

Modern Diplomacy in Practice

Robert Hutchings • Jeremi Suri
Written and Edited by

Modern Diplomacy in Practice

palgrave
macmillan

Written and Edited by

Robert Hutchings
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public
Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, USA

Jeremi Suri
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public
Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-26935-7 ISBN 978-3-030-26933-3 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-26933-3>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: Patra Kongsirimongkolchai / EyeEm / Getty Images

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

PREFACE

This book was several years in the making and has benefited from a number of distinct but related initiatives. In 2011, the two of us launched a project at the University of Texas (UT), immodestly called “reinventing diplomacy,” with the aim of reinvigorating the study, teaching, and practice of diplomacy. Former German foreign minister Joschka Fischer gave the keynote address, and during the same visit helped us inaugurate the new Austin Council on Foreign Affairs. Since that time, we and our colleagues at UT have created several new courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels, provided postdoctoral fellowships to nurture the next generation of scholars, and published numerous articles and several new books, including one that we co-edited, called *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy*.¹ We also created and have led an annual Austin Forum on Diplomacy and Statecraft that for each of the last five years has brought together some two dozen mid-career diplomats from Europe, Latin America, and the United States to engage in an intense set of strategic dialogues here on the UT campus. Each of these activities has enriched all of the others.

One of our most ambitious efforts was a year-long research project undertaken by 15 talented graduate student researchers in the academic year 2016–2017 to survey and compare the diplomatic services of eight key countries around the world. Our partner in the project was the American Foreign Service Association and particularly its president, Ambassador Barbara Stephenson, who saw this multi-country comparative study as useful to the US Foreign Service at a time of great flux and uncertainty. The resulting report, entitled “Developing Diplomats,”² was pub-

lished in May 2017 and profiled in the December 2017 issue of *The Foreign Service Journal*.³ Shortly thereafter, we were approached by Dr. Anca Pusca, a senior editor with Palgrave Macmillan, who invited us to submit a book proposal based on the student-led report but with substantial additional input from us. We are grateful to Ambassador Stephenson for joining with us in this project in its initial stages and to Dr. Pusca, who saw in the original project a potential that we might have missed but for her encouragement. We also thank Katelyn Zingg, editorial assistant at Palgrave Macmillan, for her expert help in turning the manuscript into a completed book.

In our discussions with Palgrave Macmillan, we agreed to commission two new chapters, on Japan and the United States, and to revise, update, and expand the original eight chapters. We are indebted to Ambassador (retired) Ronald McMullen, our former colleague as Diplomat in Residence here at UT, and to Kazushi Minami, a recent PhD from UT's History Department and a newly minted assistant professor, for producing superb chapters on the US Foreign Service and Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The two of us divided the remaining eight chapters between us and added our names as co-authors, but we also have listed as co-authors the original student researchers, all of whom have since graduated. They deserve great credit for doing the original digging into the inner workings of these varied diplomatic services, enabling us to build on their work and add to it our own research and analysis. We are also grateful to Diana Bolsinger, a third-year PhD student at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, for her invaluable assistance in helping us turn this multi-author study into a coherent final product.

The result is this first-ever book that assesses and compares the world's ten largest diplomatic services: those of Brazil, China, France, Germany, India, Japan, Russia, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States. We considered other combinations that would have given greater cross-regional balance or included some smaller but high-performing services, but we ultimately decided that for comparative purposes, focusing on the ten largest made the most sense. In each chapter, we have followed the same structure so as to facilitate cross-country comparisons. Each begins with an Executive Summary and then proceeds through several sections: History and Culture, Profile (size, budget, and organizational structure), Recruitment and Selection, Professional Development, Leadership, Role in Policy-Making, and Preparations for the Future. In addition to updating, and fact-checking the middle sections, the two of us focused most of

our attention on the histories and cultures of the services, their roles in foreign policy decision-making, and how well they are preparing for the future.

This has been a fascinating experience, one of the most interesting either of us has ever undertaken. Plumbing the histories and diplomatic cultures of ten very different services, and their changing roles in the decision-making arenas, has been a challenge and a pleasure. Trying to penetrate the inner workings and procedures of other countries' foreign ministries has been even more daunting. Some, notably the Chinese and Russian, do not publish much on their internal policies on recruitment, training, and promotion. Even the more open diplomatic services often operate according to unspoken rules, procedures, and customs that are known mainly to those on the inside, and even they are often mystified by the goings-on in their own institutions. This is the "inside history" of organizations, as distinct from their "public history," that Richard Neustadt and Ernest May wrote about many years ago.⁴

To meet these challenges, we have read as widely as possible, and we have consulted dozens of diplomats and scholars. Some were kind enough to read and critique earlier drafts of the chapters; others provided important inside information that helped us gain an understanding beyond what is to be found in print or online. We are indebted to these diplomats and scholars, many of whom are acknowledged at the end of each chapter. Of course, they bear no responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation that may remain.

It has been a privilege and pleasure working on this book in consultation with so many practicing diplomats from around the world. We began this project favorably disposed to the work of diplomacy and diplomats, and we conclude it with even more positive feelings. We dedicate this book to those diplomats, and we hope that the book will contribute not only to a better understanding of the practice of modern diplomacy but also to a deeper appreciation of the vital role diplomacy plays in providing for the peaceful resolution of conflict among states and the maintenance of a workable international system.

Austin, TX

Robert Hutchings
Jeremi Suri

INTRODUCTION

On October 26, 1776, four months after signing the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin set sail from Philadelphia to France, where he became the first American diplomat. Franklin was a cosmopolitan inventor, businessman, politician, and writer. He was also a skilled representative of his new nation, negotiating the first American alliance with France. This was the only formal American alliance concluded for the next century-and-a-half—until the Second World War.

Franklin and his contemporaries understood that international diplomacy—the cultivation and management of relations with other states—was crucial for national survival and prosperity. He was part of a broader transatlantic community of learned, wealthy gentlemen who used their personal skills to manage relations between rival governments in an era of aggressive empires. Diplomacy was not an alternative to war or peace, but instead an essential part of eliciting support from potential allies, and, when necessary, balancing against potential foes in a complex international system.

Diplomacy meant delicate negotiations in between the extremes of war and peace, which Franklin and others recognized as the crucial daily maintenance of contacts and communications between states and other international actors. British, French, Prussian, and Russian diplomats had mastered this game in Franklin's day. He followed suit, and brought the wisdom of his experience back to his newly emerging nation.⁵ For Franklin and his many successors, foreign relations meant a mix of cooperation, competition, and negotiations to maximize the emerging power of the United States and minimize its weaknesses. In a complex world with

diverse actors, no country could survive alone. Diplomacy was survival through interdependence, and the pursuit of the national interest through direct communication, intelligence gathering, and manipulation, when necessary. The founders and successive generations concentrated their foreign policy activities on the work of diplomats, not the military, and the most talented American statesmen served their country in this capacity, following Franklin's footsteps. They expected that their successors would do the same.⁶

The twentieth century was, in some ways, the era when this vision came to fruition. The United States and its counterparts on other continents expanded their diplomatic services, placing greater emphasis than ever before on sending some of their most talented and best-trained citizens abroad to negotiate treaties, manage daily relations, and report on potential dangers. Embassies proliferated around the world, diplomatic conferences became more numerous and specialized, and organizations (especially the League of Nations and the United Nations) turned intensive diplomatic deliberations into a form of global governance. On the eve of the Second World War, the United States possessed a small divided military (the Army and Navy were entirely separate), and a growing, highly educated, and increasingly active foreign service. The diplomats largely determined American foreign policy in the mid-twentieth century.⁷

The same was true for counterpart agencies in Great Britain and France, except their foreign ministries were also imperial offices, managing empires. American diplomats, in George Kennan's first-hand account of the period, worked to reform the world through law, negotiation, and cooperation; the diplomats from old and new empires sought to protect their holdings. Washington's diplomats were the front line of American idealism and influence in an increasingly competitive international system that descended into a Second World War, when the work of the diplomats would become married to a larger and, for the first time, permanent American global military presence. Nonetheless, at least through the post-war decade of European and Japanese reconstruction, American diplomats led policy-making as strategists, negotiators, and managers on the ground.⁸

This unprecedented expansion in America's global presence, and its underlying internationalist goals (including democratization and free trade), required a more skilled, highly organized, and professionalized diplomatic corps. Professionalization occurred across all areas of society in the twentieth century (medicine, law, education, etc.), but it was especially pronounced in the field of diplomacy. The technically trained and carefully

vetted representative of the state supplanted the aristocrat-turned-diplomat of old. Governments, including the United States, built large bureaucracies to train and organize the work of men (and eventually women), hired full-time to manage different elements of each nation's foreign activities in trade, travel, military affairs, education, and other matters. The new professional foreign service officers were selected on merit (usually through competitive examinations), they were highly trained (usually with advanced degrees), and they were specialized (by field or region).⁹

The venerable British diplomat, Harold Nicolson, described this as the "new diplomacy." Leisurely confidential aristocratic dialogues in royal courts were the ornaments of the past; highly disciplined negotiations, supported and surveilled by tightly organized government bureaucracies, were the wave of the future. Diplomacy changed from palace intrigue to a game of information gathering and sensitive policy application in changing circumstances.¹⁰

The professionalized diplomacy of the twentieth century dominated the Cold War, and it continues to shape the twenty-first century world. American diplomats (George Kennan, Averell Harriman, Dean Acheson, Henry Kissinger, and many others) were at the center of US policy-making, as were their Western European, Soviet, Chinese, Japanese, and post-colonial counterparts. Since at least 1945, every major country has strived to hire, train, and employ the most skilled foreign service professionals for a variety of tasks, including economic cooperation, counter-terrorism, cultural exchange, and, of course, conflict management. Diplomats work with diverse counterparts from their own governments, foreign governments, the business community, social movements, non-governmental organizations, and the media. And the list of potential partners continues to grow as the range of international actors expands in the early twenty-first century.¹¹ Diplomats often receive less public attention than soldiers, but they are ever-present and essential for the management of complex relationships across widely varying contexts. To travel, trade, and adjudicate unavoidable cross-boundary conflicts requires diplomats more than ever before. As jet travel and social media have transformed the job, diplomacy has grown in importance for translation and coordination in the face of disorienting changes. Diplomats keep the forces of global entropy under control; they help to build order out of chaos. In the terms used by political scientist Hedley Bull, diplomats socialize the relations among international actors, nurturing a system of rules, norms, and common expectations—even between adversaries.¹²

This comparative study is an effort to understand the similarities and differences in how countries recruit, train, and promote their diplomats. Our point of departure is the vital importance of diplomacy in the modern world—especially as violent conflicts spread across and within states during the early decades of the twenty-first century. We emphasize the need for more shared thinking about diplomacy and the potential gains from more common work to coordinate the development of first-class diplomats. The United States is only one of ten countries that we examine in this study. We believe that all nations, including the United States, can improve the preparation and performance of their diplomats by drawing on the best practices of counterparts abroad. National uniqueness is necessary and inevitable; but learning from others is crucial for cooperation and improvement—perhaps more than ever before.

Different nations train their doctors, lawyers, and even professors in similar ways—with shared bodies of knowledge and common standards of performance. Air travel worldwide is made safer by the common core training all commercial pilots receive, regardless of nationality. The same is not true for diplomats whose backgrounds and educational experiences vary as much as ever. Although their work is self-consciously global, diplomats are nationally selected, trained, and evaluated. Diplomatic training remains particularistic and nationalistic; it resists serious and deep efforts to make it more global, despite the global problems all diplomats must confront.

The best evidence for the resistance to globalization in diplomatic training is the paucity of comparative studies. We know of only two detailed studies of foreign service recruitment and training across societies.¹³ Other comparative discussions exist, but they lack detail.¹⁴ Even the best foreign services are remarkably insular in the ways they prepare for their core missions.

This study is a detailed and focused effort to broaden how we understand and conceptualize the recruitment, training, and development of professional diplomats in the twenty-first century. The goal is not to criticize processes in different countries, but to create a common foundation for comparing, learning, and even integrating training and career development models across nations. This is particularly valuable for American readers, who are frequently ill-informed about the workings of other countries.

We have focused on ten major foreign services: Brazil, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Japan, Russia, Turkey, and the United States. We chose these services based on their size, influence, and historical

role in their regions. We also chose them for their geographical and cultural differences, as well as their accessibility for research. (We included Russia as one of our case studies, although it was the least accessible of the group.)

A number of themes emerged from the final case studies, and they run through the chapters that follow. Our analysis of the ten diplomatic services interrogates these themes closely. Although the diversity of practices across services is wide, the challenges are, in fact, quite similar. The future of international diplomacy in the twenty-first century will reflect how large, powerful countries address these common diplomatic themes, with many opportunities for learning and cooperation.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

All diplomatic services strive to recruit, promote, and retain the best talent. As discussed in the chapters of this report, foreign services employ numerous methods to attract the highest qualified individuals, while weeding out less qualified applicants. Almost all of the services rely on an examination system and various other requirements, including foreign language proficiency, specialized education, psychiatric evaluation, and extensive knowledge of economics, law, and related disciplines. France especially focuses on elite education, selecting many of its officers from the *École Nationale d'Administration*, the nation's premier public administration school.

Most of the services continue to recruit top talent, but the competition for that talent is increasing. Other government institutions, non-governmental organizations, and especially private businesses offer ambitious young citizens increasingly lucrative and attractive opportunities for public influence. Concerns about excessive bureaucracy and politicization in government also discourage some top recruits from joining government. This is particularly true in Russia, India, and, in part, the United States. Foreign services in major countries can no longer assume that the best citizens will come to them—they must do more to reach out and offer attractive working environments.

After new recruits are hired, the next challenge becomes retention. How do you engage these top candidates in early work that will encourage them to stay within the organization and maintain high working morale? Some countries, like Russia, have begun to increase salaries in an attempt to stem falling retention rates. Others, like France, continue to rely on the domestic prestige of their diplomatic corps to attract and retain talent.

The nature of promotion through the organization, “up and out” service contracts, and the responsiveness of the bureaucracy to family needs are all key factors affecting long-term development of high-quality personnel. These issues need more attention, especially as the nature of family relationships and the expectations for work–life balance change with a new generation of talented, diverse young diplomats.

TRAINING

Beyond initial training at recruitment, all of the foreign services in this study offer further opportunities for professional development; however, the length and execution of mid-career education varies greatly. Some services mandate periodic moments of intensive study throughout the careers of their foreign service officers, some offer optional coursework and training programs as a prerequisite for promotion, and others utilize training programs only after promotion decisions have already been made.

The training of early employees varies significantly between services from a matter of weeks to a high of three years. Depending on the type of recruitment and education required, the services build their internal training upon that foundation. Services with a high barrier of entry tend to offer less early training; services that have a low barrier of entry, provide considerably more on-the-job training. The distinction blurs somewhat in the case of nations, like France, where the foreign ministry recruits some officers directly from its public administration school. Early training creates norms for a nation’s diplomats, and how they will define the work they do for their country.

Several services mandate professional development and an examination as a part of their promotion process. Countries like Brazil and China have strict promotion processes that incentivize employees to attend training courses if they wish to advance their careers. China, for example, uses a “points” system to promote officers. To gain points or course credits, employees must take and pass a certain number of classes concurrent with their daily work requirements. Once enough points are accrued, officers become eligible for more advanced positions. Other services, especially Turkey, give rigorous meritocratic examinations to officers before they can advance to senior or expert-level positions.

Some services mandate refresher courses or professional development sessions after officers have worked for a certain period of time. In India, for example, foreign service officers are required to complete in-service

training after their first five years of service—the goals of which are to prepare the officers for geographical specializations. France mandates mid-career training after 15 years of service, aiming to strengthen managerial and leadership skills for officers taking on upper management roles. Other services like those of Germany and Russia hold short trainings for officers between assignments, often after a term abroad.

Challenges to professional development in these services include budget limitations and current crises that take priority. These limitations often restrict the ability of services to offer extensive professional development programs.

In all services, on-the-job training and mentoring are crucial, often more important than formal classroom experiences. Nonetheless, there is a direct relationship between the different modes of learning. Services that value on-the-job training and mentoring also build in the necessary time for reflection and analysis that temporary out-of-post activities uniquely afford. Sequencing assignments for maximum learning, nurturing internal relationships that encourage growth, and allowing space for reflection away from daily pressures are interdependent elements of any serious training program.

In a rapidly changing world, with emerging actors in every region and influential new technologies, continuous training is crucial for all diplomats. Most foreign services lack sufficient personnel, resources, and internal incentives for this commitment to education, especially for mid-career diplomats. This is particularly true in the United States and Japan, where diplomats generally receive less continuous training than their military and business counterparts.

DOMESTIC POLITICS

Discussion of budget limitations inevitably raises the issue of domestic politics. Each of the foreign services under examination struggles to maintain domestic support for its work. Diplomats confront perceptions of elitism and growing skepticism toward their cosmopolitanism among nationalist voters. Many foreign services are giving ever-greater attention to direct engagement with their own citizens, but that is a potential diversion for the work of international diplomacy. There is also a deep tension between the natural professionalizing tendency of diplomatic services (emphasizing special knowledge and experience) and populist tendencies that value ordinariness, localism, and authenticity.

In this study of ten leading diplomatic services, domestic tensions ranging from funding debates to diversity challenges play a central role in the effectiveness of each service within the international community. Effective diplomats must operate with the respect and support of their citizens, and this is often lacking. In Great Britain, for example, the impact of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office appears constrained by alternative international departments, a political climate shifting away from previously held globalist attitudes, and a budgetary crisis. The Turkish foreign ministry has extended its global reach in the last decade, but it faces increasing politicization and curtailed autonomy under the current president.

The Indian Foreign Service is an extreme outlier in personnel size—over-stretched in its efforts to connect with over a billion citizens and an expansive diaspora community. In Europe, the French and German foreign ministries face an uncertain domestic landscape that questions consensus assumptions about European integration and free trade. Amidst these disparate and cacophonous national voices, diplomacy faces a growing challenge to affirm its relevance at home and abroad.

Even well-informed citizens in each country lack sufficient understanding about the importance of diplomacy. Foreign ministries must do a better job of explaining the value of their work to citizens. They must communicate better through schools, media, and public associations (including business groups). They must explain why their efforts are essential for peace and prosperity, as well as growth and innovation. In the end, foreign ministries will need more resources, not less, in coming years. They will need to make more effective claims on constrained national budgets.

DIVERSITY

One of the biggest domestic challenges is diversity—making the foreign service of a diverse nation represent that diversity. Every foreign service examined in this report comes up short, but each comes up short in its own unique way.

Most of the diplomatic services value diversity for the additional skills and perspectives it brings to diplomacy, as well as the legitimacy it provides in domestic debates. Most of the services have extensive plans to expand their diversity, defined in different ways, with different tactics.

The Constitution of India, for example, calls for proportional weighting of potential recruits by regional, caste, and tribal background; these

efforts have led to disadvantaged groups comprising 46% of all new recruits in the past five years. Current efforts in India are also focused on religious and linguistic representation.¹⁵

In Brazil, a country of vast racial and cultural diversity, the foreign service has undertaken many efforts to increase diversity, with attention to gender, race, and socioeconomic background. Following widespread criticism of its largely insular, parochial, and European-style diplomats, Brazil has implemented several reforms; chief among these efforts are a restructuring of the recruitment process in order to make the *Itamaraty's* Foreign Service Examination more accessible, the institution of quotas for recruits of Afro-Brazilian ethnicity, and the administration of the entrance exam outside of Brasilia for distant regional applicants.

In Germany, the “Charter of Diversity” seeks to guarantee that German diplomats come from diverse backgrounds. The data on Germany’s diplomatic workforce indicate impressive successes in increasing diversity, especially around gender. The same is true for France, where 53% of the diplomatic workforce is comprised of women. On racial, ethnic, and religious diversity, all of these services still have a long way to go.

TECHNOLOGY

If diversity is a common challenge, the rapid pace of technological change is probably the most serious source of uncertainty for each service. The pace and significance of technological change has undermined traditional assumptions about communication, influence, and power as a whole.

Most foreign services have taken advantage of the increased popularity of social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube to conduct public diplomacy. Today, diplomatic services can sustain an open dialogue with the public—foreign and domestic—through social media posts that answer questions, discuss changes, and address specific issues. For example, the director of the press service for the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs often uses her personal Twitter account to inform the Russian public and release talking points. In this sense, services are using technology to expand their contact with the public.

As social media have extended the reach of public diplomacy efforts, they have the potential to undermine diplomatic professionalism. For instance, several reports claimed that diplomatic officers from Britain’s Foreign and Commonwealth Office may have used a social media messag-

ing application to discuss sensitive and inappropriate topics while posted abroad. This has been a problem for the US Foreign Service as well.

The information technology revolution has opened up the possibility of real-time diplomatic communications that were unthinkable before. While these capabilities enhance the ability of diplomats to provide timely information to their counterparts and report back to their home governments, some diplomats lament how communications allow government figures at home to micromanage relations far away. Modern communication systems have contributed to a sense among many diplomats that their current role is to repeat the talking points emanating from the executive, adding few expert insights.

The information technology revolution also poses a threat to the relevance of diplomatic reporting. Historically, diplomats have contributed critical information to the decision-making bodies within their home governments. In recent years, government decision-makers have marginalized diplomatic reporting because they wish to act fast and they have numerous alternative sources of direct information from abroad. The proliferation of information sources has, in some cases, contributed to the perception that decision-makers are relying on inaccurate, or at least incomplete, information. The challenge for modern diplomatic services is to harness the capabilities of the information technology revolution to reassert the power of on-the-ground reporting.

ROLE IN FOREIGN POLICY-MAKING

Technology and domestic politics have encouraged a complex mix of centralization and fragmentation within governments. Presidents and foreign ministers now possess capabilities to manage distant events from the nation's capital, with little attention to local, on-the-ground expertise. They can find their own experts outside traditional diplomatic institutions, who will affirm their biases and preferences. They can enforce personal loyalty over professionalism.

Similarly, the spread of communications technologies and general knowledge allow diverse groups to claim access and authority over diplomatic issues formerly reserved for professional diplomats. In the United States, for example, military, intelligence, and treasury officials often assert

more influence than diplomats in large US embassies. As political leaders centralize their control over policy, more groups outside the foreign ministry can intervene in national decision-making. This might be the most significant challenge for each major foreign service.

The cultivation of local relationships and the nurturing of mutual interests are still what diplomats are trained to do best. They have the experience and skills to see beyond the latest headline-grabbing information, promoting shared wisdom between long-time friends and allies. Diplomats manage the enduring discussions and negotiations between countries that anticipate crises and carve out common ground, where it would not exist otherwise. They report on deeper cultural dynamics and they create basic norms of engagement to manage competition, even between violent adversaries. Each of the foreign services in this study must reassert its role in its nation's policy-making. Otherwise, foreign policy will become more crisis-driven, and less diplomatic.

The themes running through this study are contemporary, and also historical. They represent age-old challenges and opportunities, redefined by the contours of our current era. Studying these themes in a comparative context provides a foundation for rebuilding our diplomatic institutions, at a time when they are most in need of renewal.

Although diplomacy has evolved considerably from Benjamin Franklin's era, it remains as essential as ever to the security and prosperity of nations, as well as other international actors. Like its peers, the United States has a long and venerable diplomatic tradition that can and will adjust to the new challenges and opportunities of our times. Adjustment, however, will require closer study of other foreign services, and a general commitment to help each nation's diplomats develop the knowledge and resources to serve their country best. Each of the foreign services in this study has the opportunity to improve as it globalizes its vision of educating the next generation of high caliber diplomats. We hope this study helps in that worthy and essential mission.

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, USA

Jeremi Suri

NOTES

1. Robert Hutchings and Jeremi Suri, eds., *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
2. *Developing Diplomats: Comparing Form and Culture Across Diplomatic Services*, Policy Research Project Report on Reinventing Diplomacy, No. 194 (Austin: University of Texas, 2017): <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/62371>.
3. Robert Hutchings and Jeremi Suri, "The Making of an Effective Diplomat: A Global View," *The Foreign Service Journal*, December 2017, 22–29.
4. Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers* (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 212–13.
5. For more on Benjamin Franklin and the origins of American diplomacy, see Jonathan R. Dull, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987). For a fuller discussion of modern diplomacy, its importance, and some of its successes in the twentieth century, see Robert Hutchings and Jeremi Suri, eds., *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).
6. On the American diplomatic tradition, and its early origins, see, among many others, Felix Gilbert, *To the Farewell Address: Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961); Robert Dallek, *The American Style of Foreign Policy: Cultural Politics and Foreign Affairs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); and David Milne, *Worldmaking: The Art and Science of American Diplomacy* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2015).
7. On this point, the literature on American foreign policy during the interwar years is most revealing. Despite public isolationism, diplomats crafted and managed a coherent American internationalist vision that included increased trade, cultural influence, and political cooperation abroad. See, among others, Emily Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890–1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982); and Frank Costigliola, *Awkward Dominion: American Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations with Europe, 1919–1933* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984).
8. See, among many others, George Kennan, *Memoirs, 1925–1950* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967); Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992); William Hitchcock, *France Restored: Cold War Diplomacy and the Quest for Leadership in Europe, 1944–1954* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); and Jeremi Suri, *Liberty's Surest Guardian: American Nation-Building from the Founders to Obama* (New York: Free Press, 2011), chapters 4–5.

9. See Harry W. Kopp and Charles A. Gillespie, *Career Diplomacy: Life and Work in the U.S. Foreign Service* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2011), 63–160.
10. See Harold Nicolson, *Peacemaking, 1919* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1933).
11. See Pauline Kerr and Geoffrey Wiseman, eds., *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World: Theories and Practices* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
12. See Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977).
13. See Henry Kittredge Norton, *Foreign Office Organization: A Comparison of the Organization of the British, French, German and Italian Foreign Offices with that of The Department of State of The United States of America* (The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1929); Gianluigi Benedetti, Daniela Di Prima, Antonietta di Salvatore, Darragh Henegan, and Pietro Prosperi, eds., (comparing the foreign offices of France, Italy, UK, Germany, Spain), Directorate General for Administrative Affairs, Budget and Assets, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (no date). The American Foreign Service Association (AFSA) recently completed its own benchmarking exercise, examining selection and entry level training in eight other foreign services: Brazil, China, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada, Mexico, and India. This AFSA report was based on interviews. We have seen a 12-page summary of this report, and we have incorporated it in our research.
14. See Paul Webster Hare, *Making Diplomacy Work: Intelligent Innovation for the Modern World* (Thousand Oak, CA: CQ Press/Sage, 2016), chapter 9; Lowy Institute (London): <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/global-diplomacy-index/>.
15. See the text of the Constitution of India: <https://india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india/constitution-india-full-text>.

REFERENCES

- Bull, H. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Costigliola, F. 1984. *Awkward Dominion: American Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations with Europe, 1919–1933*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dallek, R. 1990. *The American Style of Foreign Policy: Cultural Politics and Foreign Affairs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dull, J. R. 1987. *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gilbert, F. 1961. *To the Farewell Address: Ideas of Early American Foreign Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Hare, P.W. 2016. *Making Diplomacy Work: Intelligent Innovation for the Modern World*. Thousand Oak, CA: CQ Press/Sage.
- Hitchcock, W. 1998. *France Restored: Cold War Diplomacy and the Quest for Leadership in Europe, 1944–1954*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hutchings, R., & J. Suri, eds. 2015. *Foreign Policy Breakthroughs: Cases in Successful Diplomacy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kennan, G. 1967. *Memoirs, 1925–1950*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kerr P., and G. Wiseman, eds. 2013. *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World: Theories and Practices*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kopp, H.N., and C.A. Gillespie. 2011. *Career Diplomacy: Life and Work in the U.S. Foreign Service*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Leffler, M.P. 1992. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Milne, D. 2015. *Worldmaking: The Art and Science of American Diplomacy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Morgan, W.D., and S. Kennedy. 2004. *American Diplomats: The Foreign Service at Work*. New York: iUniverse, Inc.
- Nicolson, H. 1933. *Peacemaking, 1919*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Norton, H.K. 1929. *Foreign Office Organization: A Comparison of the Organization of the British, French, German and Italian Foreign Offices with that of the Department of State of the United States of America*. The American Academy of Political and Social Science.
- Rosenberg, E. 1982. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890–1945*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Suri, J. 2011. *Liberty's Surest Guardian: American Nation-Building from the Founders to Obama*. New York: Free Press.

CONTENTS

1	Brazil	1
	Maria Pereyra-Vera, Daniel Jimenez, and Robert Hutchings	
2	China	21
	Michael Deegan, Joel Keralis, and Robert Hutchings	
3	France	43
	Bryce Block, Catherine Cousar, and Jeremi Suri	
4	Germany	59
	Marne Suttén, Catherine Cousar, and Robert Hutchings	
5	India	81
	Leena Warsi, Joshua Orme, and Jeremi Suri	
6	Japan	99
	Kazushi Minami	
7	Russia	125
	Jessica Terry, Zachary Reeves, and Jeremi Suri	

8 Turkey	143
Zuli Nigeeryasin, Evan W. Burt, and Jeremi Suri	
9 United Kingdom	161
Adam Crawford, Annika Rettstadt, and Robert Hutchings	
10 United States	189
Ronald McMullen	
Conclusion	225
Index	237

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Bryce Block holds a Master of Arts degree (2017) in Global Policy Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Evan W. Burt holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Middle Eastern Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Catherine Cousar holds a Master of Arts degree (2017) in Global Policy Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Adam Crawford holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Middle Eastern Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Michael Deegan holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Robert Hutchings is the Walt and Elspeth Rostow Chair in National Security and Professor of The Public Affairs at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, The University of Texas at Austin. His combined diplomatic and academic career has included service as chairman of the US National Intelligence Council and as special advisor to the secretary of state, with the rank of ambassador.

Daniel Jimenez holds Master of Arts degrees in Global Policy Studies (2017) and Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies (2015) from the University of Texas at Austin.

Joel Keralis holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2017) in Global Policy Studies and Asian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Ronald McMullen is a former career diplomat who served in his last post abroad as US ambassador to Eritrea. He is Ambassador in Residence at the University of Iowa and served as Diplomat in Residence at the University of Texas at Austin from 2010 to 2012. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Iowa.

Kazushi Minami is an associate professor in the Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University. He holds a PhD in History (2019) from the University of Texas at Austin. His research focuses on modern and contemporary US–East Asian relations. His articles have appeared in *Cold War History and Diplomatic History*.

Zuli Nigeeryasin holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Asian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Joshua Orme holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Asian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Maria Pereyra-Vera holds a Master of Arts degree (2018) in Global Policy Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Zachary Reeves holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Annika Rettstadt holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy Studies and Middle Eastern Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Jeremi Suri is the Mack Brown Distinguished Chair for Leadership in Global Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, where he is a professor in the Department of History and the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs. He is the author and editor of nine books on diplomacy, foreign policy, and political leadership.

Marne Sutten is a US Army colonel and was an Army Fellow at the University of Texas at Austin in 2016–2017. She holds a master's degree in Policy Management from Georgetown University and a master's degree in Military Arts and Sciences from the School of Advanced Military Studies.

Jessica Terry holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy and Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.

Leena Warsi holds dual Master of Arts degrees (2018) in Global Policy and Middle Eastern Studies from the University of Texas at Austin.