

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\\_Cm\\_9161\\_NSS\\_SD\\_Review\\_web\\_only.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478933/52309_Cm_9161_NSS_SD_Review_web_only.pdf)
- 2 Persuasion and Power in the Modern World: House of Lords Paper 150 Session 2013-14. S.I.: 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

The term "celebrity diplomacy" was introduced into scientific circulation by the Canadian political scientist A.F. Cooper, who used it to describe the activity of celebrities in the international arena in the interests of individual actors in world politics [1, p.1–14].

The researcher identified seven groups of famous personalities who may be diplomats of a new type:

- those who came to politics from show business (R. Reagan, A. Schwarzenegger);
- former politicians who acquired celebrity status at the global level (H. Kissinger, N. Mandela, Bill Clinton);
- famous social activists (O. Winfrey, Bono);
- Hollywood stars engaged in charity and philanthropy (L. DiCaprio);
- religious leaders on a global scale (Dalai Lama);
- famous entrepreneurs (B. Gates, T. Turner);
- famous intellectuals from countries where English does not have official status (G. Grass, M.V. Llosa).

The activities of celebrities in the international arena are radically different from the traditional work of diplomats. Firstly, many movie actors, musicians and athletes are quite free to choose expressions in public. An example confirming this thesis can be the public statement of the United Nations International Emergency Children's Fund (UNICEF) Goodwill Ambassador, singer Harry Belafonte, addressed to George W. Bush in 2006, in which he called the American president "the main terrorist in the world" [Cobb]. It is unlikely that something like this can be heard from the mouth of a diplomat, since he, by virtue of his profession, is forced to carefully select words, avoiding harsh expressions. This desire of diplomatic staff for self-control is often reflected in the nature of their public speeches, which, in terms of emotional intensity, seriously lose out to the bright manner of celebrities expressing their thoughts.

Secondly, celebrities have more opportunities to directly influence the audience than diplomats. Their popularity and initially a fairly high level of trust among the public simplifies the conduct of certain political campaigns.

Thirdly, many of the "celebrity diplomats" often encourage citizens to act by personal example. For example, they often donate huge amounts of money to solve certain global problems (A. Jolie, O. Bloom, Ch. Theron, B. Gates, etc.).

From our point of view, "celebrity diplomacy" is one of the most promising areas of public diplomacy, the goals of which coincide with the goals of political PR (advocacy), cultural diplomacy and national branding [2]. First of all, celebrity diplomacy seeks to promote certain political ideas. It can also participate in the dissemination of cultural values among the population of foreign countries. And finally, "celebrity diplomacy" is able to make a tangible contribution to the formation of a positive international reputation of the state (or other institutions).

Indeed, "celebrity diplomacy" should not be understood only as an activity in the interests of individual States. Various international organizations have been attracting celebrities to implement their own projects in the humanitarian sphere for a long time. Thus, since 1954, the UNICEF has awarded the title of "goodwill ambassador" to world-famous actors, musicians, athletes participating in children's rights protection programs around the world (for example, O. Hepburn, R. Federer, Shakira, L. Messi, etc.). A similar title is awarded by UNESCO for its contribution to the development of humanitarian cooperation, public and charitable activities.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees also has its own goodwill ambassador. Since 2001, this post has been held by A. Jolie, who quite often visits the most dangerous regions of the world, drawing public attention to the problems of people forced to leave their homes as a result of various international conflicts [3].

At this point, it is clear that the humanitarian work and activities have become somewhat of a moral obligation, and an indicator of how important solidarity between people all around the world is. This is widely being used by numerous international organizations, which challenge traditional discourse of power in ways that encourage the power of moral awareness, something often not present in politics. Angelina Jolie has moral and ethical values, which she believes in and fights for, separating her from other politicians and giving her an extra amount of credibility worldwide. If avoiding taboo subjects is common among politicians, Angelina Jolie daringly exposes those, even in her movies. In her movie "In the Land of Blood and Honey", she focused on the events in the Balkans, systematic rape, concentration camps and the question of a possibility of a romance between the victim and the officer. With it, she wanted to point out the crimes against women worldwide, not just in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the mistakes of the international community, which failed to react just when they were supposed and expected to. It is also about a reflection of the horrid and brutal way of living in that period. For those reasons, she was made an honorary citizen of Sarajevo in 2012, whilst also receiving the Heart of Sarajevo, a special award in 2011 at the Sarajevo Film Festival, for her active engagement in the complexities of the real world. These days, the most recent of her movies "Unbroken" has caught public attention, which she directed herself and describes a story of Louis Zamperini. Zamperini was a participant of the 5000m race, at the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936, a mid-distance runner, who as an American WWII soldier in the Pacific, got captured by the Japanese. It is an adventure that goes from the highs of Olympic glory to the lows of life in a prisoner of war camp. The movie describes the athlete's fate, his every day struggle of living in Japanese concentration camps, where he was put through some truly difficult situations. The Japanese authorities have already protested against it, claiming the movie is full of exaggeration [4].

It may seem that "celebrity diplomacy" is an absolutely new phenomenon in modern politics. But this is by no means the case. The twentieth century is replete with examples of how famous personalities aspired to become (or became regardless of their desires) active participants in international politics. So, for example, in 1919 At the Versailles Peace Conference, the legendary British traveler Lawrence of Arabia, who enjoyed great influence in Britain and the Middle East, made persistent (but unsuccessful) attempts to achieve independence for the Arab regions of the Ottoman Empire.

A striking example of a new type of diplomats from among celebrities were famous jazz performers Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, Beni Goodman, who in the 1950s and 60s were able to make a significant contribution to the popularization of American musical culture abroad.

These outstanding performers had the opportunity to perform concerts around the world, meet with world-class politicians and ultimately create a favorable impression of the United States.

With the end of the Cold War, the activities within the "celebrity diplomacy" not only did not lose their significance, but also became more extensive. It seems that this situation was caused by the transformation of modern diplomatic practice, which was accompanied by an increase in the influence of non-governmental organizations and individuals on the sphere of international relations. In addition, the development of information and communication technologies in the XXI century has given celebrities truly limitless opportunities to interact with the audience [5]. In the era of social networks, the need to organize press conferences to articulate their socio-political position is gradually losing its former relevance, since celebrities can always use the capabilities of Web 2.0 technology for these purposes.

Despite the advantages of celebrity diplomacy, this area of public diplomacy is from time to time fiercely criticized by journalists and the academic community. First of all, celebrities involved in humanitarian activities are often accused of incompetence [6, p. 260], referring to the fact that many of them (if we are not talking about former politicians) lack practical experience in solving global problems of world politics.

Critics of "celebrity diplomacy" also point out that one or another "star" personality is not always suitable for the implementation of public diplomacy programs. For example, in October 2017, The World Health Organization (WHO) has appointed former Zimbabwean President R. Mugabe (who has a rather dubious reputation in the world) to the post of goodwill ambassador. A day later, WHO, faced with a barrage of criticism, was forced to reverse its decision.

Quite often, celebrities (especially from the field of cinema) become "hostages" of their own careers, since their professional participation in projects related to violence and excessive sexuality can interfere with the implementation of humanitarian projects. In some regions of the world (for example, in the countries of the Middle East), a negative "screen" image of an actor or musician can cause hostility and distrust among the local population.

Still, these groups are negatively scrutinized on a number of other fronts. Some critics, especially in Europe, decry the erosion of civil society – and especially radical NGOs – at the expense of celebrity diplomats. American conservatives see the ascendancy of 'insider' celebrity diplomats as another sign of the triumph of Hollywood liberalism. This image is reinforced by the activism of 'anti-diplomats,' such as singer/actor Harry Belafonte, who are usually conflated into the same box by the American right.

As in all areas of International Relations, it is precisely the waves of criticism that signal the breakthrough of celebrity diplomacy as a serious enterprise deserving sustained scrutiny. As long as this was a marginal activity it only attracted a minor degree of interest with little need or interest in conceptualizing what the phenomenon means in either issue-specific cases or in conceptual terms. Rather than being viewed as an unanticipated intrusion that diminishes the discipline, taking celebrity diplomacy seriously reveals IRs rich capacity for inclusion and adaptation [7].

And finally, critics of "celebrity diplomacy" often see it as a continuation of the West's neocolonial policy towards developing countries. Through the prism of this approach (based on the ideas of neo-Marxism), the humanitarian activities of celebrities in the poorest countries of the South appear not as a socially significant phenomenon, but as a way of self-promotion for the countries of the North, additionally as a tool for planting neoliberal ideology (based on the fact that a number of celebrities (Madonna, B. Pitt, A. Jolie, Bono) in their international activities relied on the theoretical views of the neoliberal economist D. Sachs, who was one of the developers of the policy of "shock therapy" in Bolivia, Poland and Russia).

From our point of view, "celebrity diplomacy", even taking into account objective shortcomings, continues to be an extremely important area of public diplomacy. The ability of celebrities to attract a significant audience and the level of trust and support that they initially possess, favor both the formation of positive ideas about the state abroad and the minimization of existing stereotypes about it.

In analysing celebrity involvement in diplomatic initiatives, a mixed picture has emerged. UN Goodwill Ambassadors and Messengers of Peace, NGO endorsers and famous activists have used their star power to affect pressure upon diplomats, international policymakers and national leaders. As the critiques of celebrity advocates have indicated, there are dangers in oversimplifying complex forms of international diplomacy, utilizing emotional responses and becoming servants of the power elite. However, celebrities have promoted alternative discourses, and have developed credible diplomatic interventions. As Ira Wagman comments, the analysis must now move beyond the polarities of 'help or hurt' to consider why 'celebrities turn to diplomatic issues, why specific celebrities team up with particular institutions, and what each has to gain' [8]. Therefore, while remaining critically engaged with the processes of celebrity diplomacy, it is necessary to engage with the implications for opportunity and reform that have become manifest in an open-minded and intellectually curious fashion.

In moving the debate along, it should be noted that as celebrities have become more politically conscious they have brought about new forms of diplomatic engagement which have indicated a transformation from a state-centric to more populist approaches to international relations. These reforms have occurred within a construct of global collaboration so that networks of institutional and ideological power facilitate diplomatic reforms. Thus, in soft power terms, the politics of attraction within celebrity-led campaigns such as Make Poverty History and Product RED have facilitated greater forms of agency to alleviate global suffering. Further, the dialogue between celebrities and the public has allowed for new opportunities for public diplomatic engagement. This has reflected a willingness within audiences to accept celebrities as authentic advocates due to the public's identification with stars. Consequently, the celebrityization of international politics must not be simply dismissed as an erosion of the diplomatic order but should be understood as part of the transformation processes which are occurring within public diplomacy.

### References

- 1 Cooper A. *Celebrity Diplomacy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishing, 2007, P. 177.
- 2 Cull, N. (2009). *Public diplomacy: lessons from the past*. CPD report. Los Angeles: Press/USC Center on Public Diplomacy. Retrieved from:
- 3 <http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/sites/uscpublicdiplomacy.org/files/useruploads/u35361/2009%20Paper%202.pdf>
- 4 Szondi, G. (2008). *Public diplomacy and nation branding: conceptual similarities and differences*. Discussion papers in diplomacy. Retrieved from:
- 5 [https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20081022\\_pap\\_in\\_dip\\_nation\\_branding.pdf](https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/20081022_pap_in_dip_nation_branding.pdf)
- 6 Matijašević N. *Celebrity diplomacy*, *Modern Diplomacy*, 2015 // <https://modern diplomacy.eu/2015/01/11/celebrity-diplomacy/>
- 7 Wheeler, M. (2014). *The mediatization of celebrity politics through the social media*. *International Journal of Digital Television*, 5(3), 221–235.
- 8 Dieter, H., & Kumar, R. (2008). *The downside of celebrity diplomacy: the neglected complexity of development*. *Global Governance*, 14(3).
- 9 Andrew F. Cooper. *Taking Celebrity Diplomacy Seriously in International Relations* // <https://www.e-ir.info/2009/09/14/taking-celebrity-diplomacy-seriously-in-international-relations/>
- 10 Wagman, I. (2014) 'Celebrity diplomacy without effects', *Public Diplomacy Magazine*, 30 May. <http://publicdiplomacymagazine.com/celebrity-diplomacy-without-effectsdannyykaye-and-unicef/>

УДК 327.102

## ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

**Shahzadaev Rahim**

ramu99@mail.ru

2-d year master's student, Faculty of International relations,  
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan  
Supervisor – D. Akhmedyanova

IFIs - institutions established on the basis of interstate (international) agreements in the field of international finance.