Chapter 1

The changing nature of diplomacy

Diplomacy is concerned with the management of relations between states and between states and other actors. From a state perspective, diplomacy is concerned with advising, shaping and implementing foreign policy. As such it is the means by which states through their formal and other representatives, as well as other actors, articulate, coordinate and secure particular or wider interests, using correspondence, private talks, exchanges of view, lobbying, visits, threats and other related activities.

Diplomacy is often thought of as being concerned with peaceful activity, although it may occur within war or armed conflict or be used in the orchestration of particular acts of violence, such as seeking overflight clearance for an air strike. The blurring of the line, in fact, between diplomatic activity and violence is one of the developments distinguishing modern diplomacy. More generally, there is also a widening content of diplomacy. At one level, the changes in the substantive form of diplomacy are reflected in terms such as ‘oil diplomacy’, ‘resource diplomacy’, ‘knowledge diplomacy’, ‘global governance’ and ‘transition diplomacy’. Certainly, what constitutes diplomacy today goes beyond the sometimes rather narrow politico-strategic conception given to the term. Nor is it appropriate to view diplomacy in a restrictive or formal sense as being the preserve of foreign ministries and diplomatic service personnel. Rather, diplomacy is undertaken by a wide range of actors, including ‘political’ diplomats,1 advisers, envoys and officials from a wide range of ‘domestic’ ministries or agencies with their foreign counterparts, reflecting its technical content; between officials from different international organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the United Nations (UN) Secretariat, or involving foreign corporations and a host government transnationally; and with or through non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and ‘private’ individuals.

In this chapter we are concerned with discussing some of the main changes that have taken place in diplomacy since the 1960s – the starting-point for the overall study. Before looking at the changes, some discussion of the tasks of diplomacy is necessary.
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Tasks of diplomacy

The functions of diplomacy can be broken down into six broad areas: ceremonial, management, information/communication, international negotiation, duty of protection and normative/legal. Particular functions within those categories are set out in Table 1.1. The significance of each will vary from state to state. For some, diplomacy may be largely devoted to ceremonial representation; others may allocate resources to high-level roving envoys or in support of an established role in international rule making. The functions of diplomacy are also particularly closely related to evolving events and issues such as international crises, human and natural disasters or outbreaks of violence, which shift the diplomatic spotlight on to previously remote geographic areas or issues.

Table 1.1 Tasks of diplomacy

Ceremonial
• protocol
• representation
• visits

Management
• day-to-day problems
• promotion of interests (political, economic, scientific, military, tourism)
• explanation and defence of policy
• strengthening bilateral relations
• bilateral coordination
• multilateral cooperation

Information and communication
• assessment and reporting
• monitoring

International negotiation

Duty of protection

Contribution to international order
• normative
• rule making
• mediation/pacific settlement

Traditionally, diplomacy has been associated with the first of the functions in Table 1.1. Formal representation, protocol and participation in the diplomatic circuit of a national capital or international institution continue as important elements in state sovereignty and as part of the notion of international society. At a substantive level, much of the business of diplomacy is concerned with the management of short-term routine issues in bilateral and multilateral relations (coordination, consultation, lobbying, adjustment, the agenda of official or private visits).
These include the promotion and management of interests, which for most states are dominated by financial, economic, resource issues and tourism, along with threat management.

The term ‘threat management’ is used here to differentiate this form of diplomacy from defence, security policy or traditional military-security activities, and refers to coping with adverse developments affecting key interests. The term ‘threat management’ is also preferred since it reflects more fully the fusion of ‘domestic’ and international policy. Threats here are understood to include developments such as: large-scale cross-border refugee movement; the economic effects of pandemics; major crop failure; capital flight; bilateral dispute over loss of core export market; hostile transnational communications and media attacks; threats to Federal treaty-making capacity by subregional authorities; or adverse images of a state’s stability caused by criminal activity or political upheaval.

Other management activities include the explanation and defence of a particular decision or policy. These particular functions rely heavily on diplomatic negotiating skill, linguistic and technical expertise.

A third function of diplomacy is acquisition of information and assessment, including acting as a listening post or early warning system. Next to substantive representation, an embassy, if it is functioning conventionally – and not all are – should identify any key issues and domestic or external patterns, together with their implications, in order to advise or warn the sending government. As Humphrey Trevelyan notes on embassies:

Apart from negotiating, the ambassador’s basic task is to report on the political, social and economic conditions in the country in which he (she) is living, on the policy of its government and on his conversations with political leaders, officials and anyone else who has illuminated the local scene for him.²

**Contribution to international order**

In the final category are the diplomatic functions relating to conflict, disputes and international order. In the multilateralist view, an important function of diplomacy is the creation, drafting and amendment of a wide variety of international rules of a normative and regulatory kind that provide structure in the international system. The principal normative objective of diplomacy from a multilateralist perspective is contribution to the creation of universal rules. Multilateralism is thus distinct from other approaches, such as regionalism, and in direct contrast to narrow state power preoccupation, for example ‘soft’ power; ‘smart’ power.

Timely warning of adverse developments is one of the major tasks of an embassy, in cooperation with intelligence services, requiring considerable coordination, expertise, judgement and political courage.

Monitoring functions, which are generally omitted from discussion of diplomatic purposes, should be distinguished from assessments. The latter provide an analysis of short-run or longer-term developments relating
to a state, region, organisation, individual or issue. Monitoring exists in a number of forms, including covert intelligence gathering. However, in terms of diplomatic functions it is defined here as the acquisition of data from public sources in a receiving state (such as press, television, radio, journals and other media outlets) about the reporting or presentation of the sending state. The concern is with the image being presented of that state, and the accuracy of press reports on its policy or actions in the media. Monitored reports are used to form the basis for a variety of diplomatic responses, including press rebuttals by a resident ambassador, television interviews, informal exchanges, through to formal protest. Other types of monitoring involve detailed tracking of foreign press, media and other communications sources for information on attitudes, foreign policy activity and indications of shift or changes. In laying the groundwork or preparing the basis for a policy or new initiatives, diplomacy aims to float an idea or promote information or evidence relating to an issue, in order to gain acceptance or political support for the proposals.

The function of international negotiations is at the core of many of the substantive functions set out so far. It is, however, no longer the preserve of the professional diplomat.

The duty of protection is a traditional function, which has assumed increased significance in contemporary diplomacy. The growing mobility of citizens, international sporting events and international conflicts have all added a variety of types of protection problems with which embassies and consulates now must deal.

In the final category are the diplomatic functions relating to conflict, disputes and international order. As part of the development of international order, an important function of diplomacy is the creation, drafting and amendment of a wide variety of international rules of a normative and regulatory kind that provide structure in the international system.

In the event of potential or actual bilateral or wider conflict or dispute, diplomacy is concerned with reducing tension, clarification, seeking acceptable formulae and, through personal contact, ‘oiling the wheels’ of bilateral and multilateral relations. An extension of this is contributing to order and orderly change. As Adam Watson suggests: ‘the central task of diplomacy is not just the management of order, but the management of change and the maintenance by continued persuasion of order in the midst of change’.3

Counter-diplomacy

The converse of this can also be put, in that diplomacy may be a vehicle for the continuation of a dispute or conflict. In other words, differing state and non-state interests and weak or contested norms concerning local, regional or international order produce quite substantial differences between parties, in which diplomacy through direct initiatives, informal secret contacts or third parties simply cannot provide acceptable or
workable bridging solutions. Diplomacy is stalled, and meetings routi-
nised without expectation of progress. In addition, for some, the purpose
of ‘counter-diplomacy’ is the use of diplomacy to evade or frustrate politi-
cal solutions or international rules. Counter-diplomacy seeks the continu-
ation or extension of a conflict and facilitation of parallel violence.

Development of diplomacy

In discussing the development of diplomacy, an overview of the period
will help to give some perspective in which to consider the major changes
that have taken place. The views are a ‘snap shot’ of diplomacy at any one
point. The purpose is to provide a benchmark and highlight aspects that
have been noted as part of the development of diplomacy. The argument
is, however, not about ‘old’ and ‘new’ diplomacy, but rather, as Hocking
and others suggest, to see diplomacy in an evolutionary sense.4 Diplomacy
is the subject of constant change, rather than major shifts constituting a
new form.5 Harold Nicolson’s analysis – written in 1961 in Foreign Affairs
on the theme ‘Diplomacy then and now’6 – is coloured especially by the
impact of the Cold War, the intrusion of ideological conflict into diplo-
macy and its effect on explanation, and the transformation from the small
international élite in old-style diplomacy to a new or ‘democratic’ concep-
tion of international relations requiring public explanation and ‘open’
diplomacy, despite its growing complexity. A further striking change for
Nicolson was in values, especially in the loss of relations based on the
‘creation of confidence, [and] the acquisition of credit’.7 Burrows con-
trasted the raison d’état of that period with ethical foreign policy: ‘Raison
d’état predominated and personal feelings had to be forgotten. It was
lucky ethical foreign policy had not yet been invented.’8

Writing shortly after Nicolson, Livingston Merchant noted: the decline
in the decision-making power of ambassadors but the widening of their
area of competence through economic and commercial diplomacy; the
greater use of personal diplomacy; and the burden created by multilat-
eral diplomacy, with its accompanying growth in the use of specialists.9
In reviewing the period up to the 1970s, Plischke10 endorsed many of
these points, but noted as far as the diplomatic environment was con-
cerned the proliferation of the international community, including the
trend towards fragmentation and smallness,11 and the shift in the locus
of decision-making power to national capitals.12 Writing at the same
time, Pranger additionally drew attention to methods, commenting on
the growing volume of visits and increases in the number of treaties.13
Adam Watson, reviewing diplomacy and the nature of diplomatic dia-
logue, noted: the wide range of ministries involved in diplomacy; the cor-
responding decline in the influence of the foreign minister; the increase
in the direct involvement of heads of government in the details of foreign
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policy and diplomacy; and the growth in importance of the news media.\textsuperscript{14} The theme has been underscored by Small, who noted the ‘new communications architecture’ and suggests the ‘concomitant death of distance’: ‘When the cost of communication approaches zero, geography doesn’t matter anymore.’\textsuperscript{15}

Hamilton and Langhorne, writing in the mid-1990s, in the post-Soviet and Yugoslav contexts, highlight that ‘established diplomatic procedures have, as in earlier periods of political upheaval and transition, been exploited for distinctly undiplomatic ends’.\textsuperscript{16} El Baradi analyses diplomacy over clandestine nuclear programmes in ‘the age of deception’.\textsuperscript{17} The emergence of a more unstable and fluid international system and types of transactions were central for Copeland.\textsuperscript{18} Other developments influencing diplomacy include the implications of informal e-diplomacy\textsuperscript{19} for diplomatic management, records and ‘control’.\textsuperscript{20} The changing content, particularly the recognition of the forms of economic diplomacy, is examined by Melissen.\textsuperscript{21} McRae also noted the emergence of ‘network’ diplomacy and cross-regional groupings. The domestic dimensions, including the roles of citizens and other centres of influence are features addressed by Sharp.\textsuperscript{22} Meyer examines the nature and limits of bilateral political diplomacy; Greenstock diplomacy in an ‘open world’ of communications and social media.\textsuperscript{23}

Diplomatic setting

Three aspects of the diplomatic setting are explored in this section: membership, bloc and group development, and international institutions.

Membership

The continued expansion of the international community after 1945 has been one of the major factors shaping a number of features of modern diplomacy. The diplomatic community of some 40 states that fashioned the new post-war international institutions – the United Nations (UN), International Monetary Fund (IMF), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and later the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in the cramped, crowded plenary rooms – had tripled, largely as a result of decolonisation, less than a quarter of a century later. A fourth phase of expansion occurred after 1989 with the break-up of the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. By 2000, the number of UN member states had reached 189.\textsuperscript{24}

The expansion in membership had four main effects: on diplomatic style; the entry into force of conventions (making it possible for conventions to enter into force without major players); and the operating agendas
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and procedures of international institutions. A fourth effect included the emergence of a variety of UN conference management styles, lobbying, corridor diplomacy, and the institutionalisation of the Group of 77 (later to become G-118 plus China), which have significantly affected the way in which diplomacy is conducted within the UN.

Players in diplomacy

An important feature of modern diplomacy is the enhanced role of personal diplomacy by the head of state or government. The direct or indirect involvement of heads of government in central foreign policy issues has generally reduced the overall role and influence in many instances of foreign ministers, and is at times at the expense of the local ambassador. The use of cabinet secretariats rather than foreign ministers, and private envoys as an indirect channel of communication and negotiation, often results in a local ambassador in a critical trouble spot or national capital being ill-informed on an issue or bypassed. A not dissimilar situation may arise in bilateral or multilateral summits of heads of government, in which the foreign minister or professional diplomatic service are left attempting to discover what was actually said or, worse still, agreed in private exchanges.

This is not to argue, however, that an ambassador is now redundant or a largely ceremonial figure. Crises and summits apart, the contemporary resident ambassador performs important functions as a specialist contact in national and international negotiations and promotion of interests. Much depends on the post and the person. While modern communications have eroded the assessment role, that is but one of several functions. Indeed, for most small and middle/larger powers, the ambassador is a critical player in the key capitals or organisations relevant for those states.

In terms of other players, the growth of post-war multilateral regulatory diplomacy, outlined above, has led to the involvement in external relations of a wider range of ministries, such as industry, aviation, environment, shipping, customs, health, education and sport. Linked to this development is the widening content of diplomacy, particularly through the internationalising of issues relating to terrorism, immigration, political refugees and other population issues, leading to international coordination by interior, justice and intelligence ministries.

Non-state actors have proliferated in number and type, ranging from traditional economic interest groups to resource, environment, humanitarian, aid, terrorist and global criminal interests. Other important non-state players include transnational religious groups, international foundations, donors, and medical, private mercenary and prisoner-of-war organisations. Former political leaders, too, have become actors pursuing parallel or ‘private’ diplomatic initiatives, with varying degrees of approval or endorsement, at the margins of international conflict.
Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) can be categorised as above, but also in terms of the nature of the linkages with national administration. In some instances, NGOs are closely linked to official administrations (integrated in a delegation, finance, or through consultation and shared intelligence); others operate transnationally, or in some cases operate in a twilight advocacy zone. Nor is it always clear in which category an organisation is operating.

The proliferation of non-state actors has led to questions about the primacy of the state as an actor in international relations. Here, however, it is argued that states continue to be the central authoritative decision units with respect to routine, critical and strategic decisions over the conduct of external policy. Nevertheless, the operating setting and ability to exert sustained influence have become far more complex.

Another important effect of expanded membership has been on the entry into force of conventions. For example the entry into force of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea was triggered by the smaller members of the UN – such as Honduras, St Vincent and eventually Guyana in November 1994 – without ratification or accession at that time by major powers.25 Although the possibility of conventions entering into force without the participation of major players remains (e.g. the Montreal Protocol on ozone depleting substances26), thresholds or specific barriers to entry into force have been created in some agreements.

A further aspect of the membership of the international community is the existence of de facto states.27 In considering such entries, a distinction needs to be made between entities that have or seek secessionist or breakaway status (Chechnya, Transnistria, Northern Cyprus, Bougainville, Kurdistan) from transborder or transboundary cooperation (e.g. the Three Borders Area of Austria, Italy and Slovenia).28 The latter involve external relations between sub-state entities, which in effect constitute increasingly deeper functional cooperation in various sectors (economy, transport, social) contributing to the ‘distinctiveness’ of the entity, so that it is a recognisable entity within a wider regional framework. Other types of de facto states have emerged from civil conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere, which have left breakaway states or areas such as Kurdistan (Iraq) and in Libya.

**Overseas territories**

Overseas territories and enclaves are a further distinct category. These perform many statelike functions, and some develop niche roles in international relations. In the financial services sector, for example the Cayman Islands has developed a role as an offshore financial centre. Such centres have, however, come under scrutiny, through pressure on the metropole or ‘host’ power, from institutions such as the European Commission and International Monetary Fund. In addition, the financial activities of offshore centres have also been the subject of Wikileaks-type exposure of unnamed bank-account transactions.
Blocs and groupings

An important structural feature of the post-1945 diplomatic setting is the growth of and modifications to blocs, groupings and international institutions. Of the changes in blocs and groupings since the 1960s, two in particular stand out: the end of the East–West Cold War system by the 1990s; and the demise of the Group of 77 (G-77) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The non-aligned movement, initially charismatically led, had been established in the early post-war years at the Bandung Conference, whilst the trade and development agenda was pursued from 1964 through the UNCTAD conferences and developed by the G-77 as the new International Economic Order (NIEO) doctrine. By the early 1990s, the G-77 had lost much of its raison d’être, through competing interests and increasingly unwieldy size, whilst UNCTAD had become ineffective as a vehicle for trade and development reform. At an East–West level, the perceived end of the Cold War substantially brought to a close that axis of conflict.

The changes outlined above in effect removed or significantly reduced the East–West and North–South dimensions of the diplomatic system. With a depleted G-77/UNCTAD, the developing country development agenda moved uneasily into the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Doha Round framework, scattered through the UN system or tacked onto EU and other communiqués. Since 2000, the South has generally developed a variety of intra-South (South–South) cooperation mechanisms. In terms of East–West relations, the main effects of the end of the Cold War have been removal of East–West summit conferences; limited American–Russian diplomacy; and, for Russia, the long-term legacy of regaining its diplomatic space on its east European and Asian political and economic periphery.

In the transitional international system from 1990 to 2000, the diplomatic setting was distinguished by the largely unsuccessful diplomatic efforts of the Russian Federation to construct a new grouping based on the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Second, the non-aligned movement in effect became defunct through loss of raison d’être, competing ideologies, interests and above all unwieldy size. In addition, the G-77 and associated UN General Assembly process of stylised global debate diplomacy became largely ineffective by the transition period. In terms of other groupings, it is noteworthy that during the transition period a number of temporary international groupings (shifting membership) based upon economic, trade or other interests were formed, for specific purposes, as states adjusted foreign policies; and as regional organisations tried to develop new linkages with individual states and other regional organisations.

A number of these elements – particularly the fluid nature of groupings – have become more evident in the period since 2000. The international system post-2000 can in fact be characterised through four areas. First, the
fluidity in bilateral and other relations, with less clear-cut blocs. Second, the international system is not multipolar, but rather distinguished by the absence of polarity. International relations in the post-2000 system are based on much looser groupings, networks and exchanges. Some of these exchanges are routed through groups and networks in parallel to existing multilateral and regional institutions. Third, norms and core concepts are contested, in the key pillars of international order (security, trade and international financial and economic relations). Contested ideas are evident in the lessening of multilateralism and very different concepts of international trade order. They are seen, too, in the diplomacy of paradoxes, through competing and conflicting norms, in which norms compete or cancel each other out (the pursuit of arms control may be at the expense of norms on eradicating narcotics). The fourth feature of the post-2000 system is the very high level of regional organisation and bilateral diplomatic activity. Much of this is repetitive or stylised communiqué diplomacy.

Diplomatic process

The previous sections have looked at aspects of the changing international setting, players and changing blocs. In this section, aspects of the contemporary diplomatic process are noted as a basis for drawing the chapter to a close and setting the scene for further analysis in later chapters.

First, a striking feature of the diplomatic process is the continued fusion of domestic and foreign policy. The reasons for this are primarily the internationalisation of previously domestic issues, the erosion of the concept of domestic jurisdiction, transnational boundary-crossing transactions and globalisation of economies. Further special sets of factors are found in regions in which there is substantial population cross-movement or non-observance of borders in integrative organisations (such as the EU). The main effect of the increasing fusion of domestic and foreign policy is to alter the nature of diplomatic activity, bringing it into some policy areas and issues considered as ‘domestic’. Some examples of these would include economic and financial policy; promotion of medical and pharmaceutical products and trade regulatory requirements; the international diplomacy of agriculture; land acquisition and oil licensing, in federal or transition states (e.g. Iraq). In the political category, the diplomatic agenda would include issues of: governance; corruption; ‘foreign’ economic policy; international banking oversight (standards); sovereignty and moral hazard decisions (e.g. whether to support a failed state; participate in a banking ‘rescue’; or agree to a ‘sunset’ clause ending preferential assistance to heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC)). To these would be added traditional political concerns such as human rights and rule of law issues.

International agreements have been influenced by the decline in the role of the International Law Commission in preparing treaties
The changing nature of diplomacy and the growing use at a global level of ‘soft’ law instruments such as action plans and framework agreements, influenced by the international and regional practice of UN specialised agencies such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNCTAD and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). Other forms of soft law include the decisions of the G-20, and the development of parallel institutions to the multilateral specialised agencies of the UN, discussed in Chapters 5–7.

With respect to the multilateral process, the trend of informality in multilateral conferences – with fewer group-sponsored resolutions and changes in implementation procedures – is directly linked to the decline of blocs or large groupings and the growing ‘individuality’ of states (the search for ‘diplomatic space’), especially in technical negotiations and ad hoc or shifting coalitions of interests. Coalitions of small (often short-lived) groups rather than larger traditional blocs are marked features of contemporary trade and economic diplomacy. The breakdown of multilateral negotiations in the Doha framework (discussed in Chapter 7) has been accompanied by the rapid growth of bilateral relations and regional diplomacy (Chapters 5–6) reflecting the economic diplomacy. Underpinning that international economic diplomacy is the shift in the axis of political and economic power to the New Economic Powers (NEPs).

Open and secret diplomacy

One of the interesting issues in the study of diplomacy is the relationship between ‘open’ and ‘secret’ diplomacy. Earlier we noted Nicolson’s view on the shift from secret to parliamentary style and open diplomacy during the 1960s. The balance has once more shifted back to secret diplomacy, while of course recognising that much of modern diplomacy is in practice conducted on the basis of secrecy.

The extent of secrecy in international relations has been influenced particularly by the level of violence in the international system. Ongoing military operations are inevitably supported by extensive private and secret meetings between the principal players. The kidnapping of and attacks on diplomatic personnel, journalists, contract workers and tourists has led to the increased involvement of intelligence officers as diplomatic envoys in mediation and associated secret diplomacy. The diplomatic profession has never been a safe one, and in this respect has become less so.

Notes

1. The term is used by former US Secretary of State James Baker.


7. Ibid., pp. 245–6.


11. Ibid., pp. 92–8.

12. Ibid., p. 58.


24. Fiji became the 127th member of the UN in 1970. UN members admitted after 2000 included the former Republic of Yugoslavia; Tuvalu; Switzerland; East Timor; Montenegro; South Sudan.


27. See Tozun Bahcheli, Barry Bartmann and Jerry Srebrnik, De Facto States: The quest for sovereignty (Routledge, London, 2004). This largely deals with why such entities seek separate status rather than their external relations (recognition, trade, policies, links with outside states).


Chapter 2

Foreign policy organisation

Introduction

In this chapter, the initial sections examine the role of foreign ministries and representation. This is followed by issues covering the management of key sectors such as trade and foreign ministry reorganisation. The final section discusses a number of aspects of abnormal relations and representation.

Central organisation of foreign policy

In general, the differences that exist in the central arrangements for conducting foreign policy in various states have been influenced by the expansion in the content of foreign policy, the loosening of central control and the increasingly technical nature of much of external policy. In advanced industrial states especially, the development of an increasingly complex foreign policy agenda – including such varied issues as energy, resources, telecommunications, transfrontier land pollution – as well as the more conventional or traditional political issues, has had several implications for central foreign-policy organisation.

The extension of the agenda finds its expression in the international role of ministries that have traditionally been considered as essentially ‘domestic’. In other words, external policy is no longer necessarily the preserve of the ministry of foreign affairs (MFA). The increasing complexity of foreign policy, too, has been accompanied, especially in larger states, not only by a proliferation of ministries but also by tendency for fragmentation of responsibility. Ministries or agencies acquire foreign policy interests, stakes and perspectives which are promoted and defended.

The tendency for fragmentation or independent action, especially in advanced industrial states, necessarily places constraints on the central political control of foreign policy.
Functions of foreign ministries

The main functions of foreign ministries are defined as: ceremonial, managerial, information and communication, international negotiation, duty of protection and contribution to international order. The balance of emphasis on each of these will vary between countries. In terms of carrying out most of these functions, foreign ministries have been particularly affected by the vast amount of information now available from a variety of sources about issues they would have reported on or other developments in international relations. The increasing range of departments now involved in conducting external relations means that the role of foreign ministries is not necessarily captured by the concept of ‘gatekeeper’. The plurality of ministries means that in many instances the role of the foreign ministry will vary by issue and event. That said, it should be added that there are instances in which foreign ministries seek to retain the lead role across external sectors, for example Brazil, France, Canada, Australia. The position of embassies is somewhat different, in that whilst some functions may be contested (e.g. information and analysis) others – particularly substantive representation and management functions relating to explanation and promotion of interests - are of heightened importance.

Development of foreign ministries

The changed communications environment is one of the main factors influencing the organisational and functional development of foreign ministries. Changes in communication technology have affected several aspects of decision making. Speed of communication between the overseas post and centre has significantly altered, as has the ‘time’ relationship between the decisionmaker and event. The visual dimension of an event – drought, demonstration, the construction progress of a development project, armed clashes, military engagements – can be graphically captured both formally and informally by a range of actors. The net effect is to raise the volume of traffic and alter decision-making procedures. In relatively routine decision making, desk offices may receive up to several hundred emails daily, apart from other information sources such as news feeds, think tank reports via apps and social media communications. Diplomatic communications have become both informal and formal between posts and foreign ministries.

Selection and management of information has become an additional skill requirement. Clearing decisions is now much quicker and less cumbersome in some foreign ministries. The greater informality and ease of communication has been used by foreign ministries to outline views on issues via blogs and social media, especially before or after meetings,
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giving them an additional arena, and perhaps importance. Changes in communications technology have also affected some aspects of negotiation as well as pre-phases and meetings of the G-20 with use of intranet limited user communications. The use of intranet systems by foreign ministry sherpas has varied from summit to summit. Indeed the use and impact of the technology changes outlined have not necessarily displaced traditional methods such as telephone contact. For example some telephone contact between the Russians and Chinese is formally logged on the Russian Federation website. Modern forms of so-called ‘Hotlines’ have now been arranged bilaterally by a number of countries, although in the case of India and the People’s Republic of China (PRC), political and security factors held up installation.¹

Websites: foreign ministries, embassies and delegations

The development of websites by foreign ministries, embassies and delegations to international organisations is now standard practice. For foreign ministries, in particular, it is part of their renaissance as focal points for organising and projecting national presence. The foreign ministry websites serve to explain and record national foreign policy and rebut unacceptable actions or claims by other states. The construction of sites with differing emphases – such as visits, key events, or foreign policy statements – helps to convey the general political image and ambience of a state. Some aspects of site construction by delegations to international institutions remain embryonic. For example it is not clear what audience or value is reached or gained by video clips or YouTube statements by representatives in non-interview formats. Similarly, a non-operational foreign ministry or international organisation (or other) website closed for ‘service’, redesign or containing seriously out-of-date information significantly harms image, and, can undo or counteract other media activity.

Wikileaks: implications for foreign ministries and embassies

The leaked US cable traffic which appeared in the autumn of 2010, following earlier release of redacted material – the so-called Wikileaks affair - caused considerable controversy, and augmented the diplomatic security threats to states and other organisations.

The controversy surrounding the case in part arises from the virtually unprecedented scale of the leakage. The leaking of diplomatic telegrams and other documents into the public domain in their original format is relatively rare in diplomatic practice. An historical example would be
the leaking of confidential British diplomatic documents by Francesco Constantini, which appeared on the front page of Giornale d’Italia in 1936. It is, on the other hand, commonplace for various forms of briefings and assessment, along with partial sight of papers, to be given to the press and other media as part of the dissemination of government views into the public domain, or to attack another state or group of states.

The current Wikileaks are of interest to practitioners and diplomatic theorists in that they offer a snapshot of parts of a foreign policy and its associated diplomacy. The cables reflect many of the standard tasks of diplomacy: observations on receiving country policies, personalities; assessments; setting out views; exploring the views of others, and third-party reporting on the activities of other states’ diplomacy. The latter has been perceived as sensitive by some ‘reported on’ states. It is the scale of the leakage, and, the precedent set, which has caused probably the greatest difficulties. In the short term, the Wikileaks affair led to: counter-cyber measures to contain the attack; investigation; changes in encryption methods and procedures; and damage limitation diplomatic visits. The issue of the extradition of Julian Assange complicated UK-Latin America relations. A further impact has been transnational on the mobilisation of anti-authoritarian regime opinion and movements in the Middle East, e.g. Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt and elsewhere, especially in the initial phase of the ‘Arab Spring’.

In looking at the impact on the conduct of diplomatic practice more generally, four aspects can be distinguished. First, issues are raised concerning the impact of leaks on future diplomatic trust. Trust in terms of the accuracy of what is being said and how information is handled – is an essential ingredient in diplomatic craft. Leaks impact on core diplomatic functions in that contacts and exchange may be questioned or undermined.

Second, leaks impact particularly on bilateral relations (e.g. USA-Afghanistan, USA-Saudi-Arabia), calling into question relations on short-term issues and more fundamental long-term cooperation. Effects may be short-term but the role of ‘diplomatic memory’ as a variable in diplomacy and foreign policy making should not be discounted.

Third, the leaked cables illustrate the problems embassies have in undertaking reporting functions in competition with print and online media. Common examples are reporting of political party conferences or conventions and leadership campaigns which differ little if at all from mainstream press analysis. Separately, doubt must be raised over whether such diplomatic reporting is worthwhile or not.

Fourth, the leaked cables have raised issues about the function of diplomats and the relationship between diplomatic and intelligence work. It is reasonable to inquire whether it is appropriate for diplomatic activity to extend to the detailed data targeting of UN personnel, including the UN Secretary-General. The questions raised in this context relate to the inviolability of premises and documents, the provisions of the UN Charter and Headquarters Agreement.
The foreign ministry

Foreign ministries as part of the overall machinery for conducting external policy, along with diplomatic posts overseas, differ in structure and importance.

At first sight, foreign ministries tend to have certain common organisational characteristics insofar as they generally contain a mix of functional, geographic, protocol, legal and administrative divisions. Apart from the question of size, which tends to have a telescopic effect, with divisions or departments covering greater geographic areas the smaller the actor, differences in organisational structure occur partly because of particular foreign policy interests, e.g. the Cyprus foreign ministry devotes a separate department to the Cyprus problem. Functional rather than geographic departments may be set up within foreign ministries for several reasons, including: the importance attached to a particular international grouping such as the EU, African Union (AU), Asia Pacific; the importance of bilateral trade relations; special emphasis placed on cultural diplomacy, e.g. in Japan, Austria, Canada, France, Mexico, United States; or as a response to policy issues, such as international energy questions that span several departments. Among the functional departments, for example in the US Department of State, are those dealing with energy, human rights, international narcotics matters, economic and business affairs, oceans and international environmental and scientific affairs. Such departments enable a foreign ministry to monitor and follow the work of other agencies, and if necessary to take the lead. The main potential benefits are the possibility of greater coordination and a broader perspective. However, the staffing of the more specialist functional departments (e.g. civil aviation) generally poses difficulties in view of the traditional training and preferences of diplomatic service personnel. To some extent, the problem has been lessened by the secondment of officials from the relevant ‘domestic’ ministries to functional departments in the foreign ministry.

Reorganisation of foreign ministries

Foreign ministries have undergone major reorganisation over the past decade. Reorganisations have addressed a variety of issues such as: improving central coordination; the balance between geographic and functional departments; achieving a more proactive structure; the best way to handle economic matters, including trade and various questions to do with reviving presence and effectiveness. Finding the right mix between departments within foreign ministries, and improving coordination between agencies, has proved consistently difficult, with different models moving in and out of fashion. The reorganisation of the Finnish foreign ministry,
for example, took several years to complete (see Figure 2.1). As part of the review of overall structures, the Italian foreign ministry, moved over to a Directorates system in 2010, similar to that of the United Kingdom and other European powers (see Figure 2.2). The United Kingdom has also improved coordination at central government level through moving over to a national security council system. Efforts to improve the coordination and direction of foreign policy in developing countries have in the main involved building up agencies under the direct control of or attached institutionally to the head of government or state.

Related to issues of coordination are concerns over the need for a more proactive foreign policy and diplomacy which is better tuned to emerging issues. As part of the Japanese reorganisation noted earlier (2004–10), in response to one of the main concerns in the review for a more proactive foreign policy, the intelligence capabilities of the foreign ministry were reformed, with the creation of the Intelligence and Analysis Service.

A third important theme is that of increasing visibility and presence. As one of several measures, the interest in the United Kingdom – as part of the major review of its Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and Overseas Representation in 2010–11 – decided to reverse previous embassy/consulate closure policy and open up new representative offices as well as undertake greater visit diplomacy. The example of Mauritius offers an interesting contrast. In its review of external policy, Mauritius identified as a key objective the further projection of the image of
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Mauritius at international level, including increasing the representation of Mauritius and Mauritian nationals in international bodies. In an unusual move, the Japanese foreign ministry, as part of the reorganisation noted above, aimed to further understanding and trust in Japan through its pop culture diplomacy, using MANGA and Anime in addition to culture and art as its primary tools for cultural diplomacy.

**International economic policy: trade and finance**

The arrangements for managing trade at a central and representational level have often fitted uneasily into the running of other parts of foreign policy. The uneasy relationship partly derives from problems such as duplication and poor liaison, stemming from dual trade and diplomatic representation overseas and from rivalry about who should be responsible for directing and coordinating overseas trade policy. The primacy of the trade or commerce ministry is justified in terms of expertise,
continuity and administrative links with export-financing agencies. In contrast, the arguments in favour of overall responsibility resting with the foreign ministry rely on the capacity of the foreign ministry to provide an overview, coordinate initiatives, and its traditional skills of political analysis and persuasion. In practice, while most states retain separate foreign and trade ministries, arrangements for overseas representation vary. Some states have, however, attempted to unify trade promotion in the foreign ministry. In the case of Canada, the External Affairs Ministry was reorganised in 1982, and the department became directly responsible for the promotion of Canadian trade overseas, as the primary federal government contact with foreign governments and international organisations that influence trade.  

The use of a single ministry as the main authority for foreign policy and trade is now used by the following countries.

Table 2.1 Single trade/foreign ministry

- Australia
- New Zealand
- Canada
- Ecuador
- Ireland
- Jamaica
- Mauritius
- Solomon Islands
- Brunei
- Korea (Republic of)
- Brazil
- Dominica

A number of approaches have been used to address the problem of responsibility for, and coordination of, trade policy. In the 2010–11 reorganisation in the United Kingdom, the reorientation focused on improving the economic aspects of the FCO’s role by strengthening the Economic Service, and departmental reorganisation including a New Economies Unit. In contrast, emerging economies have opted for strong economic ministries combined with decentralisation. It is notable that developing countries like Nigeria, Guyana and Uganda have tended to split up ministries in sub-areas, reflecting their economic priorities, such as agriculture, power, forestry, tourism, water and land. Each of these routes has advantages and disadvantages. The UK approach has the benefit of allocating the lead role to the Trade Department, but leaves commercial and trade promotion uneasily located between individual FCO and Trade line departments, perhaps contributing to separation of political and economic (trade) aspects of foreign policy. The main disadvantages of decentralised solutions are that they tend to personalise power around one ministry or agency and reduce any input from the foreign ministry, which tends to become relatively weak. Sub-area ministry
solutions (e.g. mining) not only have the advantage of promoting expertise, but also have the disadvantage of excessively fragmenting the government structure, reducing planning capacity.

**Representation**

In general, states establish and maintain overseas representation for four main reasons. First, representation is either part of the process of achieving statehood and identity in international relations or, for established states, essential to being considered a power in the international system. Second, embassies are an important but by no means exclusive means of communication, and a source of contact with the host and other states and entities, enabling a state to participate in international discourse. Third, embassies are a means of dealing with a variety of particular problems arising with respect to bilateral relations, nations and multilateral fora. Fourth, embassies are the agencies for promoting core interests and bilateral coordinations of a country.

Most states have a core group of countries within their overall diplomatic representation. Those states within that group will be included for historical, alliance, ideological and economic reasons. For most states the membership of the core group is likely to remain relatively stable unless the state is undergoing major reorientation of its foreign policy or is in dispute. Adjustments in the ranking of countries in the core group, nevertheless, take place through modifications to staffing, budgetary allocation and tasks of those posts, in the light of such factors as changes in the volume of political work, trade opportunities, defence relations and tourism.

Beyond the core group, the spread of representation is influenced by such principles as balance, reciprocity and universality, and, above all, the availability of finance. The principle of universality is generally of importance for: major powers; those states with active foreign policies seeking ‘reach’, for example Cuba, Iran, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Norway; or states with specialist roles, for example petroleum, which have high inbound diplomatic representation. High external representation is also popular with small powers conscious of their new-found status (e.g. Azerbaijan), or, as a safeguard against their strategic vulnerability, for example Georgia. Pressures to reciprocate diplomatic representation in theory reduce freedom of action. In practice, nevertheless, states often do not comply with the principle on political and above all economic grounds.

Apart from the general principles noted above, several other factors can come into play. The opening of further embassies may be part of a policy of prestige. In this sense, diplomatic real estate is seen as part of the accoutrements of power. Conflict between two or more states may lead to the extension of representation. Economic factors are among
the more important influences leading to increases or reductions in representation. Diplomatic relations may be opened up with another state because it has become important in trade, investment or financial terms. For example the opening of diplomatic relations between Malaysia and Kuwait reflected, apart from religious factors, the growing oil relationship between the two countries, as well as the Malaysian aim of attracting inward Arab financial investment. Other reasons, such as the need for economic intelligence, often influence the decision to establish an embassy. For example Brazil maintains a significant representation in Kenya because it is an important coffee producer and target for Brazilian foreign direct investment (FDI) projects concerning ethanol.

Changes in the level of representation, above all, occur as part of the reorientation of foreign policy. The reasons for major reorientation may include economic factors such as a recognition of economic decline. Changes in representation are seen as important for altering export performances. As part of the 2011 reorganisation, for example, the UK opened consulates general in Canada and Brazil. It is important to note, too, that whilst economic factors are generally the lead drivers, value and normative factors can come into play. For example the UK reopened its embassy in Côte d’Ivoire as a contribution to stabilisation following disputed elections and in support of the UN effort there.

A final element of reorganisation concerns the increased role of foreign ministries (and embassies) vis-à-vis diaspora. Whilst this aspect of diplomacy has been important traditionally for large diaspora-linked states (e.g. the United States), a wider range of foreign ministries are now engaged in diaspora activity (such as Greece and Mali). Canada, for example, held its first official meeting with representatives of the Haitian diaspora in 2004. Diaspora, nevertheless, remain an uncertain terrain.

Other forms of representation

Embassies are not necessarily the sole means of handling the economic aspects of diplomacy. Apart from a separate trade commissioner service used by some states, consular arrangements are used to varying degrees by most states. For example the Netherlands provides a striking illustration of a small but active economic power, with very high consular coverage, reflecting the widespread range of its companies’ and nationals’ commercial, technical assistance and maritime operations.

Much depends on the scale of resources, perception of interests and role in international relations. These might be relatively limited or localised. Jamaica maintained, for example, fourteen embassies and high commissions, four missions to international organisations and six consulates general. These were supported by some 19 honorary consulates in Europe, Latin America and the USA. Jamaica had no significant
diplomatic presence in the Far East except the PRC, South-East Asia, much of Africa or the Middle East. The main focus of representation is regional (CARICOM), USA, UK, EU and UN.

The growing international involvement of internal ministries has resulted in the proliferation of representative offices overseas. These include development corporations, investment agencies, trade and tourist offices and student liaison bureaux. In Brazil’s external trade APEX Brazil is a major player, together with the sugar and ethanol trade associations. As part of its reorganisation of trade representation, Kenya, for example, decided to use foreign nationals for commercial representation work at its overseas missions.

To these must be added state and parastatal agencies such as banks, airlines and large corporations. In modern diplomacy, the blue neon sign has come to symbolise one aspect of the changing form of representation: the regional office of a major corporation is likely to be as important as or sometimes more important than its own or foreign diplomatic counterpart.

The growth of representative offices overseas and specialists from home departments in diplomatic posts has contributed to increased bureaucratic rivalry. One aspect of this is the development of multiple information channels for receiving, gathering and evaluating information. In Japan, for example, the information-gathering monopoly of the foreign ministry is rivalled by the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI), using the overseas branches of the Japan External Trade Organisation (JETRO) and links with corporations; the Defence Agency through its attachés; and the Ministry of Finance through its personnel attached to Japanese embassies. Another noticeable effect is on the traditional embassy functions of reporting and assessments, which can become downgraded through overloading from routine protocol associated with inward visits by, for example, representatives of domestic ministries or parliamentarians and other political leaders. Third, and most important, are the enhanced problems of coordination and control brought about by the splintering of policy.

**Representation and public relations**

Information is one of several specialist posts that have been added to many embassies in recent years. Putting across the correct image of a country, its people and lifestyle, gathering the support of foreign media and public are major preoccupations for most states. In this way, modern diplomacy has changed to include information work, although not in a crude propaganda sense or the high-tempo marketing style of ‘Expo’. The concern is with creating confidence in a country and its products; gaining a paragraph in a major newspaper; correcting a press story. In other words, information
work is short-term and incremental, facilitated by foreign ministry and agency websites, and is more akin to diplomatic journalism. Propaganda-style information work, however, continues to exist, especially in the media output of New Economic Powers, as part of the battle for ideas.

The importance of one other aspect of this type of diplomacy can be seen in how states have frequently augmented their official diplomatic channel by hiring the services of public relations agencies as part of public diplomacy initiatives. During the Anglo-Icelandic ‘Cod War’, Iceland used a London-based public relations firm, Whittaker Hunt, to put across its case.\textsuperscript{15} Lobbying by legal and other professional agencies is also a significant aspect of the public relations of states. The area covered by lobbying is wide, including such efforts as the attempts by the Bahamas to counteract their drug-trafficking image,\textsuperscript{16} or EU efforts to counter negative information in African media on the benefit of Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs). Using PR for defensive purposes was illustrated following, for example, the 9/11 attack in 2001, when the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar, hired the US public relations firm Burson-Marsteller to place advertisements in newspapers in the USA condemning the attacks, and appeared in TV networks to distance Saudi Arabia from the attacks.\textsuperscript{17}

Formal and informal developments in information work have taken the conduct of foreign policy – particularly for some European states, the United States and others – outside its traditional diplomatic framework, by introducing new participants, and widening, in certain instances, the arena of debate. Social media may bring for a short period greater public attention to an issue as in the case of the plight of child soldiers in the Congo and activities of the Lord’s Resistance Army, in ‘Kony 2012’.\textsuperscript{18}

The ‘Disguised’ state may also operate through ‘neutral’ or advocacy NGOs (e.g. the US World Agricultural Forum) or formal economic organisations linked to the state, such as the Russian and Chinese Marine Geological Associations, involved in deep seabed mining. Use of domestic agencies provides some distance from the centre, e.g. action on Iran sanction breaches against the Standard Chartered Bank included that by the New York state Department of Financial Services (DFS).\textsuperscript{19}

\section*{Abnormal relations and non-recognition}

The transformation of disputes and conflicts into higher levels of tension – leading eventually to breaks in diplomatic relations or other states of abnormal relations – is generally signalled by one or more factors relating to, for example, negotiation or border provisions. These include: abrogation of treaties or agreements dealing with security or non-intervention;\textsuperscript{20} the reintroduction of fundamental demands at a critical stage of negotiation;\textsuperscript{21} the cancellation and non-continuation of key talks;\textsuperscript{22} economic sanctions; and border closure.\textsuperscript{23}
The transition to armed conflict has several important implications for the conduct of diplomacy. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations treats this question broadly in three areas: the implications for diplomatic agents, assets and protection of interests. The first two of these will only be briefly noted here. Under Article 44 of the Vienna Convention, the receiving state is under an obligation to grant those with privileges and immunities the right to leave at the earliest possible moment. Article 45 deals inter alia with assets, which in the event of a break or recall (either permanent or temporary) the receiving state has a duty to protect, including premises of the mission, its property and archives (Article 45(a)). The custody of these and the protection of interests, including materials, may be undertaken by a third state with the consent of the receiving state (Article 45(b) and (c)).

The conduct of relations under conditions of armed conflict or other serious conflict becomes extremely difficult in the absence of diplomatic relations. Three kinds of difficulties can be distinguished: lines of contact; the official competence to negotiate; and the scope of negotiations. Lines of contact may be opened directly, through a friendly power either in a third state or at the UN, or other intermediaries. It is not always the case that lines of contact can be easily established. In the Russo–Finnish war, for example, Finland, having gone through the suite of possibilities, used in an act of unconventional diplomacy an informal envoy (Hella Wuolijoki, a left-wing Finnish playwright) to establish contact with the Soviet ambassador to Sweden. In cases where there is a lengthy absence of formal diplomatic relations, efforts to establish lines of communication can often be fragile and inconclusive.

At a formal level, more certainty may be achieved through the use of a third party as a protecting power, as provided for under the Law of Armed Conflict and the Vienna Convention. Third parties are quite widely used as protecting powers, as in the 1982 Falklands conflict in which the UK and Argentina were represented through interest sections respectively by Switzerland and Brazil. Agreements for the protection of interests in foreign states cover a range of matters extending to administrative, humanitarian and commercial questions, and the protection of nationals. The protecting power can also be involved in the process of normalising relations to varying degrees, ranging from the onward transmission of notes through to the ‘grey’ area of informal discussions and draft proposals. The initiation of normalisation and key stages is generally signalled through personal or special envoys.

It should be noted that the resumption of diplomatic relations may also be achieved through other means, including direct contact, friendly powers and intermediaries. The ending of diplomatic relations also does not mean necessarily the termination of consular relations. Consular officials have been used in those instances in which either there are no diplomatic relations, or diplomatic relations have been broken, for diplomatic and political functions. In these cases involving non-recognition, de-recognition or
exiled entities, several different mechanisms have evolved for transacting official and other business. These include the honorary representative, liaison office, representative office and trade mission. The use of a permanent trade mission is probably the most common of these devices, especially in instances of long-standing formal absence of relations. In some cases, the style ‘representative office’ is preferred to liaison office, presumably since it more closely connotes recognition and statehood. For example the Turkish Federated State of Northern Cyprus maintains representative offices in Belgium, the UK, the USA and the UN. Indeed, US proposals to Vietnam following the Paris Peace Accords of 1973 for a liaison office, along the lines of the USA–PRC) liaison office prior to recognition, were rejected by Vietnam. The US offer was subsequently withdrawn until 1991, when, as a result of progress on the Cambodian question, business pressure and a desire to resolve the outstanding US missing prisoners of war (POW)/missing in action (MIA) issue – the policy was revised. The USA subsequently opened POW/MIA liaison offices in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, staffed by non-permanent Defense Department personnel, with no diplomatic or political responsibility. The Hanoi office was upgraded in 1993 by diplomatic personnel, prior to full diplomatic relations.

Taiwan’s relations with the PRC and the USA are interesting for the contrasting light they throw on issues of the pace of informality, and on the other hand the need to conduct international trade and implement international conventions in a stable, legal framework. Following recognition of the PRC, the USA established through the Taiwan Relations Act (1979) a framework to enable trade and multilateral shipping and other technical agreements to be implemented through the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and Coordination Council for North American Affairs (CCNAA).

**Summary**

The differing arrangements states have for managing foreign policy have been influenced particularly by the growth in the nature and volume of international business. As more departments and agencies have become increasingly involved, so this has created problems of national coordination and institutional rivalry over the responsibility for (or direction of) the non-traditional areas of policy that are now considered part of foreign policy.

The contested and unstable international system post-2000 has also meant that the political functions of foreign ministries – assessments, options, advice and warning – have assumed greater significance. Rapid advances in international communications alter pace and methods of contact. For foreign ministries, adding value to function is a critical issue. However, for those with a stake in the international system, having a foreign policy is something that is increasingly expensive, often intangible, but an essential part of continued statehood and international presence.
Notes

3. By 1997, there were 70 departments in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). Of these 48 were now functional (e.g. energy, European integration, financial relations, trade relations and exports, maritime aviation and environment) and 22 were geographical. The other departments were specialist departments, such as the overseas labour adviser, inspectorate and legal advisers.
5. [www.gov.mu/portal/site/mfasite].
14. Lord Gore Booth (ed.), *Satow’s Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (Longman, London, 1979), Appendix VI, p. 487. Of the 2,000 or so officials on the diplomatic lists of 130 countries in London in the mid-1970s, 380 were non-career diplomats working in specialist fields such as commercial, economic and financial, press and cultural relations. Diplomatic service officers also occupied positions in these areas.
19. See LOS/PC N/30. 24 Oct. 1983, and ch. 16, pp. 329–30; and ISBA/17/c/16(China); and ISBA/17/c/12 (Russia) for consortia mining applications; Financial Times 9 August 2012 on Iran sanctions case.
For example, in the Nov. 1941 US-Japanese negotiations prior to the Pearl Harbor attack, Ambassador Nomura presented so-called Proposal B, involving the stationing of a significant number of Japanese troops in Asia, on 20 Nov. 1941, knowing at that stage that the USA would find the proposals unacceptable. At that point the State Department, having broken Japanese ciphers, was aware that Japan had decided to terminate the negotiations on 29 Nov. 1941. See Paul Hyer, ‘Hu Shih, the diplomacy of gentle persuasion’, in Richard Dean Burns and Edward M. Bennett, 

Iraqi demands, for example, prior to the occupation of Kuwait in 1990 were set out in a letter of 16 July 1990 to the Arab League, including those related to the disputed Rumailan oil-field. Subsequently, only one meeting was held on 1 Aug. 1990 between an Iraqi delegation led by Izzat Ibrahim and the Kuwaiti prime minister, Prince Saad. See John Bulloch and Harvey Morris, *Saddam’s War* (Faber & Faber, London. 1991), p. 105.

Border closure is indicative of a serious deterioration in relations, rather than the next step to war or armed conflict. It is therefore generally combined with one of the other five measures outlined. For example following the breakdown of the Iraq–Kuwait talks on 1 Aug., Iraq, having moved troops to the Kuwait border, closed the land border between the two countries. The Iraqi invasion began 12 hours later. See Bulloch and Morris, op. cit., pp. 105–6.

Under Article 44, the receiving state is to facilitate departure for those with diplomatic privileges and immunities without discrimination as to nationality, and, where necessary, provide transport.

The duties of third states vis-à-vis diplomatic agents, administrative staff and diplomatic bags, which are in or pass through their territory, are set out in Article 40(1)–(3) of the Vienna Convention. The duty to accord inviolability, administrative and other assistance is extended in Article 40(3) to situations of *force majeure*.
Switzerland, the USA brokered informal proposals on a settlement during 1987. See *The Times*, 3 April 1987 on both initiatives.


36. The Act provides for the bilateral implementation of certain multilateral conventions, e.g. in a shipping field where both countries have strong mutual shipping interests, the Exchange of Letters, 17 Aug. 1982, Arlington, Va, provides for the application of the Safety of Life at Sea, Marine Pollution 73/74 (MARPOL) and Load Lines conventions.