

The *Sir Walter Murdoch* Memorial Lecture

Murdoch University's premier public lecture was inaugurated in 1974 to mark the centenary of the of the University's namesake, Sir Walter Murdoch. A respected academic, Walter Murdoch successfully bridged the gap between academe and the wider community - thereby establishing a tradition for the University which was named in his honour just days before his death in 1970.

Through his teaching career as Foundation Professor of English at the University of Western Australia from 1913 to 1939, he influenced generations of young Western Australian scholars, but journalism career, which lasted until he was in his nineties, enabled Walter Murdoch to reach and influence a much wider audience. In his regular, syndicated newspaper columns he eschewed cant, preferring to convey his observations on all manner of issues with an economic eloquence; frequently healthy scepticism, and often with sharp wit aimed, quite deliberately, at deflating pomposity humbug. The life Sir Walter Murdoch is commemorated in an historical walk located on Level 2 of the Murdoch University Library.

Murdoch University annually invites a person of national or international standing to deliver the Murdoch Lecture on a topic of their choice. The only criteria are that it must be thought-provoking, topical and of significant interest. The Lecture provides a valuable forum for the Presenter to express passionately-held views, in a setting free from many of the usual constraints which surround them. This freedom has led to some memorable addresses. Previous Murdoch' Lecturers have included the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission chairperson Ms Lois O'Donoghue, the late Hon John Tonkin, Hon Kim Beazley, Mr Justice Kirby, Mr William Hutton, editor of *The Observer*, Historian and Chancellor of Murdoch University, Emeritus Professor Geoffrey Bolton, AO and The Rt. Hon. Malcolm Fraser, AC CH.

We proud to be joined this evening by His Excellency Dr Hans Sondaal, Ambassador of the Netherlands to Australia, to present the 2005 Sir Walter Murdoch Lecture.

Murdoch University 1975 – 2005

Murdoch is a dynamic, modern university with a national reputation for excellence in teaching, research and student satisfaction. It has strong links to its local region south-west of Perth, with the Rockingham and Peel campuses providing educational and research opportunities for their local community.

Over its 30 year history Murdoch University has always paid particular attention to quality teaching and as a result it has been ranked among the best teaching campuses of all Australia's public universities by an independent national survey of university graduates. In just the past few years Murdoch staff have won national awards from the Prime Minister for both teaching and research, helping to provide an outstanding education for all of our students. Murdoch is the only university in Australia to achieve a 5-star rating for Graduate Satisfaction 10 out of 11 consecutive years from the independent Good Universities Guide.

The University conducts outstanding research across areas as varied as biomedicine, the humanities; social, biological, environmental and physical sciences; business, information technology and law; and veterinary science. We work on a global scale, making a difference to both international and local communities through research centres such as the AJ Parker CRC for Hydrometallurgy; the United Nations Environment Programme International Environmental Technology Centre; and the Interactive Television Research Institute.

Murdoch is committed to international education and has developed links with 44 institutions around the world, contributing to an increasingly global outlook amongst students and staff. The Murdoch community comprises more than 13,000 students and 1,400 staff, including 2,000 international students from 65 different countries.

Murdoch education is designed to foster those qualities of imagination, independence of mind and life-long learning on which professional and personal development ultimately depend. Murdoch students are taught to think independently and critically, to assimilate new information and to apply their knowledge to practical problems - characteristics reflective of the University's namesake, Sir Walter Murdoch.

Murdoch University Vice Chancellor

Professor *John Yovich*

Murdoch University Chancellor

Emeritus Professor *Geoffrey Bolton* AO CitWA

His Excellency *Dr Hans Sondaal*

Ambassador of the Netherlands to Australia

Dr Sondaal is currently the Ambassador of the Netherlands to Australia, with additional responsibilities as Ambassador to Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

Dr Sondaal has more than 30 years of experience in working in Foreign Affairs for the Netherlands, working in areas of policy and best practice for visa issues, international law, political asylum and international terrorism and crime. His roles have included Director-General for Regional and Country Policy, Inspector at the Inspection and Evaluation Department, Director of Treaties and Director of the General Affairs in the Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In 1989, Dr Sondaal was appointed as the Counsellor and deputy Head of Mission at the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria for four years, followed by a four-year appointment as Ambassador to the Republic of Hungary and Republic of Croatia.

He was appointed as the Ambassador of the Netherlands to Australia in 2001.

Murdoch Lecture 2005,

by Dr Hans Sondaal,

Netherlands Ambassador to Australia

Perth, 8 September 2005

Allow me to express my sincere appreciation to the Murdoch University for inviting me to present the 2005 Sir Walter Murdoch Lecture. I am particularly honoured since the Murdoch University celebrates an important milestone with its 30th anniversary this year.

True to the academic spirit to promote and debate ideas, the University allows the person delivering the Lecture to choose the topic. I have seized this opportunity to talk about my profession: diplomacy. For not often does one get the chance to publicly reflect on one's work experiences and to project them into the future.

I do so under the title: "Diplomacy in the 21st century: dinosaur or vital force?" Though this title may seem to be more of a slogan than the theme of a serious lecture, I feel it nevertheless reflects the current situation. Today, diplomacy as the medium to implement foreign policy and as the management of international relations through diplomats as the authorized agents of their countries faces many challenges. These include a growing number of players, a continual increase in the number of complex issues and a world order in a state of fierce flux; all to such an extent that one may rightly pose the question whether diplomacy and the diplomatic profession are in peril.

Diplomacy antedates the rise of the nation-state. Diplomacy and diplomatic customs already existed in the Near East 2000 years BC, in the times of the Greeks and the Romans, in Byzantium and in the Italian city states of Venice and Florence. Both Machiavelli and Guicciardini reflected on the proper form of government and the fate of states. However the 1648 peace treaties of Westphalia marked the beginning of the European nation state system and as such are generally considered to be the origin of diplomacy as the institution we still know these days.

The treaties established the principles of sovereignty and the territorial state. With the definition of the territorial limits of centres of political power, the state became the dominant form of political, economic and social organization. It provided security and economic growth. States, whether big or small, were equal. They defined themselves by their responsibility for foreign, defence, economic and social policy.

Foreign policy became the way to relate these sovereign nations to each other, hence the term international relations. In order to shape and implement foreign policy, foreign ministries were established. The first to do so was Cardinal Richelieu in France in order to meet the need to coordinate and centralise information.

That information came increasingly from a resident diplomatic mission. As well as gathering information the diplomatic mission was also expected to facilitate communication and minimise friction. The substance of these tasks was foreign policy. Do not have grand ideas about these ministries. The French ministry, the famous Quay d'Orsay, fitted in one carriage, a stately one of course.

Diplomatic missions also symbolized the existence of a society of nations and were consequently involved in ceremonies, representative functions and formalities. With time, these aspects of diplomacy became the subject of many jokes. One of the better ones came from Peter Ustinov who once said:

"These days a diplomat is nothing but a headwaiter who's allowed to sit down occasionally".

The art of diplomacy has also been good for a few laughs. You probably have heard a diplomat being defined as a person who can tell you to go to hell in such a way that you actually look forward to the trip.

Not jokes, but in similar vein are the often heard comments: "how diplomatic" or "he or she could be a diplomat".

What people mean with these comments and what the jokes try to convey is that diplomats disguise their true intentions and formulate a view or opinion in a way that allows various interpretations. Although diplomats are indeed skilled in papering over differences if need be, to me the art of diplomacy is not so much the veiling of a message, but far more the presentation of that message in such a way that you can continue the discussion the next day. The aim is to solve differences through reasoned discussion rather than conflict.

Traditionally international relations were chiefly managed on a bilateral basis. Diplomacy was an activity predominantly limited to the conduct of relations between states and the governments of states. The main way of thinking about international relations was called realism. It was the belief that the international order was made up of states that did not want to subject themselves to any higher order. The absence of a central body governing the world meant that states had to rely on themselves in order to guarantee their independence and security.

In this situation states are forced to struggle for power. For power secures the continuation of the existence of the state. Aggression is the result of mutual distrust and fear.

This fear forms the basis of the regulatory force of the balance of power. The idea of the balance of power was the core tenet of the thinking of the realists about war and peace. The balance-of-power system did not aim to avoid crises or wars. Instead, it tried to limit both the ability of any state to dominate others and the scope of conflicts. War was permitted; interference in the internal affairs of states was not. The pursuit of dominance by one state constituted a threat that had to be countered. The balance of power system had several characteristics. I like to highlight two.

The first is that it was not advisable to involve the general public in foreign policy. The public would not understand and be able to pass judgement on the complex issue of foreign relations. The national interest served by the foreign policy could not be sacrificed on the altar of public opinion. Consequently diplomats considered their job to be a very special one beyond the reach of the common man and were thus perceived by many non-diplomats to be living in an ivory tower.

The second characteristic was that foreign policy was in no way concerned with ideologies and moral principles. Its primary obligation was to serve the interests of the state, not the moral views of the citizens.

An interesting aspect of this second characteristic was the opinion that governments may not sacrifice the lives of their soldiers when its national interests are not threatened. With soldiers in peace keeping operations this opinion has been revitalized.

If you combine the rejection of ethical elements in foreign policy with the long held view that diplomats had to be politically neutral, it comes as no surprise that diplomats would at times be caught between their conscience and the exigencies of their work. That would in particular happen in countries with objectionable regimes and poor ethical records. Let me give you a small example out of my own career.

I served in South Africa from 1989 to 1993. It was the time of the dismantling of the apartheid regime. And while the anti apartheid policies of many governments were proof that ethical considerations could well have a place in foreign policy, the neutrality of diplomats was still very much accepted as axiomatic. So we kept up appearances, but were in fact rather subversive by supporting the various opposition movements.

While visiting a township I was invited for lunch together with my son and his friend. And at the end of the lunch that had cost the community several months' income, a towering Xhosa woman started to talk about the future. She would not see full freedom and experience a decent life, she said, but her children would.

And in colourful phrases, almost chanting she sketched a new South Africa. In the meantime more and more people had gathered in the small home of board and corrugated iron. When the Xhosa woman had finished, all people present stood up and started singing "Nkosi Sikelele", the song of the National African Congress. The

situation was full of emotion, hope and expectations. I joined in, sang loudly and raised my arm with clenched fist and shouted "Amandla".

However, that was many years on from the times I was previously discussing when the heart of bilateral diplomacy was the pursuit of the national interest. But with time, situations arose involving not two but many states and gradually the need grew to find a means for representing the interests of all of the states concerned.

Such situations gave rise to ad-hoc international conferences like the Congress of Vienna in 1815 -that by the way created a permanent international body, the Rhine Commission- and like The Hague Conferences at the beginning of the 20th century that dealt with the limitations of armament and the arbitration of international disputes. Please allow me a nationalist side-step. The Hague, besides being a city of peace and justice with institutions like the International Court of Justice, the International Court for the former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Court and the Permanent Court of Arbitration, has also contributed to the development of diplomacy, in particular multilateral diplomacy.

Since these ad-hoc international conferences the multilateral system has gradually evolved. It finally became established after World War II. In this multilateral world, the diplomat needed to have associative skills to build and manage coalitions. He needed to show intercultural sensitivity and a grasp of the various subjects, often of a quite technical character, that were being negotiated. Fluency in a second or third language became an important asset.

Interestingly, some mistakes have no consequences in this multilateral world. I remember the president of an international conference who said to a minister after his opening speech: "Thank you for wasting your time here". But other mistakes can have serious diplomatic implications and the interpreters at the UN and at international conferences are permanently under pressure to properly convey the meaning and content of an intervention. Special to the environment of international organisations is the requirement to play multiple roles. Obviously the diplomat first and foremost represents and promotes his country's interest.

But he is also expected to advance the interest of the global community. An interesting example of a conflict between the national interest and that of the international community arose with the Presidency of the Law of the Sea Conference by Ambassador Amerasinghe from Sri Lanka. In 1978 the Conference decided that he continued to be President although he no longer was a member of the Sri Lankan delegation after he had fallen out of favour with his government.

I have set out in some detail the traditional bilateral and in less detail the multilateral diplomacy scenes because events in the last decennia of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century have dramatically changed the nature of international relations. These changes can only be appreciated against the background of the Westphalia order of foreign policy and diplomacy. Problems and issues that cross borders, new technologies and

the arrival on the international scene of new players have caused the changes. These issues need to be discussed separately, but in practice they have reinforced each other.

Each of the changes would be worth a separate lecture. I have limited myself to identifying the changes I find most important and to discussing these in more depth. However, all the changes share a common feature. They have all broken the monopoly of foreign ministries and diplomatic missions and have caused the fragmentation of foreign policy.

The changes can to a great deal be ascribed to what we call "globalization". It is the realization that countries have become interconnected and interdependent. As a consequence domestic policy has been internationalized and international policy has become domestic. The distinction between domestic and international issues has eroded. We cannot escape the world anymore.

Economy and trade

Globalization manifested itself most clearly in the fields of economy and trade. Goods and services are no longer produced by and for the benefit of people living within the territory of a state. They are produced at various places in the world for markets all over the world. Trade barriers have mostly been broken down and the trade agenda is now fully international with a leading role for the World.

Trade Organization

The financial markets have been transformed and capital moves across borders with unparalleled speed, intensity and coverage.

At some time it was even believed that civilizations were from now on going to be led by commerce and trade. This belief assumed that the market was an amoral instrument that, left to its own devices, would work best for society; human activity was going to be perceived principally through the prism of economics; international relations were characterized by the primacy of economics.

With the globalization of commerce and trade, a new, non-state actor entered the international scene: the multinational corporation. Multinational corporations are not new -GM, Shell and Ford for instance were in Australia before W WII- but it was the modern multinational, with its global reach, that made real the process of globalization and largely shaped the nature, form and operation of the international economic policy.

I just mentioned the globalist view that the world must be dealt with through the prism of the market. It meant among other things that the public sector had to be run like the private sector. Thus we witnessed the organization of government departments on business principles. A corporate culture was introduced.

We now deal with "stakeholders" and have to become "service oriented, flexible, effective and efficient". We must "deliver". We read books like "The Leadership Secrets of Attila the Hun".

We learn the use of metaphors when talking about organizational changes. One that still sticks with me is about expertise and salaries. It says: "If you pay peanuts, you get monkeys". Is this all a joke? No, it brought transparency, accountability and responsible financial management to the public sector. Like the private sector we needed to show corporate social responsibility.

A wider question is whether foreign departments and diplomatic missions in managing international relations can learn from multinational corporations. My answer is yes. The circumstances in which these corporations operate, are similar to those of embassies. They bargain and deal directly with governments, gather information and network at all levels of a society. They develop scenario's setting out policies for different situations both world-wide and in the country of operation. Multinational corporations show commercial assertiveness and have a keen sense for realizing their goals through strategic and practical planning. There is in my opinion every reason for diplomacy to stay in close touch with business. This recognition implies co-operation.

Development co-operation in the Netherlands is an example thereof. Government and business work together to mobilise knowledge available in the Netherlands for developing countries.

In response to the outcome of the Johannesburg Summit new policy instruments are introduced to promote public-private partnerships with a view to further commercial skills, enterprise and investment.

I myself have good experiences in working with business. When participating in the Law of the Sea Conference and working on the code for mining the deep seabed, I could draw on the advice, knowledge and networks of international mining companies. Another interesting example of the involvement of business in global affairs is the Annual Meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. This meeting is about building networks between leading politicians, business people and academics. They discuss actual policy areas of the global agenda with a view to improving conditions in the world. Some people laugh the meeting and the Forum off as an organized, concentrated lobby system. I disagree and regard the Annual Meeting as contributing to the thinking on complex problems and policies to tackle these problems.

Immigration and international tourism

Together with the issue of human rights about which I will come to speak, immigration and international tourism have put the human factor decisively and definitively on the foreign policy agenda. They burst the policy issues like non-proliferation and the notions of multinational and supranational in which diplomats are so well versed, but which are usually far too abstract for the general public.

Immigration, leaving hearth and home, for either physical security or economic reasons, has given a face to international issues. Refugees provided people with the opportunity to express their views on justice in the face of increasingly stricter admission procedures imposed by their governments. At the same time immigration leads others to oppose the arrival of people with different norms and values, who, as they see it, have invaded their neighbourhood, taken their jobs and whose kids swamped their schools without making an effort to integrate. In both our countries, and many others as well, international developments have become part of daily life, of everybody's household.

The same happens by way of tourism.

Firstly, people have travelled extensively to all sorts of places and gained knowledge of places where incidents, like the recent Tsunami, take place. Consequently they feel more involved and are more likely to question government's actions. Secondly, people get into trouble when travelling. They sometimes end up in jails that are not as comfortable as those at home. People identify with these victims, are often convinced that an injustice is done and require action their governments simply cannot take. The case of Schapelle Corby illustrates this well and I am sure that the Indonesian Embassy in Canberra and the Australian Embassy in Jakarta have gone to great lengths to avoid frictions between the two governments.

Consular assistance has been viewed by diplomats as not particularly prestigious. It is seen as an ennobled NRMA service. Critics of foreign ministries and diplomatic missions perceive consular assistance as a justification for a large network of embassies and consulates. All these views disregard the fact that the promotion and protection of the national interest is a core task of every diplomatic mission. The national interest includes the interests of nationals.

Thus we observe that foreign ministries develop norms for dealing with nationals and that they pursue active media strategies to inform the public better of the risks involved in travelling abroad. The budgets for consular services are in all probability the only budgets that increase.

With these consular problems, immigration, refugees and asylum seekers the world of diplomacy has expanded and has introduced diplomats to the real world compared to the intellectual world of concepts and strategies.

I would like to share an experience with you I had in 1987 when I went to Thailand in order to better understand the Cambodian refugee problem there. I visited what was called Site 2 at Khao I Dang near the Cambodian border. Site 2 counted over 100.000 refugees divided over four parts. I met the Cambodian who was responsible for the running of one of these parts, say the mayor. He appointed his son to take us around and invited me for lunch after the tour of the camp, together with my delegation.

On return a table awaited us decked with the finest linen cloth, the best china, silver cutlery and crystal glasses. Before I could utter a word of astonishment, the Mayor offered me a drink. I asked for water, but he said he had whisky or a gin and tonic. While trying to make a choice, music by Bach was played. When finally seated protected from the sun by the blue plastic of UN packing material, I was treated to a lunch that would befit a good French restaurant. The mayor saw my embarrassment and offered an explanation. You must understand, Ambassador, he said, we live in extremely difficult conditions, the Thais give us food and other necessities, but not enough. So we are forced to smuggle although when caught by the Thais they shoot. To prove that I am capable of running this part of the camp, and in order to maintain my authority I have to prove that I am the best smuggler here. This lunch does just that. So eat and enjoy it.

Human rights

With the foundation of the United Nations, the embodiment of the post-World War II order, respect for fundamental human rights was introduced. It was however introduced as a norm for the behaviour of states and thus had to compete with another, conflicting principle of that new world order, the sovereign equality of states and non-intervention in domestic affairs. This last principle -the non-intervention in domestic affairs- is the reason that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights often failed in its task to effectively guarantee human rights in member states.

In addition, the Cold War had a paralysing effect on the international legal order. Justice was secondary to political interests. And today, when we seriously discuss intervention to defend human rights, very often little happens unless other foreign policy objectives can be served at the same time. When the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein and the suffering of the Iraqi people under his inhumane rule were used to justify intervention in Iraq, it actually served other purposes. The selectivity is even better illustrated by non-action in the absence of other reasons for action. The appalling human rights situation in Zimbabwe and the killing in the Sudan are cases in point. Rwanda, the wider regional war in the Congo and the Sudan are used as examples to argue that the UN is incapable of either preventing such situations or adequately dealing with them when they have arisen. Although it cannot be denied that the UN has become more autonomous and makes serious mistakes, in the end the states that are members of the UN have the capacity to make the UN function. If the UN fails we all fail. It is hypocritical to blame the UN for failures for which the member states ultimately bear responsibility.

A factor of crucial importance in the promotion of human rights has been a non-state actor called civil society. It includes churches, human rights groups, political parties, and loose organizations of concerned citizens. They have narrowed the gap between morality in foreign affairs and at home. They have been able to do so because more than before the public does matter. Governments have increasingly realized that they derive their legitimacy also from positions they take in international affairs, that also foreign policy is representative of the people.

Human rights is a particularly sensitive issue because civil society wants its basic norms and values to be extended to other people as well.

I believe it essential that governments and civil society devise a concept and practice within which they work to compliment each other in the international promotion of human rights.

Non-governmental organizations

This is the moment to talk about non-governmental organizations, NGO's in short. Well known NGO's are Amnesty International and Green Peace. They have proliferated as World Globalisation, the interconnectedness of the world, has made the public more aware of what is happening and raised public interest in global affairs. NGO's offer the public the opportunity to engage in these affairs.

Another incentive to support NGO's is the growing discontent of the public with government policies or the lack of them and with growing distrust of politicians. The sovereignty free attributes of NGO's are also a major draw card.

While NGO's are not a new phenomenon their numbers have grown rapidly in the last decade. The number of known international NGO's went from 6,000 in 1990 to 26,000 in 2000. The growth in numbers went hand in hand with the growth in the number of states.

The impact of the NGO's has been significant. There are several explanations. NGO's are often committed to causes to which states give lower priority than society thinks necessary or which states handle less appropriate than society deems fit. They demonstrate that reliance on government action in areas like poverty reduction, environmental degradation and human rights is no longer tenable. NGO's allow public participation as a way of achieving social and economic equity. They possess legitimacy because they translate the needs and aspirations of civil society into concrete objectives. NGO's have been capable of modifying the content of the notion of what constitutes national interest.

The effectiveness of NGO's can also be attributed to their remarkable lobbying and public relations skills, their ability to raise funds -they are often better funded than government institutions- and their smart and skilful use of new technologies. A quite striking example of success of the NGO's is the International Campaign to ban land mines.

That campaign through use of technologies co-ordinated many NGO's into an effective network and was able by the dodgy use of the media to bring about the signing of a treaty on this subject in 1997. Another important example is the establishment of the International Criminal Court where NGO's joined states and the UN to mobilize public opinion and to overcome resistance to create an international body that subject to certain conditions could pass judgements on actions by government or government agents.

NGO's like to see themselves as the representatives of civil society who provide checks and balances to government actions. That attitude is not without problems. The success of NGO's should not hide the fact that they have their flaws in terms of accountability and the transparency of their decision making process. They often approach matters from a narrow point of view and are sometimes only concerned with single issues.

However, there is no reason to see governments and NGO's belonging to two different worlds. On the contrary we should promote interaction between governments and NGO's.

Where governments have power, but often lack a degree of legitimacy and where NGO's lack power, but often enjoy legitimacy, the case for co-operation is strong. Success of such co-operation will obviously depend on the degree of concordance of the views of the NGO's and the government. But it is worth trying for co-operation between citizens and government agencies will mean that better and more tangible results can be achieved.

Information technologies and the media

Once upon a time diplomatic communications travelled by stagecoach or steamship. A comment attributed to President Thomas Jefferson goes as follows: "For two years now we have not heard from our Ambassador in Spain. If we do not hear from him again this year, we must write him a letter". Things have changed. These days' diplomatic communications have to compete with the Web, email, mobile phones and personal digital assistants. The diplomat can be put on the spot by the quantity of information readily, and almost instantly available, to a constantly growing audience.

When I was Deputy Secretary for bilateral relations I had to receive a delegation of Moluccans living in the Netherlands who were very concerned about developments in Ambon and the fate of their kin.

While handing me a petition to request diplomatic action by the Netherlands government the mobile phone rang. I was given a real time report of the burning of a Catholic Church. Mr. Sondaal, the leader of the delegation said, you've heard what's happening, so there is no need to verify. What is the Minister going to do? This is what I would call empowerment by cellular phone. Such virtually instantaneous information puts the official under acute pressure. There is no time for reflection. Delay in commenting will be perceived as fiddling or implying a lack in policy or facts. The official's credibility is at stake. It is a situation where the official is drawn into the public domain and where no such thing exists as political neutrality.

International travel has made it very easy for ministers to meet their counterparts, either in the context of an international gathering or in their respective capitals. It has substantially undermined the position of an ambassador whose task it is to have a good working relation with local ministers and to do business with them. The same can be said of the secure telephone. It started with the hotline between Moscow and Washington. Now

it is common for the foreign minister to deal with his colleague by phone. Ambassadors still carry the title "extraordinary and plenipotentiary", but extraordinary they never were and plenipotentiary they now hardly are.

Much also has been said and written about the media and its influence. Most foreign policy professionals tend to have a negative view of the media. Ministers are considered to make policy decisions in order to stay on friendly terms with influential TV-channels or papers. Facts are supposedly not checked, articles and reports are superficial and analysis is thin, flawed or both. Foreign officials and diplomats called this the CNN-factor. With that term they meant that the international agenda was hijacked and set by the media and that foreign policy was drawn into the superficial world of sound bytes and was reduced to 30-second items.

We hear those complaints less often. Logical, for the picture is not that bleak. It is far more nuanced. Indeed, in order to sell, papers carry the news as fast as they can and not always as accurate as we specialists would like to see it. But the weekend editions often make up for the lack of depth and considered opinions from Monday to Friday. Indeed, in order to get the highest viewing figures, TV-stations bring news with the speed of light and the time for applying critical judgement is simply zero. But at the same time through documentaries and in depth reports TV is able to give you a highly informed and varied view on international affairs. Let us not forget the good things that independent investigative journalism has brought us. So I am not so concerned with the media and their role.

We know how the media world functions and should properly apply our own judgement. In fact I am far more concerned about the ability of journalists to independently gather information and report. Embedded journalism is not the road I would like the press to go.

Media and diplomats are even becoming bedfellows. The transmission of news through the Internet is taking a high flight. Action groups for instance are creating their own news agencies, bypassing the media. They report on events and pass on information in the way that they perceive things and that suits them best. Their views may be distorted, narrow or far from mainstream, but they will make it increasingly difficult to rally the public behind foreign policy directions.

Despite the availability of the various technologies, I think it is fair to say that foreign ministries still tend to work and react in rather formalised ways.

They are gradually trying to come to grips with the dynamic forces of the Internet. Remaining relevant is the main challenge now the new information technologies and the electronic media do as much reporting and analysing of foreign affairs as the ministry officials and diplomats used to do. It is essential to realize that the new technologies offer opportunities as well, not so much in terms of improving communication, but in terms of improving policy and involving a wider net of people in policy making. We see developments that point into that direction, for instance with horizontal networks in and among departments and involving partners abroad

as well. But while that happens the work processes in foreign ministries and in missions abroad are still insufficiently adapted. They are still grappling with questions as to who in the picking order approves the content of an email, as to whether the email represents the official view and needs to be archived. I particularly feel that the use of modern technologies by governments and foreign ministries is still in its infancy when it comes to policy formulation.

At 10.30 am on the 9th of November 1989 the Berlin Wall fell. The ideological and geopolitical challenges posed by communism and the Soviet Empire evaporated. A Soviet diplomat said: "We are going to do something terrible to you. You will no longer have an enemy". At first, however, it did not look terrible at all.

President Bush Sr. spoke of a new world order, a new partnership of nations, based on consultation, co-operation and collective action; a partnership united by principle and the rule of law and supported by an equitable sharing of both cost and commitment; a partnership whose goals were to increase democracy, prosperity and peace and to reduce arms.

Pax Americana was the buzzword. Was it going to be peace based on the leadership and superior power of the United States, unipolar so to say, or would it be carried by a reinforced United Nations, multipolar so to say? The short answer to these questions is no. We did not see either a Pax Americana or any other peace.

The loss of the ideological divide that kept the world together meant that a new order had to be sought by interaction between some major powers and a multiplicity of small to medium sized states. But the character of these states was not at all identical; they did not form a homogeneous group that functioned on the historic attributes of the nation state. We saw the birth of new states grappling with their new acquired status of member of the society of nations. We watched the disintegration of states in Yugoslavia and Africa. We saw the emergence of rogue states like Libya and North Korea whose behaviour saw them expelled from that same society.

At the same time the European states are no longer founded on notions of hegemony or balance of power, but on the rejection of violence and on self imposed rules of behaviour.

In this very non-homogeneous situation the realist approach was still applied in relation to the handling of conflicts.

This approach was bound to fail because the parameters within which it could function no longer existed or only partly. I only have to mention Yugoslavia, the Gulf War in 1991 and Rwanda to prove the point.

Although diplomacy thrives in a multipolar system, the overall picture has been that while the world changed, governments let the opportunity go to equally change their foreign policies and their diplomacy. They mostly

walked the beaten tracks. National interest and the balance of power remained the guiding principles in the management of international relations. The fate of people remained subordinated to considerations of "high" politics and diplomacy.

The 11th of September 2001 has ended this drifting multipolar world. On that day the US left aloofness and detachment behind and embraced pre-emption, unilateralism and hegemony. War was declared on terrorism. Terrorism became the new enemy, the new communism.

With consent of the international community in the form of a Security Council resolution, the US and the Northern Alliance ousted the Taliban. Without consent of the international community, but with support of coalition partners Iraq was invaded and the country liberated from its dictator.

It can justifiably be argued that the international community has paid a high price for the solution of the Iraq problem. It has understandably created the perception that the invasion was a pretext for consolidating US pre-eminence and its authority to set the global agenda. Some international relationships are seriously damaged and it will require a sustained diplomatic effort to undo the damage. Especially now the US has subordinated its entire foreign policy agenda to the fight against terrorism. The single mindedness with which the US treats that issue and its "one size fits all" view seriously renders a debate on other policy options to fight terrorism and on other foreign policy topics difficult. In that atmosphere the conduct of a nuanced foreign policy is quite demanding and requires optimal diplomacy.

While September 11 put the state firmly back on the international stage, the changes in actors I described will remain with us.

As I have tried to illustrate the game nations used to play, has fundamentally changed. Diplomacy is no longer exclusively concerned with the relationships between the representatives of states. And to the extent that the relations between states are at stake, states are not homogeneous in the way they manifest themselves. International relations are no longer viewed simply in terms of military and economic power. In the former communist countries and in countries in post conflict situations other states and civil society are active in realising democracy, in establishing the rule of law and the introduction of a free market system. Change is promoted from within, not imposed from the outside.

Many new states as well as non-state actors have entered the diplomatic playing field. The actors are no longer symmetrical and their roles and responsibilities not anymore clearly delineated. The issues that are on the field have increased, have become more complex and are of concern to the general public. The public has been enabled through new technologies to become an interested observer and if it so wants, even an active player as well.

Finally, all these changes take place in an international environment seeking a new balance in the post-communism and post-11 September world.

The tenets of the realist approach and of the balance of power system I mentioned in the beginning of this Lecture, namely the non-involvement of the public and the non-concern with ideologies and moral principles, have been totally overtaken. They are now completely outdated.

What are the consequences for diplomacy? Is it on the way out or shall and can it adapt and be of added value in the management of international relations? Let me try to give an answer.

Foreign policy as the substance of international relations will remain. Diplomacy as a process through which international relations are conducted will remain as well. The questions are by whom, how and to what extent. These questions go to the heart of foreign ministries and their diplomatic services.

Having served for almost 40 years in the Netherlands Foreign Ministry and in Netherlands missions abroad I remain convinced of the usefulness of these institutions provided they thoroughly adapt to the changing conditions I have outlined. Adaptation must start with the recognition that foreign ministries are not the sole interface between the domestic and foreign domain. Let me hasten to say, that in many countries, including my own, foreign ministries have recognized that they are not the exclusive guardian of foreign relations and are undergoing extensive refurbishing. But as is the case with every bureaucratic institution the process of change is slow.

I like to offer some personal views as to the direction foreign ministries need to take in order to remain relevant.

Engagement would be my keyword. It reflects that foreign policy is not just cool technocratic state business, but particularly peoples business.

Engagement must start at home. Other governmental bodies have to be fully brought into the game. Foreign ministries must and do co-ordinate, but they have to stop seeing themselves as a clearinghouse for anything that might remotely have a foreign policy aspect. The aim must be to get coherence and cohesion in core, strategic foreign policy objectives and directions that are clearly set out and agreed upon by the Cabinet.

Foreign ministries also need to engage with the general public.

Officials and diplomats must be allowed to take part in public debates that are of consequence for foreign policy issues.

Electronic contact networks can greatly assist in soliciting the views of the public. We need to be less rigid about the political neutrality of officials.

Engagement with non-state actors, either national or international ones, is equally important. Their knowledge, information and expertise are of great value for the policy and decision making process. This approach offers opportunities for effective diplomacy as the examples of the banning of landmines and the International Criminal Court have shown.

The last form of engagement is the one in other countries, not so much with the government officials (that will in any case happen), but with opinion formers and the general public. This form of engagement is already practised and is called Public Diplomacy. It is gradually becoming a standard component of diplomatic practice.

In the sense that it is a process by which relations with people in one country are pursued to advance the interests and to extend the values of those being represented, Public Diplomacy is surely not limited to foreign ministries and diplomats. Sportsmen and -women for instance actively engage in Public Diplomacy and they are often very good ambassadors for their country. Other than propaganda, Public Diplomacy is a two-way street, it is a dialogue on issues that are of interest to people and rather than talking here I should be listening to you. Public Diplomacy is more than the marketing of a country or the selling of messages. It is the promotion of international relationships and of multiple links and networks between the societies of the countries concerned. While Public Diplomacy is more encompassing than foreign policy, its effectiveness will obviously be impaired when it is believed to be inconsistent with a country's foreign policy. It will also be more difficult to make a success of Public Diplomacy when the image and reputation of a country are not very good.

I further see the need for prioritization and thematization.

Prioritization is essential to ensure that core issues as agreed upon by the Cabinet do not disappear from the scene. It will prevent policy formulation and implementation being dictated by incidents.

Dedicated departments need to be created or strengthened to perform international policy analysis and to define the issues that will dominate the foreign policy agenda for the long term. These departments should extensively consult with the academic world and corporations that have experience in analysing international developments and in drawing up scenario's to deal with these developments.

Prioritization will enhance the implementation of policies and the delivery of outcomes and reduce our current emphasis on processes instead of on delivering results.

Thematization as it is called, is becoming a necessity. Foreign policy these days deals with several complex issues that determine the present and future international agenda. I think of international security, conflict prevention,

peace keeping, poverty reduction, education, human rights, the protection of the environment and the health crisis. The foreign ministries and their diplomatic missions need a greater degree of expertise in these fields. The down-right generalist is a species that will not survive the Darwinian battle of the fittest. But at the same time the modern professional diplomat should have sufficient varied capabilities so he never has to rely fully on the specialists. It is essential that diplomacy does not become the sum of specialist views. The professional diplomat should be able to use special advice in understanding and advancing the wider subject.

This either means including in the Foreign Service specialists or attaching specialists to the foreign ministry and missions. The former may in the end better serve the integration of all these issues in a coherent foreign policy. Whatever solution is chosen, permanent training in communication, associative skills, effective networking and intercultural understanding should be a firm feature of the personnel policy.

Last but not least, the structure of the Foreign Service and the way it is organised need attention.

Firstly, governments should ask themselves whether they need to be represented everywhere in the world. A case can persuasively be made that countries are better served by concentration on countries that are of more immediate interest related to the core issues Cabinet has defined.

Secondly, I would like to see more flexibility in the deployment of foreign ministries' personnel. We need teams of diplomats that can travel to places where their services are momentarily required. Such a more flexible response to the promotion of foreign polity goals would involve drastic changes of the statute governing the status of personnel of the Foreign Service. It would be worth exploring this avenue.

Thirdly, the hierarchical structure of foreign ministries needs to be broken down. It constitutes a serious impediment to clear foreign policy formulation and decision-making that does justice to the political environment at home or abroad.

Rather, a flatter organisational model should be introduced allowing horizontal working within and outside the department. Middle management needs to be reduced.

Fourthly and lastly, foreign ministries should stop to micromanage their diplomats and to keep them as puppets on a string for fear that they might otherwise do irreparable damage. Responsibility makes better diplomats than fear for being out of line. As I suggested before, we should do away with the notion of political neutrality of the official and of the diplomat. It is a fictitious notion that prevents diplomats from freely participating in the dialogue with civil society, at home or abroad, and with other governments. It is exactly that dialogue that has become such an essential part of shaping and conducting international affairs.

If diplomacy can be transformed and re-crafted in the ways I have indicated, diplomacy will be more important than ever in the management of international relations, a vital force indeed, and definitely not a dinosaur.

I thank you for your attention.