010 it was assumed that the EEAS staff would perform their work solely on the basis of the interests of the EU; they should not request or receive instructions from national governments, authorities, organizations or individuals, with the exception of the High Representative.

Co-ordination of the public diplomacy of the member states and the EU itself is a serious problem, since it is hardly possible at the present time to ensure that they “speak with one voice”. The emphasis is on the assumption of “unity in diversity” and on behalf of the EU joint statements are made only with the unanimous approval of all members. The EU also seeks to ensure that its application is joined by EU candidate countries (for example, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania), the EFTA countries (Liechtenstein, Norway, Iceland).

In recent years, 174 diplomats were assigned to work in delegations by governments of member countries, which accounted for 46.3% of the total diplomatic staff of the EU missions. As a rule, diplomats stay on this job for four to eight years and then return to their ministries and departments. In general, within the framework of the staffing of the EEAS, the national staff is 32.9% 37. The opinion was repeatedly expressed that the tasks of public diplomacy by complexity exceed the goals of a more classical direction of diplomatic activity. That is why the EU has long discussed the issue of establishing its own Diplomatic Academy to train diplomats solely for work in EEAS and delegations.

Control questions and tasks for self-control:

1. What tools of soft power experts emit?
2. What is the European approach to understanding “soft power”?
3. What are the main priorities and directions of EU public diplomacy?

4. What is the principle of "quiet diplomacy" of the EU?
5. Which diplomatic bodies implemented public diplomacy of the EU?
6. What changes in the implementation of public diplomacy made the Lisbon Treaty?
7. What role do EU representations play in the implementation of public diplomacy?