It is the task of diplomacy to adapt to an ever-evolving international environment, and diplomats are rightly proud of their profession’s proverbial flexibility. However, some of the newly emerging demands made on them could prove particularly trying. This is certainly true of public diplomacy. Communicating with foreign publics rather than with practitioners and officials abroad presents the diplomatic community with new challenges. After all, it is hard to deny that diplomatic culture, steeped in many centuries of tradition, is rather peer-oriented, and that the dominant realist paradigm is a by-product of a long history of viewing international relations in terms of economic and military power. For these and other reasons, the rise of ‘soft power’ in international affairs is testing diplomats’ flexibility to the full. Soft power is not based on payments or threats, but on the ability to shape the preferences of others. As Joseph Nye, who coined the term, writes, it is about ‘getting others to want the outcomes you want.’ When it comes to wielding soft power abroad, the preferred practice of international relations is public diplomacy. This amounts to nothing less than a change in the rules of the games that nations play. Although diplomatic services have gone through other difficult transitions in recent decades, with states adapting to the growing complexity of multilateral decision-making and learning to live with the rise of non-state actors in international affairs, for instance, dealing with foreign publics may prove a harder nut to crack. Part of the problem is highly practical: the public (and particularly the public abroad) is an elusive entity. It is hard to know what foreign publics think, and sometimes difficult to find out whom best to contact. Loosely tied groups of individuals have proven to be a potent force, but unlike NGOs or international organisations, they do not have a telephone number. To make matters worse, in many countries people are suspicious of foreign officials’ motives. This is hardly surprising: in too many societies, members of the public are unfortunately justified in making fun of anyone who places trust in their own government’s representatives. When it comes to dealing with the public, diplomats therefore have to work harder to achieve the credibility that is essential to facilitate foreign relationships. In a sense, public diplomacy is a symptom of a broader pattern of developments in diplomacy. The rise of public diplomacy reflects a gradual change towards a more collaborative form of diplomatic practice, building on more openness and exposure to the ubiquitous media and the public at large. This means that, in the day-to-day practice of diplomats in information departments, to quote one retired ambassador, “the old dog has to learn a new trick.” Engaging with foreign societies not only requires a different mindset, but it also requires techniques, sometimes borrowed from the corporate sector, that are unfamiliar in conventional diplomatic practice. Practitioners should think twice before pouring out well-intentioned information leaflets, glossy journals or CDs and DVDs. Generally speaking, it is much preferable for people in information departments to focus on public diplomacy instruments aimed at a real dialogue with foreign publics, keeping the national interest in mind, of course. The one-way information culture of foreign ministries is in the process of making way for public diplomacy, which is fundamentally a two-way communication process with foreign societies. Perhaps to their own surprise, the CEOs of today’s diplomatic services now see the importance of looking at strategic issues intended to help manage the reputation of their country. Some of them even aspire to a true ‘national brand’ that will make their country stand out in the global marketplace of identities and ideas. Doesn’t it seem as if diplomacy has changed beyond recognition?

Public diplomacy is often associated with US public diplomacy after 9/11. It sometimes appears as if the United States is the only country with a major interest in public diplomacy, and that public diplomacy concerns major themes such as the dialogue between the West and the Islamic world.

(continued on p.2.)
In reality, from Canada to Indonesia and from Chile to Kyrgyzstan, foreign ministries across the world have a great interest in public diplomacy. Some of them developed that interest long before the war on terror became the dominant issue in US foreign policy. On each continent, there are countries with experiences that can enhance our understanding of communication with foreign audiences, even though they do not attract as much attention as the great powers. Interestingly, the concerns of public diplomacy are more often than not in the sphere of what was once called ‘low politics’, which have become increasingly important where there is a great deal of interconnection between countries. Public diplomacy has become the bread and butter of ambassadors of EU countries posted to other member states. Of course, this gradual evolution of diplomacy is not only of interest to the diplomats themselves, but also to students of diplomacy and diplomatic trainers.

Can think-tanks/diplomatic academies such as Clingendael be of any assistance when it comes to public diplomacy? The honest answer is that we are trying hard to be. In 2003, Clingendael staff from the Departments of Research and Training decided to focus on public diplomacy in theory and practice. In the field of research, Clingendael has organised international conferences on public diplomacy, and it is looking forward to a one-day executive seminar on ‘nation branding’, to be held in November. Articles and papers on public diplomacy have been published in a number of journals, and books in English and Dutch are currently in preparation. On the training side, most Clingendael courses for foreign diplomats now include lectures and discussions on public diplomacy, and our staff participate in seminars on public diplomacy across Europe. Short tailor-made seminars are also being developed. In all this, Clingendael remains well aware that public diplomacy does not only affect other countries. As one commentator in a leading Dutch newspaper wrote: “Am I the only one who is going mad as a result of our image abroad? That would truly be very alarming.”

Jan Melissen is Head of Clingendael’s Department of Training and Education and part-time Professor in Antwerp University’s Department of Politics.

Priorities Dutch EU-Presidency

On 6 July, the Dutch Minister of European Affairs, Mr Atzo Nicolaï delivered a speech on the Dutch Presidency of the European Union. In Clingendael’s large Conference Room, which was packed to capacity, Minister Nicolaï elaborated on the priorities of the Dutch government, stressing the need for further European cooperation on issues such as the fight against international terrorism.

Clingendael-TEPSA Conference

On 25 June, in a joint initiative with the Trans European Studies Association (TEPSA), Clingendael hosted an international conference on the Dutch Presidency of the European Union. The event opened with a dinner speech on the eve of the conference by the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Bernard Bot, at the Kurhaus in The Hague.

At Clingendael, the participants were welcomed by Mr Hans van den Broek, former member of the European Commission and President of the Board of Clingendael. European Commissioner and distinguished guest speaker Mr Frits Bolkestein gave a speech entitled ‘A View from the European Commission’.

Mr Atzo Nicolaï, Dutch Minister for European Affairs.

Mr Frits Bolkestein, giving his speech “A View from the European Commission”

Mr Hans van den Broek, welcoming participants to Clingendael
On 14 July, Clingendael held a seminar entitled ‘The Netherlands in the New Europe’ for some 13 mid-career officials from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The seminar focused on changes in the ‘new Europe of 25’ and their consequences for the Dutch Presidency in the second half of 2004. These changes are both institutional, relating to the European constitution, and political, relating to the European Parliament elections, the power constellation in the Council and the negotiation process in the new Europe. Participants were asked to prepare an advisory report for Prime Minister Balkenende on the best course of action for the Presidency with regard to two politically sensitive issues: the start of accession negotiations with Turkey and the further development of the common security and defence policy in relation to the United States.

The recommendations in this report would be used by the Prime Minister in his defence of the Dutch Presidency’s agenda before the European Parliament on 21 July. No simple task indeed, not least because the Dutch Presidency has to manoeuvre very carefully with respect to the Turkish issue in order to avoid estranging Turkey from Europe, while simultaneously responding to the public doubts and opposition in many EU member states to Turkish accession. As the Dutch government itself is divided on this issue, its strategy on how to proceed is unclear. With regard to the development of a common security and defence policy in relation to the United States, the Dutch Presidency runs the risk of not being viewed as completely impartial - a prerequisite for the Presidency in managing EU negotiations. Participants discussed these dilemmas and others together with an expert from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Jules Gerzon, and Clingendael expert Hans van der Meulen.

Sudan at Clingendael

The four-week International Relations and Diplomatic Practice programme for representatives from the Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) took place in June and July. On 16 July, the participants received their certificates from Ms Agnes van Ardenne, the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation (front row, centre).

27th Course for Junior Diplomats from Eastern European Countries

The 27th Course for Junior Diplomats from Eastern European countries officially opened on 1 September, with participants from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, Macedonia, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro and Ukraine. Mr J.L. Werner, Director of Political Affairs of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, gave an opening address in Clingendael’s main conference room on the Dutch Presidency of the European Union.
The Hague Academic Coalition at Clingendael

On September 9th, the The Hague Academic Coalition (HAC): Carnegie Foundation, Leiden University, Institute of Social Studies, Asser Institute, Clingendael Institute) formalised itself into a foundation under Dutch Law. Posing on the terrace of Clingendael Institute, the directors of the HAC member institutes: (from l. to r.) Steven Hoogstraten (Carnegie), Hans Opschoor (ISS), Frans Nelissen (Asser), Paul Meerts (Clingendael), Roelof Haveman (Leyden), and Alfred van Staden (Clingendael) with on his left the representative of the Notary’s Office.

Introducing

On 1 July, Rem Korteweg joined the CCSS in order to carry out research for his PhD thesis at Leiden University. Rem holds a Bachelor’s degree from University College Utrecht and a Master’s degree in History from Utrecht University. During his Master’s degree programme, he followed a two-year research apprenticeship with Professor Rob de Wijk at Clingendael. The CCSS has awarded him a four-year PhD scholarship.

Rem’s field of research includes political and strategic cultures and defence transformation issues. For his PhD, he will examine and model defence transformation processes at the political and strategic level in various historical and international contexts, with an emphasis on the role played by political and strategic cultures in shaping a state’s disposition towards the use of armed forces.

This analysis will be conducted from a practical, theoretical and philosophical perspective. The objective of the research is to provide further insight into effective defence transformation. Rem will also participate in various CCSS projects.

New Clingendael Essay

Mind the Gap: The United States, Europe and the Middle East

Dalia Dassa Kaye

In this Essay, Dr Dassa Kaye argues that the instability emanating from the Middle East is probably the most critical security challenge facing the transatlantic alliance today, underscoring the need for more robust cooperation in this region. And yet, despite a variety of common interests, division within the alliance on Middle-East policy is pervasive, the historical norm, and deeply embedded in the respective strategic cultures of the countries concerned. According to Dr Dassa Kaye, both the US and Europe need to recognise how and why their approaches to the Middle East differ, and then work actively to cultivate a common strategic agenda and dialogue on key problems.

The issues raised by the author are at the top of the foreign policy agendas on both sides of the Atlantic, and are also highly relevant in view of the current Dutch Presidency of the EU.

Dr Dalia Dassa Kaye is a Fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations (New York), based in The Hague.

55 P.
Price: € 7.50

For more information, please contact the secretariat of the Department of Research (e-mail: research@clingendael.nl).

New publications CRU

Clingendael Book
Georg Frerks and Bart Klem (eds) (August 2004), Dealing with Diversity. Sri Lankan Discourses on Peace and Conflict

CRU Policy Briefs
Pyt Douma and Jeroen de Zeeuw (August 2004), From Transitional to Sustainable Justice. Human Rights Assistance to Sierra Leone (CRU Policy Brief # 1)

CRU Occasional Papers
Emeric Rogier (July 2004), Rethinking Conflict Resolution in Africa: Lessons from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sierra Leone and Sudan

CRU Working Papers


Sorpong Peou (May 2004). International assistance for Institution Building in Post-Conflict Cambodia (Working Paper 26)

Introducing
The usability of the European Armed Forces

Measuring Input and Output to Military Effectiveness

Theo van den Doel

The combined armed forces of the European countries within NATO and the EU comprise some 1.5 million military personnel, yet the member states are barely able to commit 50,000 of these to current peace operations. A significant gap clearly exists between existing military capacity and the required operational capabilities. In this study, the author argues that the tools currently used by international organisations to identify military capacity have lost their relevance. Figures such as the total defence expenditure, defence expenditure per capita or the size of the armed forces do not provide the appropriate information and can no longer be used by international organisations to guide their decisionmaking process.

Van den Doel concludes that these instruments of the Cold War need to be replaced by other instruments tailored to the present security situation and to the active role of international organisations such as NATO and the EU.

In this study, the author presents input and output criteria that provide a clear picture of the availability and usability of the armed forces of the various member states. Applied, these criteria would effectively increase the usability of the forces and serve as tools to meet the requirements dictated by the political aims of NATO and the EU. The current ranking system used to identify the usability of the armed forces for various peace operations is based primarily on financial data. To replace this, Van den Doel presents a new system that allows a ‘quick scan’ of the usability of all the forces.

To strengthen European military capacity and to enhance military cooperation, the author also presents a set of convergence criteria to adapt national armed forces to the EU requirements. The countries that meet these criteria qualify for permanent structured military cooperation within the EU. The convergence criteria can also be used to prevent the divergence of 25 different organisations of national armed forces and can be regarded as a next step along the bumpy road of the transformation process towards European Armed Forces.

Price € 12.50, available late October 2004

About the author

Theo van den Doel is a Senior Research Fellow in the Department of Research, where his research primarily focuses on defence and international security matters.

He studied as an Officer at the Royal Netherlands Military Academy and graduated from the Royal Netherlands Army Staff College before working in Clingendael’s Department of Research from 1991 to 1994 as a military strategy researcher. His international publications during this period included a book on NATO enlargement. In 1994, he became a Member of the Dutch Parliament and until 2003 was party spokesman on defence and security issues.

For more information, please contact the secretariat of the Department of Research (e-mail: research@clingendael.nl).

Clingendael offshore

Over the past few months, Clingendael’s External Relations office has been continuing its negotiations training in the Netherlands and abroad. Highlights include the organisation of two modules (in The Hague and Dublin) of the European Diplomatic Programme (EDP) for young professionals from all EU institutions, and two contributions to the Senior Course of the NATO Defence College in Rome. In April, Clingendael was also selected to organise a comprehensive training programme for the UK’s forthcoming EU Presidency in the second half of 2005. Together with its Oxford-based partner, the Centre for Political and Diplomatic Studies (CPDS), Clingendael will offer approximately twenty courses, training approximately two hundred UK diplomats and civil servants. After Clingendael’s extensive work for both the Irish and Dutch Presidencies, this important assignment underlines the Institute’s expertise in Presidency training programmes.

Good governance in Uganda

After several months of preparation, a Clingendael team visited the Ugandan capital of Kampala to finalise arrangements for two lengthy workshops to be held in Entebbe in the last two weeks of October. The workshops mark a new series of Clingendael projects in Africa to create more awareness of good governance and to enhance the professional skills that are needed locally to ensure the best results. Clingendael held coordination talks with its counterpart in Uganda, the Uganda Martyrs University (UMU) in Nkozi, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch embassy and other relevant stakeholders. The workshops will focus on personal skills and security issues. The Prime Minister of Uganda will officially open the first workshop to underline the importance that the Uganda Government attaches to the programme.

Lt Col (RNLA) Richard van Eijsden, Deputy Head of Clingendael’s Department of Training and Education
Performance Management in Foreign Ministries
Kishan S. Rana,
Discussion Paper in Diplomacy no. 93, July 2004

Foreign ministries are currently using performance management (PERM) techniques borrowed from the corporate world in three specific areas: the overseeing and optimisation of the diplomatic system’s distributed networks (i.e., the embassies and permanent missions); human resource management; and detailed reporting to the public on the objectives and the outcomes of the ministry’s work (i.e., public diplomacy). Although some aspects of the performance of diplomatic systems can be measured, allowing limited comparison, most are not amenable to measurement. This makes their performance inaccessible to external scholars, at least until documents are declassified after some decades. Performance management is leading to leaner embassies, greater use of local staff, and systemic change, generally raising levels of efficiency. However, if carried too far with respect to the overseeing of embassies, it can be counterproductive, leading to mechanical conformity and micro-management from headquarters, and sapping local initiative. In contrast, in the areas of human resource management and improved accountability through detailed reporting to the public, PERM is proving a clear success.

About the author
Kishan S. Rana holds BA (Hons) and MA degrees in Economics from St. Stephens College, Delhi University. He served in the Indian Foreign Service from 1960 to 1995, and was Ambassador/High Commissioner to Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Kenya, Mauritius and Germany. He also worked on the staff of Prime Minister Indira Ghandi for a year and was Consul General in San Francisco. Mr Rana currently teaches at the Foreign Service Institute in New Delhi, where he is Professor Emeritus, and is a Senior Fellow of the DiploFoundation (Malta and Geneva), teaching within its distance learning programmes. He is the author of Inside Diplomacy (2000), Bilateral Diplomacy (2002), and The 21st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive (March 2004).

Culture Communicates: US Diplomacy that works
Cynthia P. Schneider,
Discussion Paper in Diplomacy no. 94, September 2004

Cultural diplomacy is a prime example of ‘soft power’, or the ability to persuade through culture, values, and ideas as opposed to ‘hard power’, which conquers or coerces through military might. Cultural diplomacy helped to win the Cold War, but today when the US struggles to communicate its ideals of democracy and individual rights to a hostile world, cultural diplomacy plays a negligible role in the broader endeavour of public diplomacy. Even though significant foreign policy experts from the right and the left have argued for the importance of cultural diplomacy, in the current climate it is easily dismissed as too soft and peripheral to the real issues. This paper will examine the reasons behind the decline of US cultural diplomacy from the 1990s, when the United States Information Agency, the home of cultural diplomacy, was dismantled and merged into the State Department.

In addition, it focuses on the past and present components of successful cultural diplomacy in the US and elsewhere. Finally, challenges facing the US in the post-9/11 world and the potential and limitations of cultural diplomacy in meeting them will be discussed.

About the author
Dr. Cynthia P. Schneider is Director of the Life Science and Society Initiative and Distinguished Professor of Diplomacy at Georgetown University. For 2004-6 she has been named Pfizer Medical Humanities Initiative Scholar-in-Residence. In addition she has been awarded a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for the project “Ethics Meets the Marketplace”. From 1984-2004 Dr. Schneider taught in the Department of Art History at Georgetown University, where she gave courses in Renaissance and Baroque art. She has published several books and numerous articles on seventeenth century Dutch art and Rembrandt. As US Ambassador to the Netherlands (1996-2001), Dr. Schneider was active in cultural diplomacy, military and business relations, international law, cyber security, education, and biotechnology. She was awarded the Office of the Secretary of Defence Exceptional Public Service Order, the highest civilian award given by the Department of Defence. Ambassador Schneider is a member of the Supervisory Board of the international food conglomerate Royal Ahold, and of the Board of the Institute of Europe at Columbia University, the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, and of the Anne Frank Foundation American Board. She is a non-Resident Fellow at the Brookings Institution, and also a non-Resident Fellow at the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at Georgetown University.

Introducing
Marc Bentinck joined Clingendael’s Department of Research in August, on temporary secondment from the Dutch Foreign Ministry. As an officer of the Dutch Foreign Service, he has served in both The Hague and abroad, with postings to the former Conference on Security and Cooperation in Vienna (now the Organisation on Security and Cooperation), to London, and to the NATO International Staff in Brussels. In The Hague, he worked within the UN Political Affairs and Security Policy Departments of the UN, first as Desk Officer and later as Head of Section. His main areas of responsibility have been Western political and military cooperation and chemical and biological disarmament and non-proliferation. During the first half of 2004, Marc served as political advisor/liaison to the British commander of the Multinational Division South East in Basrah, southern Iraq. He is an associate member of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) in London and author of an Adelphi Paper on NATO out-of-area issues. At Clingendael, he will be working on NATO affairs.