

Abstracts

Nordic Varieties of Diplomacy

Martin Marcussen, Professor,
Institut for Statskundskab,
Københavns Universitet, mm@ifs.ku.dk

In their foreign policies, Sweden, Denmark, Finland and Norway are huge successes. They are punching above their weight in international relations. It should not come as a surprise, therefore, that outsiders only see one Nordic model of diplomacy. In their foreign relations the Nordic countries are open and caring model countries with good international brands who are pursuing activist foreign policies in bilateral as well as multilateral contexts. However, this article concludes that it makes good sense to talk about a Nordic variety of diplomacy. In strategic, political as well as in organizational terms, there are basic differences between the Nordic models of diplomacy. The overall point, therefore, is this: there are many ways to success in foreign policy.

The Foreign Policy is Dead – Long Live Diplomacy!

Jess Pilegaard,
Kontorchef i Udenrigsministeriet, Ph.D.,
ekstern lektor ved Roskilde Universitet,
jespil@um.dk

There are no closed circuits in the globalized world. The distinction between domestic and foreign policies is blurred. The monopoly of diplomacy over foreign policy has been broken. In combination with the fact that resources allocated to foreign policy have become scarce while the demands for foreign policy activism have grown it is fair to say that diplomacy all the world has become challenged. In the Danish Foreign Service the challenge has been met with ongoing organizational reforms, increased collaboration with likeminded countries in Northern Europe as well as within the framework of international intergovernmental organizations and, not least, increased focus on digital diplomacy and improved public diplomacy. Diplomacy is more important today than ever before. However, today the Danish Foreign Service is working in the back-ground preparing the ground for other foreign policy actors. This makes its activities less visible in domestic politics.

The Changing Face of Finnish Diplomacy: A New Model in the Making?

Hiski Haukkala,
Professor i International Politik,
Tampere Universitet, Finland,
Hiski.haukkala@uta.fi

This article discusses the changing substance, structures and context of Finnish diplomacy. The article will analyze the substance of Finnish diplomacy with a view to setting the scene for an analysis of the context(s) within which Finnish diplomacy and, in the final instance, Finnish diplomats are operating. The central finding of this piece is that during the post-Cold War period, Finnish foreign policy and, consequently, the substance, structures and context of Finnish diplomacy have been in flux. The main argument is that Finnish diplomacy is currently going through a period of serious soul searching, facing a situation where increased diplomatic challenges and tasks have to be met in an era of decreasing financial and human resources. This has already forced Finland to innovate, a process that is likely to continue and even gather pace in future. To a degree, Finland is clinging to a notion of autonomous diplomatic actorness in a world where the possibilities of small countries to succeed in the task are becoming increasingly challenged.

A Swedish Model of Diplomacy?

Mats Bergquist,
Docent i statskundskab ved Lunds Universitet,
tidligere svensk ambassadør
mats.bergquist@lnu.se

The loss of Finland in 1809 and the union with Norway in 1814 meant a paradigmatic change in Swedish foreign policy. After 200 years of engagement in European affairs, since the Thirty Years War, Sweden withdrew from the

continent and initiated a policy of neutrality that generally would last until the accession to the European Union in 1995. During the war in Vietnam, the policies would become much more active and vocal on the international scene. At the same time, Sweden began to increase its development cooperation with many recently independent countries. Membership of the EU, and thus of a political alliance, meant a new paradigmatic change. Swedish diplomacy is now adjusting to the new situation, to the communication revolution and continuing budgetary constraints. Still, the profession is much respected and sought-after

Nordic Smart Diplomacy: for Others to Emulate?

Anders Wivel, lektor,
Institut for Statskundskab,
Københavns Universitet, aw@ifs.ku.dk

Despite fitting almost any definition of small states, the Nordic countries has for years played an active and very visible role in international diplomacy, and thereby challenging expectations of small state diplomacy. Taking its departure in the so-called smart state approach to international diplomacy, this article answers three questions: What characterizes the Nordic approach to international diplomacy? How is Nordic diplomacy different from traditional small state diplomacy? What lessons can be learned from the Nordic experience with smart diplomacy in international affairs?

Building Bridges and Walls. Paradoxes in Public-Private Innovation Projects

Nana Vaaben, Ph.D.-studerende,
Institut for Samfund og Globalisering,
Roskilde Universitet, nana@ruc.dk

Dorthe Hedensted Lund, adjunkt,
Skov & Landskab/By- og landskabsstudier,
Københavns Universitet, dhl@life.ku.dk

The article pictures two different but co-existing notions of the market: The Market Mechanism and the Growth Motor. New Public Management has sought to renew the public sector by activating the Market Mechanism, and New Public Governance

is seeking to renew the public sector by the help of Growth Motor thinking. Because the two ways of thinking exist simultaneously in both the private and the public sector, and because they imply very different types of relations between the two sectors, they end up standing in the way of each other. New Public Management calls for short non-binding relations of trade between the partners, whereas New Public Governance calls for long, binding partnerships based on mutual trust. The article suggests a political debate about the relation between the sectors, rather than letting local partners struggle with the paradoxes of building bridges and walls in exactly the same places.