

Chapter 1 : Diplomacy: Wallet Warriors and Winning Wars

*Men, Money and Diplomacy: The Evolution of British Strategic Foreign Policy, (Cornell Studies in Security Affairs) [John Robert Ferris] on theinnatdunvilla.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

Byzantine diplomacy The key challenge to the Byzantine Empire was to maintain a set of relations between itself and its sundry neighbors, including the Georgians , Iberians , the Germanic peoples , the Bulgars , the Slavs , the Armenians , the Huns , the Avars , the Franks , the Lombards , and the Arabs , that embodied and so maintained its imperial status. All these neighbors lacked a key resource that Byzantium had taken over from Rome, namely a formalized legal structure. When they set about forging formal political institutions, they were dependent on the empire. Whereas classical writers are fond of making a sharp distinction between peace and war, for the Byzantines diplomacy was a form of war by other means. On Strategy, from the 6th century, offers advice about foreign embassies: Their attendants, however, should be kept under surveillance to keep them from obtaining any information by asking questions of our people. Milan played a leading role, especially under Francesco Sforza who established permanent embassies to the other city states of Northern Italy. Tuscany and Venice were also flourishing centres of diplomacy from the 14th century onwards. From Italy the practice was spread across Europe. Milan was the first to send a representative to the court of France in 1489. However, Milan refused to host French representatives fearing espionage and that the French representatives would intervene in its internal affairs. As foreign powers such as France and Spain became increasingly involved in Italian politics the need to accept emissaries was recognized. Soon the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Spain was the first to send a permanent representative; it appointed an ambassador to the Court of St. James. By the late 16th century, permanent missions became customary. The Holy Roman Emperor , however, did not regularly send permanent legates, as they could not represent the interests of all the German princes who were in theory all subordinate to the Emperor, but in practice each independent. In rules of modern diplomacy were further developed. The top rank of representatives was an ambassador. At that time an ambassador was a nobleman, the rank of the noble assigned varying with the prestige of the country he was delegated to. Strict standards developed for ambassadors, requiring they have large residences, host lavish parties, and play an important role in the court life of their host nation. In Rome, the most prized posting for a Catholic ambassador, the French and Spanish representatives would have a retinue of up to a hundred. Even in smaller posts, ambassadors were very expensive. Smaller states would send and receive envoys , who were a rung below ambassador. Somewhere between the two was the position of minister plenipotentiary. Diplomacy was a complex affair, even more so than now. The ambassadors from each state were ranked by complex levels of precedence that were much disputed. States were normally ranked by the title of the sovereign; for Catholic nations the emissary from the Vatican was paramount, then those from the kingdoms , then those from duchies and principalities. Representatives from republics were ranked the lowest which often angered the leaders of the numerous German, Scandinavian and Italian republics. Determining precedence between two kingdoms depended on a number of factors that often fluctuated, leading to near-constant squabbling. Ambassadors were often nobles with little foreign experience and no expectation of a career in diplomacy. They were supported by their embassy staff. These professionals would be sent on longer assignments and would be far more knowledgeable than the higher-ranking officials about the host country. Embassy staff would include a wide range of employees, including some dedicated to espionage. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the graduates of universities, and this led to a great increase in the study of international law , French, and history at universities throughout Europe. Frontispiece of the Acts of the Congress of Vienna. At the same time, permanent foreign ministries began to be established in almost all European states to coordinate embassies and their staffs. These ministries were still far from their modern form, and many of them had extraneous internal responsibilities. Britain had two departments with frequently overlapping powers until 1702. They were also far smaller than they are currently. France, which boasted the largest foreign affairs department, had only some 70 full-time employees in the 17th century. The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and Russia , arriving by the early 18th

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

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

Chapter 2 : Ronan Farrow explores decline of U.S. diplomacy in "War on Peace" - CBS News

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

Hello, please complete the form below to share with a friend: She went on to say: Today women are engaged in every facet of global affairs, from policymaking to deal-making, from arms control to trade, from the courtroom of the War Crimes Tribunal to the far-flung operations of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Even in the United Nations Security Council, there is, thanks to President Clinton, one skirt to balance the fourteen suits. I like to think that is just about even odds. In record numbers, women in the United States US are entering the rarified field of diplomacy, assuming leadership roles, and breaking with centuries of tradition. However, as recently as the s, women made up only 4. The United States has had women ambassadors since President Harry Truman appointed the first female ambassador in . These numbers are lower than in , when there were . Seen against the background of United Nations member countries, it means a little more than three percent of UN ambassadors are women. Breaking Diplomatic Tradition Historically, diplomacy has been the preserve of men. Women were not admitted to diplomatic and consular services in any appreciable numbers until , when 13 countries, including Nicaragua and Turkey, had women diplomats. Until the mid 20th century, the most extensive contribution made by women to diplomacy was as the wives of diplomatic and consular officers. In this capacity, they supported their husbands by running diplomatic households, presiding as hostesses, making their own range of contacts to complement the official work of the Embassy and in many instances, distinguishing themselves by local, voluntary, and community work. In the US State Department, there have been very few women or minority diplomats. The transition to a merit-based Foreign Service examination in 1946 theoretically opened up the Foreign Service, but many women and minority candidates were weeded out during the oral exams. The US Foreign Service did not gain a critical mass of women officers until the 1960s, when 26 percent in 1960 and 33 percent in 1965. Until the 1960s, women diplomats had to choose between marriage and career. Can you believe that the State Department expected women to give up their jobs if they married and did not remove this unfair requirement until 1972? The American diplomatic service is relatively young—only 80 years old. Nevertheless, it took 25 years to have the first female US ambassador, when Eugenie Anderson went to Denmark in 1917 under the Truman administration. It took 65 years for America to have its first Asian American ambassador. And it took 72 years for women to attain the highest diplomatic position when Madeleine Albright became the first woman Secretary of State. Barriers and Challenges While the numbers of women in diplomacy are growing, significant barriers and challenges remain. There has been very little research on women in diplomacy, but a study by Nancy E. McGlen and Meredith Reid Sarkees found that various factors excluded women and continue to exclude women from the foreign policy arena. Can you guess what the factors are? Traditional gender stereotypes; Cultural norms; Overt discriminatory practices of foreign policy institutions. Women have been marginalized in the arena of foreign policy-making because traditional western and eastern philosophers from Aristotle to Confucius taught that the state, like the household, should be governed by men. Particularly in affairs of the state, the traits most associated with being a man have been those most valued in the conduct of international politics. Toughness, courage, power, strength, and even the use of force are seen as qualities more appropriate and relevant to the successful management of the state. Added to these barriers posed by gender and cultural stereotyping, the study found past and current examples of both direct and indirect discrimination against women by the National Security Council, Congress, the Department of State and the Department of Defense. Baker , found the Department to have violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and to have engaged in gender discrimination in a wide range of activities, including the Foreign Service exam, assignments, evaluations and awards. In a subsequent case, the Voice of America and its parent organization, the United States Information Agency, were likewise found to have been guilty of sex discrimination and ordered also to compensate the victims. Women remain largely under-represented in the top administrative and policy decision-making positions. I participated in the

study and remember being asked five basic questions: What was your career strategy? What were the factors that facilitated or hindered your advancement? Are there lessons that you can offer from your experiences? What do women bring to the field of diplomacy? In its report, *Leading by Example: Job satisfaction outranked job security, material benefits or career status as motivational factors in their careers.* A majority shared similar generational experiences and educational qualifications. Most had early exposure to other cultures, had studied abroad and obtained advanced college degrees. Affirmative action and special training programs did not often figure in their career progression. Most cited mentoring as important for advancement even though they did not have the benefit of mentors. Almost all said that serendipity, in the form of seized opportunities, had been more important to their career advancement than structured planning. Balancing family life with frequent overseas travel, long office hours and the need to attend conferences exacted a toll. To succeed the women had constantly to exceed performance expectations, make their male colleagues feel comfortable, and schedule marriage, family time, and even childbirth around their careers. The study went on to offer more concrete strategies for women achieving leadership positions in diplomacy. Earn an advanced degree, obtain internships and seek out mentors for guidance; Gain international experience and language skills early on; Develop or identify a specialty or expertise that women care about; Work hard, taking on high profile assignments, learning to take risks, developing transferable skills and being flexible; and, Recognize and manage the tensions between private life and professional obligations. I happened to be in the right place at the right time. Although I had spent my entire professional career at that point in government service, I was not a Foreign Service officer. US law required nine years citizenship before anyone could join the Foreign Service at the time when I graduated from college. I did not get my American citizenship until after graduation. When you are 20 years old, you think 30 is very old; so, the Foreign Service seemed impractical and out of reach. And I saw no one who remotely looked like me in the Foreign Service, let alone in positions as ambassadors. The closest I could get to diplomacy was to join the Peace Corps; so, I did. After the Peace Corps, I wanted to pursue an international career. Several of my male volunteer colleagues had gotten good assignments overseas, and I wanted, like them, to return to work in Asia. Peace Corps management told me repeatedly that Asian cultures would not accept a woman, particularly a young woman, in any position of responsibility. After three years with the Peace Corps in Washington, I realized that the only way for me to go overseas was to take a personal sabbatical with my new husband. Therefore, I took a year off to explore the Middle East and Europe. I was lucky enough to get a substantive job; to have escaped the usual positions relegated to females whatever their qualifications—receptionists, secretaries, or legislative correspondents. I still remember how one senator told me that I could not qualify for a committee position because I did not speak Spanish. When I told him that, indeed, I did speak Spanish, he blustered that I was not from his state—end of interview. Like so many of my compatriots studied by McGlen and Sarkees and the WFPG, I realized very quickly that I would have to work harder, smarter and constantly exceed performance expectations to be able to even gain a foothold in diplomacy. And so, I did. Twenty years later, a different problem surfaced. Finally, I was offered an ambassadorship. However, my husband was not enthusiastic. Faced with having to balance marriage with a coveted career move, I opted for marriage. Women in diplomacy are often faced with such dilemmas. But four years later, I got another chance. This time, my husband gave his blessings, as he has been a life-long supporter. *Do Women in Diplomacy Make a Difference?* Becoming ambassador, I felt a double burden. I had to succeed, to break the persistent stereotypes that women and Asians are not equipped to handle foreign affairs. I also did not want to become another excuse for denying women and Asians future ambassadorial appointments. I found that success did not turn on making a difference as a woman ambassador, but on establishing credibility with my Nepali interlocuters, the Embassy staff, my State Department handlers, and the foreign policy community. To be taken seriously, women ambassadors have to establish their credibility. In my case, credibility turned on how well I managed the totality of the bilateral relationship—from revolution to trade to aid—as well as how well I ran the Embassy. I brought my experience in foreign aid and economic development to bear in overseeing US assistance to Nepal, integrating issues of concern to women into our bilateral relations. At the Agency for International Development AID, it was widely known that investments in women yield big development gains. Evidence and Policies from the

Developing World, confirmed that: Educated women are more productive, have fewer children, enjoy lower infant and child mortality rates, and are more likely to send their children and keep them in school; and, Nothing, arguably, is as important today in the political economy of development as adequate recognition of political, economic, and social participation and leadership of women. When I was working for Senator Charles H. I was the first US aid official to meet with the women in the camps because all other visiting officials had been men and were not allowed to see or talk to the women. With me the women poured out their suffering and loss of hope. They told me that they were not allowed to pick up their rations unless accompanied by a male, that their illnesses could not be treated because the doctors were all male, that there were not even sanitary facilities for them and they could not relieve themselves until dark because of propriety. I told the camp commanders "all male" that the girls should be educated like the boys, that the women and girls ought to have clinics and sanitary facilities, and that provisions should be made for women who had no male relatives to be able to pick up their rations. I believe I drove home the point that the treatment of women and girls in the Afghan refugee camps was very important to the US and AID and, thereby, helped somewhat to improve the lives of these Afghan women and girls. These include domestic violence, dowry murders, mutilation, and the forcing of young girls into prostitution. In her biography, Madam Secretary, she questions whether a married woman with full domestic responsibilities could ever be the player she was on the world stage. Unfortunately, we still have a long way to go. Mainstreaming a gender perspective into foreign policy may make a difference on the margin, but masculine policies related to security and national defense, particularly at this time when terrorism is at the heart of US foreign policy, will continue to dominate and be the issues that matter. Women, however, can take heart in the fact that more and more women are becoming involved in international relations and increasingly taking positions that matter. Gender stereotypes and assumptions are increasingly less deeply embedded in international relations and foreign policy theory. And unfailingly, issues that particularly impact women and are of importance to women are also gaining prominence.

Chapter 3 : Public diplomacy | DiploFoundation

John Robert Ferris is the author of Men, Money, And Diplomacy (avg rating, 2 ratings, 0 reviews, published) and The Evolution Of British Strate.

Tweet Michel Aglietta, most famous as the cofounder of the regulation school of economics, has written *Money*: The book demonstrates that money not only shapes economics, but society itself. Aglietta starts off by giving a brief history of money and commerce. The start of the Bronze Age around years ago ushered in both a rapid rise in industrialization and the use of metal coinage as a form of payment for increasingly large and cross-border transactions. Over time however, money became more complex due to war and trade. Indebted men often had to end up selling their wives, children or themselves into slavery to pay off their debt. This was an effort in Athens before the end of the 6th century B. One of the foremost determinants of currency value in the pre-modern era was the availability of gold and silver. If a ruler lost access to mines or the means to buy precious metal, then financial disaster would likely ensue. Conversely, striking gold literally would be the same as striking gold metaphorically. Britain, France and especially Spain became fabulously wealthy in the colonization era by stealing gold and silver from Africa and the Americas. Spain brought back so much silver from the Americas that it massively deflated the value of silver, which ultimately caused lasting economic harm to Spain. Thus, Dutch and British economists started to move the global market towards the scriptural system during the Enlightenment. Increasingly complex financial instruments, such as interest-bearing business loans, were developed by merchants in Amsterdam and London. On the contrary, the creation of scriptural money by issuing debts transferable to third parties is only valid if these debts can ultimately be settled. Money is thus created on the basis of anticipated future wealth. Aglietta expresses some reservations with this status quo. Certain millennial economists might offer up cryptocurrencies as a savior for global commerce. He writes extensively about the limitations of the euro and the European Central Bank. Since the euro is a non-sovereign currency, it has severe limitations in terms of revaluation and addressing financial crises, among other issues. Many of these problems were supposed to be addressed during Bretton Woods negotiations and later by the formation of the IMF; Aglietta writes about why these initiatives failed. He bemoans the impotence of current banking institutions and the competing exchange rates and financial policies of different nations.

Chapter 4 : Men, Money and Diplomacy by Ferris, John Robert

Find Men, Money and Diplomacy by Ferris, John Robert at Biblio. Uncommonly good collectible and rare books from uncommonly good booksellers.

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

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

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

Chapter 5 : Trump Is Making American Diplomacy White Again - POLITICO Magazine

*Men, Money, and Diplomacy: The Evolution of British Strategic Foreign Policy, [John Robert C. Ferris] on theinnatdunvilla.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers.*

LinkedIn What is the role of women in international politics and diplomacy today? In a field commonly dominated by men, women are finding it difficult to carve out a place. With women taking more prominent roles in government, diplomacy and development, claims of a new era are commonly heard. Some trace the increased influence of women to United Nations Security Council Resolution on women, peace and security, adopted on 31 October. This resolution reaffirmed the role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflict and their equal participation in peace and security. Building upon the resolution and earlier efforts, the UN has also sought global improvements in the status and health of women, giving such objectives prominence among the Millennium Development Goals in and in their replacement the Sustainable Development Goals in. What is Australia doing? Australia has also made some progress on this front. The country has had its first female governor-general and its first female prime minister and now has its first female foreign minister, as well as opposition foreign affairs spokeswoman. Australia has appointed a female ambassador for women and girls, and for the first time has a female chief justice. It was well attended, and broke new ground, with men and women participants calling for the demystification of the national security culture, for a gender-based peace dividend and for women to bring a perspective, otherwise absent, to the policy process. Following this, The Global Summit of Women will be held in Sydney in , with participants from the government and business sectors from 80 countries. In addition to supporting these events, DFAT has also sought to change its organisational culture. Even though DFAT had recruited even numbers of men and women since the mids, only 30 women had reached senior positions. Further study found that women were disadvantaged by unconscious assumptions about capacity, suitable roles and by inflexible working arrangements. In order to rectify this situation, DFAT launched a Women in Leadership strategy, aiming for career advancement and a more inclusive workplace. The strategy encompasses four major themes: The strategy commits DFAT to three- and five-year targets, and by women will fill 40 to 43 per cent of senior positions. How Australia compares Internationally, the status of women has been slow to change. Australia has also failed to meet the target of 30 per cent of board seats for women by. In , the rate of such appointments is falling and the boards of 13 of the ASX companies, have no women members. Separately, a selection of banking and broadcasting companies have recently been reported to have misogynistic cultures. Other cultures have had similar problems. Since , the majority of terrorist attackers have been Muslim men. This year, a group of leading Muslim women in the UK blamed toxic masculinity for terrorist acts and called for recognition of the link between violence against women and other forms of hate. Female-led groups, they claimed, work in a less combative way. Professor Valerie Hudson argues that violence is higher where women are disempowered. Of national legislators around the world, one in five are women but East Timor performs exceptionally well. Political leaders can set back efforts to establish women as equal political actors. Although military recruiters actively seek women, in defence establishments women still face barriers to equal participation, as they do in some areas of business. Some women respond by behaving like men, seeing this as the way to get recruited or promoted. Governments say they want more women in their armed forces, but reports of a toxic culture are widespread and deter many women. With the expansion of national security concerns, the power of foreign ministries is in decline and some governments are ignoring treaties and international law, while diplomacy is marginalised as a means of settling disputes. Increasingly, power is migrating to the military-security industry. President Trump has appointed retired generals and top business people to critical diplomatic roles, sidelining those with diplomatic expertise. The number of people in US military marching bands is now 6,, double the number of Department of State Department staff. Would the world be different with women in charge? Looking to the future, many have asked how different the world would be with women playing a greater role. Men kill more people than women. The first job of women in charge is to liberate men. Societies work better with less violence and instability, and more peace. Our current

social system is built on reproductive exploitation. Which women would be in charge? Generalised binaries are uninformative, and polarising people as male and female is counterproductive—equality, not exclusion is the aim. It produces nothing useful, apart from identifying the bad decisions made mainly by men that give rise to the assumption that women would do better. Men migrate to where the power and money are, marginalising the role of diplomacy and international law. This has produced a dangerous world and brought it to the brink of nuclear war and environmental disaster. Bringing more women into the top international positions, the boardrooms and cabinet rooms can do no harm and may do some good. A change of our current direction is imperative. She has written and edited 14 books about Australia and the world. This article is published under a Creative Commons Licence and may be republished with attribution.

Chapter 6 : Diplomacy - Wikipedia

Abstract. During the s Treasury control and the ten-year rule did not always dominate strategic policy. They became decisive only in and then as a convenient means for the government to enforce the policy of its choice.

Conciliatory Resolution Lord North took the uncharacteristic role of conciliator for the drafting of a resolution which was passed on February 20, It was an attempt to reach a peaceful settlement with the Thirteen Colonies immediately prior to the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War ; it declared that any colony that contributed to the common defense and provided support for the civil government, and the administration of justice i. The resolution proved to be "too little, too late", and the American Revolutionary War began at Lexington , on April 19, However, a smaller group of delegates led by John Adams believed that war was inevitable or had already started , but remained quiet. This decision allowed John Dickinson, and his followers to pursue whatever means of reconciliation they wanted: The letter was approved on 5 July, but signed and sent to London, on 8 July Letters to the inhabitants of Canada In , the British Parliament enacted the Quebec Act , along with other legislation that was labeled by American colonists as the Intolerable Acts. This measure guaranteed among other things the rights of French Canadians to practice Roman Catholicism. Their purpose was to draw the large French-speaking population to the American revolutionary cause. This goal ultimately failed, and Quebec, along with the other northern provinces of British America remained in British hands. The only significant assistance that was gained was the recruitment of two regiments totalling less than 1, men. He met with the Committee of Secret Correspondence. On arriving in Paris, Deane at once opened negotiations with Vergennes, and Beaumarchais , securing through Roderigue Hortalez and Company , the shipment of many arms and munitions to America. Arthur Lee , was appointed correspondent of Congress in London in He was dispatched as an envoy to Spain and Prussia to gain their support for the rebel cause. However, British trade was too important to lose, and there was risk of attack from Austria, so he pursued a peace policy and officially maintained strict neutrality. Franklin remained in France until Staten Island Peace Conference[edit] See also: Lord Howe stated he did not have the authority to meet that demand. Although many informal treaties were held with Native Americans during the American Revolution years of "1776-1783", this was the only one that resulted in a formal document. It was signed at Fort Pitt, Pennsylvania, site of present-day downtown Pittsburgh. It was essentially a formal treaty of alliance. It was largely unsuccessful as the majority of Indian tribes sided with the British. Franklin, with his charm offensive , was negotiating with Vergennes, for increasing French support, beyond the covert loans and French volunteers. Signed on February 6, , it was a defensive alliance where the two parties agreed to aid each other in the event of British attack. Further, neither country would make a separate peace with London, until the independence of the Thirteen Colonies was recognized. France believed it could defeat the British within two years. As far as the Americans were concerned, it was far too late. A commission was sent to negotiate a settlement with the Americans, organized by William Eden , with George Johnstone , and headed by Frederick Howard, 5th Earl of Carlisle. Arriving in Philadelphia, the Commission sent a package of proposals to Congress. Among the terms of the Commission, it was proposed that, More effectually to demonstrate our good intentions, we think proper to declare, even in this our first communication, that we are disposed to concur in every satisfactory and just arrangement towards the following among other purposes: To consent to a cessation of hostilities, both by sea and land. To restore free intercourse, to revive mutual affection, and restore the common benefits of naturalisation through the several parts of this empire. To extend every freedom to trade that our respective interests can require. To agree that no military force shall be kept up in the different states of North America, without the consent of the general congress, or particular assemblies. To concur in measures calculated to discharge the debts of America, and raise the value and credit of the paper circulation. To perpetuate our union, by a reciprocal deputation of an agent or agents from the different states, who shall have the privilege of a seat and voice in the parliament of Great Britain; or, if sent from Britain, to have in that case a seat and voice in the assemblies of the different states to which they may be deputed respectively, in order to attend to the several interests of those by whom they are deputed. In short, to establish the power of the respective legislatures in each

particular state, to settle its revenue, its civil and military establishment, and to exercise a perfect freedom of legislation and internal government, so that the British states throughout North America, acting with us in peace and war, under our common sovereign, may have the irrevocable enjoyment of every privilege that is short of a total separation of interest, or consistent with that union of force, on which the safety of our common religion and liberty depends. Relations with Spain[edit] See also: The Treaty of Aranjuez was signed on 12 April ; France agreed to aid in the capture of Gibraltar , Florida , and the island of Menorca. On 21 June , Spain declared war on England. They were the last participant of the American Revolutionary War to acknowledge the independence of the United States, on 3 February Ragusa[edit] Ragusa present-day Dubrovnik , Croatia , a major city with historical and cultural ties to Italy on the Adriatic Sea, was interested in the economic potential of the United States learned by its diplomatic representative in Paris , Francesco Favi. The United States were anxious to conclude trade agreements with foreign powers during this period of the revolution. The American diplomat Arthur Lee learned that Italian merchants wanted to trade with the Americans but worried about the risk of corsairs or privateers. She endorsed the right of neutral countries to trade by sea with nationals of belligerent countries without hindrance, except in weapons and military supplies. The Russian navy dispatched three squadrons to the Mediterranean, Atlantic, and North Sea to enforce this decree. They remained otherwise out of the war, but threatened joint retaliation for every ship of theirs searched by a belligerent. As the British Navy outnumbered all their fleets combined, the alliance as a military measure was what Catherine later called it, an "armed nullity ". Diplomatically, however, it carried greater weight; France and the United States of America were quick to proclaim their adherence to the new principle of free neutral commerce. While both sides of the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War tacitly understood it as an attempt to keep the Netherlands out of the League, Britain did not officially regard the alliance as hostile. In , the United Provinces were the first country to salute the Flag of the United States , leading to growing British suspicions of the Dutch. The Dutch were major suppliers of the Americans: Britain declared war in December , [36] before the Dutch could join the League of Armed Neutrality. This resulted in the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War , which diverted British resources, but ultimately confirmed the decline of the Dutch Republic. On March 28, , after a petition campaign on behalf of the American cause organised by Adams and the Dutch patriot politician Joan van der Capellen , the United Netherlands recognized American independence, and subsequently signed a treaty of commerce and friendship. John Adams traveled to Vienna in to lobby for American independence.

Chapter 7 : John Robert Ferris (Author of Men, Money, and Diplomacy)

Michel Aglietta, most famous as the cofounder of the regulation school of economics, has written Money: Years of Debt and Power.. As the title suggests, it's a bold exploration of the history of money and, by extension, finance in general.

Whiskey Men and International Diplomacy Foreword: With more than individual posts on pre-Prohibition American distillers, liquor dealers and saloonkeepers featured on this blog, it seems appropriate from time to time to describe patterns of behavior that link individuals and enlarging the perspective on what they were contributing to our Nation. I have decided to begin the series by briefly relating the stories of four whiskey men historically involved in international diplomacy. Shown right, Suit also was responsible for the venue of negotiations that settled a major crisis between the United States and England. The dispute concerned warships built in Britain and sold to the Confederacy during the Civil War. Before its end, however, the Alabama had done significant damage to U. The British responded by stalling. When President Ulysses S. Grant sought negotiations to end the prolonged controversy he needed a location. Suit was delighted to oblige and played genial host throughout the deliberations. The ambiance " and perhaps the whiskey " Suit provided seems to have helped break the deadlock and the result became known as the Treaty of Washington. In the end the U. The British quickly paid up. And Suit took his place in the history books. Hayes, was responsible for Guido Marx, a whiskey wholesaler from Toledo, Ohio, playing a role in international diplomacy. Settling in Toledo, Ohio, Marx became, in turn, a grocer, the owner of a German-language newspaper, and finally proprietor of the oldest and largest wholesale liquor business in town. A Republican, along the way he had befriended Rutherford B. Hayes from nearby Fremont, an Ohio governor who became U. Hayes appointed Marx ambassador to Chile. Marx along with his counterparts in the belligerent countries arranged peace talks among delegates from Peru, Bolivia and Chile aboard an American ship, the USS Lackawanna. Peru and Bolivia made extreme demands that Chile rejected and the talks failed. Chile eventually prevailed in the war. By he had accrued sufficient wealth to open a bank. Despite his business success, Bosak never forgot the place of his birth. During World War I he organized collections of money and clothing to help native Slovaks who were suffering from wartime conditions in Europe. With the final break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a movement emerged to create a new country to be called Czechoslovakia. Since his death in , Bosak has continued to be honored in Slovakia, now a country in its own right. In on the th anniversary of his birth, the Michael Bosak Society was formed among Slovaks in Northeast Pennsylvania. Each year the Society presents a monetary prize in the name of Michael Bosak to business and economics students in the secondary schools of Slovakia. Milton Kronheim dropped out of school in the District of Columbia in to open a liquor store on M Street in Georgetown. He was only 14 years old. Already a rich man when D. With Repeal in he jumped back in the liquor trade. A photo here shows them together. Strongly in favor of Israel, Kronheim offered advocates for Israel access into the Oval Office and has been credited with swaying Truman to recognize the State of Israel only minutes after its leaders, as shown below, had declared independence on May 14, In an oral history for the Truman Library, he said: Truman at heart"that he was whole-heartedly in favor of the establishment of a Jewish home. He knew more about Jewish history that a lot of people will ever know. In tribute to his contribution, a town in Israel is named Nachalat Kronheim. Here we have four whiskey men who who played a part in international diplomacy, each with a somewhat different role " host, ambassador, conferee, and political insider. Three were assisted in their efforts by being friends of U. This blog contains fuller biographies of each of these men:

Chapter 8 : Those Pre-Pro Whiskey Men!: Whiskey Men and International Diplomacy

Header art by Mintaki. This is part four of a five-part series on Diplomacy in EVE Online. The previous three articles in this series dealt with the scope and shape of the diplomat in New Eden; from what their place is, to the implications of their presence, and how they can act as agents of change.

Continue to article content When I joined the U. Foreign Service in , I used to joke that all my South Asian-American colleagues and I could fit comfortably at a table for four. While serving at U. As of June , Asian-Americans represented 6. Census, while Hispanic 6. Our progress on diversity was far from adequate, but for most of my career, across both Democratic and Republican administrations, I could say with confidence that my government was striving to build a diplomatic corps that looked more like America as a whole. Story Continued Below That is, until the Trump administration. But it was not just a matter of turnover among a few top officials. President Trump stands out from his six predecessors in his failure so far to nominate a single African-American female ambassador; African-American women made up 6 percent of all ambassadors under President Barack Obama and 5 percent under President George W. Bush, who had two African-American secretaries of state. Meanwhile, from September to June , the share of African-Americans in the Senior Foreign Service—the top ranks from which most career ambassadorial nominees are drawn—dropped from 4. A new glass ceiling is also thinning the ranks of female ambassadors, who represent 26 percent of Trump nominees so far, 2 percentage points above the overall share in the Bush administration but a 7 percentage point drop from the Obama administration. A year upward trend that saw the percentage of female ambassadors increase with every administration since President Bill Clinton has now been reversed. The State Department says it is working to fix all this. In my own case, I hit the buzz saw that Team Trump wielded against career professionals after leading the U. A vast body of research has shown that organizations are more successful and innovative when they employ diverse talent; national security is no exception. At the moment, it is not leveraging its inherent comparative advantage: Diversity is essential for diplomacy because of the human element that the job requires. As a reporting officer in the Middle East, for example, I was able to engage local women who were off-limits to male diplomats. And I have no doubt that my ability to connect with foreign audiences, from India to France, was aided in part by their appreciation of my own immigrant story. A less diverse diplomatic corps, especially at the top level, undercuts American national security by narrowing the scope of engagement at embassies abroad, constricting the flow of new ideas and perspectives, and contradicting the example of America as a champion of equality and opportunity for all. But it is difficult to leverage diversity with a Senior Foreign Service that remains . If the State Department is not going to acknowledge this problem, Congress should insist on a serious commitment to diversity in American diplomacy from Secretary Pompeo—by demanding answers for the slide in minority and female senior representation at State, accountability if any officials have violated equal opportunity laws, prohibitions on political retaliation and protections for employees who report wrongdoing. The most meaningful step toward rebuilding a State Department that looks like America is electing a president who cherishes our legacy as a nation of immigrants and diversity as one of many strengths that make our diplomatic corps—and America as a whole—truly great. This article tagged under:

Chapter 9 : Diplomacy Dress Shirt - Hitman - Brands

Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of theirinnatdunvilla.com usually refers to international diplomacy, the conduct of international relations through the intercession of professional diplomats with regard to a full range of topical issues.

JuriusDoctor Header art by Mintaki. The previous three articles in this series dealt with the scope and shape of the diplomat in New Eden; from what their place is , to the implications of their presence , and how they can act as agents of change. Part four addresses the diplomacy that happens as an economic effort. This is the diplomacy of power, from rental agreements and non-invasion pacts, to the greater strategy of out-maneuvering and out-spending your enemies and allies. The previous three articles are for establishing context and an awareness of the broad strokes of diplomacy. In this article I have to get into greater detail and examples. Please note, I am not a diplomat. That experience is only accurate within its own frame of reference, and the experience changes respective to the alliance and corporation you belong to. The experience of the small corporation with no dedicated diplomat will be vastly different from that of an alliance with a dedicated diplomatic corps, sky team, and spymasters. This article assumes a degree of organisational complexity â€” that you do have a dedicated diplomat s. I also assume that you have some way of intelligently gathering and documenting intelligence, economic efforts, and formal relationships. These are the three great commodities of New Eden. I touched on this in a previous article about planetary interactions changes coming with Into the Abyss, but it bears repeating here. Provide anyone with a gain or surplus of any one of ISK, Morale, or Time and you will make a new best friend. The objective of the diplomat is to win with words. How well you can achieve these ends is determined by what utility you may serve to your friends, your leadership, and your enemies. War in Sov Null is a circular recurrence of the following milestones: Coercion â€” Someone is unhappy, or someone wants something, or both. Pressure is applied, or conflict breaks out. Duration of conflict is decided by the reserves and the economic, logistic, and combat efficiency of both sides. Appeasement â€” Eventually Someone decides the fighting is too costly and sues for peace. Relocation â€” Defensive agreements form, or an offer is made to establish safety elsewhere. Someone comes to town, someone leaves town. Acculturation â€” The culture of the newcomer begins to disseminate; the culture of the incumbent establishes boundaries. Economics â€” Economic warfare germinates in the growth of the newcomer and the neglect of the incumbent Coercion and Appeasement are driven by your ability to cost someone money, time, or morale, and is supported entirely by your excess of the three commodities. Relocation is the inevitable for all organizations in EVE; burnout is real and one of the best strategies to combat burnout is a change of scenery, though diplomacy often seeks to control when it happens, and to whom. Goons have lived in Fountain, now they live in mostly in Delve. For new players it may be difficult to imagine a time when they did not live in Delve. Even the biggest groups move. Part of moving and establishing new space means also establishing NIPs Non-Invasion Pacts , defensive agreements, and diplomatic relationships to foster the development of safe space and mutual content creation. After all, no one wants to necessarily jump out of one war of attrition and directly into another. The shadow wars of acculturation and economic warfare are all about rebuilding that war chest of time, morale, and money. Rebuilding the organisational confidence, enjoyment of the game, and willingness to spend their time and money to get into another war when it will happen â€” because it will â€” is a key part of the development of organizations in Sov and NPC Null. By building and demonstrating a unique culture you also plant a flag in the sand for other, like-minded players to join your cause, thereby recovering any losses or departures which inevitably occur when people chafe at duress or stagnation, when you purge spies and casuals, and when you move too far for their comfort. Some people are like tortoises, reliable but slow-moving and locked to certain climates. One of them is to let someone else work it for you. The United States Land Ordinance of laid the foundations for land policy, public school via funding from taxes , and the rules of ownership in the US. Before these ordinances, defining the size and division of land, the United States offered legal grant of land to settlers in the form of a headright. Put simply, a settler could own as much land as they had men labour to

work it. The more labour you had, the more land you could hold. The headright system laid the grounds for slavery in America because it gave a commodity value to the headright in acres, worth between 1 and 1, acres for a labourer, depending on where the land was. Capsuleer corporations of every size have renters. X], cover entire regions. What separates the renter alliances those renting from larger entities in New Eden from slaves is that renters have rights, and these are codified in the rental agreement. In return, the landlord alliance or coalition typically guarantees some degree of safety and protection for the renters. This arrangement works very well for those industrial corporations which specialize in mining, drug production, or industry. In fact, some alliances would rather pay a premium for protection than have to become competent PVP pilots and defend their own space. Typically renters pay some combination of one of a sliding monthly fee in billions of ISK , a percentage of their production, taxes, or all of the above in order to use space held by a larger organization. Renters increase the number of bodies paying taxes, and that tax income plus any additional rental fees can represent trillions of ISK over time. This pays for a lot of ship replacement policy SRP , sov upgrades, structures, and market capital. For many, having renters at all means the difference between being able to afford to engage in war, or not. Renters, however, often represent a significant logistical burden. So, when you get hit by an outside force you may find yourself having to fight spread-out over a larger area than is ideal, with fewer actual bodies than you have on paper. Some renters are barely better than indentured servants, however, and it may be possible to make diplomatic inroads by offering renters a better, more lucrative arrangement in space you control. To maintain an easing of hostility or strained relations, alliances large enough to operate as self-contained states typically form several types of agreements with respect to the drawing of political and strategic borders and the kinds of activities which will be tolerated; or at the very least not considered a provocation of war. These agreement types often fall into these groups: When people talk about the blue doughnut, many often conflate having a NIP as the being the same thing as being blue friendly or positively-aligned , which is not strictly the case. The boundaries of acceptability should be written into your NIPs in specific detail with actions deemed off-limits clearly defined, with clear escalation, compensation for transgressions, and reasonable response outlined. A plain language example of a basic nip is: Cloaky camping is, for the sake of this agreement, being cloaked in a single system for longer than 15 minutes, or in a constellation for greater than 45 minutes. Contact persons for this NIP are: X and X Discord IDs. This allows everyone to have fun, and everyone to save for the rainy or abysmal day when war breaks out. Mutual-Defense Pacts MDPs are similar to a NIP and often neighboring alliances will have both in place, particularly if their region is disputed or the forces likely to attempt an annex outnumber the defenders. MDPs formalize a contingency plan wherein X, Y, or Z alliance or coalition tries to attack either party, one comes to the defense of the other. You may find yourself the wealthier party, where your neighbor has pilots in plenty and just needs someone to help finance their defense. This can be an extremely beneficial position to find yourself in, because favors are worth as much or more than secrets. Opening the Door to War Diplomacy primarily seeks to avoid war. War is the result of the failure of your diplomatic efforts. When you can no longer win with words, the forces at play will resort to arms. When it comes to winning the wars you wade into, preparation and culture count for more than raw bank. However, everything has a cost and having a large war chest will help to mitigate the effect of long investment in a theatre of conflict. For this reason, unless war is forced upon you, you should always weigh your proverbial silver before you go looking to deprive someone else of theirs. This is why the truly adeptâ€”those leaders who are actually good at this gameâ€”do not seek out war but cultivate a dizzying array of agreements and relationships and situations of mutual benefit; not to avoid war, per se, but to make the cost of war so abhorrent, or their own utility so apparent, that the idea is quickly shut away. Players are people and everyone has family, or friends, or significant others, or pets, or careers, or hobbies that they need to spend time with to get enjoyment out of life. People are willing to alarm clock for strategic operations or structure defences at all hours for a time. Sometimes, the content is its own reward, other times the loss of the thing they are defending is worth the trade of some of their downtime or a little irritation from their loved ones. When war does break out, or the strategies of coercion and conflict do their dire work, and when FCs and members in fleets are exceptionally successful, it is the role of the diplomats on both sides to find the road back to equilibrium. Only a foolhardy leader goes headstrong and

bullish into war without weighing the human costs of waging all-out war in EVE. Preparation to be made before opening the door to war should be, first and foremost: Establish a culture of continuing education and promote risk toleranceâ€”People who view failure as a learning opportunity and a pathway to success, who seek out failure and accept losses as necessary to growth, are infinitely happier and more successful. Teach this to your kids, folks. Build failure tolerance and redundancy into everything you doâ€”Go into every fight expecting to lose everything. As your tolerance to that risk grows and your comfort at losing higher value assets grows with it, make sure you have backups of everything you plan to lose. If the worst happens and you lose all your ships, your space, and your structures, just move somewhere else and drop new ones. Your Skyteam and leadership are less likely to flip on you if you treat them well, and they share your values. Information warfare is about knowing more than your enemy, and being able to apply it shrewdly. Diplomats professionally make friends. Friends tend to tell each other things, if even to gauge a reaction or to use each other as sounding boards. Being able to get that information into the hands of the right parties, or even knowing who to give it to, is bread and butter for diplomatic exchange. Being able to use your knowledge of a situation, who is involved, and where their relationships stand can be critical to bringing conflict to an early close. More important than just having access to that information is being able to filter it. Like project or product managers, a diplomat needs to be able to take what someone is saying and identify the real pain point. People will complain about the damndest things, and if you take it at face value you run the risk of not being able to serve them well. Diplomats need to be able to read between the lines and put the pieces together from multiple conversations. Diplomats should be prepared to vet what they hear, however, as shrewd leaders know when to seed misinformation. Logistical Warfare I feel like I have to start this section with two equally meaningful quotes: Transport is the stem without which it could never have blossomed. This is not simply a matter of being able to make tactical decisions about how to meet that offensive, but also in forming strategies about how to reduce their ability and desire to fight.