АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ
МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН ТА БЕЗПЕКИ

L. I. Kormych
orcid.org/0000-0002-6417-8620
Doctor of History, Professor,
Head of the Department of Political Theories
National University "Odesa Law Academy"

T. M. Krasnopolska
orcid.org/0000-0001-5936-5889
PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Political Theories
National University "Odesa Law Academy"

A. V. Pekhnik
orcid.org/0000-0003-2534-7652
PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor

SOFT POWER INSTRUMENTS IN THE SYSTEM
OF ENSURING NATIONAL SECURITY

Introduction. At the beginning of the XXI century, as a result of globalization and the development of the information society, the blurring of borders, and the transformation of the "state sovereignty" concept, international relations have been undergoing tremendous changes and the national and international security system has been evolving. One of the most popular tools for such transformations is the use of the "soft power" methods, which replace the military power of countries. This state of affairs is caused by the fact that states' military resources are limited, which necessitates the search for new means of global, regional, and local influence. Consequently, military operations are being replaced by information campaigns, cultural, educational, scientific, sports, and other projects, all of which combined form the "soft power" tools and contribute to the better positioning of the country that has such tools in the international arena. Furthermore, "soft power" is becoming a means of ensuring national security. In this context, soft power instruments should be considered and the most promising ones for Ukraine in ensuring our country's national security should be identified.

Methods. The theoretical and methodological foundation of our research consists of the works by foreign and domestic scholars, devoted to the analysis of "soft power" and its tools, as well as the study of the national security system and its elements.

Notably, the issues of the general theory of national security were considered in the works by thinkers: N.A. Berdyaev, H. Grotius, Plato, J.P. Marat, G. Spencer; D. Kauffman, G. Brown, E. Carter and others. Problems of national security have been the subject of research by Ukrainian scientists such as A.A. Kolodii, V.A. Lipkan, V.T. Maliarenko, G.P. Sytnik, V.V. Chernyakhivska, and others.

The "soft power" concept within the political science framework and the international relations theory was developed by J. Nye (who introduced this term into scientific circulation), G. Gallarotti,

S. Lukes, N. Ferguson, M.M. Lebedeva, E.P. Panova, O.F. Rusakova, E.G. Solovyov, A.V. Torkunov, I.A. Chikharev and others. T. Zonov, I. Panarin, M. Trimash, B. Renald, A.I. Sukharev addressed the issues of public diplomacy. The essence of digital and electronic diplomacy was considered by F. Hanson, G. Gerbner, J. Grunig, L. Pai, and others.

This study uses general and special research methods, including dialectical, historical, comparative, systemic, structural, and functional. The dialectical method is used to analyze the essence of national security and "soft power". The historical method made it possible to analyze the evolution of the essence of "soft power" and its tools, the comparative method – to identify and compare the most popular "soft power" tools of specific countries and define the prospects for their utilization in Ukraine. The systemic approach allows considering national security as a holistic system, structural and functional – to define the role of "soft power" tools within this system.

Results. Before analyzing the role of "soft power" in the system of ensuring national security, let us turn to the definition of the concepts that will be used moving further.

The term "soft power" was introduced into political science by American researcher Joseph S. Nye in his 1990 work, Bound ToLead: The Changing Nature of American Power. The author defines it as "the ability to obtain the desired outcome based on the voluntary participation of allies and not through coercion or payments" (Nye, 1990: 14). At the same time, according to the author, the modern state has three sources of power: military, economic, and "soft power". The scholar sees the sources of the latter in three components: culture, government policy, and the attractiveness of the way of life that dominates in the country. It is with the help of such resources that the country can attract other countries and their leaders or the population of these countries to its side by creating a positive impression of its culture and values, especially political democratic values (which are the hallmark of the US "soft power"). "Temptation is always more efficient than coercion, and values such as democracy, human rights, and individual opportunities are deeply tempting" (Nye, 2004), says the author. With this, of course, one should agree, in the conditions of the modern geopolitical environment and the practice of using the "soft power" instruments.

J. Nye believes that "soft power" is becoming the leading instrument of US foreign policy, in a certain sense replacing the means of "hard power" wherever possible, but in no way displacing the latter, only supplementing them. In this context, J. Nye introduces another term into scientific circulation – "smart power", by which he understands the balance and use of the means of "hard" and "soft power" as complementary components of an effective strategy (Nye, 2006: 105).

"Soft power" can be implemented through different models, take various forms and use various tools. Each state chooses its strategy for implementing such power and its tools.

Studying the foreign countries' experience and identifying the leading (dominant) instruments in the national security system will determine Ukraine's priorities and the most effective tools for our country.

When it comes to the models of "soft power", researchers differentiates the model of direct influence and indirect influence. In the first case, the leaders of one country change the direction of their policies under the influence of the attractiveness of another country's values and the beliefs of its leaders. The second model involves influencing public opinion in another country and the leaders because of it.

The researcher distinguishes two mechanisms of "soft power" influence on the process of ensuring national security: the influence of "soft power" as an external factor (when our country is affected by "soft power" of other countries) and "soft power" as an internal factor (i.e. the means and tools that the country itself uses to influence other countries within the international relations system).

In the first case, the state must react to external influences and threats that may be caused by another country's "soft power". In the second case, the country is supposed to use all the "soft power" instruments to influence other political actors. The tools include information flows and the ability to manage them, the ability to wage information wars, migration policy, political PR, the language of the country and the degree of its distribution in the world, cultural exchanges, sports and tourism, as well as science, education, and student exchanges. In doing so, "soft power" appears in the form of creating an attractive image, persuasion (and the formation of supporters), setting the agenda. All these tools in modern conditions are becoming effective levers for ensuring the national security system.

In turn, national security is a systemic and multifaceted phenomenon. According to the Law of Ukraine "On National Security of Ukraine" of 2018, national security is "protection of state sovereignty, territorial integrity, democratic constitutional system and other national interests of Ukraine from actual and potential threats" (*Pro nacional`nu*, 2018).

It has three main elements in its structure: the subject (governmental and non-governmental institutions that constitute the national security system), the object, and the content (the activity of ensuring security). The object of national security, according to Z.D. Chuiko, which one should agree with, has a threefold structure: the security of man and citizen, society's security, and the security of the country itself (Chujko, 2008: 8). It is must be noted here that "soft power" may affect all three elements using its tools.

The Law of Ukraine "On the National Security of Ukraine" of 2018 defines the following concepts of "state security" ("protection of state sovereignty, territorial integrity and democratic constitutional order and other vital national interests from actual and potential threats of non-military nature") "military security" ("protection of state sovereignty, territorial integrity and democratic constitutional order and other vital national interests from military threats") and "public security" ("protection of interests, human and civil rights and freedoms vital for society and the individual, the provision of which is the primary task of security forces, other state bodies, local self-government bodies, their officials and the public, carrying out coordinated measures to implement and protect national interests from the influence of threats").

With that being said, Ukraine's national security priorities are to protect the interests of the individual, society, and the state. Notably, in our country, just like in most modern countries, along with the fact that the guarantee of national security is still power or the threat of its use, the importance of economic, spiritual, scientific and technical, economic, and other non-power related aspects of ensuring national security. That is the "soft power" instruments.

Moving further, it is crucial to define the essence and content of the "system of ensuring national security" concept and distinguish it from the term "system of national security". The latter is a functional system, which reflects only the processes of interaction between interests and threats. The first is an organizational system and, as the name suggests, is aimed at organizing the available resources in the form of state bodies, forces, means, and other organizations to solve problems of ensuring national security.

The combination of the two systems allows the government to form a national security strategy that will most completely satisfy the country's national interests. Without the right understanding of the mechanisms of national interests interaction, it is impossible to prioritize and organize resources to ensure security. Consequently, the national security strategy can be defined as a set of understanding of the interaction of interests and threats, as well as methods of realizing interests and countering threats in these conditions.

National security in modern countries is implemented within the framework of two main strategies: preventive (that is, preventing security threats) and defensive (eliminating threats). As a rule, when they talk about the meaning of "soft power" in the mechanism of ensuring national security, we are talking about the first strategy. However, according to the authors of this article, it plays an equally important role in the second strategy. So, for example, Ukraine, due to the aggression of the Russian Federation, found itself in a situation of a forced choice of the second strategy. It should be noted that the significant role of "soft power" in the system of ensuring the national security of the state is confirmed by a new theoretical concept – "soft security", which appears in the last quarter of the XX century. Even J. Nye drew the attention of world scientists to the fact that all actions aimed at increasing the attractiveness of the state are a lever of "soft power", thanks to which the state can achieve a lot, including the protection of its security.

The "soft security" concept as a scientific category was first used in the 1970s within the framework of the Copenhagen Institute for Peace Development. Its author is J. Galtung, who put forward the thesis that the basis for ensuring such security should be interstate cooperation and the rejection of block systems (Galtung, 1985). Analyzing the current state of the world, the author identifies four key threats: violence, environmental crisis, poverty, and violation of human rights. The solution of these issues is possible only on conditions of joint efforts of states within the framework of the "soft

security" concept. Against the background of such threats and their solutions, a kind of "third dimension of security" – human security, which belongs to the sphere of "soft" security, will emerge in Europe. An essential area of human preservation is the task of ensuring the personal and collective rights and freedoms of people.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the clear distinction between the concepts of "soft security" and "hard security" was overcome due to the need to constantly use both instruments to ensure national security. Thus, S.A. Makarichev believes that the object of "hard security" is the state, and in the case of "soft security" – a person. At the beginning of the 21st century, the clear distinction between the concepts of "soft security" and "hard security" was overcome due to the need to constantly use both instruments to ensure national security. He also believes that the object of "hard security" is the state, and "soft security" is a person. The researcher also proposes to interpret geographic boundaries in a new way: "soft security" extends beyond the territory of the state; most of all, it can be achieved by joint efforts, at the regional or transregional level (Makarychev, 2008, 47). Since the 1990s, another "related" category of soft security has appeared – humanitarian security, aimed at human security, the security of local worlds and communities, and the security of human interests. With that said, "soft security" appears as a multidimensional phenomenon capable of characterizing the degree of "embeddedness" of states in the world political reality. Its methods are non-military and preventive measures, long-term development strategies, and the geographical scope of the security object.

The mechanism for ensuring "soft security" in the international context in a broad sense is the membership of the state in integration associations itself, whose cooperation includes countering the challenges and threats of "soft security", ratification of the key framework, or legal treaties by the state, unification, participation in the formation of the order of unification, and the development of common approaches to countering challenges and threats.

In a narrow sense, the mechanism for ensuring "soft security" is a certain format of the partnership between countries, including a set of specific practical measures implemented mainly within the framework of a preventive model of national security with the participation of many actors, including state and civil society institutions, the private sector, etc. it should be noted that it is precisely the use of "soft power" instruments that allows such a wide range of actors to be involved in the system of ensuring national security.

In the context of soft security, the Sustainable Development Goals were updated in 2015. They included peace, security, and governance issues into Goal 16 – "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels" (*Peretvorennya nashogo*, 2015). Meanwhile, according to V.I. Bartenev, developed Western countries used a broad interpretation of security, including not only and not so many military-political issues as "human security" in general (Bartenev, 2015).

Currently, "soft security" is the official foreign policy paradigm of the European Union (Kavaliūnaitė, 2013). So, as it can be seen, the components of the national security system include "hard" and "soft" security. Moreover, "soft power" is the basis of the second and one of the levers of the first. In this context, "soft power", in our opinion, performs the following functions within the framework of the national security system: popularizing the country and its culture, attracting allies, and, as a result, preventing threats (in the context of a preventive national security strategy); preventing of information and hybrid war (within the framework of the national security defense strategy).

Each country forms its arsenal of "soft power" instruments depending on historical circumstances, the characteristics of its cultural, socio-economic, and political development. This arsenal is one of the factors determining the country's positioning in the system of international relations in the context of globalization and the development of information and communication technologies. For example, in the situation of the Russian Federation's war against Ukraine, different countries see Ukraine's defense against invaders and terrorists in different ways. According to the data, "On average around the world, a majority say that their country should support sovereign countries in the event of an attack (70%) and that inaction in Ukraine will encourage the Russian Federation to take further military action elsewhere (68%). At the same time, the majority also say that their country should avoid military intervention (72%) and that military action in Ukraine will encourage attacks on other countries (68%)" (*61% globally think the war…*, 2022).

There are also relevant positions when it comes "to providing military support or sending troops to Ukraine. Globally, on average, about one-third support their country's provision of weapons – such as cannons and anti-tank weapons – to the Ukrainian military (36%), funding the Ukrainian military (33%) and sending troops to neighboring NATO countries. Ukraine (32%)" (*61% globally think the war…*, 2022).

The main directions of the implementation of soft power policy include cooperation in scientific, educational, and technological areas, cultural cooperation and promotion of the national language, assistance in the development of business relations, assistance in international development, and public diplomacy. The latter in the XXI century is turning into the most important component of "soft power" and is a highly intelligent system of influencing public opinion and consciousness. It leads to the establishment of a new character of dialogues between governments and non-governmental organizations of some countries with the population of foreign countries.

Public diplomacy (as technologies aimed at building long-term relations, protecting the interests of national foreign policy, and a better understanding of the values and institutions of one's state abroad) is becoming increasingly crucial in world politics as one of the effective tools, the use of which contributes to the formation of "soft power" in international relations. At the beginning of the XXI century on based on the "soft power" concept, a "new" public diplomacy is being formed, which provides for the active involvement of non-state actors, whose circle has expanded significantly. There are no tools associated with the use of lies, blackmail, pressure, etc. in its arsenal. It is characterized by the rejection of a monologue and the formation of a dialogue with the other countries' societies, the widespread use of lobbying business structures in order to form a positive image of the state. The leading elements of the new public diplomacy are the media and communications, as well as the holding of various cultural, educational, sports, and other events, educational exchanges carried out with full or partial governmental support in the country and abroad. Such measures are aimed at creating a favorable public opinion and a positive image of the country abroad.

New public diplomacy, by definition, is focused on dialogue with the foreign public, and not just on the dissemination of information (Dolinskiy, 2011: 67). J. Melissen notes that the new public diplomacy is based on the long-term formation of trust and cooperation, therefore it gives a positive effect only in the long run (*New Public Diplomacy*, 2005). The most popular technologies for new public diplomacy include digital diplomacy, niche diplomacy, and national branding.

The so-called "digital diplomacy" (or "public diplomacy 2.0") is becoming the leading technology of the "new" public diplomacy, uniting the rest of the tools.

The XXI century is called the era of "soft power" tools – the winner here is the one who masters the tools of public diplomacy better than others.

In the EU countries, an important direction in public diplomacy development has been the formation of a positive image abroad. With that said, the combination of public diplomacy with marketing enabled the idea that the government image and its politics is a product that needs to be sold to a foreign audience. Consequently, the government image began to be called a national brand (Tsvetkova, 2015: 187). National branding is a set of measures in the field of goods export, tourism, culture, domestic and foreign policy, and investments to develop and implement a strategy for building a brand of the country, aimed at improving the country's image, perceived by both the local population and foreigners.

With the use of national branding, governments demonstrate the best aspects of their country in the international arena, attracting the attention of target audiences and the media, consequently enhancing the national identity of the country's citizens. For instance, Germany with the help of the brand "Deutschland – Land der Ideen" (*Deutschland*, 2010) in 2010 managed to attract investments in research and development amounting to 58.4 billion euros (*UNESCO*, 2010). More so, thanks to this brand Germany has become the country with the most positive image in the world (62%) (*Views of US*, 2011). According to the Anholt-Ipsos Nation Brands Index, "Germany retains the first place in the ranking of "national brands", Canada and Japan have overtaken Great Britain and closed the top three. 2021 is marked by a generally more positive outlook, with some of the top 10 NBI countries benefiting from this movement as the softening Anholt-Ipsos Nation Brands Index SM (NBI) across all countries seen in 2020 reverses. Germany retains its top spot in the 2021 Anholt-Ipsos Nation

Brands Index SM (NBI) for the fifth consecutive year, but there were some gains and losses among the top 10 rankings, with Italy jumping from sixth to fourth and the United States moving from 10 on the eighth Great Britain, which was second last year, dropped to fifth; France, Sweden and Australia drop one place". (Germany maintains top "nation brand" ranking…, 2021). When it comes to ratings on governance, immigration and investment, Canada leads the way. "Relatively stable rankings for exports, tourism and culture contributed to Canada's record ranking in 2021" (Germany maintains top "nation brand" ranking…, 2021).

In 2018, the "Ukraine NOW" brand was founded with the help of the British government. It became the most extensive in terms of promoting the image of Ukraine in the international arena. The central theme is the thesis about Ukraine's openness and progressiveness towards development and cooperation. A sociological study was conducted by the British side to determine the opinion regarding the association of Ukraine with the relevant socio-political phenomena. In the results of the study, it was determined that Ukraine is associated with corruption, revolution and hostilities. "In addition, the foreign audience perceived Ukrainians mainly as a rather closed, intolerant and aggressive society. The new branding is designed to replace in the mass consciousness these not the most pleasant associations with the ideas of foreigners about the beauty, openness, dynamism and innovation of our Motherland" (Kovach, 2022).

After the invasion of the Russian Federation into Ukraine, the "new information campaign Brave. ua" appeared. The new national brand of Ukraine has become the courage of its people, who resolutely opposed the larger forces of the second army of the world" (Kovach, 2022).

According to the "Anholt-Ipsos Nation Brands Index" ranking, which evaluates state image campaigns, in 2020 our country took 43rd place, and in 2021 – 48th. In the 2021 Brand Finance Global Soft Power Index rating, Ukraine was in 61st place, losing 15 positions compared to 2020. However, this drop is caused not so much by our country's loss of attractiveness, but by the growth of potential and the number of other countries in the rating. According to the corporation's data for 2021, Ukraine's image in the world is helped by its education system, which annually accepts foreign students from all corners of the planet, as well as the improvement of potential for business and trade, which was determined by the land reform" (Kovach, 2022).

Another practice of the new public diplomacy that has been developed abroad is "niche diplomacy", which usually means that a country occupies a certain position, a place, based on certain favorable conditions for this. It is most characteristic of medium-size and small states. This practice means that a country is able to focus on a few specific local objectives (Henrikson, 2005). According to N.Y. Kaveshnikov, the ability to focus diplomatic activity in one or several areas is a "competitive advantage" of such countries: "The fewer resources a country has, the more value these insignificant resources have for it. For smaller countries, diplomacy poses as such resource, so they are active supporters of the institutionalization of international law, the reinforcement of international regimes, collective actions, the creation of international organizations and collective security systems" (Kaveshnikov, 2008).

The need for "niche diplomacy" appeared from the political balance of power in the international arena after the USSR collapse (Glebov, 2018: 284). After the collapse of the bipolar system, there is only one superpower left in the world – the USA and several other countries with significant potential, capable of competing with the hegemon in the future – India, China, Russia. Other economically developed countries were classified by diplomats as regional states that have significant local influence.

The countries that use the "niche diplomacy" concept in their foreign affairs include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden. Almost all of them have chosen peacekeeping as their current agenda.

Norway, for instance, chose the path of "global public good" largely through peacekeeping and the support of poor countries. Aid to poor Third World countries is now associated with Norwegian contributions to world politics. With that said, Norway, alongside Canada, initiated humanitarian missions, be it a campaign to ban antipersonnel mines (the Ottawa Process) or mediation in a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict (the Oslo process) (Henrikson, 2005).

Ranked third in the world after Japan in the number of trained engineers per capita, Sweden uses "niche diplomacy" as a tool to support its image as a country with a high level of innovation among

EU members. Notably, Sweden has had the third-highest growth rate of patents per capita over the past 15 years (*Innovation in Sweden*).

With that said, "niche diplomacy" is different in that it is purely a concept of a post-bipolar system since most states do not have sufficient resources to effectively solve their strategic tasks. Through "niche diplomacy," public diplomacy in these countries is evolving towards intelligent interaction, where it focuses on "the power of a better argument", which implies better awareness of facts and critical issues.

Theorists and practitioners of modern public diplomacy come to the following general provisions: the source of public diplomacy should be primarily non-governmental organizations, which not only more effectively cover a certain part of the foreign audience with their influence, but also are more independent than state bodies; modern public diplomacy should have a network model since it allows for the faster mobilization of the resources of civil society; public diplomacy is a set of practices that require a certain human resource, therefore, significant efforts must be taken towards training participants; successful public diplomacy must always be consistent with official diplomatic statements and events (Glebov, 2018: 287).

New public diplomacy and digital diplomacy as its component has become a powerful instrument and part of the globalization process and the practical embodiment of "soft power" as an instrument of the national security system. A competent combination of such public diplomacy with the official political line of a certain state leads to the strengthening of the political dominance of the country in the international arena, and, consequently, to the strengthening of its national security system. That is why the Western countries' experience in the new public diplomacy area is interesting for Ukraine and can be applied in its foreign policy relations.

In Ukraine, the necessity of "soft power" tools was only discussed during the conflict in Eastern Ukraine in the face of the need to protect the territorial integrity, sovereignty, and information space from Russian influence. One of the first directions was the information policy and the provision of information and cyber security, as well as the formation on this basis of an information strategy, which must include the "soft power" tools, namely: the formation of Ukraine's positive image in the eyes of the global community through information campaigns and work of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and diplomatic missions in host countries.

In 2015, the public diplomacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, according to D. Kuleba, included three areas of work: image programs (conferences, round tables, public events, interaction with experts and society in general); cultural diplomacy (reform of Ukraine's cultural representation system abroad, implementation of Ukraine's cultural projects abroad, assistance in attracting the best foreign cultural practices in Ukraine); media relations (proactive media work, managing the diplomacy system in social networks, managing Ministry of Foreign Affairs blogs, generating content and implementing online campaigns) (Kuleba, 2015).

At the current stage, Ukraine is using the "soft power" principles in the formation of digital diplomacy, particularly: consistency in promoting a positive public image of both Ukraine and foreign countries; efficiency of outreach actions (press conferences, briefings, press releases, publication of news articles); reliability of government PR-campaigns with a real material and documentary base, comprehensive coverage of events; coordination of actions of all state PR-departments and clear regulation of coverage of the most significant issues for the national interests of the country and its image; conducting constant monitoring of world information flows, reflecting the image of the state, neutralizing the activities of information subjects that undermine the positive image of the state; building up the media presence in the information environment of foreign countries; studying foreign experience of using "soft power" to advance national interests; establishing information interaction with foreign structures in order to integrate the country into the main global processes and increasing its influence in the world information space (Safranchuk, Sinegubov, 2014).

Digital cultural diplomacy, according to A.A. Segeda now serves as an excellent vehicle for promoting different image initiatives at the national level – from reinforcing its presence in the international information field to popularizing national cultural products on the global stage. In this context, it is worth mentioning that the media activity of the embassy has a significant impact on the

perception of the state by citizens, political and business circles of the host country" (Segeda, 2020: 144).

In 2021 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine adopted a public diplomacy strategy for a five-year period, which embodies the spread of Ukraine's "soft power". The Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be developing a positive image of Ukraine and communicating with partners on its basis. First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine E. Dzhaparova in her speech at the forum "Ukraine 30. Image of Ukraine" defines the tasks of the public diplomacy development for the next 5 years: "first – Ukraine is more widely known and recognized by foreign audiences, second – Ukraine is perceived as a democratic European country, which is moving towards the full EU and NATO membership, despite the external aggression of Russia, and third – in its foreign policy activities Ukraine relies on an effective system of combating harmful narratives aimed at discrediting the Ukrainian nation and actively promotes its identity" (*Dzhaparova nazvala*, 2021).

The strategy already presupposes seven directions of public diplomacy using the "soft power" instruments: cultural; expert; economic; culinary; digital; scientific and educational; sports diplomacy Also, the Strategy defines five principles which public diplomacy will be based on: project management, innovation, respect for cultural diversity, human-centeredness, and responsibility (*MID Ukrainy*, 2021).

According to V.G. Tsivatyi, in order to create efficient mechanisms of the institution of public diplomacy and to solve its tasks, Ukrainian diplomacy must first of all focus on using the strategy of "openness" in public diplomacy in order to actively implement the strategic national interests of the country; identification, analysis of activities and involvement of the most efficient of the existing structures in the development of programs of cultural, patriotic, information policy and the provision of effective mechanisms for monitoring their execution; creating favorable conditions for the development of the information business, developing a unified information strategy, initiating an open dialogue and cooperation with the state" (Tsivatyy, 2014: 128).

At the same time, emphasis should be placed on digital diplomacy, which should become an integrating element of the system of public diplomacy as part of Ukraine's "soft power".

Here is an analysis of digitalization rating indices and the representation of Ukraine in them (as of December 2020), offered by Google Analytics.

Name of the index	The popularity of the index (the number of mentions when making requests on the sites of the Google search engine on the Internet), thousands of units	Representation of Ukraine (+;-)	The period of representation of our state (from which year)
1. Digital Economy and Society Index – DESI	107.000	=	=
2. Digital Evolution Index – DEI	173.000	=	=
3. Digital Adoption Index – DAI	191.000	+	3 2014
4. Development Index – IDI	70.700	+	3 2002
5. Global Innovation Index – GII	457.000	+	3 2007
6. Networked Readiness Index – NRI	897	+	3 2002
7. Boston Consulting Group – eIntensity	7 990	+	3 2011
8. World Digital Competiveness Index	16 600	+	32014

A crucial "soft power" element in this context is the information strategy of the state, aimed at creating a positive image of the country and the development of national branding (both within the country and abroad). It should be noted that the latter vector is now being actively implemented, both within the framework of the parliament and in social media. Thus, the official English-language page of Ukraine on Instagram (@ ukraine.ua) was created, which is aimed at promoting Ukraine's positive image in the world.

Conclusions. The changing nature of challenges and threats to security in the XXI century prompted the adoption in 2016 of the EU's Global Defense and Foreign Policy Strategy, the main

attention of which is focused on "soft security" instruments that will effectively combat terrorism, illegal migration, prevent conflicts and cooperate for the sustainable development and prosperity of the world. All of this is due to the widespread use of "soft power" instruments, which is gaining more and more popularity in the world. It is becoming one of the national security system instruments, both of a preventive and a protective model. Non-military and preventive measures, long-term development strategies, information campaigns, PR-actions, and image strategies are increasingly used by countries in foreign policy and are becoming an alternative to the use of "hard power" to ensure national security. However, it is worth noting that they do not replace the latter, but only substantially supplement them.

The newest and traditional challenges and threats ("frozen" and "hot" armed conflicts, energy supply systems instability, illegal migration, information war, the drug addiction problem, international drug trafficking, and others) necessitate the development of a fundamentally new model for the social development in Ukraine, which remains a strategic priority of the state policy of national security, which should include both "hard" and "soft" security means. The current full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine convincingly proves the need for the constant use of "soft power" instruments for security at the national, regional and global levels. Even under conditions of armed conflict, such methods can be used to expand the range of support subjects, search for partners, proving their effectiveness.

With that said, "hard" and "soft" security are the two main components of the national security system. And "soft power" acts as the basis of the second and is one of the levers of the first one, performing such functions within the framework of the national security system: popularizing the country and its culture, attracting allies, and, as a result, preventing threats (in the context of a preventive national security strategy); confrontation in information and hybrid warfare (within the framework of the national security defense strategy).

Based on the foreign experience analysis, within the framework of the promising development direction of the "soft power" as a tool for ensuring the national security of Ukraine, it is necessary to determine the development of public diplomacy, namely niche diplomacy, national branding, and branding of territories. The use of digital diplomacy means will make it possible to implement these vectors.

The growth of the level of knowledge about Ukraine of the world (particularly, the European) community will contribute to the improvement of diplomatic relations and partnership of our state with the EU countries. And this, in turn, will increase the level of "soft security", which will have a beneficial effect on the degree of ensuring national security as a whole.

Bibliography

Джапарова назвала три задачи публичной дипломатии на пять лет. (2021). *Ukrinform*, August 3, https://www.ukrinform.ru/rubric-polytics/3291440-dzaparov-nazvala-tri-zadaci-publicnoj-diplomatii-na-pat-let.html

Чуйко З.Д. (2008) Конституційні основи національної безпеки України. Автореферат дисертації кандидата юридичних наук – 12.00.02. Харків. http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/

Ковач А. (2022). Національний бренд України: крізь призму сприйняття держави за кордоном. *ADASTRA*. http://adastra.org.ua/blog/nacionalnij-brend-ukrayini-kriz-prizmu-sprijnyattya-derzhavi-za-kordonom

Кулеба Д. (2015). Публична дипломатия – новое оружие Украины в условиях гибридной войны. Європейська правда, 23 вересня, https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/rus/experts/2015/09/23/7038633/

Макарычев А.С. (2008) Безопасность и возвращение политического: критические дебаты в Европе. *Индекс безопасности*, 14(4), 20–56.

МИД Украины приняло стратегию публичной дипломатии и коммуникационную стратегию. (2021). *Interfax Ukraine*, 26 марта. https://interfax.com.ua/news/general/733158.html

Перетворення нашого світу: Порядок денний у сфері сталого розвитку до 2030 року. (2015). *UNDP Ukraine*, 11 травня. http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/library/sustainable-development-report/the-2030-agenda-for-sustainable-development.html

Про Національну безпеку. Закон України. №. 2469-VIII. 2018. *Верховна Рада.* https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2469-19#Text

Сегеда О.О. (2020). *Цифрова дипломатія України як елемент нової публічної дипломатії.* Politicus, 3, 139–147. https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-9616.2020-3.21

Циватый В.Г. (2014). Публичная и культурная дипломатия Украины XXI века: институциональное измерение и стратегии развития. Дискурс-Пи, 1(14), 124–130.

Цветкова Н.А. (2015) Публичная дипломатия США: теории и концепции. Грамота, 4(54), 186–189.

61% globally think the war in Ukraine poses a significant risk to their country (2022). *Ipsos*. URL: https://www.ipsos.com/en/war-in-ukraine-april-2022

Bartenev V.I. (2015). Shaping the global sustainable development agenda beyond 2015. *Bulletin of international organizations.* International Organisations Research Journal, 10 (3), 7-32.

Deutschland – Land der Ideen (2010). Official website. URL: http://www.land-der-ideen.de/ (12.10.2021).

Dolinskiy A.V. (2011) Discourse on public diplomacy. Mezhdunarodnyye protsessy, 9 (25), 63–73.

Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/002234338502200205

Germany maintains top "nation brand" ranking, Canada and Japan overtake the UK to round out the top three. (2021). *Ipsos*. https://www.ipsos.com/en/nation-brands-index-2021 (15.07.2022).

Glebov M.S. (2018). Elements and mechanism of a new public diplomacy in the state foreign policy. *Gosudarstvennoye upravleniye*, 68, 275–293.

Henrikson, A.K. (2005). Niche Diplomacy in the World Public Arena: the Global 'Corners' of Canada and Norway. In: Melissen, J. (eds) *The New Public Diplomacy. Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230554931_4

Innovation in Sweden: Sweden official website. https://sweden.se/business/innovation-in-sweden/

Kavaliūnaitė S. (2013), *Comparative analysis of concepts "soft security" and "soft power"*, EU legislation. Mykolas Romeris University. 2002–2013. URL: https://repository.mruni.eu/handle/007/12172?show=full (21.12.2021).

Kaveshnikov N.Y. (2008). Small and harmful? *Mezhdunarodnyye protsessy*, 6(3), 84–92.

New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations / Ed. by Jan Melissen. (2005), New York: Palgrave Macmillan. www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomacy.pdf

Nye J. (Jr.) (2006). Smart Security: Killing M.Campbell and Michael E. O'Hanlon. *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, 2 (Fall).

Nye Jr. Joseph S. (1990). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books.

Nye Jr. Joseph S. (2004). *Soft Power. World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

UNESCO. (2010). UNESCO science report, 2010: the current status of science around the world. *UNESCO*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000189883

Views of US Continue to Improve in 2011 BBC Country Rating Poll. (2011). *BBC News*, March 7. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/050311bbcwscountrypoll.pdf

References

Dzhaparova nazvala tri zadachi publichnoy diplomatii na pyat let. (2021)

Ukrinform, August 3, https://www.ukrinform.ru/rubric-polytics/3291440-dzaparov-nazvala-tri-zadaci-publicnoj-diplomatii-na-pat-let.html

Chuiko Z.D. (2008) Konstytutsiini osnovy natsionalnoi bezpeky Ukrainy. Avtoreferat dysertatsii kandydata yurydychnykh nauk – 12.00.02. Kharkiv. http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/

Kovach A. (2022). Natsionalnyi brend Ukrainy: kriz pryzmu spryiniattia derzhavy za kordonom. *ADASTRA*. http://adastra.org.ua/blog/nacionalnij-brend-ukrayini-kriz-prizmu-sprijnyattya-derzhavi-za-kordonom

Kuleba D. (2015). Publichnaya diplomatiya – novoye oruzhiye Ukrainy v usloviyakh gibridnoy voyny. *Evropeyska pravda*, September 23. https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/rus/experts/2015/09/23/7038633/

Makarychev A.S. (2008). Bezopasnost i vozvrashcheniye politicheskogo kriticheskiye debaty v Evrope. *Indeks bezopasnosti*, 14 (4), 20–56.

MID Ukrainy prinyalo strategiyu publichnoy diplomatii i kommunikatsionnuyu strategiyu. (2021). *Interfax Ukraine*, March 26. https://interfax.com.ua/news/general/733158.html

Peretvorennia nashoho svitu: Poriadok dennyi u sferi staloho rozvytku do 2030 roku. (2015). *UNDP Ukraine*, May 1. http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/library/sustainable-development-report/the-2030-agenda-for-sustainable-development.html

Pro natsionalnu bezpeku. Zakon Ukrainy No. 2469-VIII. 2018. *Verkhovna Rada.* https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2469-19#Text

Segeda O.O. (2020). Tsyfrova dyplomatiia Ukrainy yak element novoi publichnoi dyplomatii. *Politicus*, 3, 139–147. https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-9616.2020-3.21

Tsivatyy V.G. (2014). Publichnaya i kulturnaya diplomatiya Ukrainy XXI veka: institutsionalnoye izmereniye i strategii razvitiya. Diskurs-Pi, 1(14). 124–130.

Tsvetkova N.A. (2015), *Publichnaya diplomatiya SShA: teorii i kontseptsii*. Gramota, 4(54). 186–189.

61% globally think the war in Ukraine poses a significant risk to their country (2022). *Ipsos*. URL: https://www.ipsos.com/en/war-in-ukraine-april-2022

Bartenev V.I. (2015). Shaping the global sustainable development agenda beyond 2015. *Bulletin of international organizations*. International Organisations Research Journal, 10 (3), 7-32.

Deutschland – Land der Ideen (2010). Official website. URL: http://www.land-der-ideen.de/ (12.10.2021).

Dolinskiy A.V. (2011) Discourse on public diplomacy. Mezhdunarodnyye protsessy, 9 (25), 63–73.

Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/002234338502200205

Germany maintains top "nation brand" ranking, Canada and Japan overtake the UK to round out the top three. (2021). *Ipsos*. https://www.ipsos.com/en/nation-brands-index-2021

Glebov M.S. (2018). Elements and mechanism of a new public diplomacy in the state foreign policy. *Gosudarstvennoye upravleniye*, 68, 275–293.

Henrikson, A.K. (2005). Niche Diplomacy in the World Public Arena: the Global 'Corners' of Canada and Norway. In: Melissen, J. (eds) *The New Public Diplomacy. Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230554931_4

Innovation in Sweden. *Sweden official website*. https://sweden.se/business/innovation-in-sweden/

Kavaliūnaitė S. (2013), *Comparative analysis of concepts "soft security" and "soft power"*, EU legislation. Mykolas Romeris University. https://repository.mruni.eu/handle/007/12172?show=full

Kaveshnikov N.Y. (2008). Small and harmful? *Mezhdunarodnyye protsessy*, 6(3), 84–92.

New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations / Ed. by Jan Melissen. (2005), New York: Palgrave Macmillan. www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/soft_power/The_New_Public_Diplomacy.pdf

Nye J. (Jr.) (2006). Smart Security: Killing M.Campbell and Michael E. O'Hanlon. *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, 2 (Fall).

Nye Jr. Joseph S. (1990). *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books.

Nye Jr. Joseph S. (2004). *Soft Power. World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

UNESCO. (2010). UNESCO science report, 2010: the current status of science around the world. *UNESCO*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000189883

Views of US Continue to Improve in 2011 BBC Country Rating Poll. (2011). *BBC News*, March 7. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/050311bbcwscountrypoll.pdf

Summary

Kormych L. I., Krasnopolska T. M., Pekhnik A. V. **Soft power instruments in the system of ensuring national security.** – Article.

This article is devoted to the analysis of the role of "soft power" instruments in the system of ensuring national security, particularly, it is determined that as a result of globalization and the development of the information society, the concept of security is being transformed – the "soft security" concept appears, which provides for preventive measures (for example, participation in international organizations, cooperation in the fight against terrorism, etc.). It has been established that within both models of ensuring national security, preventive and defensive, the use of "soft power" tools takes place. One of the most popular tools is public diplomacy, whose role is constantly increasing in the global community.

It is established that the priorities of Ukraine's national security are the protection of the interests of the individual, society, and the state. It was ascertained that the soft security concept is formed precisely in the context of the third dimension of security – human security.

It is determined that at the beginning of the XXI century, a "new" public diplomacy is being formed based on the "soft power" concept, the arsenal of tools which includes "soft power" tools, including information flows and their management, migration policy, political PR, the spread of the countries' languages in the world, cultural exchanges, cooperation in the framework of science and education, student exchanges. It is determined that the most promising forms of "soft power" are digital, niche diplomacy, and national branding.

It is substantiated that "soft power" is a way of creating an attractive image of the country in the global community, attracting partners, developing diplomatic ties, and, as a result, strengthening the system of ensuring national security. A broad implementation of "soft power" tools can play the role of preventive measures against the use of hard power and military methods in world politics. The current

full-scale aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine convincingly proves the need for the constant use of respective instruments for security at the national, regional and global levels. Even under conditions of war or another deep crisis in international relations, "soft power" can be effectively employed for expanding a circle of supporters, convincing partners, forming favorable agenda at different platforms.

Key words: "soft power", ensuring national security, "soft security", public diplomacy, the image of the country.

Анотація

Кормич Л. І., Краснопольська Т. М., Пехник А. В. **Інструменти «м'якої сили» в системі забезпечення національної безпеки.** – Стаття.

Стаття присвячена аналізу ролі інструментів «м'якої сили» в системі забезпечення національної безпеки. Зокрема визначено, що внаслідок глобалізації та розвитку інформаційного суспільства поняття безпеки змінюється. трансформується – з'являється концепція «м'якої безпеки», яка передбачає превентивні заходи (наприклад, участь у міжнародних організаціях, співробітництво в боротьбі з тероризмом тощо). Доведено, що в рамках обох моделей забезпечення національної безпеки, превентивної та оборонної, має місце використання інструментів «м'якої сили». Одним із найпопулярніших інструментів є публічна дипломатія, роль якої у світовому співтоваристві постійно зростає.

Наголошено, що пріоритетами національної безпеки України є захист інтересів особи, суспільства і держави. Показано, що концепція м'якої безпеки формується саме в контексті такого виміру безпеки як безпека людини.

Визначено, що на початку XXI століття на основі концепції «м'якої сили» формується «нова» публічна дипломатія, арсенал інструментів якої включає: засоби «м'якої сили», зокрема інформаційні потоки та управління ними; міграційну політику, політичний піар, поширення національних іміджів країн у світі, культурні обміни, співпрацю в рамках науки та освіти, освітню мобільність тощо. Підкреслено, що найбільш перспективними формами «м'якої сили» є використання можливостей цифровізації, публічна дипломатія та національний брендинг.

Обґрунтовано, що «м'яка сила» – це спосіб створення привабливого іміджу країни у світовій спільноті, залучення партнерів, розвиток дипломатичних зв'язків і, як наслідок, зміцнення системи забезпечення національної безпеки. Широке впровадження інструментів «м'якої сили» може відігравати роль превентивних заходів проти використання жорсткої сили та військових методів у світовій політиці. Сучасна повномасштабна агресія Російської Федерації проти України переконливо доводить необхідність постійного використання відповідних інструментів безпеки на національному, регіональному та глобальному рівнях. Навіть за умов війни чи іншої глибокої кризи в міжнародних відносинах «м'яка сила» може бути ефективно використана для розширення кола прихильників, переконування партнерів, формування сприятливого порядку денного на різних майданчиках.

Ключові слова: «м'яка сила», забезпечення національної безпеки, «м'яка безпека», публічна дипломатія, імідж країни.