DISCUSSION PAPERS IN DIPLOMACY

Discourse Analysis of EU Public Diplomacy Messages and Practices

Steffen Bay Rasmussen

ABSTRACT

This paper examines EU public diplomacy and its implications for the wider EU diplomatic efforts. Drawing on discourse theory, public diplomacy is conceptualised as a modality of diplomacy that seeks to influence specific elements within foreign political discourses. The influence sought by the EU through its messages relates to the projection of its identity as an actor and to the diffusion of its own normative foundation, and it is argued that these are potentially conflicting objectives. EU public diplomacy is characterized by its decentralized nature, where the delegations of the Commission in third states are the most important actors in the network 'doing' EU public diplomacy, since they plan and execute specific initiatives. This paper argues that the traditional and public diplomacy of the EU are complementary sets of practices that are closely linked and influence each other. They are also both fundamentally restrained by political disagreement among member states about the nature and roles of the EU. Finally, this paper argues that the network organization of EU public diplomacy, although giving rise to important problems of coherence, is better adapted to current patterns of diplomatic interaction and more effective in the pursuit of EU strategic objectives than a more hierarchical organization able to speak with one voice and act in a more concerted manner.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Steffen Bay Rasmussen is a Ph.D. student at the University of the Basque Country. He holds a BA in political science from the University of Southern Denmark, an MA in European Studies from the University of Aalborg and a Diploma of Advances Studies in International Law and International Relations from the University of the Basque Country. His current research focuses on the European Union as a diplomatic actor and the ways in which the significance of contemporary changes in diplomacy can be understood.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF EU PUBLIC DIPLOMACY: MESSAGES AND PRACTICES[*]

Steffen Bay Rasmussen

> This is not an exercise in 'national branding'; it is not 'propaganda', because we know that this does not work. It is the recognition of a fundamental shift, and especially so in relatively open societies, of how power, influence and decision-making has spread, and how complex it has become. (Margot Wallström, European Commissioner responsible for Communication).[1]

In a world characterised by the wide expansion of democracy and rising levels of education, what ordinary people think is increasingly important to governments. The shrinking of the geopolitical and psychological distance between different parts of the world brought about by processes of globalization only reinforces the effect, since people with influence on foreign policy through the democratic system are better informed and more interested in what goes on beyond state borders. Governments must define the national interests and foreign policy strategy within the enabling and constraining context of public opinion, and political influence is therefore increasingly a matter of being able to shape how foreign publics define the meaning of facts, interpret events and perceive other actors in the international system. In this paper, public diplomacy is considered a modality of diplomacy that seeks indirect and structural influence internationally by affecting the political discourses within other states. It has become increasingly important relative to other diplomatic activities, a fact reflected both in the activities and priorities of foreign ministries and in the generous scholarly attention paid to it.

---

[1] Margot Wallström, *Public Diplomacy And its Role in the EU's External Relations*, Speech given on 2 October 2008, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/494&guiLanguage=en (March 2009).

When studying new trends in the contemporary diplomatic landscape, such as the surge of public diplomacy, the EU is an interesting case. As an international actor under construction, there is general agreement that the EU lacks the hard power to directly influence reality 'on the ground', and it has been convincingly argued that the primary means of influence of the EU is through its normative power, i.e. the ability to shape what is normal,[2] and to operate at the margin of official foreign policy and material capabilities.[3] Only a few studies have focused on how the EU communicates with the world and seeks to influence foreign public opinion, and these generally focus on branding,[4] the external image of the EU[5] or the communication strategies and on giving policy recommendations for improvement.[6]

Leaning to a greater degree on Michalski's study[7] that includes a focus on the values and ideas contained in EU public diplomacy, this paper examines the images and practices of EU public diplomacy, and places these in the context of the EU's wider diplomatic practices and its strategic objectives as an actor. The basis of the argument is a discourse theoretical framework, which conceptualises EU public diplomacy as being not merely about influencing foreign perceptions of the EU, but about establishing an identity for the EU as an actor, and about influencing foreign conceptions of other discursive elements, such as democracy, human rights, climate change. An additional benefit of this approach is that the findings will hopefully contribute to the wider debate on the nature and identity of the EU as a *sui generis* actor with both intergovernmental and supranational traits.

In the next section of the paper, I outline the discursive approach to public diplomacy that constitutes the conceptual framework of the paper. In

---

2) Ian Manners, 'Normative power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2002) pp. 235-258.

3) Javier Noya, *Diplomacia Pública Para el Siglo XXI,* (Ariel: Barcelona, 2007) p. 322.

4) Peter van Ham, 'Branding European Power', *Place Branding*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2005a) pp. 122-126.

5) The focus on the external image of the EU is also shared by Emma Basker, 'EU Public Diplomacy', in J. Noya, *The Present and Future of Public Diplomacy: A European Perspective. The 2006 Madrid Conference on Public Diplomacy,* (Madrid: Elcano, 2006) and Noya (2007) pp. 305-318, and reflects a tendency in public diplomacy studies to see image-projection as central.

6) Philip Fiske de Gouveia, *European Infopolitik: Developing EU Public Diplomacy Strategy*, (London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2005); Dov Lynch, 'Communicating Europe to the World: What Public Diplomacy for the EU?', *EPC Working Paper*, No. 21 (Brussels: European Policy Centre, 2005).

7) Anna Michalski, 'The EU as a Soft Power: The Force of Persuasion', in J. Melissen (ed.), *The New Public diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2005) pp. 124-144.

the third part, the analysis turns to the self-images and core messages contained in EU public diplomacy, and in the following sections, the focus is on the different practices of EU public diplomacy. The final part of the paper discusses EU public diplomacy in the context of its broader diplomatic effort and strategic objectives.

Public diplomacy: conceptual framework

While a general consensus exists about public diplomacy involving activities in the fields of information, education and culture that are not directed towards the government,[8] there is no agreement on a strict definition of the concept. For the present purposes, Sharp's definition is a good starting point, defining public diplomacy in instrumentalist terms as 'the process by which direct relations with the people in a country are pursued to advance the interests and extend the values of those being represented'.[9] McClellan's definition is similar:

> 'the strategic planning and execution of informational, cultural and educational programming by an advocate country to create a public opinion environment in a target country or countries that will enable target country political leaders to make decisions that are supportive of advocate country's foreign policy objectives.'[10]

In a discursive approach, which sees international politics as increasingly being a struggle over ideas and values, public diplomacy activities are an important means of political influence alongside traditional diplomacy among governments. I shall not go into detailed theoretical arguments, but merely outline a conception of public diplomacy based on Laclau's and Mouffe's classic discourse theory,[11] while combining their approach with a focus on the

---

8) Peter van Ham, 'Power, Public Diplomacy and the *Pax Americana*,' in J. Melissen (2005b) pp. 47-66, p. 57.
9) Paul Sharp, 'Revolutionary States, Outlaw Regimes and the Techniques of Public Diplomacy', in J. Melissen (2005), pp. 106-123 p. 106.
10) Michael McClellan, 'Public Diplomacy in the Context of Traditional Diplomacy', *Favorita Papers*, Vol. 2004, No. 1, pp. 23-32, pp. 23-24.
11) Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, (London: Verso, 1985).

specific practices[12] by which the EU acts. The basic tenet of this theoretical framework is that the meaning of phenomena is socially constructed through language. To claim that politics is a struggle over ideas and values is to claim that what matters is not only facts and events in themselves, but how they are interpreted. Political influence is thus achieved by articulating a certain meaning of a concept that others then adopt, making it a socially constructed truth. A discourse is the result of social practice that establishes relations among concepts and thereby their meaning. Public diplomacy thus operates through what essentially communicative practices intended to influence foreign political discourses, i.e. seeking support for one's particular definition of reality.

Public diplomacy is generally associated with the notion of soft power, defined by Joseph Nye as 'getting others to want the outcomes you want'[13] or to shape what others want,[14] not by means of coercion, but by attraction.[15] Some scholars explicitly define public diplomacy in soft power terms,[16] whereas Melissen sees public diplomacy as a key instrument of soft power.[17] The linkage is not without problems, though. Hocking highlights the paradox of associating soft power with public diplomacy, arguing that if attraction really worked, there would be no need for public diplomacy.[18] Indeed, because values and ideas do not transfer themselves, there must be some contact between the two parties. Manners' argument about normative power recognises this, and identifies specific mechanisms for normative diffusion.[19] The soft power notion of attraction seems to imply that it happens

---

12) As proposed by Ivar B. Neumann, 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (2002) pp. 627-651.

13) Joseph S. Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, (New York: Public Affairs, 2004) p. 5.

14) Nye (2004) p. 7.

15) Nye (2004) p. 6.

16) Examples include Jozef Bátora, 'Public Diplomacy in Small and Medium-sized States: Norway and Canada', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 97 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2005) p. 4 and R.S Zaharna as quoted in Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, 'Advancing the New Public Diplomacy: A Public Relations Perspective', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (2007) pp. 187-211, p. 195.

17) Jan Melissen, 'The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice', in J. Melissen (2005) pp. 3-27, p. 5.

18) Brian Hocking, 'Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy', in J. Melissen (2005) pp. 28-43, p. 35.

19) Of which public diplomacy refers to the mechanisms of informational diffusion and the cultural filter diffusion. See Ian Manners (2002) pp. 244-245.

automatically, whereas public diplomacy is seen as the efforts by which an actor seeks to transfer ideas and beliefs by influencing foreign political discourses through direct contact and participation in political debates. Public diplomacy is aimed at the structural environment in which actors define themselves, their interests and their truths about the world. From a discourse-theoretical perspective, the power notion underlying public diplomacy is thus structural in nature, as proposed by Steven Lukes. He considers the central question of public diplomacy to be:

> 'To what extent, in which ways and by what mechanisms do powerful agents influence others' conceptions of their own interests?'[20]

It follows that public diplomacy as a communicative practice is not only a matter of projecting and controlling self-images abroad.[21] Other discursive elements are also targets of public diplomacy. Political influence is achieved through influencing how specific issues, such as human rights or corruption, are perceived abroad, or by adding new issues to the political agenda, by relating them to important discursive elements. From the theoretical perspective adopted here, nation-branding and identity projection become merely the part of public diplomacy that seeks to influence self-image as an element in foreign political discourses, whereas public diplomacy remains a larger phenomenon seeking also to influence foreign publics in other ways.[22]

The elements with the most solidly determined meaning are also the most central to political discourses, such as those relating to the state and to the nation as a collective identity.[23] It should also be common sense that it is more difficult to influence the basic beliefs of others than their opinion of phenomena of marginal importance to them. This points to the futility of trying to go against basic beliefs and perceptions in a publicity campaign.

---

20) Steven Lukes, 'Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds', *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (2005) pp. 477-494, pp. 492-493.

21) For examples of such an approach, see Basker (2006); Philip Fiske de Gouveia, 'The Future of Public Diplomacy' in J. Noya (2006); van Ham (2005a).

22) For a discussion of alternative ways to define the relationship between nation branding and public diplomacy, see Gyorgy Szondi, 'Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No.112 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2008).

23) See Ole Wæver, 'Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses', in A. Wivel, *Explaining European Integration*, (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Political Studies Press, 1998); Ole Wæver, 'Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy', in L. Hansen and O. Wæver (eds.), *European Integration and National Identity. The Challenge of the Nordic States*, (London: Routledge, 2002).

Discursive influence is more easily obtained if the message transmitted is consistent with the basic beliefs and values of people.

Social structures of meaning function in this way as a structural constraint on future articulations. This means that any articulation seeking to influence a foreign discourse must be attuned to specific patterns of meaning that already exist. Influence is maximised by framing interventions in subtle terms that resonate with the existing discursive elements. Public diplomacy should thus as a first step involve a solid analysis of the political discourses of the target group, or as formulated by Malone:

> 'If we strive to be successful in our efforts to create understanding for our society and for our policies, we must first understand the motives, culture, history, and psychology of the people with whom we wish to communicate.'[24]

Related hereto is the importance of the audience, for which the message sent must be tailor-made for increased efficiency. Also, it is vital to maintain a two-way communication process, to engage in dialogue,[25] since the message should be adjusted continuously depending on how it impacts the foreign discourses.[26] This creates a need for high flexibility at the time of planning public diplomacy initiatives. In consequence, Van Ham concludes that for the US experience the one-size-fits-all approach to public diplomacy has been a failure,[27] and Noya concludes in the same vein that public diplomacy practitioners must be specialised in specific areas or regions.[28]

Another factor is the elitist bias in public diplomacy, stemming from the fact that not all individuals have the same political influence on a discourse. Some will primarily be discourse takers, whereas others will be more discourse shapers, and therefore can be considered 'message multipliers',[29] which should be targeted for increased impact of the public diplomacy efforts. These message multipliers include, for instance, organisations of civil society,

---

24) Gifford D. Malone quoted in Evan H. Potter, 'Canada and the New Public Diplomacy', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 81 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2002).

25) Melissen (2005) pp. 13-14.

26) Leonard adds to this argument that one-way messages are likely to create resentment in foreign publics. Mark Leonard et al., *Public Diplomacy*, (London: Foreign Policy Centre, 2002) p. 48.

27) Van Ham (2005b), pp. 60-61. Similar conclusions are drawn by Jan Melissen, 'Public Diplomacy Between Theory and Practice', in J. Noya, (2006).

28) Noya (2007) p. 155.

29) Noya (2007) p. 68.

journalists, business leaders and persons that are widely respected in society. When interacting with foreign civil society, it is also logical to include also domestic civil society organisations in a network approach to public diplomacy.[30] Civil society organisations can better communicate with foreign publics than can a diplomat, and especially many NGOs have a moral authority that official representatives do not,[31] so they are generally influential with the public. Also, they often have expert and local knowledge that the diplomats may not.[32]

It is important to note that communication is not done only through speech, but also through practice. Indeed, specific actions may communicate a message more powerfully to a foreign audience than any number of words. Of course, a combined message of words and actions is most efficient. Melissen concludes that with words you cannot move beyond social realities,[33] since there must be consistency between words and actions. In a discourse theoretical perspective, the problem of consistency can be thought of as a question of not sending antagonistic messages to foreign audiences. Words can be used to affect the interpretation of actions, but there is a limit to how much foreign perceptions of events and actions can be altered.

A related problem in communicating public diplomacy is ensuring that the message is interpreted in the way it was intended. It is impossible to maintain control over one's messages,[34] although careful planning can reduce the risk of miscommunication. It may be that the biggest impact on foreign publics comes not from public diplomacy, but from books, TV, films, company brands, etc. outside of government control.[35]

To analyze the public diplomacy activities of a specific actor, Leonard's[36] and Wang's[37] models both distinguish public diplomacy activities depending on how broad an influence is sought. In both models objectives range from the very specific, related to specific policies on strategic initiatives aimed at values and ideas, to more general and broad influence through

---

30) Metzl thus argues that public diplomacy is 'ideally suited' to a network approach. Jamie Metzl, 'Network Diplomacy', *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.3, No. 1 (2001).

31) Noya (2007) p. 123.

32) Shaun Riordan (2005), 'Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A New Foreign Policy Paradigm?' in J. Melissen (2005) pp. 180-195, p. 191.

33) Melissen (2005) p. 20.

34) Melissen (2005) p. 25.

35) Leonard et al. (2002) p. 4.

36) Leonard et al. (2002) p. 8-21.

37) Jian Wang, 'Localizing Public Diplomacy: The Role of Sub-national Actors in Nation-branding', *Place Branding*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2006) pp. 33-42, pp. 37-39.

relationship building. Leonard argues that three aspects correspond to the time horizon of the initiatives, where news management is reactionary and short-term, strategic communication is proactive and medium-term, and relationship building is long-term. Nevertheless, reactionary public diplomacy commenting on events is not necessarily less strategic and shorter term than proactive public diplomacy, since it obviously takes place in a larger strategic context where messages and specific statements are sent in accordance with established communication strategies. Building on the idea of distinguishing public diplomacy activities by how specific an influence is sought, this paper suggest distinguishing public diplomacy practices by the discursive influence they seek to obtain, dividing them into three categories which will structure the analysis in this paper. At the most specific, practices seek to influence the interpretation of a single event or isolated concept, with an impact also beyond the immediate consequences. An EU-relevant example could be the concept of a moratorium on executions and a specific event would here be the execution of a specific prisoner, with public diplomacy seeking to define the execution within a larger campaign against the death penalty as being a violation of universal human rights. Practices seeking less specific influence would include those directed at discursive nodal points. Nodal points are the key elements of a discourse determining the meaning of a range of other elements. In the case of the EU, for instance, one example would be working for democracy in general by linking it to different specific concepts, such as freedom of the press, human rights, gender equality or good governance. Finally, practices aimed at very diffuse influence would be those that are not directed at any discursive element in particular, but aimed at increasing general knowledge of the actor in question and its core values and ideas, e.g. through helping to establish links between domestic and foreign civil society actors, or inviting students on exchanges so that they can see for themselves what a certain society is about.

EU self-image and core messages

With respect to EU external communication, it has been convincingly argued that it is futile to try to identify one single message of the EU to the world,[38] in part due to the many conflicting views on the nature of the EU and what it should be doing in its external policies, and in part due to the lack of

---

38) For instance by Missiroli in Lynch (2005).

communicative cohesion in the EU. While it is undoubtedly true that the EU does not speak with one voice, this does not necessarily mean that there is not, on an abstract level, a common self-image and common messages transmitted by the cacophony of EU voices. As noted by a Commission official, 'diversity *is* the EU brand,' [39] and it is not only communicated through official communications and initiatives, but lived on a daily basis through the actual functioning of the EU. The basis for this concept is the politically uncontroversial presentation of the EU as an internally diverse political entity of different states that work effectively together for the common good. This basic abstract idea leads to two sets of messages being communicated. The first set relates to the self-image of the EU as an internally diverse political entity which through integration has secured a Kantian logic of anarchy[40] among the European states, and therefore is a model for peace to be followed.[41] The second set of messages focuses on communicating the effectiveness of the EU as an external actor.

With respect to the self-image of the EU as a model for peace, the narrative of the EU as a peace project has pervaded European integration since its beginnings in the 1950s. Although the EU recognises that the narrative does little to convince younger generations of EU citizens of the virtues of the EU, the 'EU as a peace project' is still very much the identity that the EU seeks to communicate to the world.[42] While the EU promotes this image of itself, a further element is added in that the EU is also presented as a model to be followed by other states and regions,[43] since the European experience has clearly demonstrated the success of the model. Apart from the intrinsic and universal value of the founding principles of the EU of peace,

---

39) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.

40) Wendt contrasts the Kantian logic of friendship with a Lockean logic of competitive coexistence and a Hobbesian logic of enmity. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 246-312.

41) According to van Ham, this self-image constitutes the 'founding myth' of the EU. Peter van Ham, 'The Power of War: Why Europe Needs It', *Clingendael Diplomacy Papers*, No. 19 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2008) pp. 3-4.

42) Carta concludes on the basis of 48 interviews with high-ranking Commission officials serving in the delegations abroad, that 'the EU as model for peace' is still very much the primary image. Caterina Carta, 'The Commission's Diplomats and the EU International Image', in S. Lucarelli, *The External Image of the European Union*, Garnet Working Paper No. 17 (2007). Michalski (2005), p. 135 reaches a similar conclusion.

43) For instance in the public diplomacy campaign surrounding the EU's 50th anniversary. European Commission, *The EU's 50th Anniversary Celebrations Around the World. A Glance at EU Public Diplomacy at Work*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2007a) pp. 5 and 11.

democracy, the rule of law, human rights and equality of member states,[44] these principles should also be adopted elsewhere because of the benefits they bring to all parties when used as the basis for international interaction among states, and more specifically, institutions of regional integration. Therefore, in addition to their politically uncontroversial nature, the discursive nodal points of democracy and human rights in particular are central to EU public diplomacy efforts. Apart from these central principles, the more specific ways in which the EU functions can also be identified as nodal points that the EU seeks to influence. These relate to the value of dialogue and consensus-seeking as well as to interdependence, multilateralism,[45] and institutionalisation as ways to overcome security dilemmas in the international system.[46] A final nodal point and component of the EU model that the EU seeks to communicate is that of a liberal market economy and free trade as a key to wealth,[47] which is a persistent theme in EU foreign policy and one which has caused problems.[48]

With respect to the image of the EU as an effective actor, this set of messages is transmitted to both domestic and foreign audiences. Although the population of the EU generally favours its existence, the EU does not enjoy the same kind of automatic legitimacy as a state in the eyes of its citizens and the world when it acts externally. The messages identified in the EU external policy communications strategy[49] are therefore aimed to legitimise EU external policy, arguing for the value and the efficiency of its activities. A first group of messages responds to the question of 'why' the EU has a foreign policy in the first place. This is done by arguing that the EU adds value to that of the member states acting alone by being more financially efficient when activities are coordinated, for instance with respect to development assistance, and that EU member states are more powerful internationally

---

44) The EU external policy communication strategy focuses on messages where the EU is presented as being about stability, prosperity, democracy, human rights, sustainable development and international solidarity (the EU is presented as the biggest donor of development assistance). European Commission, *The EU in the World: Towards a Communication Policy for the European Union's External Policy 2006-2009*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2006).

45) Multilateralism is singled out as a nodal point in the external policy communication strategy. European Commission (2006).

46) The EU external policy communication strategy singles out as a message the EU governance system as a model for the world. European Commission (2006).

47) European Commission (2006).

48) Michalski notes the difficulties the Commission has had convincing NGO partners of the virtues of free trade. Michalski (2005) p. 136.

49) European Commission (2006).

when acting in concert, for instance in trade policy. A second group of messages responds to the question of what the EU external policy is about. The argument is that the EU is effective in promoting stability, prosperity, democracy and human rights, and that it delivers concrete results in the fight to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development. The third cluster of messages seeks to explain how the EU acts externally through the support of regional integration and a rule-based international order, and works for multilateralism as a way of solving global problems. The EU self-image as a model to be followed and as an efficient actor means that the key nodal points that it seeks to influence link its self-image to the values promoted, being the key nodal points of democracy, human rights and multilateralism.

Public diplomacy practices

EU public diplomacy is closely linked to its domestic communication, due to its need to legitimize its existence and policies internally as well as externally. While all states must live with the fact that they cannot control information flows about themselves or their activities, the EU must take into account the separate public diplomacy efforts of the 27 member states as well. Thus, domestic EU communication must also be seen as a way of coordinating external communication, since it is designed to convince domestic audiences of the external communication messages, so that states and other actors within the EU align the messages transmitted by their own activities to those of the EU. It is important not only for external policy to be seen as legitimate, but also to facilitate the cooperation on the ground in third states upon which the effectiveness of EU public diplomacy depends. Having noted this point though, the analysis will be limited to EU external communication.

Influencing discursive nodal points

Although other EU actors undertake activities with a public diplomacy effect, for example the journeys abroad of European Parliament delegations or the Council's publication of 'internal' EU documents such as the European Security Strategy, the present section will focus on the public diplomacy activities of the Commission, since its delegations are the primary actors in EU public diplomacy.

The general EU approach to influencing foreign publics is to delegate the tasks to the relevant bodies, with central coordination taking place only on

a strategic level. The EU does not try to speak with one voice, but undertakes instead a series of efforts to coordinate the statements of different actors, so that there is a certain common direction in the statements of EU actors, with the aim of increasing visibility and influence and showing the EU as a coherent actor that does everything from issuing political statements on development projects to the dispatching of troops.[50]

The most important coordination at the strategic level takes place between the Council Secretariat and the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the European Commission's Directorate General for External Relations (DG RELEX).[51] The general policy lines are agreed to in the respective council working groups, which can ask the Commission delegations abroad to contribute with communication lines.[52] For the final communications project, various desk officers from both the Council Secretariat and the Commission are involved. The primary area for cooperation is the CFSP and the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), where the Commission and the Council Secretariat work together on communication with a dedicated budget. Activities include writing joint papers and organising seminars for journalists.[53]

Within the Commission there is also a great need for coordination among the different DGs with external policy competences, known as the RELEX family. This takes place in the RELEX Information Committee,[54] which meets on a monthly basis. This way, the various DGs of the Commission with different perspectives on external relations coordinate their external communication, so that the specific messages of each DG resonate with the overall messages that the EU wishes to communicate. The intent of the EU is thus not that all the DGs communicate the same messages, since each is responsible for communication within their political issue areas, but that they avoid sending contradictory messages. This is of course the ideal situation that the EU seeks to achieve, but in practice the delegation of authority makes it difficult to avoid having specific communicative initiatives point in different directions and potentially contradict one another.

Coordination and consultation also takes place with stakeholders in given policy areas, for instance with respect to development cooperation. Generally, it is not an open dialogue among equals. The Commission

---

50) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
51) Michalski (2005) p. 132.
52) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
53) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
54) Consisting of the DG's RELEX, Development, Trade, AIDCO (Europe Aid), ECHO, PRESS, ECFIN and Enlargement.

proposes and asks for views, although stakeholders at times also present proposals and specific contributions to the Commission. With respect to the annual activity plans, for instance, stakeholders are presented with the plans on the eve of the decision and invited to share their points of view.[55] In contrast, three rounds of consultations were held on defining the strategy for 2007-2010 of the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).[56] The point is not only to avoid duplication of efforts between EU activities and those of the NGOs, but also to convince the relevant epistemic community of the value of the EU's communicative priorities and ideas, thereby making NGOs work along similar lines to the extent possible, and multiplying the effect of EU initiatives.

The role of the Commission Delegations

The delegations of the Commission are central to EU public diplomacy efforts. While Brussels-based officials deal more with domestic EU communication, the delegations are the primary drivers of external communication. As such, the concrete and technical aspects of EU public diplomacy is primarily done in the delegations, whereas the Brussels headquarters of the Commission is generally concerned with the strategic aspects and with coordinating the work of the delegations when public diplomacy initiatives involve more than one third country.

The centrality of the delegations for EU public diplomacy is reflected in the budget. Of the annual external communications budget of around 8 million euros,[57] between two-thirds and three-quarters are destined to the work of the delegations. The communication budget of the specific delegation is determined annually at the beginning of the year, on the basis of a plan sent to headquarters in Brussels together with an activity report for the previous year. However, the budget does not vary much since a great part of it is

---

55) Interview at Europe Aid, May 2008.

56) European Commission, *European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) – Strategy Paper 2007-2010*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2007b), available at http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/eidhr/documents/eidhr-strategy-paper-2007_en.pdf (March 2009).

57) To situate this figure in context, it should be noted that it is equivalent to roughly 10 percent of the budget allotted to domestic communication in the EU. The distribution of funds clearly reflects EU communicative priorities, which are determined by the constant need for legitimization of EU external action.

salaries and since the Commission does not centrally approve specific initiatives, although suggestions might be made to improve planning.[58] The distribution of funds is unequal among delegations and determined by the political priorities of the Commission. The delegation in the US with more than a dozen staff dedicated to communication receives the most, while the smallest budgets are given to the often one-person press and information units of delegations in Sub-Saharan Africa or other ACP countries.

With unequal distribution of funds and staff, there are obvious differences to the range of activities that each delegation is capable of undertaking, and it is therefore difficult to paint a general picture of the public diplomacy activities of the delegations. Also, which messages are given most importance and how they are transmitted depends on the specific circumstances of the third country in question, for instance with large differences between activities in developed and developing countries. Nevertheless, on a general level, there is a similarity of approaches. The delegations are responsible for identifying target audiences and taking specific communicative initiatives.[59] The specific activities depend on the audience targeted, but generally the delegations seek to target discourse shapers, such as journalists, NGOs and academics, through the organisation of conferences, seminars and visits.[60] Another general focus group is young people,[61] but it again depends on the issue and the specific message being communicated. Specific public diplomacy activities include, apart from conferences and seminars, a range of different activities from the publication of newsletters, maintenance of mailing lists, speeches and web-site management to food fairs and sporting competitions. Cultural events and the presentation of journalism awards are also used by the EU. In terms of centrally initiated communication, the co-financing of the TV channel EuroNews and the launch of the video channel EUTube on YouTube should be mentioned as well.

The delegations are the primary point of contact with the EU for the local population in third states, either via their physical presence or the web site of the delegation. They provide information about the EU and explain

---

58) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
59) Michalski (2005) p. 133.
60) Michalski (2005) p. 138.
61) Singled out as target group by DG Development. European Commission, *DG Development Information and Communication Strategy 2005-2009 and Action Plan for 2005*, (Brussels, European Commission, 2004), available at http://www.dgos.be/documents/en/topics/european_conference_public_awareness/DG _Development_Information_Communication_Strategy_2005-2009.doc (March 2009).

policies and political priorities. This is done not only by the press and information staff of the delegations, but also by the diplomats attached to specific policy areas, who have the responsibility to ensure adequate communication in their field. For example, the official responsible for trade will use communication initiatives to explain EU trade policy via press releases or conferences about trade. Part of the work of the RELEX Information Committee is also to ensure that the delegations represent the entire Commission and not only DG RELEX or DG Development.

In order to communicate the core messages of the EU identified above, two different approaches can be identified. The first is providing information, which seems to be based upon a perception that foreign audiences need 'neutral' information about what the EU is and what the EU does. This approach is seen in various publications explaining EU policies, or in the web pages of the delegations and the different EU bodies.[62] This is the much criticised 'facts and figures' approach to public diplomacy, which is in the process of being replaced by a focus on narratives about the core messages and linkages among them. The EU seeks to tell success stories about itself and its external activities by highlighting concrete cases.[63] This second approach is used both in written publications, web pages and speeches. Narratives generally highlight the positive effects of EU activities on an area of central importance, thereby linking the message of the EU as an effective actor with nodal points related to human rights, democracy or multilateralism. Still, there is a limit to how propagandist the communication can be, as noted by a DG Development official.[64] When the Commission communicates, it needs to take into account the interests of other actors in the network doing EU public diplomacy, such as members of the European Parliament and member states' representatives. A concrete example offered was that of communication related to the pursuit of the Millennium Goals, where the majority of awareness-raising content was about the Millennium Goals themselves and development issues, and only a smaller part about EU achievements.

The EU seeks to enhance the effect of its public diplomacy by organising its communication around themes, which is then the focus of

---

62) Out of seven specific objectives identified in the communication strategy of DG Development, the three are about improving knowledge. European Commission (2004).

63) As explicitly stated in the EuropeAid communication strategy. European Commission, *EuropeAid Communication Strategy 2007-2009*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2007c).

64) Interview at DG Development, May 2008.

delegations worldwide, as well as Brussels-initiated communication. In 2008 the theme was climate change, and three messages about the topic can be identified. First, climate change is a real problem that needs to be dealt with. Second, the EU is leading in the field of fighting climate change, and third, cooperation on a global level is necessary to solve the problem. The theme of climate change is thus a good example of how the EU seeks to influence foreign political discourses. It seeks to put a foreign policy issue of central concern to the EU on the political agenda in third states, while simultaneously communicating its identity as an efficient actor capable of producing real results. At the same time, the message of multilateralism is also communicated.

In this way, the public diplomacy activities of the delegations are not restricted to issues regarding the bilateral relations between the EU and the receiving state, although this remains important. Also, current political topics of global interests are dealt with, since the EU needs to be able to communicate about topics that the local population finds important in order to influence local discourses, rather than only topics deemed important by the EU. These include political issues such as the peace process in the Middle East, the Iranian nuclear programme, food security, etc.

To coordinate the public diplomacy efforts of the delegations, the press and information officials of the delegations are brought together on a regular basis from similar third states in order to agree on main issues and communication priorities, as well as to exchange best practices. For instance, all the relevant officials from Latin America met in Brussels in the run-up to the May 2008 EU-Latin America summit, to coordinate the communication surrounding the event and to exchange views with staff from different branches of the Commission.[65]

EU public diplomacy and the member states

The EU member states have their own public diplomacy programmes through which they seek to project their national identities and messages according to domestic political priorities. There is not necessarily a conflict between the public diplomacy programmes, although of course it means that the EU can never speak with only one voice. This, however, is not a problem of public diplomacy strategy or organisation, but a political issue related to

---

65)   Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.

the current state of European integration. The Commission accepts this as fact, and accordingly portrays the EU as a diverse actor with room for diverging opinions. This EU identity hardly conflicts with national identities or branding programmes such as 'Cool Britannia'. The cultural diplomacy efforts of member states to promote their cultures and languages resonate particularly well with the EU's message of a functioning diversity. Still, the EU is to some extent disassociated from its member states and portrayed as something qualitatively different. This need not necessarily be a hindrance to EU public diplomacy goals, since it is thereby also disassociated from the unpopular policies of some member states in third countries, such as nuclear testing programmes and invasions of sovereign third states.

The role the Commission tries to play is that of a facilitator and multiplier of efforts, to convince member states of the added value of a coordinated approach. The Commission sees this as a way to communicate more and better, since it does not have to rely exclusively on its own human and financial resources.[66] The theme of climate change is a good example of how internal haggling in the EU over emissions quotas and binding obligations does not necessarily hinder the EU and its member states from together transmitting the core EU messages on the topic: that climate change is a serious problem, that the EU is doing something about it, and that a multilateral approach is the only way forward. On the ground in third states, the lessons drawn from the EU's 50th anniversary celebrations, which involved a major public diplomacy effort, were that the member state embassies are in general keen to cooperate with Commission delegations,[67] and further, that the active involvement of the Presidency is vital and that cooperation is easiest when organised around a concrete theme.[68] It seems to be a general impression in the Commission that the situation between the delegations and the member state embassies is not competitive,[69] and there are regular meetings in third countries between the delegation staff and the information and press officials of the member state embassies. At the level of specific projects, there is coordination on an ad-hoc basis, and before the beginning of each presidency there is a meeting between this and the Commission to talk about communicative priorities and strategies.

---

66) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
67) European Commission (2007a) p. 9.
68) Interview at DG RELEX, May 2008.
69) An impression shared by interviewees from DG RELEX, DG Development and EuropeAid. However, this impression also reflects the Commission objective of creating a non-competitive environment, and does not necessarily mean that there is not competition among member states on the ground in third states in some instances.

Public diplomacy directed at specific discursive elements

Part of EU public diplomacy is concerned with affecting very specific discursive elements, for instance by trying to affect the news stream related to particular events in the world. In this way, the EU tries to frame specific events in a certain way, thereby affecting how it is perceived in other countries. This is done through different channels, including press releases, speeches and web sites. The idea is that these should function as multipliers, so that the stories are brought also in the national and local press of third countries.

That the events are specific, however, does not mean that the intention behind the activities is not strategic. In the press releases of the EU, whether by the Presidency, the Commission or the High Representative for the CFSP, specific events are generally interpreted to fit with general EU messages, and events are often used to generalize about a certain topic and to connect different discursive elements. An example of this is the execution of prisoners in states with the death penalty, be it Iran, China or the United States. In commenting on the case of a specific prisoner, pleading that the convict be imprisoned instead of executed, the EU follows up on the case by including in the statement a general argument against the death penalty, and reiterating EU policy stances on the topic. Another case is where the EU tries to tie different discursive elements together. A case in point is the declaration on the occasion of the International Day in Support of Victims of Torture, on the 26th of June 2008.[70] In the press release, the EU not only expressed its opposition to torture, but also used the declaration to argue the virtues of multilateralism and a rule-based international order by urging states to sign up to various international agreements against torture, and by highlighting the value of UN activities in the field. Also, the EU informed audiences about its own activities to prevent torture. Thus in one press release, the EU not only affects the perception of an event, but sends messages related to the nodal points of human rights and multilateralism as well as expressing its identity as an effective international actor.

In addition to affecting the news stream, an effort is made to transmit information about specific EU programmes and activities. A lot of work of

---

70) Council of the European Union, *Declaration by the Presidency on Behalf of the European Union on the International Day in Support of the Victims of Torture*, (Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2008), available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/101501.pdf (March 2009).

this kind is done by the delegations of the Commission, particularly in developing countries, where information is used to get credit for money spent on development programmes, i.e. by informing audiences about the specific ways in which the EU contributes to the development of a specific country.[71] Apart from this, the delegations also comment on news and events in the local news stream within their general mandate, using 'how to' guidelines updated annually that include information about which topics are most appropriate for a press note, a newsletter, a video, etc.[72]

Raising awareness and building relationships

The final aspect of EU direct efforts to influence foreign discourses is diffuse in nature and therefore more difficult to pin down. The effect of these activities is to raise awareness in the world of what the EU is and does, thereby changing general perceptions of the EU without directing efforts at any discursive element in particular. The goal is also to facilitate relationships between individuals and institutions from the EU with partners from outside the EU in order to set up structures for further interaction among them. These efforts are in many ways a complementary set of practices to those directed towards specific discursive elements or nodal points. By establishing contacts between individuals and institutions, the EU hopes that the resulting interchange will improve knowledge of the EU and sympathy for its values through foreigners' direct contact with individuals and institutions, rather than talking about the values to the foreign audience. There is a certain parallel in the Commission's co-funding of the EuroNews TV channel, although the primary audience of this may be domestic. It seeks to give a European perspective on the news in general without the EU interfering directly in the specific content broadcast. More broadly, two specific initiatives aimed at general and diffuse discursive influence can be identified: student exchange programmes and the EU Visitors Programme.

The European Union Visitors Programme is a joint initiative by the Commission and the European Parliament that every year invites approximately 160 government officials, journalists and leaders from NGOs and trade unions on a 5-8 day visit to the EU involving meetings with EU officials. Although the programmes also include talks on specific topics - thus

---

71) These public diplomacy activities are treated in more detailed in section 5.
72) Interview at DG Development, May 2008.

of a more specific discursive influence - the principal aim is to increase general knowledge and understanding of the EU and its values, and not least to create 'informal networks of officials',[73] which the EU can use later when seeking a specific influence.[74]

Another activity with similar aims is the Erasmus Mundus programme, which is a public diplomacy effort aimed at improving the understanding of the EU's values. With a 950 million budget, it involves the creation of joint Master's and Doctoral programmes, awarding student scholarships to non-EU citizens, supporting interchange of researchers between EU and foreign academic institutions as well as the establishment of partnerships between these institutions.[75] Student exchange is an obvious example of where EU and member state initiatives overlap, since the goals of promoting academic interchange between EU member states and non-member states are identical. The work of the delegation in Moscow is an interesting example of the role of the EU in this type of public diplomacy activities. Even though the member states supposedly compete for the best students to come to their country, the delegation has published a guide to EU scholarships, which include not only EU programmes, but those of all of the member states as well.[76] The example shows how delegations can coordinate the communicative effort of the member states and that when there is an initiative for coordination, the individual member state cannot afford to be left out.

Public diplomacy by proxy: supporting civil society activities

Apart from official EU communication directed at foreign audiences, whether aimed at specific events, discursive nodal points or more broadly, a complementary form of EU public diplomacy is found in the funding of projects undertaken by foreign civil society actors. This modality is important

---

73) Giles Scott-Smith, 'Mending the 'Unhinged Alliance' in the 1970s: Transatlantic Relations, Public Diplomacy, and the Origins of the European Union Visitors Program', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 16 (2005) pp. 749-778, p. 769.
74) Scott-Smith (2005) p. 771.
75) European Commission, *Erasmus Mundus*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2008a), available at http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/doc/presentation2_en.pdf (March 2009).
76) Delegation of the European Commission to Russia, *Your Scholarship in Europe*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2007), available at http://www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/en/images/pText_pict/220/Guide%20eng%2007.pdf (March 2009).

for affecting the nodal points of democracy and human rights in foreign political discourses, and relates to the third states that the EU supports financially through its many programmes for promoting development and human rights. Three types of EU activities can be discerned. First, the EU supports projects that aim directly at nodal points which are a priority to EU public diplomacy, i.e. those relating to human rights and democracy.[77] The second type is projects destined to strengthen civil society organisations in third countries[78] so that these will have greater discursive influence. Since the organisations supported will be working to promote the same values as the EU, the projects seek a structural change that will indirectly further the aims of EU public diplomacy. There is also a direct influence on a discursive nodal point central to EU public diplomacy, since an active and organised civil society is part of the EU's discursive construction of democracy. The third type is related to the communication efforts of 'pure' development projects aimed at changing material reality rather than discourses. These projects are not only implemented by civil society organisations, but also through cooperation with foreign governments. The public diplomacy effect achieved by the visibility and communication requirements of such projects relates primarily to the promotion of an EU identity as an efficient actor capable of making a difference with its development cooperation.

The Commission has created many policy networks involving civil society actors and stakeholders, from technical expert committees overseeing NGOs to socio-economic interest groups and diplomatic networks.[79] The aim of interaction with civil society actors is both to gain expert insights and value-driven input as well as to diffuse ideas and values to the relevant epistemic community in order to use it as a multiplier for EU public diplomacy.

The basic modus operandi of EU-related public diplomacy is to let civil society actors apply for funding from the EU. The project proposals must include communication provisions, which specify target audiences, ways of communicating and specific messages.[80] When choosing which projects to fund, these are evaluated in part on the communicative aspect and on how the topic fits in with general EU messages and communicative priorities, as

---

77) European Com mission (2007b).
78) European Com mission (2007b).
79) Michalski (2005) pp. 130-131.
80) European Commission, *Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Action*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2008b), available at http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf (March 2009).

identified in the 'EU in the World' strategy.[81] The aim is not to control the specific messages as such, but to ensure a link between projects and the overall strategic messages.[82]

The Commission delegations are also a hub for communication when it comes to projects. Their interaction with civil society actors is in a large part determined by their role as a provider of funding, where the civil society actors must adapt to EU requirements to accede to EU funding. This setup brings flexibility to EU public diplomacy, and should improve the possibilities for adapting the messages specifically to the audience, since the implementers are civil society actors. When projects are underway, delegation staff continue to interact with the civil society implementers to improve communication and seek synergies with other EU public diplomacy initiatives, as well as to make sure that the communicative elements of projects are being implemented satisfactorily. To this end, another recent initiative of EuropeAid is to develop communications packages that allow the press and information staff of delegations to train the project staff in communication.[83] Also, a distance learning programme is envisaged for project officials of the delegations to make them take more into account the communicative aspects of the projects.[84]

The projects funded by the EU include support for advocacy related to the discursive nodal points of human rights and democracy. Usually, the projects are aimed at specific discursive elements related to these nodal points, such as for instance torture, racism, gender equality, freedom of speech or corruption.[85] Such advocacy projects normally involve public debates and seminars organised not by the delegations, but by civil society actors. The advantage is that the messages might be seen as more credible by not coming from EU diplomats, but from 'altruistic' NGOs, although this may be undermined by the visibility requirements on EU funded projects obliging partners to clearly state the origins of their funds on all material published by acknowledging the financial support in text and by displaying EU symbols.[86] On the one hand, visibility requirements are placed upon

---

81) Interview at EuropeAid, May 2008.
82) Interview at EuropeAid, May 2008.
83) European Commission (2007c).
84) Interview at EuropeAid, May 2008.
85) For a complete list of projects funded by the EIDHR in the recent past, see European Commission, *Compendium of Activities Funded Under the EIDHR 2000-2006*, (Brussels: European Commission, 2008c), available at http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/eidhr/documents/updated_report_by_location_en.pdf (March 2009).
86) European Commission (2008b).

projects to better project the EU identity as an actor that works for universal values, but on the other hand, the diffusion of values is potentially undermined by these same requirements. The EU risks being perceived not as a benign power with universal values, as it would like, but as a foreign power wanting to change local customs and impose new values to further its own geostrategic interests.[87] It should be noted that the visibility requirements not only apply to projects by civil society actors, but to all development projects funded by the EU, and thus to the bulk of development work that is done by the EU together with third state governments.

Whereas both EU-based and local NGOs implement EU-funded projects, there is no pattern with respect to who does best the communication related to the projects.[88] Nor is a pattern detectable with regard to efficiency of implementation. Apart from the latent conflict between promoting the identity of the EU and diffusing its values, another trade-off exists here in the work with civil society actors.[89] When choosing projects, the dilemma is that many good projects cannot be funded, since the organisations proposing them are often not able to live up to EU bureaucratic requirements relating to antifraud and control, such as having a legal personality, conducting evaluations and drafting reports according to EU standards. These actors are often unofficially constituted organisations, especially in the case of human rights promotion in countries where such activities are persecuted by the government. There is thus a certain conflict between the need for the domestic legitimacy of the EU (spending money well and being able to account for it) and the ambition to promote EU values externally.

'Traditional' diplomacy, strategic objectives and public diplomacy

Public diplomacy is a modality of diplomacy seeking indirect and structural influence internationally by affecting the political discourses within other states. It is thus a set of practices complementary to the traditional diplomatic practices of official representatives of political entities in the international system. There is a close link between public diplomacy and traditional diplomatic practices, since the latter undoubtedly has a public diplomacy

---

87) A problem also highlighted by Hazel Smith, *European Union Foreign Policy: What It Is and What It Does*, (London: Pluto Press, 2002) p. 95.
88) Interview at EuropeAid, May 2008.
89) Interview at EuropeAid, May 2008.

effect apart from the intended diplomatic effect. Any diplomatic practice has at least a potential public diplomacy effect. Consistency between the discursive impact of traditional diplomacy and that of public diplomacy is thus important so that the two modalities of diplomacy do not cancel out each other's effects. A good example is human rights promotion undertaken by EU public diplomacy activities, which is complemented by human rights initiatives in traditional diplomatic practice, such as the EU taking the form of human rights clauses in the agreements with third states. As noted by Michalski,[90] the fact is that the EU does not always enforce the human rights clauses in the agreements with third states, particularly those with the Maghreb, and this has the effect of undermining EU public diplomacy to promote human rights. On the other hand, the EIDHR contains not only public diplomacy initiatives, but also complementary traditional diplomatic initiatives, such as the support for international institutions devoted to the protection of human rights.[91]

EU diplomacy in general has a clear structural focus[92] and the traditional and public diplomacy modalities complement one another in the pursuit of the transformative strategic objectives of the EU outlined in the 2003 European Security Strategy.[93] EU public diplomacy tries to communicate the virtues of the EU model of international governance and its way of overcoming the diplomatic dilemmas of the Westphalian states system in a bottom-up approach to international change, aiming at the political discourses of third states as structures that influence the nature of these states. The diplomatic practices of the EU that generally seek to institutionalise and legalise relations with third states into written agreements and promote regional integration among third states can be seen as the corresponding top-down approach to change, seeking to install elements of the European model in the foreign policy actions of third state governments.

While there might be contradictions between EU public diplomacy and the traditional diplomatic activities of the EU in specific instances, the two modalities of diplomacy nevertheless work in the same direction to export the EU model, albeit in different ways. The effect of traditional diplomacy in the

---

90) Michalski (2005) p. 132.
91) European Commission (2007b).
92) A conclusion reached also by Stephan Keukeleire, 'The European Union as a Diplomatic Actor: Internal, Structural, and Traditional Diplomacy', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (2003) pp. 31-56.
93) Javier Solana, *A secure Europe in a Better World*, (Brussels: Council of the European Union, 2003), available at http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/reports/76255.pdf (March 2009).

first instance is to merely coerce by means of conditionality or convince foreign governments to change their actions. The intent to lock third states into a network of interdependence and mutually binding commitments brings with it socialisation processes that, to the extent that they are successful, convince foreign elites of the virtues of the EU model and values. In such an instance, the impact of EU public diplomacy is enhanced, since local elites will then already be adhering to a discourse similar to that of EU public diplomacy. The effect is not straightforward though, since the EU's own experience of referenda shows that political elites convinced of the virtues of the European project are not always very successful in persuading the populations. The complement of EU public diplomacy and traditional diplomacy also goes the other way, since public diplomacy will help narrow the gap between the population at large and elites socialised through traditional diplomacy. Alternately, when the discursive influence of EU public diplomacy is more successful in moving foreign discourses along the lines of EU objectives, foreign discourses will pressure the elites and thereby make their socialisation through traditional diplomacy easier.

A general criticism of EU diplomacy, and particularly its public diplomacy, is its lack of consistency due to the multitude of actors involved in it, leading observers to call for better strategic planning of EU public diplomacy and structural changes[94] to allow the EU to speak with one voice.[95] A classic example is the development objectives and trade policy of the EU, in which public diplomacy messages of development are seen by external audiences to be clashing with the free trade stance in diplomatic negotiations and their related public diplomacy. Recent Commission initiatives to improve coordination systems seem to suggest that the EU is aware of the need to enhance coherence. The contradictions, however, are not primarily a result of lack of coordination among EU actors, or of traditional and public diplomacy being contradictory. Rather, the main problem is the doubtful universal applicability of the various elements of the EU model, as promoted by the EU. Whereas free trade in the Common Market may have been a key in the economic development of the EU, the African experience with free trade suggests that it may not be the case for them. The problem is thus that the basic message of the universal validity and applicability of the EU experience contradicts the facts on the ground in other parts of the world. EU identity is therefore incompatible with the reality it encounters abroad. Another interpretation is that the EU does not export its model faithfully, since it

---

94) Fiske de Gouveia (2005); Lynch (2005).
95) To speak with one voice is for Michalski an 'obvious requirement' if the EU is to be able to promote its values. Michalski (2005) p. 141.

includes also a common tariff towards other states and a system of fixed prices for agriculture, which it does not seem too keen to allow African regional groupings of states to implement. Whatever the case, the problem is not so much one of traditional and public diplomacy contradicting one another, or of different actors sending contradictory messages to foreign audiences, but one of the doubtful viability of the EU model in other parts of the world or a general misinterpretation of the model when exported to entail free trade globally and liberal organisation internally. Speaking with one voice abroad would not solve this problem, but rather increase aversion towards what is by foreign audiences at times seen as the imposition of harmful principles by a foreign power for its own self-interest.

With respect to the projection of an EU identity that is more essentialist than the message of an 'effective diversity' identified in the analysis above, the multitude of voices and lack of coordination is not the main problem either. The constraint is the same for traditional diplomacy as for public diplomacy: the fundamental lack of agreement among member states with respect to the EU's nature and purpose in the world. The lack of a central authority in EU public diplomacy and the lack of a unified diplomatic representation both have a basis in the underlying antagonistic discourses on EU external action of the member states. Anholt thus notes that the main task is to generate internal consensus, passion and ambition around an EU identity.[96] If there were an agreement on what is the essence of the EU and on the details of the roles it should play in the world, then having a multitude of actors relaying the message would not be a problem. But the messages identified in the analysis above clearly demonstrate that the discourses of the member states are so different that a social construction of a more essentialist EU identity is not possible. The underlying political disagreement does not allow for common external agency, neither in the traditional diplomatic sphere nor in public diplomacy, except for perhaps in the very long run.[97]

---

96) Simon Anholt, 'Brand Europe – Where Next?', *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 3 (2007) pp. 115-119, p. 119.

97) The Lisbon Treaty contains provisions on a European External Action Service, intended to unify and simplify the representation abroad of policy areas falling under different EU pillars. Although its precise role and functioning remains unclear, article 27 explicitly states that it does not pretend to be a common representation, since the Member States will maintain each their representations alongside the EU representation. Treaty on European Union (consolidated version, as amended by the Lisbon Treaty), (Brussels: European Union, 2008), available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML (March 2009) art. 27.

While speaking with one voice would undoubtedly make it easier to project an essentialist EU identity or brand, and also to influence specific policy related discursive elements, this is probably not the case with respect to the value diffusion ambitions of EU public diplomacy. A good example is the visibility requirements that help establish an EU identity but potentially hinder the transmission of a message related to a discursive nodal point. As such, being a hierarchically organised unitary actor capable of speaking with one voice might hinder the diffusion of EU values through public diplomacy as well as through socialisation of foreign elites in traditional diplomatic interaction. This is because the EU could be perceived as a classic self-interested foreign power rather than a benign *sui generis* organisation based on new and universally applicable ideas. In this case, the EU would only be able to coerce some foreign governments to change their short-term behaviour through diplomacy, but this would not have a socialising effect with a long-term impact. As argued by Manners, the problem is that the EU loses what may be the most important influence that it has - the power of the example by being a new kind of international actor.[98]

Conclusion

This paper set out to examine the public diplomacy activities of the EU in order to analyse the ways in which the EU wields its normative power and to better understand the wider phenomenon of the construction of the EU as a diplomatic actor. It found that the nature of the EU is a determinant of its public diplomacy in two ways. Firstly, EU public diplomacy is done where there is agreement about messages, which tend to be either rather abstract or politically uncontroversial. This is particularly true for the self-image and the values that the EU sought to diffuse. Secondly, EU public diplomacy is characterised by the network of actors involved in its execution, with the delegations of the Commission having the central role. The Commission seeks to ensure coordination among different EU bodies, the different DGs of the Commission, the delegations abroad and member states through regular contacts among these actors and through the elaboration of strategy documents that define the EU public diplomacy messages in abstract terms for each actor to then adapt to its particular target audience and policy area.

The EU messages relate to the self-image of the EU as an internally diverse but effective international actor, whose founding values and model of

---

98) Manners (2002) p. 252.

governance is of universal applicability. This leads the EU to seek influence on elements of foreign discourses related not only to how the EU is perceived, but also to the key elements of the EU model: democracy, human rights and multilateralism. Apart from these identity-driven public diplomacy messages, the EU also develops messages related to specific policy objectives, with a good example being climate change. A latent conflict was identified between the identity projection of the EU as an efficient actor, necessary for reasons of domestic legitimacy, and the value diffusion objectives of EU public diplomacy. The identity projection, by presenting the EU as a strong and effective actor, has a potential negative impact on value diffusion because the EU may no longer be considered a benign and altruistic actor by foreign audiences.

The public diplomacy activities of the EU involve different forms of communication and events organised by the Commission and its delegations in third countries to inform foreign publics about the EU and to influence the political discourses related to democracy, human rights and multilateralism. These activities generally seek to combine messages, for instance by combining human rights activities with messages relating to EU action in that sphere. Of perhaps greater significance is the effect of EU support to NGOs in third states. The EU seeks to empower civil society in third states by funding organisations and projects relevant to its public diplomacy messages, so that these civil society actors can increasingly affect political discourses in the direction desired by the EU.

EU public diplomacy is complementary to the traditional diplomacy between official representatives in the pursuit of EU strategic objectives of establishing an international value-based society based on the EU experience. The socialisation of foreign elites, which is a result of traditional diplomatic interaction, is helped by public diplomacy initiatives directed at discourses in general, whereas socialised foreign elites function as message multipliers in a public diplomacy context. Just as the projection of the EU as a strong cohesive actor potentially conflicts with the objectives of normative diffusion through public diplomacy, so it conflicts with the socialisation processes of traditional diplomacy. The EU, to the extent it is perceived as a self-interested and power-seeking actor, may see its ability to socialise foreign elites reduced and be capable only of provoking changes in behaviour using conditionality and other hard power tools.

When outlining the discursive concept of public diplomacy based on existing literature, four aspects of effective public diplomacy were identified: letting experts in local conditions handle communication, targeting discourse shapers, involving civil society actors in the conduct of public diplomacy and

not sending antagonistic messages. With respect to the latter point, the EU continues to have difficulties, partially because of its network organisation and partially because of the tension between identity projection and the diffusion of norms. However, with respect to the three former points, the EU can be said to adapt well to the environment within which it conducts its public diplomacy. Although it is debatable how well the EU does public diplomacy, the analysis has shown that the EU is in the process of trying to optimise the functioning of its network, by focusing on getting as many actors as possible to cooperate where they have interests in common, and to make the different actors of the network learn from the experiences of the others through a range of mechanisms for coordination of efforts and exchange of best practices.

Given that one of the EU's strategic objectives is the transformation of international politics into a rule-based international society modelled on the EU itself, behaving and promoting oneself as a self-interested state-like actor with military capability and a willingness to use it, although logical from a short-term security necessity of countering urgent threats,[99] would at the very least require a total rethink of the EU self-image and public diplomacy messages. Further, it would be strategically counterproductive, since the contemporary transformation of the diplomatic landscape is eroding the power and control of central governments and increases the effectiveness of networked forms of influence, a fact that the EU is aware of.[100] This is not only the case for the EU, but also for states in general and EU member states in particular, where foreign ministries are shifting from being gate-keepers to being boundary spanners[101] in a network of actors amongst whom no hierarchical relations exist. Since the international environment will increasingly require networked forms of influence where central control is an illusion, it seems to make more sense for the EU to continue developing its network model of doing both traditional and public diplomacy, rather than replace it with the hierarchical solution that the 'speaking with one voice' argument implies. Still, it remains to be seen whether the EU will be able to develop its network approach to diplomacy, since it is based on causal ideas and an identity that are at best partially antagonistic to the ideal established in academic and political discourses of a unitary actor capable of decisive action producing concrete results in the short term.

---

99) As argued by van Ham (2008).
100) See the statement of Commissioner Wallström quoted above.
101) In the words of Brian Hocking, 'Introduction: Gatekeepers and Boundary-spanners – Thinking About Foreign Ministries in the European Union', in B. Hocking and D. Spence, *Foreign Ministries in the European Union: Integrating Diplomats*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2002).

Bibliography

Anholt, Simon (2007). 'Brand Europe – Where Next?', *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, Vol. 3, 115-119.

Basker, Emma (2006). 'EU Public Diplomacy', in Javier Noya (ed.), *The Present and Future of Public Diplomacy: A European Perspective. The 2006 Madrid Conference on Public Diplomacy,* (Madrid: Elcano).

Bátora, Jozef (2005). 'Public Diplomacy in Small and Medium-sized States: Norway and Canada', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 97 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael').

Carta, Caterina (2007). 'The Commission's Diplomats and the EU International Image', in Sonia Lucarelli, *The External Image of the European Union*, Garnet Working Paper No. 17.

Council of the European Union (2008). *Declaration by the Presidency on Behalf of the European Union on the International Day in Support of the Victims of Torture*, (Brussels: Council of the European Union), available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/cfsp/101501.pdf (March 2009).

Delegation of the European Commission to Russia (2007). *Your Scholarship in Europe,* (Brussels: European Commission), available at http://www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/en/images/pText_pict/220/Guide%20eng%2007.pdf (March 2009).

European Commission (2004). *DG Development Information and Communication Strategy 2005-2009 and Action Plan for 2005*, (Brussels, European Commission), available at http://www.dgos.be/documents/en/topics/european_conference_public_awareness/DG_Development_Information_Communication_Strategy_2005-2009.doc (March 2009).

———(2006). *The EU in the World: Towards a Communication Policy for the European Union's External Policy 2006-2009*, (Brussels: European Commission).

——— (2007a). *The EU's 50th Anniversary Celebrations Around the World. A Glance at EU Public Diplomacy at Work*, (Brussels: European Commission).

——— (2007b). *European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) – Strategy Paper 2007-2010*, (Brussels: European Commission), available at

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/eidhr/documents/eidhr-strategy-paper-2007_en.pdf (March 2009).

——— (2007c). *EuropeAid Communication Strategy 2007-2009*, (Brussels: European Commission).

——— (2008a). *Erasmus Mundus*, (Brussels: European Commission), available at
http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/mundus/doc/presentation2_en.pdf (March 2009).

——— (2008b). *Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Action*, (Brussels: European Commission), available at
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/documents/communication_and_visibility_manual_en.pdf (March 2009).

——— (2008c). *Compendium of Activities Funded Under the EIDHR 2000-2006*, (Brussels: European Commission), available at
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/eidhr/documents/updated_report_by_location_en.pdf (March 2009).

Fiske de Gouveia, Philip (2005). *European Infopolitik: Developing EU Public Diplomacy Strategy* (London: Foreign Policy Centre).

——— (2006). 'The Future of Public Diplomacy' in Javier Noya (ed.), *The Present and Future of Public Diplomacy: A European Perspective. The 2006 Madrid Conference on Public Diplomacy,* (Madrid: Elcano).

Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. (2007). 'Advancing the New Public Diplomacy: A Public Relations Perspective', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 187-211.

Hocking, Brian (2005). 'Rethinking the 'New' Public Diplomacy', in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 28-43.

Keukeleire, Stephan (2003). 'The European Union as a Diplomatic Actor: Internal, Structural, and Traditional Diplomacy', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 31-56.

Laclau Ernesto and Mouffe, Chantal (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, (London: Verso).

Leonard, Mark et al. (2002). *Public Diplomacy*, (London: Foreign Policy Centre).

Lukes, Steven (2006). 'Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds', *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 3, 477-494.

Lynch, Dov (2005). 'Communicating Europe to the World: What Public Diplomacy for the EU?', *EPC Working Paper*, No. 21 (Brussels: European Policy Centre).

Manners, Ian (2002) 'Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, 235-258.

McClellan, Michael (2004). 'Public Diplomacy in the Context of Traditional Diplomacy', *Favorita Papers*, Vol. 2004, No. 1, 23-32.

Melissen, Jan (2005). 'The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice', in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 3-27.

———(2006). 'Public Diplomacy between Theory and Practice', in Javier Noya (ed.), *The Present and Future of Public Diplomacy: A European Perspective. The 2006 Madrid Conference on Public Diplomacy,* (Madrid: Elcano).

Metzl, Jamie (2001). 'Network Diplomacy', *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.3, No. 1.

Michalski, Anna (2005). 'The EU as a Soft Power: The Force of Persuasion', in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 124-144.

Neumann, Ivar B. (2002). 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 627-651.

Noya, Javier (2007). *Diplomacia Pública para el Siglo XXI* (Barcelona: Ariel).

Nye, Joseph S. (2004). *Soft power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, (New York: Public Affairs).

Potter, Evan H. (2002). 'Canada and the New Public Diplomacy', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 81 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael').

Riordan, Shaun (2005). 'Dialogue-based Public Diplomacy: A new Foreign Policy Paradigm?' in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 180-195.

Scott-Smith, Giles (2005). 'Mending the 'Unhinged Alliance' in the 1970s: Transatlantic Relations, Public Diplomacy, and the Origins of the European Union Visitors Program', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 16, 749-778.

Sharp, Paul (2005). 'Revolutionary States, Outlaw Regimes and the Techniques of Public Diplomacy', in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 106-123.

Smith, Hazel (2002). *European Union Foreign Policy: What It Is and What It Does*, (London: Pluto Press).

Solana, Javier (2003), *A secure Europe in a Better World*, (Brussels: Council of the European Union), available at http://ue.eu.int/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/reports/76255.pdf (March 2009).

Szondi, Gyorgy (2008). 'Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences', *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 112 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael').

Treaty on European Union (2008) (Consolidated version, as amended by the Lisbon Treaty), (Brussels: European Union), available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:115:SOM:EN:HTML (March 2009).

Van Ham, Peter (2005a). 'Branding European Power', *Place Branding*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 122-126.

——— (2005b). 'Power, Public Diplomacy and the *Pax Americana*' in Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan), 47-66.

———(2008). 'The power of war: Why Europe needs it', *Clingendael Diplomacy Papers*, No. 19 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael').

Wallström, Margot (2008). Public Diplomacy and its Role in the EU's External Relations, Speech given on 2 October 2008, available at http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/494&guiLanguage=en (March 2009).

Wang, Jian (2006). 'Localizing Public Diplomacy: The Role of Sub-national Actors in Nation-branding', *Place Branding*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 33-42.

Wendt, Alexander (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wæver, Ole (1998). 'Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses', in Anders Wivel, *Explaining European Integration*, (Copenhagen: Copenhagen Political Studies Press).

———(2002). 'Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy', in Lene Hansen and Ole

Wæver (eds.), *European Integration and National Identity. The Challenge of the Nordic States*, (London: Routledge).

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Discussion Papers in Diplomacy are a vehicle for the circulation of current research in the field of diplomacy. Each paper is distributed to universities, foreign ministries, embassies and researchers and teachers on diplomacy. In accordance with the objective to publish the most contemporary work, each discussion paper will normally appear within three months of its acceptance.

The Editors are happy to discuss ideas prior to submission and welcome papers up to approximately 10,000 words. An electronic version of the manuscript should be sent to papersindiplomacy@clingendael.nl and the text presented as follows:

REFERENCES AND NOTES

References and notes should be presented at the bottom of each page rather than at the end of the article. The first mention of a source should include full biographical details, including place of publication and publisher. Thereafter the author's surname and the year of publication should be used.

1   Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2005) pp. 16-25.

2   Melissen (2005), p. 24.

3   Ingrid d'Hooghe, 'Public Diplomacy in the People's Republic of China', in Jan Melissen (ed), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2005) pp. 88-103.

4   D'Hooghe (2005), p. 90.

5   Dominic Kelly, 'Rice, Oil and the Atom: A Study of the Role of Key Material Resources in the Security and Development of Japan', *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (2005), pp. 278-327.

•   Discussion Papers in Diplomacy should be cited as follows: Brian Hocking and David Spence, Towards a European Diplomatic System?, *Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, No. 98 (The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2005).

•   References to web sites are to be bracketed from the main text.

Copyright will remain with the author, who will receive five free copies of the completed work. Additional bulk orders can be purchased at a reduced rate.

THE HAGUE JOURNAL OF DIPLOMACY (HJD)

The Hague Journal of Diplomacy is a refereed journal. It promotes the analysis and understanding of diplomacy by acquainting a broad audience of readers with the best works being undertaken in diplomatic studies in a variety of intellectual traditions. To this end, HJD is open to the wide array of methodologies by which diplomacy may be studied. Each issue contains research articles and at least one piece focused on the practical aspects of diplomatic experience. From time-to-time, issues will be focused on a single diplomatic theme or debate about diplomacy.

The Hague Journal of Diplomacy is published by Brill Academic Publishers (http://www.brill.nl).

Manuscripts or proposals may be submitted online at www.editorialmanager.com/hjd.

NEW BOOK SERIES BY

BRILL ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS

DIPLOMATIC STUDIES

General Editor:
Jan Melissen (jmelissen@clingendael.nl)

Diplomatic Studies is a peer reviewed book series that encourages original work on diplomacy and its role in international relations. The broad scope of the series reflects the inter-disciplinary and inclusive nature of diplomatic studies, and it is therefore open to contributors from a variety of academic disciplines and backgrounds. Authors will include academics, researchers from think tanks, and people with professional experience in diplomacy.

The series' focus is wide-ranging and it publishes high-quality research on the theory, practice, and techniques of diplomacy. It aims to advance the understanding of the importance of diplomacy to international relations, and engage in debates on diplomatic innovation. The series will deal with bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, but also with a variety of other forms of diplomatic practice, such as public diplomacy, track-two diplomacy, and sub-state diplomacy. It also welcomes studies on age-old functions of the institution of diplomacy, including international negotiation and mediation, as well as less traditional ones that are emerging in the current international environment.

More information on the book series is to be found on http://www.brill.nl/dist.
Jozef Bátora, *Foreign Ministries and the Information Revolution: Going Virtual?* (2008)
Lorna Lloyd, *Diplomacy with a Difference: the Commonwealth Office of High Commissioner, 1880-2006*
G.R. Berrige, *British Diplomacy in Turkey, 1583 to the present* (2009)

Forthcoming:
Kathy R. Fitzpatrick, The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy: An Uncertain Fate
Kenneth Osgood and Brian C. Etheridge, The United States and Public Diplomacy:
New Directions in Cultural and International History

PALGRAVE

DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Series Editors:
Donna Lee (dlee@ssc1.bham.ac.uk)
and
Paul Sharp (psharp@d.umn.edu)

This re-launched Palgrave series aims to encourage scholarship which emphasizes the importance of diplomacy to what happens and ought to happen in international relations, and the importance of diplomatic studies to understanding what happens and ought to happen in international relations.
Proposals on all aspects of diplomacy are encouraged, but the editors are particularly interested in studies of diplomacy which engage the big practical and theoretical issues of contemporary international relations from historical, philosophical, social scientific, legal and, indeed, diplomatic perspectives.

Formal proposals should be made to Palgrave, but the series editors welcome informal contacts about ideas which they may have in the first instance.

Recently published titles:

Brian Hocking and Andrew Cooper (eds.), *Global Governance and Diplomacy: Worlds Apart*?

Christer Jönsson and Martin Hall, *The Essence of Diplomacy*

Karl Schweizer and Paul Sharp (eds.), *The International Thought of Sir Herbert Butterfield*

Paul Sharp and Geoffrey Wiseman (eds.), *The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society*

Jan Melissen (ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*

Mai'a K. Davis Cross, *The European Diplomatic Corps*