

**Chapter 1 : Institute for Cultural Diplomacy**

*Drawing on English and Japanese published and archival sources, Artifacts of Diplomacy extensively documents each artifact and presents the context of cultural contacts from both the Japanese and the American points of view.*

However, there exists a more neglected piece of IR scholarship dedicated to diplomacy. While Africa has always had trouble finding a home in the school of IR, the lack of research on African diplomats and their practices is a glaring hole in IR, especially considering the rich recent history of the international movements associated with the continent. The actions of transnational movements connected to independence movements, development aid, and human rights deserve study by scholars to understand if Africa is still on the receiving end of norms from the West or whether the continent is a source of new practices and norms in IR. This paper will put forth an argument that there are diplomatic norms that have taken hold on the continent, which have connections to the Pan-Africanist movement which now resides in the African Union. These norms have had significant impact on the integration movement on the continent from the Organization for African Unity to the African Union. This paper will outline the diplomatic norms and explain how they impact the push for continental integration. I will also investigate a potential actor in the integration process that has yet to be identified in this process: Pan-Africanist Union

When the independence movement of Sub-Saharan Africa finally broke through the barrier of European rule in , the liberation leaders of the newly independent countries sought to join together to purge the continent of all colonial rulers and to bind their collective power into an organization that would represent the new Africa to the world. The leaders who sought this integration of the continent came to be seen by later generations as the fathers of the Pan-African movement, which still continues today, though in different forms. However, the current integration of the continent is significantly less than comparable supra-national organizations with the European Union EU the body the AU is most often compared to. Westphalian sovereignty was a norm passed on to African states at independence and one enshrined very quickly in the Organization for African Unity OAU cite. Maintaining the borders of colonial states has become a hallmark of African IR, which was primarily motivated by leaders seeking to consolidate their sovereignty as a way of compensating for their weak power or legitimacy within their country. In fact, the idea of collective action on a continental level dates back to the first Pan-African Congress held in Paris in This idea was intertwined with the themes of economic development, political freedom, and social welfare that remain prominent in African Union discourse today. With Nkrumah the leading voice for a continent government, his reasonings hold particular interest because of their applicability to present day Africa. First, Nkrumah saw the need for continental economic planning that would maximize the benefits of African resources for African people. Second, a unified defense and military strategy was necessary to protect the micro-states that had emerged during the independence era who could not resist the neo-colonial advances of external powers. Third, the ability to unify foreign policy and diplomacy would amplify political coordination in the areas of defense and economic development. Afromats have the potential to be entrepreneurs in this new regional body to advocate for this new agenda of African integration. Before exploring the role that diplomats could have for integration, it is important to highlight the current diplomatic norms that formed during the OAU that still have resonance today. There is no mention of those states who found themselves in the Non-Aligned Movement of the Cold War, or those of the developing or emerging world today. In fact, he fails to draw on any possible examples that would support his five diplomatic norms from any region other than those intertwined with the Anglo-Saxon sphere of geo-politics. Africa, Asia, and South America are all omitted from these norms and raises questions about the norms applicability to these culturally vastly different regions of the world. As noted earlier, state sovereignty in mid-century Africa was a contested issue due to the historical experiences with colonialism and neo-colonialism during the Cold War. African states thus developed diplomatic norms and principles connected to their low standing in world politics and international relations. While the space does not exist to examine these norms in detail, it is important to understand them in relation to regional integration. The first African diplomatic norm is anti-imperialism, the movement by African states to rid the continent of external and foreign forces that seek to exploit the African population. It

is important to note that even though anti-European liberation movements ended with the political independence of Zimbabwe in 1980, the rhetoric of African leaders continued to advocate for economic autonomy in the decades after self-rule began. Anti-imperial rhetoric continues today, and while often used to cover domestic failings of autocratic or corrupt leaders, this usage and resonance with African constituencies in fact proves the longevity and pervasiveness of the norm. This poses a challenge to integrationists, because small states may perceive the transfer of sovereignty to Addis Ababa as a neo-imperialist threat if they perceive the more powerful African states are forcing integration. The second norm that integrationists at the AU must confront is the vehement adherence to the political borders left by the colonial powers. The OAU enshrined this norm of *uti possidetis* in its charter and in subsequent meetings, and has made a substantial impact on the continent for the nearly 50 years. This has meant the lines drawn on the continent by European powers in Berlin in 1884 remain in place despite the irrationality of the borders. The consequences have been the inability of secession movements to gain support among other African states. The OAU supported the national sovereignty of state by working towards compromises retaining the integrity of the colonial borders. African integrationists will confront African publics that see the lasting reputation of the regional body as stifling self-determination and political rights. The norm had the chance to evolve with the successful independence of South Sudan, but the coming AU-backed military invasion into northern Mali likely reinforces this norm. The third norm of African diplomacy is the solidarity of African states on the world stage. The solidarity in voting at the UN began very soon after independence, and extended to issues beyond those on the African agenda. This last norm bodes well for a potential AU foreign service. If all African countries are committed to coordinating their foreign policies, then current Addis-based Afromats would be permitted to shape more of the diplomatic agenda on the supra-national level allowing them to put more comprehensive integration on the agenda. There has been notable resistance of African leaders to norms that would threaten sovereign prerogatives and territorial integrity since independence. Therefore, the first two norms, anti-imperialism and adherence to colonial borders, stand as significant obstacles to African integration. She identifies the European diplomats as an epistemic community that uses their shared expertise and common culture to increase collaboration that extends beyond their national mandate. Cross sees this happening particularly in the area of security, drawing on the numerous interviews conducted at The Hague with ambassadors, generals, and other experts. *Africrats and Their Unlikely Opponents* The OAU was granted very limited supra-national power at its formation and struggled to become a meaningful regional body because of the resistance to deep integration by those countries in the Monrovia Group. This left the organs of the OAU, particularly the Secretariat, with weak mandates and packed with inept political appointees. This policy-setting extended back to the 1960s when a geo-political shift took place following the Cold War and Africrats sought the development of a single act to govern to two major organs of African integration: This essentially was a call to replace the OAU, and set in motion the reform that gave birth to the AU. Despite this new framework and the new policy organ, Tiekue argues that Africrats have continued to create and direct policy initiatives. This has resulted in the inability of the primary policy organ of the AU to conduct any long-term strategic planning. Tiekue does not lay the blame for poor-policy planning on just the Presidents and Foreign Ministers that make up the two major organs of the AU. In fact, he shows how Afromats on the Permanent Representatives Committee PRC have become inhibiting gatekeepers that have stifled innovation and ideas. In distinction to Europe, the diplomats have a stifling effect on integration, thus adhering to the anti-integration diplomatic norms that have developed over the past 50 years, limiting the pull of sovereignty to Addis Ababa. *Conclusion* The implications for diplomacy and integration described in this paper reinforce the belief that diplomats and diplomatic culture have strong effects on efforts to consolidate power in supra-national regional organizations. In Europe, they are the drivers of integration through the socialization of state representatives to The Hague. In Africa, the diplomats are a hand-brake to the more integrationist Africrats. Still, the power of the diplomatic epistemic community as identified by Cross has great potential for Africa. A significant amount of Pan-African support at the highest levels of African governments has been a hallmark of the continent since the independence of Ghana in 1946. Discussions surrounding the concept of a union government has continued, displaying that the resilience of goal despite changes in governments and national policies. However, substantial challenges are posed to the

epistemic community of Afromats and Africrats in Addis Ababa. Notably, the diplomatic norms of strict respect for state sovereignty and resistance to external powers, even African powers, pose obstacles to those in the African Union seeking a stronger supra-national organization. These obstacles are then combined with the obstructionist behavior Tiekku identified in AU diplomats, who damper innovation on the continental level. Despite this finding that Afromats are part of the impediment to further AU integration, their importance is still worth noting. In both African and European examples, diplomats assigned to the supra-national body have exceptional influence that go beyond the design of the body. In Europe, this has resulted in further integration, in Africa the opposite is seen. However, both sets of diplomats appear to be the gatekeepers to innovative ideas. Future research in Africa should be dedicated to understanding how Africrats and those Africans who seek greater integration can aid Afromats in overcoming their objections to innovation and deeper collaboration. New York, Cambria Press; This edited volume contains significant analysis of the founding of the African Union and the forces behind the progressive integrationist approach and the gradualistic approach that eventually won the debate on how the supra-national organizations of Africa should interact with state sovereignty. With sovereignty intrinsically tied to the monopoly over violence, the transfer of the security agenda from a national level to a continental level, also transfers sovereignty to the European Union. However, it is not just the matter of security that impacts integration. The level of interactivity of the diplomatic corps stationed in Brussels and The Hague has allowed a homogenous group of actors, who share similar norms of diplomacy and protocol, to develop new norms. Cross argues that it is necessary to understand the diplomatic role played by these actors in order to understand the progress or set backs of European integration. This creates a lens that research on other regional bodies, such as the African Union, could conduct studies in order to gain an understanding of the impact diplomats have on African integration efforts. *The European Diplomatic Corps: Diplomats and International Cooperation from Westphalia to Maastricht.* Cross considers four historical diplomatic encounters that shaped the course of European Integration. *Drivers of African Regionalism.* Andrew Grant, and Scarlett Cornelissen, This article presents a new look on African integration by focusing on the technocrats who make up the organs of the African Union. Tiekku explains how Secretary-Generals of the organization were able to push reforms through with little debate or discussion from the member states. Importantly, Tiekku identifies opponents to his integrationist Africrats: Tiekku writes that most are dismissed out of hand, but especially those that would require financial considerations. *Bumping into Diplomatic Culture.* The article explains the different IR perspectives on diplomatic culture, and the argument put forth by Wiseman that diplomatic culture exists and is important is accepted as the foundation for the writing of this paper.

### Chapter 2 : 2,year-old Persian artifact a gift of U.S. diplomacy to Iran? - CNN

*Summary. Following a ten-page Chronicle recounting how what is known as the Perry Collection came into being, the bulk of this page book consists of a Catalog containing collection item descriptions with accompanying black and white photographs.*

Perhaps the invitation resulted in part from the fact that besides being a practitioner of public diplomacy for most of my professional life, I recently worked in a government "reinvention lab" at the U. Information Agency in Washington, where the newest ideas in management and communications technology were tested. This experience gives me, I like to think, a view of the future of public diplomacy as well as the present. In any case, I will speak from my experience and hope that you will see parallels and applications that might be relevant elsewhere. I would be happy to take questions and debate any of my assertions at the end of the presentation. To understand, inform, and influence foreign publics in promotion of the national interest and to broaden the dialogue between Americans and U. To accomplish this, we explain and advocate U. A colleague of mine summarized this mission by calling our activities "retail politics on a global scale. On another day, the public diplomacy practitioner is helping select candidates for the Fulbright academic exchange program and attending a seminar or cultural event that connects the country where he is posted with the United States. In each case, our practitioner is reaching beyond the government elites who decide policy and is interacting with the larger publics in the country where he or she is serving. He is in touch primarily with influential people, journalists, academics, and other leaders in society who help shape public opinion. Public diplomacy, at least as it is construed in the U. Hence the term "diplomacy. You will not be surprised that this is essentially the same as the context for practicing "regular" diplomacy, except that with public diplomacy one throws a bit more communications technology into the mix. A number of foresightful people in our foreign affairs community - chiefly Barry Fulton, my recent boss and mentor in the Information Bureau at USIA - have observed that the era of the "wise men" has now ended. Diplomacy is undergoing changes as profound as those that established it as an art and science in the sixteenth century. For a host of reasons including the telecommunications revolution, decision-making about foreign policy and about many aspects of life is moving away from the center of government and out into society. Foreign affairs is no longer the preserve of a few elites, but increasingly is shared by regions, states, non-governmental organizations, businesses and other non-state actors. Who is more influential - Bill Clinton or Bill Gates? Jessica Matthews of the Council on Foreign Relations warns us of a forthcoming "emotional, cultural, and political earthquake" as a result of these changes. Parallel with the way decision-making is evolving is, of course, the revolution in technology - especially information technology - and the effect of this revolution on the social order. Fulton has drawn attention to a Canadian scholar, Harold Innis, who observed over fifty years ago that major changes in communications result in social change. To test this theory, I invite you to consider how progress in information technology affected human and official reactions to war: I would propose that with each advance of technology, more information became available, the interested public became broader and public opinion rallied faster and more powerfully around the world. I would further propose that this sequence expands citizen participation and enlarges democracy and is therefore, on the whole, a desirable development. Finally, for further context, I would like to turn again to Dr. Fulton, who constructed a paradigm last year for considering the world now and into the next century. Fulton asks that we imagine a three-dimensional space defined on one axis by the terms "integration" and "fragmentation. If we repeated this same exercise in ten years and if we constructed our map using data from ten years ago as well, we could demonstrate the dynamism of the world, seeing how the units move in relation to each other. No country or group would stay in the same place or in the same relation to other units. While dynamism characterized mapping processes in the past, change was occurring much, much more slowly than it is today. As the rate of change accelerates, former habits of control and of international relationships need to be re-thought. What this new paradigm suggests is that the geo-political world has become so complex that the notion of national control is obsolete, a useless chimera. Instead, "dynamic stability" is what we should be striving to achieve. This is actually a

central thesis of "systems theory," which suggests that stability is strengthened in a rich but loosely connected dynamic system that maintains its integrity through an information flow that is called "feedback. The first is time, which is implicit in the dynamism in the map. The second is image, and how important the effect of images has become on us as our world becomes more visual and less literary. The third variable is trust. When trust in relations and institutions diminishes, the dynamic relation between elements on the map can easily fall into a state of disequilibrium and the stability of the system is put at risk. Why do we need it? The first and most important reason from my perspective is that the influence of public opinion on government decision-making is increasing steadily around the world. Publics in democratic countries have learned to wield influence on their governments in ever more effective ways - note the reasons the Vietnam War ended, for a classic example of this phenomenon. Meanwhile more and more countries appear to be in the act of becoming democratic and thus subject to the power of public opinion. There is little rationale for believing that either of these trends will fade away; in fact, it is more likely that they will intensify. Even the few closed societies that remain are finding themselves somewhat more attendant to public opinion than previously. I argue that where the influence of public opinion is growing, there should be a concomitant strengthening of public diplomacy. Citizens similarly and routinely use public demonstrations, like those that often occur outside embassies, to convey their views, directly or via the media, to foreign governments. Leaders also bypass the closed circuits of traditional diplomacy to talk directly by phone, as Clinton and Blair seem in the habit of doing, often several times a week. Most of this open-circuit communication is made possible by the modern revolution in information technology, and most of this is wonderful. For one thing, the media are not always accurate and not always complete. For another, the media often sensationalize or slant a story in order to attract audiences in what is a fiercely competitive commercial battle for market share. Additionally, the profusion of sources and amounts of information available results in a public overwhelmed and confused by the welter of messages. Who has time to figure it out? One significant solution to this nexus of problems is a robust government public diplomacy program that organizes, conveys, verifies and authenticates information about its country, so that the interested public, including opinion-leaders, have a reliable source. A major power is going to be the subject of discussion and controversy no matter what it does. It is going to wish to have some direct input into that discussion, and it can do so through public diplomacy. This has not changed with the passing into history of the bipolar world of the Cold War. In fact, the multipolar world, rife with less predictable threats - terrorism, ethnic rivalries, contentious trade disputes among allies and adversaries alike, catastrophic environmental degradation and so on - forces the major powers into simultaneous efforts to win public support for a variety of their positions. I believe we could have had more productive global debate and a better outcome on global warming prior to the Kyoto conference, for example, if we had mounted a concerted public diplomacy campaign explaining the U. Generally, the smaller powers do not enter the global public discussion unless a crisis or scandal envelops them. It is unfortunate, but these seem to be the events that attract the global media and interest the mass audiences to which they cater. Perhaps it is for this very reason that smaller powers need public diplomacy programs, just as major powers do. The task for the smaller powers is to be heard on the stories that matter to them, to explain their positions and aspirations during the non-crisis moments, and to do so in a way that captures attention. The demise of the bipolar world and the rise of the new paradigm appear to mean that major and smaller powers both find themselves in new relationships and collaborations with other nations. Power and prosperity depend, instead, at least as much and maybe more, on a healthy economy, access to markets, and leadership in the creation of marketable services and products. Diplomacy has become the art of achieving agreements among entities whose mutual advantage is served by collaborative effort. Public support is essential. How to do it? Now I intend to describe how public diplomacy programs are conducted, drawing on my own experience as an American practitioner. Other countries with energetic public diplomacy programs, which most of the major powers have, would offer interesting variations, and I certainly invite you to examine them. I will start with information programs and proceed to cultural and educational activities. Information programs concentrate on the fast-moving actions and decisions of government and aim dissemination of materials to international journalists, government officials, and those academics and other opinion-shapers who follow the daily agenda of world affairs. In Washington at our

headquarters we gather all the speeches, public position papers, transcripts of press conferences or other public pronouncements of the U. Within hours of these materials becoming available, we compile them and send them electronically to each U. We also mount them on our Website so that the overseas public has direct and immediate access to them. Additionally, we translate many of these materials into world languages - French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, with recent additions of Chinese and Portuguese. We do all this centrally because it saves time. Also centrally, we develop strategies on how best to convey U. At our embassies overseas, we have people like me in London or, here in Malta, like Keith Peterson, who manage the dissemination locally of all this material coming from Washington. We also absorb it so that we can explain it in person, ideally with sensitivity to local issues and concerns and by means of using the local language with some fluency. In large media centers like London, we have a larger staff, of course, with several American officers each specializing in, say, broadcast or print media, and with locally hired experts to assist them. Our embassy operations in large media centers also become adept at handling the press-related requirements of VIP visits. In London, where the number of visiting U. In the last couple of months, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright met frequently in London with Cook, Netanyahu and Arafat, and each time she held a press conference afterward, thus confirming the observation that the public side of diplomacy is at least as important as the private side. Actually, in Malta I should not neglect the fact that high-visibility events come to small countries, too: The press arrangements were just as crucial and considerably more challenging than if they had met in London. The information side of public diplomacy also includes the writing of speeches, either for senior officers of the embassy or oneself. Our Ambassador in London, for example, is asked to give far more public statements than any one person could generate alone, if he intended also to keep time aside for such other tasks as running the embassy, acting as liaison between the two governments or staying abreast of policy developments. So my office provides him with background information, research and other materials on which to draw. In a large embassy, this means acting as the information front-end of the U. Our offerings must run this same gamut: At the end of what I thought was a very persuasive presentation, one of the junior diplomats in the audience said, "Yes, but what we really want to know is how to control the press. No amount of "spinning" is going to change the facts. What you can do, though, is present and explain the facts accurately, persuasively and fast. When I was in Indonesia, we had a very contentious trade dispute that involved obscure U. The Indonesian press and public initially were outraged at what they assumed was an action on the part of the U. Fortunately for both countries, this initial assumption was faulty. By first grasping and then explaining the facts of the U. Thus a fast, fact-driven campaign was able to prevent a nasty dispute and preserve what were quite harmonious overall relations.

### Chapter 3 : Drop the diktats, try diplomacy: Major takeaways from Lavrov's UN speech " RT World I

*THE ART OF DIPLOMACY: THE USE OF ART IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.*

What is Cultural Diplomacy? What is Soft Power? Watch a Video Lecture by Prof. Whilst the term "cultural diplomacy" has only recently been established, evidence of its practice can be seen throughout history and has existed for centuries. For example, the establishment of regular trade routes enables a frequent exchange of information and cultural gifts and expressions between traders and government representatives. Such deliberate efforts of cultural and communication exchange can be identified as early examples of cultural diplomacy. Throughout history the interaction of peoples, the exchange of language, religion, ideas, arts and societal structures have consistently improved relations between divergent groups. No longer relegated to the periphery of the international relations discipline, cultural diplomacy today is a vibrant and innovative academic field of research and has successfully established itself as a stand-alone theory and practice.

Definition What is Cultural Diplomacy? These models include for example diverse cultural exchange programs, international delegations e. The examples are uniquely able to affect intercultural and interfaith understanding and promote reconciliation. By accomplishing the first principle, one enables the second, which in turn enables the third until the fifth ultimate principle of global peace and stability is achieved. The political scientist Prof. This is where the role of Soft Power as a form of cultural diplomacy becomes significant. On this basis, cultural diplomacy is not secondary to political or economic diplomacy, but rather functions as an intrinsic and necessary component of it. The Private Sector As the move towards more socially responsible business practices gains momentum, the ability to understand and embrace the different values and needs of diverse cultures and societies becomes ever more important. There are many reasons why corporations need to be aware of the differences between cultures in their strategic decision-making process and adopt cultural diplomacy models into their agenda: In the era of growing social awareness, corporates with culturally sensitive marketing plans and campaigns will enjoy a positive public opinion and good image, thus financially perform better. Companies seeking to expand abroad, will encounter problems unless they conduct research into, and act according to the cultural differences with the host country. Companies with a national focus face a related challenge in ensuring that they are aware of and sensitive to national cultural minorities.

## Chapter 4 : Public diplomacy | DiploFoundation

*Diplomacy is an art form, involving communication, negotiation, and relationship building. Art is also a tool of diplomacy, a universal language that visually communicates cross-culturally.*

Our activities follow the principles, approach and logic of the European strategic approach to international cultural relations and rely on the experience of practitioners, including cultural operators and artists. Each activity is therefore organised in cooperation and co-creation with local partners within a sustainable framework, and involving civil society. Culture is at the core of our foreign policy, and for quite some time now, the development of a strategic approach to international cultural relations is one of our priorities. And this direction must go beyond the simple teaching of our culture: The Cultural Diplomacy Platform will strengthen our ability to engage on an equal footing with our partners across with the globe – from international organisations, national governments, local authorities, civil society organisations and individual citizens. The Platform will provide support and policy advice to the EU institutions, including the EU Delegations, cultural stakeholders in Europe and outside, and set up a global cultural leadership training programme for young cultural managers. Ultimately, this will truly make culture the European way to engage partners around the world. Our main objectives are to: In the long term, the consortium implementing the Cultural Diplomacy Platform hopes that these activities will lead to: New and positive development of existing cultural diplomacy policies and methodologies at EU level; An increasing number of cultural diplomacy activities at EU level, including by EU Delegations; New and positive development of existing tools and training programmes for cultural diplomacy at EU level; Changes in EU Strategic Partnership Agreements or other documents setting the frame for EU relations with partner countries

Sana Ouchtati Team Leader As an independent cultural relations consultant, Sana Ouchtati is the Team Leader of the Cultural Diplomacy Platform. She is also involved in several other initiatives in the field and is steering important initiatives dedicated to external culture relations. In , she worked at the European Institutions in Brussels, mainly on trade multilateral and bilateral agreements. She has a thorough knowledge of the cultural field, international relations as well as EU processes, policies and instruments dedicated to external relations, culture and intercultural dialogue. She is also a postdoctoral researcher and independent expert in the field of cultural heritage and development. She has established competences and wide experience in field of cultural heritage and cultural relations working in different organisations and she holds a PhD in participatory and integrated governance of cultural heritage in the Western Balkans. She also studied in France and in the United States. She is French, speaks English and has been working on her German. She has been working with different European programmes in the sectors of culture, education, civil society and youth. From to Antonia Blau coordinated the establishment of an antenna of the Goethe-Institut in Marseilles in the framework of the European Capital of Culture Marseille-Provence She is interested in the contact points between politics and arts and culture in an international context and holds an M. It promotes the study of the German language abroad and encourages international cultural exchange, including through European projects.

**Chapter 5 : Cultural diplomacy - Wikipedia**

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

Byzantine diplomacy The key challenge to the Byzantine Empire was to maintain a set of relations between itself and its sundry neighbors, including the Georgians , Iberians , the Germanic peoples , the Bulgars , the Slavs , the Armenians , the Huns , the Avars , the Franks , the Lombards , and the Arabs , that embodied and so maintained its imperial status. All these neighbors lacked a key resource that Byzantium had taken over from Rome, namely a formalized legal structure. When they set about forging formal political institutions, they were dependent on the empire. Whereas classical writers are fond of making a sharp distinction between peace and war, for the Byzantines diplomacy was a form of war by other means. On Strategy, from the 6th century, offers advice about foreign embassies: Their attendants, however, should be kept under surveillance to keep them from obtaining any information by asking questions of our people. Milan played a leading role, especially under Francesco Sforza who established permanent embassies to the other city states of Northern Italy. Tuscany and Venice were also flourishing centres of diplomacy from the 14th century onwards. From Italy the practice was spread across Europe. Milan was the first to send a representative to the court of France in 1489. However, Milan refused to host French representatives fearing espionage and that the French representatives would intervene in its internal affairs. As foreign powers such as France and Spain became increasingly involved in Italian politics the need to accept emissaries was recognized. Soon the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Spain was the first to send a permanent representative; it appointed an ambassador to the Court of St. James. By the late 16th century, permanent missions became customary. The Holy Roman Emperor , however, did not regularly send permanent legates, as they could not represent the interests of all the German princes who were in theory all subordinate to the Emperor, but in practice each independent. In rules of modern diplomacy were further developed. The top rank of representatives was an ambassador. At that time an ambassador was a nobleman, the rank of the noble assigned varying with the prestige of the country he was delegated to. Strict standards developed for ambassadors, requiring they have large residences, host lavish parties, and play an important role in the court life of their host nation. In Rome, the most prized posting for a Catholic ambassador, the French and Spanish representatives would have a retinue of up to a hundred. Even in smaller posts, ambassadors were very expensive. Smaller states would send and receive envoys , who were a rung below ambassador. Somewhere between the two was the position of minister plenipotentiary. Diplomacy was a complex affair, even more so than now. The ambassadors from each state were ranked by complex levels of precedence that were much disputed. States were normally ranked by the title of the sovereign; for Catholic nations the emissary from the Vatican was paramount, then those from the kingdoms , then those from duchies and principalities. Representatives from republics were ranked the lowest which often angered the leaders of the numerous German, Scandinavian and Italian republics. Determining precedence between two kingdoms depended on a number of factors that often fluctuated, leading to near-constant squabbling. Ambassadors were often nobles with little foreign experience and no expectation of a career in diplomacy. They were supported by their embassy staff. These professionals would be sent on longer assignments and would be far more knowledgeable than the higher-ranking officials about the host country. Embassy staff would include a wide range of employees, including some dedicated to espionage. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the graduates of universities, and this led to a great increase in the study of international law , French, and history at universities throughout Europe. Frontispiece of the Acts of the Congress of Vienna. At the same time, permanent foreign ministries began to be established in almost all European states to coordinate embassies and their staffs. These ministries were still far from their modern form, and many of them had extraneous internal responsibilities. Britain had two departments with frequently overlapping powers until 1801. They were also far smaller than they are currently. France, which boasted the largest foreign affairs department, had only some 70 full-time employees in the s.

The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and Russia , arriving by the early 18th century. The entire edifice would be greatly disrupted by the French Revolution and the subsequent years of warfare. The revolution would see commoners take over the diplomacy of the French state, and of those conquered by revolutionary armies. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France. After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna established an international system of diplomatic rank. Disputes on precedence among nations and therefore the appropriate diplomatic ranks used were first addressed at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1793, but persisted for over a century until after World War II , when the rank of ambassador became the norm. In between that time, figures such as the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck were renowned for international diplomacy. Diplomats themselves and historians often refer to the foreign ministry by its address: The "Consulta" referred to the Italian ministry of Foreign Affairs, based in the Palazzo della Consulta from 1871 to 1947. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. July Main article: Diplomatic immunity The sanctity of diplomats has long been observed. This sanctity has come to be known as diplomatic immunity. While there have been a number of cases where diplomats have been killed, this is normally viewed as a great breach of honour. Genghis Khan and the Mongols were well known for strongly insisting on the rights of diplomats, and they would often wreak horrific vengeance against any state that violated these rights. Diplomatic rights were established in the mid-th century in Europe and have spread throughout the world. These rights were formalized by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations , which protects diplomats from being persecuted or prosecuted while on a diplomatic mission. If a diplomat does commit a serious crime while in a host country he may be declared as *persona non grata* unwanted person. Such diplomats are then often tried for the crime in their homeland. Diplomatic communications are also viewed as sacrosanct, and diplomats have long been allowed to carry documents across borders without being searched. The mechanism for this is the so-called " diplomatic bag " or, in some countries, the "diplomatic pouch". While radio and digital communication have become more standard for embassies, diplomatic pouches are still quite common and some countries, including the United States, declare entire shipping containers as diplomatic pouches to bring sensitive material often building supplies into a country. Ambassadors and other diplomats are sometimes recalled temporarily by their home countries as a way to express displeasure with the host country. In both cases, lower-level employees still remain to actually do the business of diplomacy. This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. April Learn how and when to remove this template message Diplomacy is closely linked to espionage or gathering of intelligence. Embassies are bases for both diplomats and spies, and some diplomats are essentially openly acknowledged spies. They do not try to hide this role and, as such, are only invited to events allowed by their hosts, such as military parades or air shows. There are also deep-cover spies operating in many embassies. These individuals are given fake positions at the embassy, but their main task is to illegally gather intelligence, usually by coordinating spy rings of locals or other spies. For the most part, spies operating out of embassies gather little intelligence themselves and their identities tend to be known by the opposition. If discovered, these diplomats can be expelled from an embassy, but for the most part counter-intelligence agencies prefer to keep these agents in situ and under close monitoring. The information gathered by spies plays an increasingly important role in diplomacy. Arms-control treaties would be impossible without the power of reconnaissance satellites and agents to monitor compliance. Information gleaned from espionage is useful in almost all forms of diplomacy, everything from trade agreements to border disputes. Diplomatic resolution of problems[ edit ] This section does not cite any sources. April Various processes and procedures have evolved over time for handling diplomatic issues and disputes. Arbitration and mediation[ edit ] Brazilian President Prudente de Morais shakes hands with King Carlos I of Portugal during the re-establishment of diplomatic relations between Brazil and Portugal after talks mediated by Queen Victoria , 16 March Nations sometimes resort to international arbitration when faced with a specific question or point of contention in need of resolution. For most of history, there were no official or formal procedures for such proceedings. They were generally accepted to abide by general principles and protocols related to

international law and justice. Sometimes these took the form of formal arbitrations and mediations. In such cases a commission of diplomats might be convened to hear all sides of an issue, and to come some sort of ruling based on international law. Below are some examples. Conferences[ edit ] Anton von Werner , Congress of Berlin Final meeting at the Reich Chancellery on 13 July Other times, resolutions were sought through the convening of international conferences. In such cases, there are fewer ground rules, and fewer formal applications of international law. However, participants are expected to guide themselves through principles of international fairness, logic, and protocol. This included the shape of the map of Europe , the disposition of political and nationalist claims of various ethnic groups and nationalities wishing to have some political autonomy, and the resolution of various claims by various European powers. Celebrating the signing of the Camp David Accords: Menachem Begin , Jimmy Carter , Anwar El Sadat Sometimes nations convene official negotiation processes to settle a specific dispute or specific issue between several nations which are parties to a dispute. These are similar to the conferences mentioned above, as there are technically no established rules or procedures. However, there are general principles and precedents which help define a course for such proceedings. After weeks of negotiation, agreement was reached and the accords were signed, later leading directly to the Egyptâ€™Israel Peace Treaty of

### Chapter 6 : About us | Cultural Diplomacy Platform

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

Definition[ edit ] Culture is a set of values and practices that create meaning for society. This includes both high culture literature, art, and education, which appeals to elites and popular culture appeals to the masses. It is a type of soft power , which is the "ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. Cultural diplomacy is also a component of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is enhanced by a larger society and culture, but simultaneously public diplomacy helps to "amplify and advertise that society and culture to the world at large". Arndt, a former State Department cultural diplomacy practitioner, said "Cultural relations grow naturally and organically, without government intervention â€” the transactions of trade and tourism, student flows, communications, book circulation, migration, media access, inter-marriage â€” millions of daily cross-cultural encounters. If that is correct, cultural diplomacy can only be said to take place when formal diplomats, serving national governments, try to shape and channel this natural flow to advance national interests. Cultural diplomacy attempts to manage the international environment by utilizing these sources and achievements and making them known abroad. Cultural diplomacy derives its credibility not from being close to government institutions, but from its proximity to cultural authorities. Purpose[ edit ] Ultimately, the goal of cultural diplomacy is to influence a foreign audience and use that influence, which is built up over the long term, as a sort of good will reserve to win support for policies. It seeks to harness the elements of culture to induce foreigners to: In turn, cultural diplomacy can help a nation better understand the foreign nation it is engaged with and foster mutual understanding. Cultural diplomacy is a way of conducting international relations without expecting anything in return in the way that traditional diplomacy typically expects. This influence has implications ranging from national security to increasing tourism and commercial opportunities. Another unique and important element of cultural diplomacy is its ability to reach youth, non-elites and other audiences outside of the traditional embassy circuit. In short, cultural diplomacy plants the seeds of ideals, ideas, political arguments, spiritual perceptions and a general view point of the world that may or may not flourish in a foreign nation. Furthermore, because cultural diplomacy includes political and ideological arguments, and uses the language of persuasion and advocacy, it can be used as an instrument of political warfare and be useful in achieving traditional goals of war. This is the way in which ideas and perceptions can ultimately affect the ability of a nation to achieve its national security goals. In terms of policy that supports national security goals, the information revolution has created an increasingly connected world in which public perceptions of values and motivations can create an enabling or disabling environment in the quest for international support of policies. If an action is not interpreted abroad as the nation meant to it be, then the action itself can become meaningless. Participants in cultural diplomacy often have insights into foreign attitudes that official embassy employees do not. It can also be used to counter hostile propaganda and the collection of open source intelligence. Exhibitions which offer the potential to showcase numerous objects of culture Educational programs such as universities and language programs abroad Exchanges- scientific, artistic, educational etc. They work best when they are proven to be relevant to the target audience, which requires an understanding of the audience. The tools can be utilized by working through NGOs, diasporas and political parties abroad, which may help with the challenge of relevance and understanding. The arts[ edit ] Migrant Mother , Dorothea Lange In the s the Soviet Union had a reputation that was associated with peace, international class solidarity and progress due to its sponsorship of local revolutionary movements for liberation. The photographs by professional and amateur photographers were curated and put together by Edward Steichen. The images showed glimpses of everyday human life in its various stages; courtship, birth, parenting, work, self-expression, etc. The display was extremely popular and attracted large numbers of crowds, in short America "showed the world, the world and got credit for it". The display included 27 images, detailing the September 11 attacks by Joel Meyerowitz that circulated, with the backing of embassies and consulates, to 60 nations. The display was intended to shape and maintain the public memory of the attack and

its aftermath. The display sought to show the human side of the tragedy, and not just the destruction of buildings. The display was also intended to show a story of recovery and resolution through documenting not only the grief and pain, but also the recovery efforts. In many countries where the display was run, it was personalized for the population. For example, relatives of those who died in the Towers were often invited to the event openings. The most popular question was "what is the meaning of the American Dream? But ultimately people came, and the souvenir pins that were given out turned up in every corner of the country. The Soviets banned printed material, but the Americans gave it out anyway. The most popular items were the Bible and a Sears catalogue. The guides for the exhibition were American graduate students, including African Americans and women, who spoke Russian. This gave Russians the ability to speak to real Americans and ask difficult questions. New US-UK Fulbright Logo Riccardo Giacconi The usefulness of exchanges is based on two assumptions- some form of political intent lies behind the exchange and the result will have some sort of political effect. The idea is that exchanges will create a network of influential people abroad that will tie them to their host country and will appreciate their host country more due to their time spent there.

### Chapter 7 : The Norms of African Diplomatic Culture: Implications for African Integration | The African File

*Dunya News - Multan: Artifacts crafted from Camel's bone make their mark all over the world Islamic State release video showing militants destroying centuries-old artifacts in a museum.*

### Chapter 8 : Diplomacy - Wikipedia

*The Center. The U.S. Diplomacy Center is a museum and education center at the U.S. Department of State currently under development. The new glass pavilion at the 21st Street entrance to the Department is the beginning of what will become a dynamic space fully open to the public with permanent and temporary exhibitions and education programs.*

### Chapter 9 : Italian Culture: An asset for country's public diplomacy - Modern Diplomacy

*Cultural diplomacy a type of public diplomacy and soft power that includes the "exchange of ideas, information, art, language and other aspects of culture among nations and their peoples in order to foster mutual understanding".*