

A Fine Kettle of Fish:
Comparing How Diplomats and Academics Teach Diplomacy
Within The United States of America

Donna Marie Oglesby
Diplomat in Residence
Eckerd College
4200 54th Ave. South
St. Petersburg, Fl. 33711

oglesbdm@eckerd.edu

Presented at British International Studies Association Conference, Dublin
June 18-20, 2014

Abstract

This paper examines the teaching of diplomacy in the United States through a review of over five-dozen syllabi and lengthy interviews of many of their authors. By intentionally seeking out both academics and practitioners teaching diplomacy, including public diplomacy, to compare their choices in content and pedagogy, I find patterns of difference that exceed those expected by a close reading of the theory and practice “gap” literature. What the two distinct epistemic communities teach in terms of skills and procedures as well as the beliefs that inform them, the values that sustain them and the theories that lie behind them differ significantly. Drawing on the author’s three decades of diplomatic practice followed by eighteen years teaching at the college level, this paper attempts to explain why that might be the case.

Keywords: diplomacy, public diplomacy, teaching and learning, foreign policy, theory and practice

There are these two young fish swimming along and they happen to meet an older fish swimming the other way, who nods at them and says, "Morning, boys. How's the water?"

And the two young fish swim on for a bit, and then eventually one of them looks over at the other and goes, "What the hell is water?"

—David Foster Wallace, "This Is Water"¹

Introduction

This paper explores the core values and realities of academics and diplomats teaching diplomacy within the United States to illuminate the tensions and ambiguities at the interface of the two, largely autonomous, communities sharing a common subject. Specifically it asks what, if anything, is different about teaching and learning in diplomacy courses offered by practitioners and by academics in American colleges and universities.² Most of the surprisingly limited number of courses on diplomacy, understood to be the conduct of international relations, are offered as seminars at the graduate level. But, I include a number of lecture and seminar undergraduate courses in my sample because the teaching methods, materials and assessment tasks vary in interesting ways. Although my study consists of an extensive review of five-dozen syllabi followed by lengthy interviews with available syllabi authors, it is limited to the teaching of diplomacy in United States in the twenty-first century. I share the view advanced by Parker Palmer, author of the seminal book, *The Courage to Teach*, that there exists a "hidden curriculum of our culture" that conditions our thinking and deserves critical reflection.³ American liberalism shapes our acquisition of knowledge

¹ David Foster Wallace, *This Is Water: Some Thoughts, Delivered on a Significant Occasion, about Living a Compassionate Life*, (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2009), p. 3-4.

² This paper uses the term diplomacy broadly, as do those who teach it, to mean the conduct of international relations. Diplomacy is a political instrument of statecraft now engaged in as well by actors other than states.

³ Parker J. Palmer, "A New Professional: The Aims of Education Revisited" (*Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, November - December 2007). Accessed August 18, 2013 at <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/November-December%202007/full-new-professional.html>.

just as it molds our view of the role of the state, the nature of governmental institutions and ideas about foreign relations.⁴

Teachers of diplomacy in the United States are a hardy lot. They have to be. They have been swimming against the current. Whether they are shoaling with the scholarly international studies community or the practicing American foreign policy community, the subject that intrigues them, that they care about, attracts few others. It may be true, as prominent diplomacy theorist Paul Sharp wrote in 2011, that “there has never been a better time for studying diplomacy,” but few in the United States do so.⁵ Even fewer now in the twenty-first century than once did. So few, in fact, that it has been possible to identify a sizable sample of those practitioners and scholars called to teach diplomacy, review their syllabi, interview them and learn of their vocation. I wanted to understand from both diplomats and academics: how they define their subject, what motivated them to teach it, how they actually used materials and assessment techniques listed in their syllabi to what effect, what student learning outcomes they sought and why, and how the capabilities, interests and priorities of their students modified their course content or methods. My peers were generous with their time and ideas. The rich veins coursing through this paper owe largely to their willingness to share experience and insight.

Although the aggregation of those teaching diplomacy is relatively small it is far from coherent making the sociological dimensions of teaching diplomacy in the United States as interesting as the intellectual dimensions of content and pedagogy. The syllabi under review suggest that *who* is teaching diplomacy governs *what* is taught, and *how*, far more than might be seen in most subject-centered courses in established fields. The footprints of personal experience track across each syllabus in surprising ways. Generally thought to be a field of study within the larger discipline of International Relations, the academics communing around diplomacy are actually drawn from various disciplines to inquire into a web of puzzles arising from the conduct

⁴ American liberalism here refers to the shared belief in the autonomy of the individual, commitment to political liberty and limited state power.

⁵ Paul Sharp, “Diplomats, Diplomacy, Diplomatic Studies, and the Future of International Relations and International Studies,” in Stuart Murray, et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomacy Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 13/4, 2011), p. 695-698.

of international relations. Professors schooled in History, Political Science, and International Relations are now joined by a new generation of scholars disciplined in Communication Studies, Public Relations and Cultural Anthropology who come to Diplomacy Studies because they are interested in diplomacy's public dimension. Rather like grass carp, scholars of *public* diplomacy are newly introduced and very large fish in the minnow family of Diplomacy Studies making a fine kettle of fish to examine. Their small pond invasion has dynamically altered the academic Diplomacy Studies habitat already disturbed by the changing nature of diplomacy as practiced in the contemporary globalizing yet fragmented world.

In addition to the mixed stream of academic specialists darting about observing, interpreting and categorizing the swirl of particles arising from the practice of international relations, there are an increasing number of former practitioners from the American diplomatic community teaching today. Both retired officials from the defunct United States Information Agency as well as the State Department, they are inspired to reach out to the next generation to stimulate an appreciation of their craft and its continued importance to American well being in a radically changing world. Some former senior diplomats like Ambassador Nicholas Burns heading the aspirational *Future of Diplomacy Project* created in 2010, at The John F. Kennedy School at Harvard University have high public profiles. Others have named professorships. Most are adjunct, part time or visitors. Performing diplomacy for decades prior to teaching gives the practitioner a background understanding of the subject guiding them to insights and intuitions about the realities of the practice that they must then learn how to share.⁶ For the seasoned practitioner, knowledge does not precede and is not separable from practice; it is enclosed in its execution.⁷ The quality of practitioner teaching, therefore, comes from their identity and integrity even though they do not often adhere to the consensual framework of procedural rules that govern the teaching of the same subject by their more academic colleagues. Their courses are in high

⁶ This concept, advanced by Michael Polanyi in *Personal Knowledge* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1960) was quoted in Parker J. Palmer, *The Courage to Teach: Exploring The Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1998), p. 98.

⁷ Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot, "International Practices" (*International Theory*, 3, 2011), p. 1–36.

demand from students, particularly at the graduate level in American Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA) schools, whose eyes are on employability and mastering the intricacies of tradecraft practiced in foreign affairs agencies and the broader world of policy institutes, global non-profit organizations and corporations.

Student-consumer demand for skills and concepts that enable them to work successfully in a globalizing world also roils the diplomacy instructional waters. In teaching, more than scholarship, the market matters. As paymasters in the American system of higher education, student-consumers either fill or do not fill the seats in the classrooms. What they care about and are willing to pay for places them in interactive relationship those who teach and those deans who monitor societal trends and decide what to market. The twenty-first century has seen the solidification of binary tracks in American international public affairs schools: either security and conflict studies or international human development. Diplomacy as a subject of study bridging the two has been squeezed out of the course catalogs.⁸ Instead, the curricula are dominated by courses focused on a basket of global problems to be solved by specific policy expertise learned by traveling one of the two more technical paths.

Aligning with this trend, students in the United States on a civilian human development path appear more attracted to the study of *public* diplomacy than the foundational sub-field because they see themselves — as global citizens — included in the highly elastic term. Along the security studies track — for those who aspire to the many jobs in the military/intelligence sphere — *strategic communication* is the more common course signifier.⁹ Although some students like the Pickering - Rangel Fellows wherever they study in the United States as well as a larger number of students in the four Washington based APSIA schools do aspire to become official American diplomats, most students studying *public* diplomacy seek direct participation in international affairs without the compromising commitment they believe career

⁸ According to one practitioner teaching at Georgetown University, diplomacy also receives only passing reference in eleven pages of guidance and questions for the Masters of Science in Foreign Service (MSFS) oral exam.

⁹ I have not included a review of strategic communications courses in this paper because it further complicates an already complex sample.

government service requires.¹⁰ They want to acquire mastery of the concepts and skills that will empower them to succeed in ameliorating global conditions that concern them or advancing issues they care about all the while earning a living. Their desire to shape the world in accord with their values and make their own mark creatively leads them to want to work for non-state actors: think-tanks, transnational political advocacy campaigns as well as the ostensibly apolitical humanitarian, intercultural and economic development institutions that abound in the non-governmental sector. Few American students seem aware that the robust NGO sphere exists in no small part because of their government's public policy choice to move federal funds instrumentally through private sector contractors.

Even with the idiosyncratic nature of the syllabi under review, some patterns in the teaching of diplomacy emerge. Naturally, the patterns I suggest here do not minimize the individuality of each author's syllabus or the general fluidity of the boundaries drawn around diplomacy as subject of instruction. Both diplomats and academics are members of communities of individuals. The personal signature of each syllabus reflects that ethos and reflects as well the American liberalism that washes the whole. The following two snapshots capture some key comparative dimensions of findings emerging from my research.¹¹ In each composite category there are, of course, outliers coloring well outside the lines I have drawn, some quite boldly.

Snapshot of a Professing Diplomat

When diplomats cross the bridge into academe, they carry their household gods.¹² Inspired by these deities, they in turn serve students by recreating

¹⁰ The Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship and the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Fellowship programs identify and develop candidates for the American Foreign Service from all racial and ethnic backgrounds. Funded by the Department of State, the programs provide financial support for both graduate and undergraduate study.

¹¹ The theme for developing my comparisons is derived from ISA 2014: Call for Proposals: Spaces and Places: Geopolitics in an Era of Globalization. Accessed April 18, 2013 at <http://www.isanet.org/Conferences/Toronto2014/Call.aspx>

¹² Andrew Hurrell credits Fred Halliday with the introduction of this fine metaphor in Fred Halliday, "The Chimera of the International University" (*International Affairs* 75:11), p. 108. He employs it as well in Andrew Hurrell, "America and the World: Issues in the Teaching of U.S. Foreign Policy" (*Perspectives on Politics*, 2 (1)), p. 101–111.

within the classroom the practice of foreign policy. For diplomats, foreign policy above all is an activity. Having led the life of action in the international public arena, crossover diplomats often embrace an active learning pedagogy unwittingly. They believe their value lies in teaching students to think operationally. Diplomats want to introduce students to the body of practical knowledge that they have mastered, the lessons they have learned from the doing. Practitioners want students to develop good political judgment, plan strategically, report accurately, write quickly and short, brief smartly, negotiate, persuade and cooperate with or confront others to achieve a political purpose. They would want the same of junior staff.

Their courses are grounded in the soil of the particular: “Yemen - Crafting a Comprehensive Strategy for a Fragile State” or “U.S. Borders and Borderlands.”^{13 14} Even when the course titles carry the more generic “Creating a 21st Century Diplomacy,” the syllabus’ perspective is a belly-to-the-ground of distinct localities in specific times.¹⁵ The granular details of issue history, culture and leadership personalities enmeshed in political institutions of a given society matter to professing diplomats in the presentation of the cases laid before students. The diplomat writes a syllabus with the wisdom gained and the hands dirtied from hard work in foreign lands. “Foreignness” is a core concept. Local context is decisive. Reading assignments convey regional or issue specific knowledge, are interdisciplinary, sometimes biographical and policy relevant. Very rarely do assigned readings come from the academic subfield of Diplomatic Studies. The teaching diplomat strives for verisimilitude by connecting students face-to-face with working diplomats still on duty around the world in guest lectures, interviews or videoconferences. In cities like New York and Washington, they also provide students with some direct experience of the

¹³ Barbara K. Bodine, Princeton University: Fall 2010. “Yemen-Crafting a Comprehensive Strategy for a Fragile State.” Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

¹⁴ Stephen R. Kelly, Duke University: Fall 2012. “U.S. Borders and Borderlands.” Shared via e-mail to the author July 21, 2013.

¹⁵ Marc Grossman, Georgetown University: Fall 2010. “Creating a 21st Century Diplomacy,” Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

world of diplomacy by visits to embassies, consulates, international organizations and departments of government. Their touchstone to authenticity is the real and the now.

There is a deep physicality to the diplomat's real world professional experience as U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Thomas A. Shannon says, "they're at the rock face, chipping away every day at a reality that is constantly changing and is constantly challenging and sometimes quite dangerous."¹⁶ Crossing from doing to teaching, these diplomats pride themselves most often on designing courses that place student apprentices at simulated sites of action to choose among sometimes poor options and to apply the instruments needed to shape an external environment, and advance a national purpose when their own time to serve as public policy officials comes. Students learn the tools of statecraft by teamwork, role-play, simulations and exercises designed by the practitioner to mimic common diplomatic tasks and train the skill set through repetition and correction.

Time, of course, matters. The professing practitioner once worked under severe time constraints never having all the essential information before needing to act. Simulating press conferences that take place on the run, flashbulbs bursting, microphones thrusting in their faces give students a taste of the pressure of communicating to the public on the real-time record. Managing Twitter accounts teaches students how to navigate the pace and complexity of the information rapids swirling around international political events. Two-minute elevator briefings — cold called student to professor — on the morning's breaking news simulates the rush to influence the day's agenda of the principal whose time available is inversely proportionate to her rank. Time management is a critical practical skill students should learn believes the crossover diplomat.

Space is limited. The view narrows. Squeezing what the principal needs to know about the current situation and how it is likely to develop into a single tight summary paragraph pushes students to think clearly and quickly about the nub of the matter boiling on the front burner. It forces students to take responsibility for selecting the

¹⁶ Ambassador. Thomas A. Shannon, Keynote Address to Public Diplomacy Council Conference: *The Last Three Feet: New Media, New Approaches, and New Challenges for American Public Diplomacy*. November 3, 2011. Accessed August 14, 2013 at <http://publicdiplomacycouncil.org/keynoter-panelist-information-and-transcripts>.

most essential policy relevant information from the wash of uncertain evidence and communicating it clearly up front. Role-played reporting from the field on the views and policies of the country's leadership in a manner that will draw attention to shifting developments on the ground but connect to the existing departmental narrative schools students in the microphysics of power and the power of consensus.¹⁷

Space also is limited by the possible. Students learn through case studies that there are constraints for even the most powerful statesmen who are always concerned with contingencies. Power is always a salient factor in international politics but very little can be commanded. Pragmatism and prudence rule in decisional space. Much requires negotiation constrained by bureaucracy, domestic politics and the agency of other actors in the increasingly complex international system. Private NGO and corporate actors may sometimes crowd the international stage and shape the back-story of state action but the narrative of the diplomat's syllabus puts states in the limelight. Perhaps the hardest lesson the cross-over diplomat tries to present to today's individualistic yet cosmopolitan students is that a diplomat serves the legitimate interests and very particular concerns of a given government that is necessarily and rightly accountable to its own citizens. Representing and communicating those interests and values and trying to reconcile them through persuasion and negotiation with the legitimate interests and preoccupations of others operating internationally is the ethical obligation of the diplomat in service.

Snapshot of an Academic Professor of Diplomacy

On the other hand, sitting in the *Ivory Tower*, or more likely in an adjacent public policy institute created by the university to bridge the worlds of action and contemplation, the academic professor of diplomacy teaches under the watchful gaze of his own household gods. Normally, one prominent guardian deity disciplines his study through a bounded domain of knowledge, identifies the tribe and lights the path to tenure. Disciplinary cultures influence academic beliefs and perceptions about

¹⁷ Iver B. Neumann, "A Speech That the Entire Ministry May Stand For, or: Why Diplomats Never Produce Anything New" (*International Political Sociology*, 2007), p. 183–200.

producing and evaluating knowledge.¹⁸ Differences in epistemological styles by discipline are visible in the syllabi under review. Their varied approaches to theory and method inform the pedagogies.

Academic courses on diplomacy are often bedded in an intellectual integrity that derives from independence from the power structure that governs the performance of diplomacy. Distance from the corrupting calculus of power frees the academic from narrow professional orientation and allows skeptical, even critical, analysis of prevailing state policies. Returning to the academy after feeling hurt by their embrace of the state during the Vietnam War, American social scientists turned to an ostensibly apolitical technocratic approach to public policy. As Lisa Anderson, former dean of Columbia University's School of International Public Affairs continues, "the withdrawal of social scientists [from association with the state] marked, though it probably did not cause, the beginning of the erosion of the state's monopoly on the definition of the public good, both domestically and internationally."¹⁹ Detachment from the urgent need to operate in the world of particulars, allows the academic to abstract patterns from multiple specifics and reach toward a scientific understanding of universals. Elegant theory is the touchstone. "Theories of Diplomacy" or "Diplomacy: History, Theory and Practice" are signifying course titles.^{20 21} Even theory's absence in the field of public diplomacy is noted and addressed by remedial organizing concepts advanced across the disciplines. The assigned literature is drawn from the interdisciplinary academic field of Diplomacy Studies driving students onto a conversational path populated by scholars who seek to solve a common set of puzzles.²² Peer reviewed articles and books selected to reflect the subfield's intellectual landscape dominate the reading

¹⁸ Michele Lamont, *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), p. 53.

¹⁹ Lisa Anderson, *Pursuing Truth, Exercising Power: Social Science and Public Policy in the 21st Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 104.

²⁰ Geoffrey Wiseman, USC: Fall 2012. "Theories of Diplomacy." E-mailed to the author on August 2, 2012.

²¹ Alan K. Henrikson, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy: Spring 2012. "DHP D200: Diplomacy: History, Theory and Practice." Shared via e-mail to the author August 12, 2013.

²² There is no available list of members of the Diplomacy Studies Section of ISA according to current chair, Geoff Pigman so I was unable to cross check syllabi with section membership. There are positivist scholars who continue to teach diplomacy from a distinct force and statecraft perspective and do not appear to be part of the Diplomatic Studies community.

lists. The goal is student understanding of the way the world works diplomatically, not specifically the production of diplomats.

Academics are intellectuals by design. They strive to correct the myopia of the practitioner harnessed to the rock face of a particular reality by the limits of his experience. Academics employ a daisy chain of language, concepts, categories and principles to help students climb above the escarpment of the narrow example to see more broadly in the context of the whole. Their assignments are designed to train students in the disciplinary templates and methods required to ensure objectivity, impartiality and transparency. They want students to engage in purposeful deliberation about claims or ideas, evaluate evidence soundly, and retain a disinterested posture. Postpositivist scholars less sympathetic to traditional diplomacy encourage students to acquire a more skeptical stance about who conducts “diplomacy” in their name and what it really means. Although active learning strategies are increasingly used, particularly when the word “practice” figures in the course title, academic professors of diplomacy generally test their students’ knowledge in exams and hone their academic skills with essay requirements and challenging lengthy final research paper assignments.²³

Taking the time for coherent reasoning is important to the academic particularly when the issues under consideration are highly charged and the evidence uncertain. Usually, the academic professor of diplomacy exhibits a critical distance from the subject at hand carefully illuminating the underlying structures of reality that the practitioner is too busy to notice. She places the present diplomatic crises, issues and practices in a continuum of time against relevant historical patterns. He uses comparative approaches to break-free of the blinders of being in and of a particular national approach to diplomacy at a given historical moment.

Depending on discipline, place is diminished in the academic design of diplomacy course syllabi. The changes in diplomacy brought by the end of the cold war, globalization and technology that shift power to non-state actors feature

²³ Public diplomacy courses whether taught by academics or practitioners are much more likely to include active learning strategies than diplomacy courses.

prominently. The academic sees diplomacy, particularly *public* diplomacy, as a process escaping traditional statist boundaries, instruments and sites and looks beyond the traditional political strata to bring the tumult of international societies and civil society acting transnationally into sharper relief. Some take care in their course design to illuminate non-Western diplomatic traditions, systems and styles in order to highlight the Euro-centric principles of traditional diplomacy that many assume to be natural and universal. In the period under study, scholars may also be separating themselves from Anglo-American policies on Iraq and the Global War on Terrorism with which they disagreed. With attention to interactions and relationships, the academic slips the gravity of place into a constructed transnational space of network processes and connection. Attention to multilateralism and conference diplomacy dominates. There is a tendency to portray the world as a collection of challenges that only a worldwide co-operative process can address. Farsighted attention to a single post-national global public sphere often slights the lived experience of particular people rooted in particular places with palpable histories and concerns of their own.

Space, on the other hand, opens up for students of the academic professor of diplomacy because the international context and factors external to the decision-making diplomat come more clearly into view. Rather than the internal foreign policy decision making and implementation approach generally taken by the cross-over diplomat, the academic is at home in the externals emphasizing global interactions and systemic forces in the international system at large. Hands cleansed by distance from the action, the academic professor of diplomacy frequently writes a syllabus with a normative voice. Without the experience needed to act in the gritty, grimy world of trade-offs inhabited by diplomats serving political masters, the academic often guides students to moral principles, norms and values that might serve humanity well beyond the borders of a given state, rather than a particular group of human beings located within it.

Research Method

The composite snapshots above and the more nuanced portraits that follow are based primarily on a review of over five dozen syllabi followed by lengthy interviews with available syllabi authors about their purposes in teaching. I began with what is being taught, not the research agenda of scholars in the academic subfield of Diplomatic Studies. To find my interview subjects I explored several collections of diplomacy syllabi maintained by concerned institutions on-line, primary among them: those collected by The Public Diplomacy Council and the American Academy of Diplomacy.²⁴ I explored the course listings of all U.S. based members of the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA), Googled for diplomacy syllabi in American institutions of higher learning more broadly and reached out to individual scholars writing in the field for their relevant syllabi. I also approached academic publishers of Diplomacy Studies literature for the connection to those who had adopted their books. I pursued all links they gave me to others teaching in the field.²⁵ My conversations with each syllabus author who responded to my request generally lasted about an hour and a half. In some cases, interviews took the form of extensive e-mail exchanges.

Naturally, I examined the readings that sampled syllabi authors chose to require and recommend in their courses. Very few professing diplomats select texts from the Diplomatic Studies canon in building their course content. At a minimum, this finding raises questions about achievement of the ISA Diplomatic Studies Section objective “to serve as a two-way conduit between practitioners and scholars” by alerting them to the best in IR scholarship.²⁶ That diplomats who teach the subject within the United States rarely use the scholarship produced by Diplomatic Studies community suggests diplomats and Diplomatic Studies scholars comprise distinct epistemic communities. That calls for an examination made more intriguing by the finding that practitioners

²⁴ The syllabi are cached at The Public Diplomacy Council <http://www.publicdiplomacycouncil.org/syllabi> and The American Academy of Diplomacy http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

²⁵ My efforts here proved unproductive. For privacy reasons publishers could not give me the names of course adopters but did forward a message from me to the faculty concerned. I received no responses.

²⁶ Stuart Murray, et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 2011, 13), p. 709.

experienced in public diplomacy make greater use of public diplomacy scholarship when teaching. Furthermore, I found, to my surprise, that several scholars of Diplomacy Studies whose theoretical work defines the field rarely teach courses on diplomacy in the United States. The relative absence of diplomacy as an academic course offering presents itself as a puzzle: does diplomacy have cultural resonance in the United States? Is it thought to be teachable?

The Gap Between Theory and Policy

Seeking answers I reviewed several bodies of academic and policy literature relevant to my study. I began by revisiting the small body of literature on the gap between theory and practice in International Relations over the last twenty years flowing from the concerns first expressed by Alexander George. George's influential book, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* framed the problem he placed on the agenda with key words "bridge" and "gap."²⁷ I borrow them here as has been standard in books and articles by a number of noted scholars following in his footsteps.²⁸ Most scholars writing in this vein, Joseph Nye currently prominent among them, argue that there is a serious disconnect between the academic community studying international relations and the diplomatic community managing them. They contend that narrowing the policy-academy divide would well serve both groups. The essential finding as Bruce Jentleson suggests is that the disciplines of Political Science and International Relations put a limited value on policy relevance because of American liberalism's inherent suspicion of government and that the disciplines suffer for it.²⁹

²⁷ A.L. George, *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* (Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1993).

²⁸ Particularly useful are Joseph Leggold, and Miroslav Nincic, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: International Relations and The Issue of Policy Relevance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002). For a British perspective on the problem see Christopher Hill, and Pamela Beshoff, (eds.) *Two Worlds of International Relations: Academics, Practitioners and the Trade in Ideas* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

²⁹ Bruce W. Jentleson, "The Need for Praxis: Bringing Policy Relevance Back In" (*International Security*, Vol. 26, No.4 Spring 2002), p. 169. Jentleson entered the Obama Administration to work with fellow academic Anne Marie Slaughter on the first Quadrennial diplomacy and development review *Leading Through Civilian Power* published by the State Department in 2010.

Others like Stanley Hoffmann insist that academic work must have a “distance from power and the temptations of power.”³⁰ A variant of this stance sees the locus of global power in the United States government and seeks critical distance from American foreign policy above all yet at the same time succumbing, perhaps, to power’s temptations through opposition to it. According to annual surveys of IR scholars conducted by the Teaching, Research and International Policy Project (TRIP) of the Institute for the Theory & Practice of International Relations at the College of William and Mary, the “bridging” view represents half of those sampled.³¹ The other half of the 2700 IR scholars surveyed prefers to maintain an “arm’s-length relationship” with policy makers.³² This literature does not yet reflect on teaching despite the intention of TRIP to include pedagogy in its research triad: research, teaching and policy/politics. But, insights on the differing purposes and concerns of the practitioner at work in the world of action and the scholar at work in the world of contemplation are germane to this study of teaching diplomacy and evidenced by the syllabi I analyzed and the interviews I conducted.

Some members of the Diplomacy Studies community, reflecting on the gap debate, attribute the habitual marginalization of its subfield within the American discipline of International Relations to its being “far too close to its boring subject” to maintain intellectual integrity.³³ In a seminal article on the “Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies” published in 2011, several “epistemic torch bearers” of the old-guard joined by generation 3.0 scholars argue that most International Relations scholars neglect diplomacy because it is a human practice in service to sovereign states.³⁴ The current intensified and varied theorization of

³⁰ Andrew Hurrell, “The Theory and Practice of Global Governance: The Worst of All Possible Worlds” (*International Studies Review*, 2011), p. 145.

³¹ Bradley C. Parks, and Alena Stern, “In-And-Outers and Moonlighters: An Evaluation of the Impact of Policy-making Exposure on IR Scholarship” (*International Studies Perspectives*, 2013), p. 3

³² Bradley C. Parks, and Alena Stern, “In-And-Outers and Moonlighters: An Evaluation of the Impact of Policy-making Exposure on IR Scholarship” (*International Studies Perspectives*, 2013), p. 2.

³³ Stuart Murray, et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 2011), p. 720.

³⁴ The term “epistemic torch bearer” was coined by Geoffrey Wiseman in his chapter, “The Palme Commission: New Thinking about Security” in Ramesh Thakur, Andrew F. Cooper and John English eds. *International Commissions and The Power of Ideas* (United Nations University Press, 2005), p. 46-75. Stuart Murray credits

Diplomacy Studies can be read as an attempt to gain status in the eyes of fellow scholars regardless of discipline who distrust those among them who might, in the words of young Australian scholar Stuart Murray, be “theoretically reluctant to bite the empirical hand that supposedly feeds them.”³⁵ Why some Diplomatic Studies scholars would take their cues from the half of International Relations academic community who think their work would be sullied by proximity to power, rather than the half holding the “bridging view,” raises questions to be addressed later in this paper. Still, they have drawn the conclusion that the more theoretical the scholarship, the more independent the scholar is perceived to be within several disciplines, whether Communications Studies, Political Sociology or International Relations. That conclusion has implications and consequences for the utility of their work for American diplomats either learning their craft or teaching it to others.

The Gap Between Scholarship and The Public Sphere

The assertion that teaching and research in International Relations is disconnected from reality is broadened in the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Essay Series: *Academia and the Public Sphere*. Importantly, this recent on-line symposium relates scholarship not just to the policy world, but to publics as well. Stephen M. Walt began the 2011 discussion on *International Affairs and the Public Sphere* by framing the debate between those who criticize the “cult of irrelevance” said to have transformed scholarship into scholasticism and those who defend the need for academic independence from the corruptions of power. Corruptions derive both from working in concert with the policy world and from the politicization that might arise were the scholar to try to influence discussion in the public sphere.³⁶ The SSRC’s focus on academia and the public sphere was prescient and deserves consideration. The political implications of a collective of scholars being perceived to be out of touch with the publics they should seek to serve educationally were apparent last summer as the

Wiseman with the term in Stuart Murray, et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 2011), p. 720.

³⁵ Stuart Murray, et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 2011), p. 720.

³⁶ Stephen M. Walt, “International Affairs and the Public Sphere” (*Social Science Research Council* July, 2011). Accessed September 17, 2011 at <http://publicsphere.ssrc.org/walt-international-affairs-and-the-public-sphere>.

National Science Foundation (NSF), under Congressional pressure, suspended the 2014 research funding for the Political Science discipline. While some contend that the Congressional action to defund Political Science research — unless the NSF Director certified that supported projects “promote the national security or economic interests of the United States” — was an ideologically motivated response to an effective “telling truth to power” scholarly ethos, the public did not appear to care that their tax dollars would no longer fund the basic scientific research into politics that academics cherish.³⁷ The funding has since been restored as a result of intense American Political Science Association lobbying.

Effective Education and Training

The public does care in these economically troubled times that the higher education they buy as investment in their children’s futures is worth the money they spend. The academy knows it. One response to the market pressure has been robust teaching and learning discussions held across the disciplines in order to improve the quality of courses offered. To reflect on the pedagogical approaches taken by the diplomats and scholars I also reviewed the growing higher education teaching and learning literature for context. I particularly looked at the studies generated by colleagues in Political Science and International Relations in the United States and, by comparison, Great Britain. As a consequence of the public status of many British institutions of higher learning and government funding pressure, their conversation more pointedly addresses embedding employability in the International Relations curriculum.³⁸ Researching for this paper, I reviewed the conference papers presented by the teaching and learning sections archived on-line by both the International Studies Association and the American Political Science Association. Until 2014, none

³⁷ Henry Farrell, “Tom Coburn Doesn’t Like Political Science” (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 22, 2013). Accessed, August 19, 2013 at <http://chronicle.com/blogs/conversation/2013/03/22/tom-coburn-doesnt-like-political-science>.

³⁸ The flavor of the collegial discussions in Great Britain is easily tasted on-line at sites maintained by the British International Studies Association Learning and Teaching Working Group. Accessed August 19, 2013 at <https://sites.google.com/site/bisaltwg>. Also useful is the fine collection of articles contained in Cathy Gormley-Heenan, and Simon Lightfoot (eds.), *Teaching Politics and International Relations* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

specifically addressed the teaching of diplomacy but several evaluated the effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies reflected in the syllabi I sampled.³⁹

Concern about effective education and training in diplomacy occurs on the other side of the bridge as well. So finally, in preparation for this paper I reviewed several studies by Washington policy institutes such as the American Academy of Diplomacy and the Stimson Center calling for increased preparedness of diplomatic personnel to meet the political and economic challenges arising once the military completes its scheduled withdrawal from the post 9/11 wars in 2016.⁴⁰ Within the United States “diplomatic readiness” is the buzzword. One impetus for reaffirming diplomacy as a profession is that diplomats want to reclaim ground lost to the military over the last decade in the conduct of American foreign relations. A second driver is concern about the corrosive effects of “the overwhelming — and growing — presence of transient political appointees in mid-level and top leadership positions at the State Department.”⁴¹

The United States has never been particularly hospitable to the concept of diplomacy as a profession requiring dedicated career diplomats but the increasing marginalization of the professional career service alarms the American Foreign Service. As scholar David Clinton writes, “Whatever the opinion of students of diplomacy on this state of affairs, it is a vigorous expression of Jacksonian democracy: the institutionalized expression of the view that all citizens are capable of holding responsible political office.”⁴² Resources for increased training and education for diplomats can only come when the American political class sees diplomacy as a

³⁹ Steven Curtis presented his fine United Kingdom specific paper in progress on “*Teaching the Practice of Diplomacy: Five Interventions and Their Evaluation*” at the American Political Science Association annual Teaching and Learning Conference in Philadelphia in February 2014.

⁴⁰ See “*Forging a 21st-Century Diplomatic Service for the United States through Professional Education and Training*” (Washington D.C.: The Henry L. Stimson Center, American Foreign Policy Association and The American Academy of Diplomacy, February 2011) Accessed August 20, 2013 at <http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/DPET.html>.

⁴¹ Susan R. Johnson, Ronald E. Neumann and Thomas R. Pickering, “Presidents are breaking the U.S. Foreign Service” (*The Washington Post*, April 11, 2013). Accessed April 6, 2014 at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/presidents-are-breaking-the-us-foreign-service/2013/04/11/4efb5afe-a235-11e2-82bc-511538ae90a4_story.html

⁴² David Clinton, “The Distinction Between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy In American International Thought and Practice” (*The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 6 (2011)), p. 274.

profession worthy of the investment. Such funding is therefore unlikely. Nicholas Kralev documented shocking levels of ignorance about and distrust of the American Foreign Service and the State Department in an interesting but methodologically weak 2013 study commissioned by the American Foreign Service Association.⁴³ Kralev's interviews during the spring of 2013 with key congressional staffers make clear that there is little congressional interest in increasing the funding available for the education and training of the American diplomatic service because they do not know what they do even now ninety years after the Rogers Act established the Foreign Service as a merit-based, professional diplomatic service in 1924.

The Who: Social Actors

Most teachers of diplomacy have a positive commitment to guiding the next generation with respect to the common project of understanding and valuing diplomacy. Both academics and diplomats understand that “teachers plant seeds that shape the thinking of each new generation;” Ambassador David D. Newsom who straddled the bridge between the policy community and academy decades ago writes, “and this is probably the academic world's most lasting contribution.”⁴⁴ Diplomatic Studies scholar Jan Melissen would agree arguing that his colleagues should focus more on teaching as a way of enlarging the field: “teaching is vital to instill an appreciation of diplomacy in successive generations of students.”⁴⁵ Although postmodernist scholars might protest, most syllabi under review demonstrate some reflective quality and varying degrees of critical distance from the subject on the part of syllabi authors with very few celebrants of untarnished legacy among either the practitioners or academics surveyed. Yet, what the two distinct communities teach in terms of skills and procedures as well as the beliefs that inform them, the values that sustain them and the theories that lie behind them differ significantly.

⁴³ Nicholas Kralev, “*Congressional Staff Attitudes Toward the Foreign Service and the Department of State*” (Washington D.C.: American Foreign Service Association, June 2013). Accessed August 20, 2013 at http://www.afsa.org/Portals/0/2013_Congressional_Attitudes.pdf.

⁴⁴ David D. Newsom, “Foreign Policy and Academia” (*Foreign Policy*, Winter 1995), p. 52.

⁴⁵ Jan Melissen, “Diplomatic Studies in the Right Season.” in Stuart Murray et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomacy Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 2011), p.723 -725

Teaching diplomats and academics often inhabit the same social space, particularly in APSIA schools, but the practitioner is less like her academic colleague and more akin to members of the policy think tank community written about so insightfully by sociologist Thomas Medvetz.⁴⁶ The teaching American diplomat's claim to knowledge and expertise is based on credentials, experience and access to diplomatic and whole of government foreign policy networks not scholarship. Most practitioners teaching do not have doctorates.⁴⁷ With some notable exceptions, most were United States Foreign Service Officers.⁴⁸ Identified with that elite service now felt to be under siege, their teaching focus is on tradecraft not on *diplomatic culture* as Diplomacy Studies scholars have defined the concept. Australian practitioner-scholar Geoffrey Wiseman, teaching at the University of Southern California defines *diplomatic culture* as "the accumulated communicative and operational norms, rules and institutions devised to improve relations and avoid war between interacting and mutually recognizing political entities."⁴⁹ One may fairly ask where these expectations about proper behavior come from and why the interpretation offered as a socially constructed norm does not seem to capture the reality of American diplomats' experiences as reflected in their teaching. Clearly there are variables at play between a particular set of scholars who theorize Diplomatic Studies and the Americans who practice then teach diplomacy worthy of exploration.

Scholars of Diplomacy Studies

Diplomacy Studies is a distinct body of literature within the discipline of International Relations that has an historical and theoretical cast.⁵⁰ Significantly, the subfield of study is anchored in the English School, one of only two fully-fledged non-American research programs according to international political sociologist Iver B.

⁴⁶ Thomas Medvetz, *Think Tanks in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

⁴⁷ Notable exceptions interviewed are Ambassador William Rugh teaching at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, John Brown teaching at Georgetown University and Michael Schneider teaching in the Syracuse Maxwell School Washington Program.

⁴⁸ Notable exceptions interviewed include Bruce Gregory teaching at George Washington and Georgetown universities and Michael Schneider, teaching in the Syracuse Maxwell School Washington Program.

⁴⁹ Geoffrey Wiseman, "Pax Americana: Bumping into Diplomatic Culture" (*International Studies Perspectives*, 2005, 6), p. 409 - 410.

⁵⁰ The academic study of the multiple dimensions of diplomacy is much broader than this particular subfield.

Neumann.⁵¹ The subfield of has grown to its current maturity during the years of European Union expansion and consolidation. Scholars intrigued by this particular landscape of profound socio-political change choose problem sets to study like governance rather than statecraft and emphasize processes that transcend traditional structures of government focusing attention on systemic interactions and the web of institutions, rules and expectations that govern the international milieu.

By design, the study of foreign policy has been excluded from the Diplomacy Studies paradigm since Harold Nicolson made the distinction between foreign policy and diplomacy in 1939. As Ambassador Monteagle Stearns noted in his fine book *Talking to Strangers*, “for Europeans, the process of diplomacy is distinct from the foundations of policy.”⁵² Logically therefore given its provenance, the Diplomatic Studies subfield holds that foreign policy is generally analyzed from the perspective of the state making and executing it; and diplomacy, which must be kept separate, is considered to be the means by which policies are achieved.⁵³ Setting the parameters of the Diplomatic Studies subfield to exclude Foreign Policy Analysis may bring diplomacy more clearly into focus and clarify the paradigmatic castle to be defended by associated scholars but it increases rather than bridges the gap with American diplomats.⁵⁴ The more hybrid, less theoretical, nature of public diplomacy scholarship rooted both in Diplomatic Studies and International Communications may contribute one explanation for its greater appreciation by practitioners. A second explanation may lie in the intentional bridging work done by institutions like the Public Diplomacy

⁵¹ Iver B. Neumann, “The English School on Diplomacy” (*Discussion Papers in Diplomacy*, Netherlands School of International Relations ‘Clingendael,’ 2002). Last accessed March 8, 2014 at http://clingendael.info/publications/2002/20020300_cli_paper_dip_issue79.pdf.

⁵² Monteagle Stearns, *Talking To Strangers: Improving American Diplomacy At Home And Abroad* (Princeton University Press, 1996), Kindle version loc 625.

⁵³ Diplomacy Studies scholars made this point repeatedly in interviews with me. Geoff Pigman also takes pains to defend the paradigmatic assumptions in Geoffrey Allan Pigman, “Debates About Contemporary and Future Diplomacy” in Pauline Kerr & Geoffrey Wiseman eds., *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World*, (Oxford University Press, 2013) p. 68-84. See as well the excellent David Clinton, “The Distinction Between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy In American International Thought and Practice” (*The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 6 (2011)), p. 261-276.

⁵⁴ Samuel Barkin offers an excellent discussion of the defense of IR paradigm by opposition and exclusion in “*Realist Constructivism* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Council, the Center for Public Diplomacy at USC and the Institute for Public Diplomacy and Global Communication at George Washington University.

Diplomatic Studies makes cosmopolitan claims and aspires, like all science, to universal truths. Associated scholars are distinguished by their individual achievements, different professional trajectories and varied scholarly voices but it is worth noting that most of the leading Diplomatic Studies scholars teaching in the United States are British Commonwealth expatriates.⁵⁵ And, perhaps as evidence of the public diplomacy effectiveness of international education experience, they include among their number several prominent American scholars who were educated at British universities, primarily Oxford.⁵⁶ Who can really know where and when a particular intellectual curiosity is piqued? Surely then, it is not reductionist to note this particularly bright node of connection in the Diplomacy Studies network and wonder about the extent of its affect on their epistemic community. As John Robert Kelly, teaching public diplomacy at the School of International Service at American University notes, “ideas are organic social products that require nurturing by informed elites to give them visibility.”⁵⁷ Academic agenda setters, however they have been seasoned by life experience, influence how ideas within their epistemic community are sorted, filtered, organized and promoted. They, too, are networked social actors.

Given the sociology of their science, long-standing British Commonwealth academic tradition may have also influenced how some Diplomacy Studies scholars read the cause of their marginalization within the broader international studies community mentioned earlier in this paper. According to British historian and analyst of American foreign policy, David Milne, academics at elite British institutions are even less policy oriented than their American counterparts. In a 2010 study of “America’s ‘intellectual’ diplomacy,” Milne finds that the American foreign policy structure is much more amenable to input from intellectuals than the British system and offers as evidence revolving door cases ranging from Paul Nitze, McGeorge Bundy, Walt

⁵⁵ The most prominent among them are Geoff Wiseman, Paul Sharp and Nick Cull.

⁵⁶ Prominent among them are Alan Henrikson, James Der Derian, Geoff Pigman. and Erik Goldstein.

⁵⁷ John Robert Kelley, “The Agenda-Setting Power of Epistemic Communities in Public Diplomacy,” Paper delivered at the International Studies Association Annual Conference, San Diego, April 2012. Kelley earned his doctorate in International Relations from the London School of Economics.

Rostow and Henry Kissinger to the more recent Paul Wolfowitz, Condoleezza Rice and Anne Marie Slaughter.⁵⁸ The exclusion of foreign policy considerations from the Diplomacy Studies subfield is a choice not uniformly made by scholars; but by insisting on emphasizing the differences between diplomacy and foreign policy, excluding the later, some Diplomacy Studies scholars make their work less accessible to American diplomats who have not traditionally, and do not now honor the distinction in either theory or practice.

I would argue that the work of Diplomacy Studies scholars on the contemporary nature of the world and diplomacy's place in it should be taken into consideration when American diplomats teaching their craft in American classrooms select reading material for their diplomacy courses, but it is not.⁵⁹ American diplomats are either indifferent to its existence or rarely find this material useful because it does not speak to their very different experience in the world of foreign policy. As Clinton documents, this American exception has been true since both the realist diplomat George Kennan and the idealist Nicholas Murray Butler "found themselves at one in rejecting Nicolson's distinction [between diplomacy and foreign policy.]"⁶⁰ The new public diplomacy literature, on the other hand, populates syllabi written both by practitioners and academics. However, it is often balanced by Political Communications and Media Studies scholarship not specifically applied to public diplomacy. Although the academics I have interviewed find it strange, practitioners report their preference for the non-PD specific material in terms of classroom utility. They value clean explanation of threshold concepts like agenda setting, framing and network analysis rather than seeing the concepts applied by scholars to work the practitioner believes he knows well. They also value the comparative diplomacy literature that fills the gaps in their

⁵⁸ David Milne, "America's 'intellectual' diplomacy" (*International Affairs* 86: I (2010) p. 49-68.

⁵⁹ Apart from my own course on "*Diplomacy and IR*," I found only two retired State Department Officers making use of the "Diplomacy Studies" scholarship in their courses. One has had extensive educational experience at Oxford as a Marshall Scholar. The other spent formative educational years at the University of Glasgow.

⁶⁰ David Clinton, "The Distinction Between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in American International Thought and Practice" (*The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 6 (2011), p. 261.

own national experience and responds to the expressed interests of international students and cosmopolitan millennials who populate their classrooms.⁶¹

It is worth noting that international students would appear to constitute at least a third of most diplomacy classes offered in the United States.⁶² Some of these students at the graduate level in international public policy schools are already diplomats in their nation's service. Others aspire to diplomatic careers. Their large and vocal presence does affect course content over time as teachers respond to student demands for material relevant to their own national diplomatic styles and systems with increased attention to comparative scholarship.

As in the earlier case of the Vietnam War, the political context brought about by 9/11 is critical to understanding one set of key differences between practitioners and Diplomatic Studies scholars as social actors writing syllabi in the 21st century. Both might agree with the social prescription that "as a general idea states should use peaceful means rather than military force in dealing with each other," but American diplomats know from experience that diplomats in service to a global military power such as the United States do not simply make peace.⁶³ Much of their diplomacy in the twenty-first century has been before, during and after conflict. Sometimes diplomats employ coercive tactics to prevent war through forceful persuasion; or, as theorist Thomas Schelling would have it, "the exploitation of potential force."⁶⁴ Sometimes their work involves the preparation for conflict, and generating public support for it should coercive diplomacy fail. And sometimes, their diplomacy is focused on establishing order and promoting political and economic pluralism after conflict has ended.⁶⁵

Practitioners teach from experience and their syllabi reflect what they have experienced including the tough minded use of U.S. power in cases as varied as Iraq, Haiti, Kosovo, Libya and Iran. As practitioners of representation, negotiations and

⁶¹ Bruce Gregory reports that links to the comparative scholarship are the most appreciated notations in his *Diplomacy's Public Dimension* annotated bibliographies.

⁶² I always ask this question of those whom I interview but I have not verified the numbers with registrars.

⁶³ Geoffrey Wiseman, "Pax Americana: Bumping into Diplomatic Culture" (*International Studies Perspectives*, 2005), p. 410.

⁶⁴ As quoted in Alexander L George, Paul Gordon Lauren, & Gordon A. Craig, *Force and Statecraft: Diplomatic Challenges of our time 5th Ed.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 212.

⁶⁵ The relationship between diplomacy and conflict is explored by Ambassador Marc Grossman in "Diplomacy Before and After Conflict" (*Prism* Vol. 1, No. 4, 2012).

persuasion in times of war and of peace, American diplomats would agree with retired Ambassador Chester Crocker, teaching at Georgetown University, that it their job to convert “raw energy and tangible power into meaningful political results” whatever other instruments of statecraft are also employed.⁶⁶ American diplomats are not always effective. In the case of Iraq, it could well be that the United States was punished by events because it had not correctly read the twenty-first century transformation in international politics well examined by scholars.

Iraq War Context

In this vein, Geoff Wiseman argues in his 2005 *International Studies Perspectives* article, “Pax Americana: Bumping into Diplomatic Culture”, that the United States was seen to transgress prevailing diplomatic norms in the run up to the invasion of Iraq.⁶⁷ The American failure to meet the collective expectations of the global democratic community at the time did have its costs. The consequent lack of legitimacy for the Iraq War prevented American diplomats from “effectively shifting a fair percentage of the cost on to others as it had in the Persian Gulf War of 1990-91.”⁶⁸ It is fair to note that the United States had over the years contributed to the collective understandings constituting the descriptive norm and did attempt to secure UN Security Council approval for its action. As Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs at the time Marc Grossman writes, “This possibility of a broad international coalition lost all relevance on January 20, 2003, when the French government announced that it would never support a second UN Security Council resolution to authorize the use of force in Iraq.”⁶⁹

The Diplomatic Studies community’s essential opposition to the 2003 Iraq War on normative grounds exemplified well in Wiseman’s 2005 *International Studies Perspectives* article was shared broadly by 80% of IR academics surveyed according

⁶⁶ Chester A. Crocker, “The Art of Peace: Bringing Diplomacy Back to Washington” (*Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2007).

⁶⁷ Geoffrey Wiseman, “Pax Americana: Bumping into Diplomatic Culture” (*International Studies Perspectives*, 2005, 6) p. 409-430.

⁶⁸ Richard Ned Lebow, *A Cultural Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 468.

⁶⁹ Marc Grossman, “Diplomacy Before and After Conflict” (*Prism* Vol. 1, No. 4, 2012), p. 6.

to TRIP survey data from the same year.⁷⁰ Sharing sympathetic policy views in the Iraq case, American International Relations scholars were nonetheless divided by their reasoning. Many of the most prominent American scholars used the grammar of security rather than diplomacy in making their case. Still, it can be argued that a new wave of Diplomatic Studies scholarship and the temporary modest uptick in teaching public diplomacy in the decade since the Iraq War stems from the Diplomatic Studies community's repudiation of the United States' unilateral action. Jan Melissen agrees arguing that the post 9/11 call for a "new public diplomacy" was in part "a response to the political climate in which U.S. diplomacy and public diplomacy became traumatized by the 'war on terror' and dominated by considerations of national security."⁷¹ Not only did the U.S. action violate the collective security norms Diplomatic Studies scholars believe had been in place but by doing so invalidated theoretical assumptions that such normative constraints existed.

Despite the State Department's well-documented skepticism regarding the argument that Iraq presented a security threat justifying the risks of conflict and fear that war would destabilize the region, the Bush Administration decision to invade in spring 2003 has had an inevitable effect on the culture and identity of American diplomats whose job then became one of support for military commanders. One significant post 9/11 consequence I noticed in interviews is the high percentage of American diplomats whose only long-term professional education opportunities were in institutions of the Department of Defense rather than American universities. For reasons of cost if not preference, about two-thirds of the approximately 125 Foreign Service Officers receiving yearlong professional education and training annually attend "The National War College, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and The Army, Naval and Air War Colleges."⁷² Ostensibly sent to study leadership initially at the

⁷⁰ Susan Peterson, Michael J. Tierney with Daniel Maliniak, Full Report: 2004/2005 *Survey on Teaching, Research and Policy*, (College of William and Mary, 2005), p. 39.
http://www.wm.edu/offices/itpir/_documents/trip/trip_summary2005.pdf.

⁷¹ Jan Melissen, "Beyond the New Public Diplomacy" (*Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael*, October 2011), p. 9.

⁷² "Forging a 21st-Century Diplomatic Service for the United States through Professional Education and Training" (The Henry L. Stimpson Center, American Foreign Service Association, and American Academy of Diplomacy, 2011), p. 39.

instigation of former Secretary of State Colin Powell, the political-military perspective of the war colleges seeps into the American diplomatic service's culture and identity and is reflected in the syllabi they write, the case studies and tabletop exercises they present and the networks they make available to their students.

Practitioners Teaching Diplomacy

Still, when described as “wingmen” to military officers leading the charge abroad since 9/11, American diplomats weep. American diplomats are alarmed by the perception among key audiences and the public at large that diplomacy is not a worthy profession or a profession at all.⁷³ Looking left, retired ambassador Marc Grossman, teaching at Yale's new Jackson Center in 2013, conveys the diplomat's post Wiki Leaks foreboding about, “a lingering public impression that diplomacy is tainted because it is carried out by patriotic people pledged to the advancement of their country and may sometimes be better accomplished in private than in public.”⁷⁴ Looking right, Crocker conveys his sense that “the concept of negotiated outcomes and diplomatic engagement with troublesome or nasty regimes remains neuralgic in the U.S. body politic.”⁷⁵ This pincer movement of unlikely ideological bedfellows from the left and right of the American political spectrum delegitimizes the very idea of diplomacy within the American context.⁷⁶

Sharing the Diplomatic Studies scholar's concerns, many American practitioners teach diplomacy because they fear its decline as a chosen instrument of statecraft by the United States in the post cold war 9/11 world and want to pass the torch to the next generation in hope of resurgence. They teach because “they want Americans to understand the importance of diplomacy; the reality of how it works as well as the

⁷³ David H. Petraeus, “Holbrooke: My diplomatic wingman” (*Washington Post*, December 17, 2010) accessed December 17, 2010 at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/14/AR2010121403026.html>.

⁷⁴ Marc Grossman, “A Diplomat's Philosophy” (*JFQ*, Issue 62, 3rd Quarter 2011), p. 47.

⁷⁵ Chester A. Crocker “The Art of Peace: Bringing Diplomacy Back to Washington” (*Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2007), p. 163

⁷⁶ I wrote about the effect of this pincer movement on the elimination of USIA in “A Pox on Both Our Houses,” Paper delivered at the American Political Science Association Conference on Communication and Conflict, Georgetown University, August 31, 2005.

goals of policy.”⁷⁷ They want to pass on their lessons learned and make their lives count by having diplomacy valued and continued by the next generation. They also enjoy teaching and report having fun. Some are well remunerated for their efforts but most receive typical modest per course adjunct salaries. In a sense they are giving away a storehouse of knowledge they have gained over a lifetime of experience.

To teach effectively they first have to structure their own thinking and reflect upon what they might offer students while being true to who they are. They do not want to “pretend” to be academics and claim they were hired to introduce students to the world of practice that they know. Nor do they want to be criticized for being in their “anecdotalage” and read deeply to prepare their lectures and pedagogy. Most admit in interviews that they had no time for reading academic literature while practicing their profession and began only after deciding to teach. Their reading is governed by what they have already chosen to teach as they search for materials to support their course objectives. This instrumental use of the literature is characteristic of the practitioner who evaluates excellence on the basis of whether the material helps solve a particular problem: in this case, needing course reading material to assign to students. Getting students then to read the material assigned is a challenge shared by practitioners and academics alike.

American diplomats are focused on the problems they must address rather than thinking diplomatically. Retired Ambassador Chas. W. Freeman criticizes his former colleagues observing that Foreign Service officers “define themselves not as diplomats but as specialists” on Iran or South Asia or Latin America.”⁷⁸ By doing so they make their profession vulnerable to competition from politically well-connected knowledge networks already intent on displacing members of the career service in policy formulation and implementation. Foreign Service Officer policy specialization is evident in the content of most of their courses under review. Practitioners make extensive use

⁷⁷ “*Diplomacy & Education: Discovering & Teaching Reality*” Conference Summary (The American Academy of Diplomacy, June 13, 2011). Accessed August 23, 2103 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Diplomacy%20and%20Education%20Conference%20Summary_final.pdf.

⁷⁸ J. Robert Moskin, *American Statecraft: The Story of the U.S. Foreign Service* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2013). p. 679.

of the area studies scholarship fallen in disfavor over recent decades within the academy because many scholars aspire to find global patterns transcending national culture and place. In my interviews of teaching diplomats, I have found, as Medvetz did of policy experts, that while most do not disparage their academic colleagues, they, “insist, almost unanimously that their [own] work is more ‘useful’ and ‘tied to the real world.’ The “real world” connection is, they say repeatedly, what attracts students to their courses. Yet, academic scholars constitute the main reference group against which policy experts recognize their own affinities.”⁷⁹ In interviews, most practitioners asked about the Diplomatic Studies literature either frankly admit to not being aware of its existence or characterize it as “too abstract,” “heavy duty,” “divorced from reality,” “flawed” or “not useful.” Prominent International Relations theorist Stephen Krasner, who served as State Department Director of Policy Planning during the Bush Administration in 2005 - 2007 confirms this finding. He writes, “My own experience in Washington did not suggest that academics came with any particular authority. For better or worse (probably for better) Americans may respect academics in general, and defer to their judgment if they have technical knowledge, but they do not regard them as deserving any particular deference.”⁸⁰

Academics Teaching Diplomacy

For their part, academics teaching diplomacy see themselves as different from practitioners because they teach “diplomacy” not “foreign policy,” because they articulate the “theories” that lie behind the “mere stories” teaching diplomats tell, and because they have the integrity that comes with distance. They criticize practitioners teaching as “state insiders talking about policy” rather than as members of the collective diplomatic corps, which is an institution of international society by their definition.⁸¹ They pride themselves on research-based teaching arguing “like all social

⁷⁹ Thomas Medvetz, “Opening the Black Box of Intellectual Autonomy” paper presented at a Symposium on Michèle Lamont’s *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment* (2009) (*Papers: revisita de sociologia*, 98/3, 2013), p. 576. Accessed December 10, 2013 at https://www.academia.edu/4186803/_How_Professors_Think_in_Spain_English_-_Symposium.

⁸⁰ Stephen Krasner, “Policy-Making and Academic Research: Why Wisdom May Not Result in Action” (*Bridging the Gap Working Paper Series: Working Paper #1*, 2008), p. 11.

⁸¹ For a full discussion of this concept see Paul Sharp and Geoffrey Wiseman eds. *The Diplomatic Corps As An Institution of International Society* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2007).

theory, diplomacy is dynamic, not static so the latest research must be a part of teaching.”⁸² While most academics focused on diplomacy value the diplomatic practice that others in the International Relations discipline disparage, they also believe it essential to theorize and conceptualize in order to make meaning of the practice they observe.

Without attention to philosophic principles and concepts, some contend that teaching diplomacy can be mere vocational training. In the words of Geoffrey Wiseman teaching at USC, scholars of Diplomatic Studies want “to bring these internalized practices and norms to light.”⁸³ In this they echo the late American scholar-diplomat R. Smith Simpson whose insistence that the theory and techniques of diplomacy could be taught in the United States led to the creation of the Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy: “People were always interested in international affairs, writ large, but diplomacy was a neglected field. It wasn’t sexy. Everyone wants to talk about what we want to do in the world; not a lot want to talk how to get it done.”⁸⁴ They still do, particularly when getting it done involves the many dimensional forms of political action called diplomacy.

Conclusion

“What the hell is water?” Well, which political seas are you swimming in?

When I began this research in the spring of 2013, I did not expect to find academics and diplomats who teach diplomacy in the United States describing the world in which they swim so differently. They are very different fish, shoaling not schooling in shared waters. That research intended to produce a finding on comparative pedagogy of a shared subject led me to considerations of Political Sociology surprises me greatly. Once I saw what practitioners and academics were teaching with respect to diplomacy, and how they discussed their work in conversation

⁸² Pauline Kerr & Geoffrey Wiseman eds., *Diplomacy in a Globalizing World* (Oxford University Press, 2013) p. 342.

⁸³ Geoffrey Wiseman, “Bringing Diplomacy Back in,” in Stuart Murray et al., “The Present and Future of Diplomacy and Diplomacy Studies” (*International Studies Review*, 13/4, 2011), p. 710-713.

⁸⁴ Adam Bernstein, “R. Smith Simpson, Foreign Service Officer and author, dies at 103” (*Washington Post*, September 9, 2010) Accessed April 13, 2014 at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/08/AR2010090806883_pf.html.

with me, I needed to follow the actors and understand the broader sociological forces shaping their efforts. My analysis of *who* is teaching diplomacy governing *what* is taught, and *how*, seemed a necessary first step before answering the panel's more normative question: "what should the study of diplomacy involve and how should it be taught?"

Diplomats are shoal shifters by a lifetime of practice. Their service abroad hones their political intuitions about the varied social systems and values operating in the numerous sites of their assignment. They succeed when they understand the political communities in which they work well enough to advance the objectives of the community they represent with knowledge, tact and integrity. Diplomats teaching in American institutions of higher education have cued into student thirst for the practical knowledge and skills required to operate in an international policy environment. While addressing those needs, the practitioners' insistence on grounding their courses in the particulars of place may also lead students to the important awareness that the many pieces of the global jigsaw of problems they are intent on solving have multiple national dimensions.

The core skill of a diplomat, as retired Ambassador Stearns insists is "the skill of living and working among foreigners, of communicating with them, of understanding their motives and intentions" and this requires specialized knowledge of the history, language and culture of particular foreign societies.⁸⁵ The national dimension of the diplomats' own service reminds young global citizens cherishing their individual autonomy and global reach, that they are also members of a political community whose state interacts in the world in institutional representation of their interests and values with multiple other political communities. It is the work of diplomats that shapes the international seas students wish to learn to navigate.

The work of diplomats may also contribute to shaping domestic affairs. To understand how and why both are so, students need to avail themselves of the more reflective and theoretical courses taught by academics. Fortunately, some scholars of

⁸⁵ Montegale Stearns, *Talking To Strangers: Improving American Diplomacy At Home And Abroad* (Princeton University Press, 1996), Kindle version loc 1270

several disciplines are interested in the study of the multi-faceted nature diplomacy and chose to teach. Diplomatic Studies is an important subfield to comprehend but not the only academic literature of value in understanding diplomacy. For generations, diplomatic historians have helped their students gain the essential knowledge that foreign affairs is “less a series of excellent adventures” than a “turbulent but flowing process of change and synthesis.”⁸⁶ Security Studies scholars have taught diplomacy as one of several instruments of statecraft. Students wishing to make sense of diplomacy from the various levels of analysis key to Foreign Policy Analysis also need the conceptual grounding in which academics in several fields ranging from International Relations theory to Psychology and Sociology excel. Without forming a personal philosophy of diplomacy rich with concepts about how the world works and how it ought to work, students may in time practice the craft of diplomacy if they so chose, but they will never master its art.

I hope my respect for the knowledge exemplified by both the practitioners of my past life and the scholars of my present one are evidenced in this paper. It matters to me that both communities care deeply about what they do in guiding the next generation through quality teaching. It saddens me that because of indifference, self-identity and definitional choice their work within the United States is not strengthened by ongoing exchange of perspectives. Were they mutually reinforcing, those currently as passionate about the teaching of diplomacy as the late R. Smith Simpson once was might have more effectively stemmed the cultural tide washing diplomacy out of American course catalogs, and perhaps out of American statecraft. Surely we can all agree with Smith Simpson that “upon [diplomacy] and its quality rest the lives of all of us.”⁸⁷ That shared acknowledgement should be motivation enough to challenge the apparent curriculum of American culture from the middle of the bridge responding together: “Boys, this is water.”

⁸⁶ Monteagle Stearns, *Talking To Strangers: Improving American Diplomacy At Home And Abroad* (Princeton University Press, 1996), Kindle version loc 177.

⁸⁷ Carl Goodman, “Smith Simpson on Diplomacy” (*State Magazine*, October 1999) p. 34. Accessed April 13, 2013 at <http://2001-2009.state.gov/documents/organization/83405.pdf>.

Syllabi Reviewed

Abhyankar, Rajendra, *The Practice of Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Indiana University, School of Public and Environmental Affairs: Fall 2012. Shared via email on July 22, 2013.

Asquino, Mark S., *Public Diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Challenges*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2011. Accessed on May 25, 2013 at <http://www.publicdiplomacycouncil.org/syllabi>

Atwood, Brian J., *Bilateral and Multilateral Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Princeton University: Spring 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Bodine, Barbara K., *The U.S., the Gulf and Its Neighbors*. Syllabus, Princeton University: Spring 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Bodine, Barbara K., *Yemen- Crafting a Comprehensive Strategy for a Fragile State*. Syllabus, Princeton University: Fall 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Brown, John, *Propaganda and American Foreign Policy*. Syllabus, Georgetown University MALS Liberal Studies Degree Program: Spring 2013. Shared via email on July 26, 2013.

Callahan, Robert J., *Public Diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Challenge*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2007. Shared via email May 25, 2013.

Clinton, David, *Diplomacy in Theory and Practice*. Syllabus, Baylor University: undated. Accessed April 6, 2013 at <http://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/23028.doc>

Crocker, Chester A., *International Mediation: Strategy and Methods*. Syllabus, Georgetown University: Spring 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Cross, Mai'a K. Davis, *European Public Diplomacy*, Syllabus, Northeastern University: no date specified. Shared via email on October 14, 2013.

Cross, Mai'a K. Davis, *Hard power, Soft Power, Smart Power*, Syllabus, Northeastern University: no date specified. Shared via email on October 14, 2013.

Curtin, Jeremy, *Media and Foreign Policy*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2009. Accessed May 25, 2013 at <http://www.publicdiplomacycouncil.org/syllabi>.

Edelman, Eric, *Diplomatic Disasters: Statecraft in War, Peace, and Revolution*. Syllabus, SAIS: Fall 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Edelman, Eric, *America's Wartime Diplomacy: The Politics of Coalition Maintenance and Alliance Management*. Syllabus, SAIS: Fall 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Danspeckgruber, Wolfgang F., *International Crisis Diplomacy: Theories, Challenges, and Opportunities*. Syllabus, Princeton University: Spring 2005. Accessed on December 15, 2013 at <http://lisd.princeton.edu/courses/international-crisis-diplomacy-theories-challenges-opportunities>.

Drury, Cooper, *Coercive Diplomacy*. Syllabus, University of Missouri: Fall 2011. Accessed on December 15, 2013 at <http://politicalscience.missouri.edu/docs/syllabi/PS9460.pdf>

Dry, Robert W. *Diplomacy in Theory and Action*. Syllabus. New York University: undated. Shared by e-mail with the author July 26, 2013.

Fulton, Barry, *Public Diplomacy Challenges*. Syllabus, George Washington University,

School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2008. Shared via email May 25, 2013.

Gregory, Bruce, *Beyond The New Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University SMPA: Spring 2013. Shared via email on May 31, 2013.

Gregory, Bruce, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University SMPA: Spring 2012. Shared via email on May 31, 2013.

Gregory, Bruce, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Georgetown University: Fall 2012. Shared via email on May 31, 2013.

Gnehm, Edward "Skip", *The Conduct of American Foreign Policy Abroad*. Syllabus, The Elliot School at George Washington University: Fall 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Goldstein, Eric, *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. Syllabus, Boston University: Fall 2012. Accessed on December 15, 2013 at http://www.bu.edu/ir/files/2012/10/Syllabi_Fall2012_IR535_Goldstein.pdf

Grossman, Marc, *Creating a 21st Century Diplomacy*, Syllabus, Georgetown University: Fall 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Grossman, Marc, *Creating a 21st Century Diplomacy*, Syllabus, Yale University: Fall 2013. Accessed December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Handley, John M., *War and Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Webster University: Fall 2013. Accessed on December 16, 2013 at <http://www.webster.edu/arts-and-sciences/graduate-programs/internationalrelations/courses/index.html>.

Hayden, Craig, *Applied Public Diplomacy*, Syllabus, American University, School of International Affairs: Fall 2013. Shared via email on September 6, 2012.

Hayden, Craig, *Global Perspectives on Public Diplomacy*, Syllabus, American University, School of International Affairs: Fall 2013. Shared via email on November 13, 2013.

Henick, Jonathan, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2014. Shared via email May 6, 2014.

Henrikson, Alan K., *DHP D200: Diplomacy: History, Theory and Practice*. Syllabus, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy: Spring 2012. Shared via email August 12, 2013.

Henrikson, Alan K., *DHP D200: Diplomacy: History, Theory and Practice*. Syllabus, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy: Spring 2014. Shared via email April 29, 2014.

Holmes, Allen H., *Somalia to Afghanistan/Iraq: A New World*. Syllabus, Georgetown University: Spring 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Jeffers, Mary, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Fall 2012. Shared via email on May 28, 2013.

Jeffers, Mary, *Cultural Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2013. Shared via email on May 28, 2013.

Jett, Dennis, *INTAF 802 -- Foundations of Diplomacy and International Relations Theory*. Syllabus, Penn State University: Fall 2010. Accessed August 13, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html

Jewell, Linda, *Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. Syllabus, Yale University: Spring 2011. Shared via email on July 11, 2013.

Kelley, John Robert, *Diplomatic Action in The Public Sphere*. Syllabus, American University, School of International Affairs: Fall 2013. Shared via email on November 5, 2013.

Kelly, Stephen R., *Energy and U.S. National Security*. Syllabus, Duke University, Spring 2013. Shared via email on July 21, 2013.

Kelly, Stephen R., *Current Critical Issues in North America*. Syllabus, Duke University: Spring 2013. Shared via email on July 21, 2013.

Kelly, Stephen R., *North American Security Issues*. Syllabus, Duke University: Fall 2012. Shared via email on July 21, 2013.

Kelly, Stephen R., *U.S. Borders and Borderlands*. Syllabus, Duke University: Fall 2012. Shared via email on July 21, 2013.

Leguey-Feilleux, Jean-Robert, *Global Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Saint Louis University: Fall 2013. Accessed on March 10, 2014 at https://www.slu.edu/Documents/arts_sciences/political_science/POLS462.pdf.

Levitsky, Melvyn, *Issues in U.S. National Security*. Syllabus. University of Michigan: Fall 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Levitsky, Melvyn, *Global Issues: Drugs, Crime and Terrorism*. Syllabus, University of Michigan: Fall 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Margolis, Jonathan, & Pershing, Jonathan, *International Environmental Policy*. Syllabus, American University School of International Service: Fall 1998. Shared via email on July 21, 2013.

Martinez, Hilarion, *Diplomacy in Practice*. Syllabus, Florida International University: Spring 2012. Accessed on July 21, 2013 at https://www.academia.edu/2066168/Current_Syllabus_Fall_2012.

Nagy, Tibor, *"Africa's Role in the Contemporary World."* Syllabus, Texas Tech University: Fall 2013. Accessed December 9, 2013 at

www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Oglesby, Donna Marie, *Diplomacy and International Relations*. Syllabus, Eckerd College: Spring 2014.

Oglesby, Donna Marie, *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Syllabus, Eckerd College: Spring 2014.

Pigman, G.A., *Contemporary Economic Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Bennington College: Spring 2011. Shared via email on September 3, 2013.

Quainton, Anthony, *Diplomatic Practice*, Syllabus, American University, School of International Service: Fall 2013. Shared via email on October 23, 2013.

Quainton, Anthony, *United States Public Diplomacy*, Syllabus, American University, School of International Service: Fall 2013. Shared via email on October 23, 2013.

Romero, Peter F., *The Study of Non-State Actors: "Preventing Them from Breaking Bad"*. Syllabus, Georgetown University: Fall 2010. Accessed December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Rugh, William A., *Seminar on United States Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy: Fall 2012. Shared via email on July 29, 2013.

Schaffer, Howard B., *Practicing Diplomacy Abroad*. Syllabus, Georgetown: Fall 2013. Accessed December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Schneider, Cynthia, *CULP-220 Diplomacy and Culture*. Syllabus, Georgetown University: Spring 2014. Accessed on March 10, 2014 at <http://courses.georgetown.edu/?CourseID=CULP-220>.

Schneider, Michael, *Issues in Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Syracuse University Washington D.C. Program: Spring 2013. Shared via email May 26, 2013.

Schneider, Michael, *Statecraft and Soft Power in the Digital Era*. Syllabus, Syracuse University Washington D.C. Global Security and Development Program: Fall 2012. Shared via email May 26, 2013.

Smith, Pamela Hyde, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, Georgetown University, Institute for the Study of Diplomacy: Fall 2007. Accessed May 25, 2013 at <http://www.publicdiplomacycouncil.org/syllabi>.

Stempel, John D., *Dynamics of Diplomacy*. Syllabus, University of Kentucky, Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce: Fall 2010. Accessed on March 10, 2014 at <http://www.uky.edu/~stempel>.

Taplin, Mark A., *Public Diplomacy: Theory, Practice and Challenges*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2010. Shared via email on May 25, 2013.

Walker, Edward (Ned), *Making America's Policy toward the Middle East and Related Regions*. Syllabus, Hamilton College: Fall 2010. Accessed on December 9, 2013 at http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/programs/Diplomacy_and_Education/Index_of_Syllabi.html.

Whitaker, Elizabeth, *Public Diplomacy*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Fall 2012. Shared August 2, 2013.

Wilson, Doug, *Crisis Communication*. Syllabus, George Washington University, School of Media and Public Affairs: Spring 2013. Shared via email on July 23, 2013.

Wiseman, Geoffrey, *Leadership and Diplomacy*. Syllabus, USC, School of International Relations: Fall 2010. Shared via email on July 16, 2013.

Wiseman, Geoffrey, *Global Civil Society: Non-Governmental Organizations in World Politics*. Syllabus, USC, School of International Relations: Spring 2011. Shared via email on July 16, 2013.

Interviews Conducted

Brion, Kathy (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. July 17, 2013.

Brown, John (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Washington D.C. July 26, 2013.

Callahan, Robert (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Cape Cod, MA. July 12, 2013.

Cull, Nicholas. Interview by author. Toronto, Canada. March 27, 2014.

Curtin, Jeremy (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. August 5, 2103.

Duddy, Patrick (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Chapel Hill, NC. August 7, 2013.

Fulton, Barry (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. October 14, 2013.

Gregory, Bruce. Interview by author. Washington D.C. November 13, 2013.

Grossman, Marc (U.S.F.S. ret.). Interview by author. Washington D.C. December 17, 2013.

Hayden, Craig. Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. November 13, 2013.

Henick, Jonathan. Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. May 7, 2014.

Henrikson, Alan. Interview with author. Christmas Cove, MA. October 14, 2013.

Jeffers, Mary (U.S.F.S.) Interview by author. Tape Recording. Washington D.C. May 30, 2013.

Jewell, Linda (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. July 13, 2013.

Kelley, John Robert. Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. November 13, 2013.

Kelly, Steve (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Chapel Hill, NC. July 23, 2013.

Miller, Lia. (U.S.F.S.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. August 18, 2013.

Morris, Greta (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. July 29, 2013.

Nagy, Tibor (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Lubbock, TX. December 11, 2013.

Pigman, Geoffrey. Interview by author. Toronto, Ca. March 26, 2014.

Reibling, Michelle (U.S.F.S.) Interview by author. Washington D.C. July 24, 2013.

Rugh, William (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Woods Hole, MA. August 1, 2013.

Quinton, Anthony (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. November 11, 2013.

Schneider, Michael. Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. May 26, 2013.

Shaeffer, Howard (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Washington D.C. December 11, 2013.

Sharp, Paul. Interview by author. Tape recording. Duluth, MN. September 12, 2013.

Smith, Pamela Hyde (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. Telluride, CO. August 8, 2013.

Whitaker, Elizabeth. (U.S.F.S. ret.) Interview by author. Tape recording. On the road. July 18, 2013.

Wiseman, Geoffrey. Interview by author. Tape recording. Los Angeles, CA. October 18, 2013.

Zaharna, R.S. Interview by author. Washington D.C. November 11, 2013.