УДК 327.162
THE IMPORTANCE OF "SOFT POWER" IN BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY

Nurzhakypov Yerzhan Yerlanovich
yerzhan.nurzhakypov@gmail.com
2-d year master's student, Faculty of International relations,
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – G. Kakenova

The notion of "soft power" has proven to be popular not just in the United States, but also in many other countries. The United Kingdom is no exception. The phrase "soft power" is now commonly used by British politicians, appearing in government papers, parliament, scientific and professional communities, and the media. As a result, the recently released 2015 National Security Strategy and Strategic Review of Defense and Security (National Security Strategy and Strategic Defense and Security Review) placed a strong emphasis on "soft power": one of the national security strategy's top priorities is to strengthen British influence through "soft power."

The work of the aforementioned Committee on "Soft Power" and the Influence of the United Kingdom on the House of Lords demonstrates the significance of the idea of "soft power" [1]. A study was issued by the British Academy - the National Academy of the United Kingdom for Social Sciences and Humanities – in 2014 "Attraction is a skill that can be learned. Soft power and the role of the United Kingdom in the globe" [2], and the British Council published "Influence and Attractiveness" [3] in 2013, which was also about British "soft power."

In light of the history of international relations and the world order that had emerged by the turn of the twenty-first century, renowned domestic specialists discuss the importance of non-violent means of approbation in the globe, specifically, "the dissemination in various countries and regions of modern Western standards of economic and political life, patterns and models of behaviour, ideas about ways and means of ensuring national and international security, and in a broader sense – about the categories of good, harm and danger – for their subsequent cultivation and consolidation there" [3]. If non-Western powers, like Russia and Kazakhstan for instance, have to adapt to the leaders while also looking for their unique position in a particular coordinate system in order to strengthen their own "soft power," then Great Britain, on the other hand, is one of the system's initial designers.

On the one hand, the British Empire and the United Kingdom's foreign policy contributed significantly to the establishment of today's international order; on the other, it attempted to meet the difficulties of the period and account for the expanding significance of non–military factors of force. "Soft power," which is based on the attractiveness of the state's culture, national values, and foreign policy, promotes economic growth while also allowing the state to shape trends and set development vectors in the world, influence the international agenda, and ensure national security and well-being.

Issues relating to national, post-imperial, and other identities, the country's image abroad, the country's role in the world, the preservation and spread of influence, and the increase of "soft power" are always present in British power, scientific, and public discussion: scientists, politicians and journalists discuss these topics, and books and articles are published on a regular basis. As he stated in his speech to the Foreign Office Diplomatic Academy graduates in February 2016, 'For many centuries, Britain has been an outward-looking nation, beyond the British Isles,' says Prince William, Duke of Cambridge. According to him, the economy, cultural and educational exports, the military forces, and the state's diplomatic service continue to be driven by knowledge of the mission and curiosity [3].

The colonial history is crucial in the establishment of British "soft power," and it explains why so many British politicians and intellectuals are interested in this idea. The British Empire, "over which the sun never set," interacted with many people around the world to establish its orders, create colonial administrative structures in its image, spread its norms and principles of organization of various public and state institutions, and introduce people from outside the country to its culture and language. However, during the twentieth century, enormous changes occurred, and the world's biggest empire ceased to exist. Despite this, the British colonial history continues to impact foreign policy and international relations today. The global growth of the English language and its development into a language of international communication is a clear example of this impact.

Following the fall of the British Empire, politicians and academics from all over the world, not just the British, were continually debating the country's place in the world. Domestic and international scholars have looked at problems such as the United Kingdom's position in international relations, foreign policy, and ties with the United States, the EU, and the British Commonwealth countries [4]. Scientists and publicists viewed Great Britain's transformation in the twentieth century in various ways: as a success story, as a process of gradual decline and loss of influence, and as attempts in new circumstances to reconfigure the former imperial space now based on post-imperial identity principles.

Those who see the country's development in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a success story point out that in the modern world, new forms of power and influence are becoming increasingly important, and that, despite the loss of colonies, Great Britain remains one of the world's leaders in the economy, culture, education, and science. Experts and politicians who want to make arguments in favor of the second point of view and dispel preconceptions about the country's "fall" after the empire's demise might leverage the notion of "soft power" and British successes in this sector.

Within the context of the spatial approach, it can be stated that the old British Empire's political space, which was founded on "rigid" ties: economic and military control, and hierarchical connections of the metropolis-colony, has experienced considerable changes. Nonetheless, the outlines of this space have largely been preserved, but it is now linked by "soft" forms of interaction: common language, forms of social structure, symbols (for example, the flag of the United Kingdom is still present on the flags of several Commonwealth countries), the institution of the monarchy, cultural and educational programs, financing of development assistance projects, and so on. The United Kingdom was able to effectively revamp its policies and employ "soft power" where it had previously relied on "hard force." Many key institutions and mechanisms of modern British "soft power," were created to rebuild relations with various parts of the former empire by the requirements of the time, to establish communication between them in new historical and political conditions – and only then did their work spread to a wider range of countries.

The study of the United Kingdom's foreign policy activities using the concept of "soft power" allows us to take a fresh look at the country's position in the world and foreign policy strategy, taking into account not only military or economic power but also the country's ability to influence other participants in international relations through the attractiveness of national culture, values, and behaviors. On the other hand, analyzing "soft power" through the lens of British professionals and politicians enables us to better understand their motivations and actions. Finally, the UK's achievement in this field has been observed by many Russian scientists and policymakers, not only in worldwide rankings. In this regard, a study of the United Kingdom's experience in this field would undoubtedly be useful in the development and execution of Kazakhstani projects.

The UK's "soft power" can be viewed in two ways: as a policy (or, in a broader sense, the activity of a variety of actors, not just state actors) that allows for the achievement of measurable results and economic and foreign policy goals, and as a policy (or, in a broader sense, the activity

of a variety of actors, not just state actors). To carry out this policy, the UK funds numerous state and non-state organizations' programs and projects, creates public awareness campaigns, invites celebrities to participate in various activities, and supports initiatives in the fields of education, tourism, sports, public diplomacy, culture, information and communication, and so on; and as a long-term strategic "framework" covering a wide range of issues, such as ideas about the United Kingdom's mission in the world and the values it promotes, the entire range of symbols, ideas, and meanings associated with the concept of "Britishness" and "British" (both domestically and abroad), a certain way of life, and so on – that is, what distinguishes the United Kingdom from other participants in international relations and what cannot always be clearly described, evaluated and measured, but what is the determining environment for the formation of appropriate policy.

The second level is critical for British "soft power," as it ensures the continuity of such a policy despite changing priorities, the international environment, and the rapid development of communication and information technologies. A long-term strategic "framework" like this opens up opportunities for a wide range of state and non-state actors, including business, non-governmental organizations, cultural and educational institutions, the media, British cities, universities, and so on. Even without careful monitoring and stringent official instructions, it contributed to the expansion of British "soft power" across the world.

The United Kingdom's leading positions in ratings of "soft power," "brands of states," and so on are explained not only by the presence of certain advantages over other countries, but also by how the country uses existing resources to form a favorable external environment, its choice of target audiences, and focusing efforts to achieve its objectives.

On the one hand, the country possesses certain "soft power" assets, such as historical heritage, the richest literature, traditions and modern achievements in the field of fine arts and cinema, a unique political system with its inherent values and norms, a high reputation in the scientific and educational spheres, and many other characteristics that allow you to claim the role of a leader in this field. On the other hand, just possessing a given capacity, such as military might, does not imply a genuine effect and change in the conduct of other actors in international relations. J. Nye emphasizes the possibility of achieving specific results by appealing to national culture, values, and foreign policy. However, the potential appeal should be communicated and implemented to foreign audiences. Furthermore, what is appealing to some segments of the population may be repulsive to others: thus, the spread of "soft power" necessitates the identification of target audiences and the development of tools aimed at specific segments of the population, rather than the entire society in foreign countries as a whole.

Without a doubt, "soft power," or reliance on the attractiveness of national values, culture, and foreign policy to achieve goals and boost a country's influence in the globe, played an important part in British foreign policy strategy even before the word was coined. Throughout history, similar actions were recognized by scientists and exploited by political leaders under many titles to aid in the completion of various objectives. Propaganda, public diplomacy, information policy, language and culture promotion, state branding, the spread of democracy, and the promotion of international development – all of these phenomena are related to the country's increased influence in the world and are now regarded by the political establishment as components of British "soft power."

J. Nye, the coiner of the phrase "soft power," testified in 2013 during the hearings of the aforementioned special committee of the British House of Lords, praising Britain's successes in this field. He specifically mentioned the English language's international leadership, the historical significance of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the global media's focus on the British royal family, the authority of national universities, as well as the activities of the Government Department for International Development and organizations such as the British Council, the BBC World Service, and others. J. Nye argues that the United Kingdom is a pioneer in the field of "soft power," emphasizing that the country has achieved outstanding achievement while having a

relatively small population and territory [5]. All of these accomplishments, of course, are the product of long-term efforts, not just with the introduction of the notion of "soft power".

The key institutions and procedures that play a part in the British policy of "soft power" today were developed throughout the course of the twentieth century. Their origin and growth were influenced by the obstacles that the country encountered as a result of the two world wars, as well as the construction and collapse of the bipolar system of international relations [5]. Of course, the history of earlier centuries, as well as the heritage connected with renowned cultural people, philosophers, navigators, generals, and politicians, are also extremely influential in the globe. However, as the examples of China, Turkey, Iran, India, and many others demonstrate, even the most illustrious historical and cultural heritage does not inevitably translate into a rise in "soft power."

The United Kingdom's recent successes in this field are the result of substantial work by numerous institutions and procedures. Their stages of development are intimately tied to major events in the country's history.

To sum up, the importance of soft power in British foreign policy is determined by its historical development and a huge role in almost all parts of the world during its leadership in international arena. Although the British empire does no longer exist, the legacy of it across the globe accumulates to become a large portion of UK's soft power resources, thus making the UK one of the core and most powerful players of the soft power politics.

References

1   HM Government. National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review. 2015. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478933/52309_C m_9161_NSS_SD_Rev iew_web_only.pdf

2   Persuasion and Power in the Modern World: House of Lords Paper 150 Session 2013-14. S.l.: Stationery Office, 2014. – 105 p. Available at: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldsoftpower/150/150.pdf

3 The British Academy. The Art of Attraction. 2014. Available at: http://www.britac.ac.uk/intl/softpower.cfm

4   British Council. Influence and Attraction: Culture and the race for soft power in the 21st century. London, British Council, 2013. 42 p. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/influence-and-attraction-report.pdf

5   Soft power and the UK's influence committee. Oral and written evidence – Vol. 2. House of Lords, London, 2014. – P. 747-760. Available at: https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/lords-committees/soft-power-uk-influence/SoftPowerEvVol2.pdf

UDC 327.7
**THE ROLE OF CELEBRITY DIPLOMACY IN CONTEMPORARY DIPLOMATIC
ENGAGEMENTS**

Samarkhan Shugyla Aidoskyzy
shugyla14@gmail.com
Student of the L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
Supervisor - G.Zh. Kenzhlina