Sited diplomacy

Book section

Sited Diplomacy

pp. 79-92 in Jason Dittmer and Fiona MacConnell (eds) Dipomatic Cultures and InternationalPolitics: Translations, Spaces, Alternatives London: Routledge, 2016.

Iver B. Neumann

Globalisation reconfigures the sites of diplomacy.[1] Old sites take on new characteristics and new sites emerge. A focus on sites may demonstrate how diplomacy, far from remaining the privileged reserve of specialists, is now also imbricated in a number of other practices. These practices come in packages. The concept of site is important because it pinpoints how these packages have spatiality. A site may be physical or virtual, but in both cases, it is where diplomacy actually takes place, and where it can be captured analytically. The negotiation table and the permanent representation abroad remain important, but diplomacy has also cascaded onto a number of new sites. The human experience has an irreducible but variable spatial dimension. It follows that any social institution, and diplomacy is one such, should also be studied in terms of that dimension.

I try to capture the importance of sites to diplomacy by following George Marcus's (1998, back cover) call for social scientists to 'study culture by exploring connections, parallels, and contrasts among a variety of often seemingly incommensurate sites'. When somebody says space, time is never far off. There is a sizeable literature about how globalization changes space/time relations. Jameson's (1991) argument to the effect that postmodernity tends to gather pastiches of stuff

[1] I draw on Neumann 2013 throughout.

from different times in the same space and Baudrillard's (1991) argument that space is being relativized by simulacra have been amongst the most influential. While these themes are clearly relevant for diplomacy, I will not focus on that aspect here. Temporality is in play – there is a lot in this chapter on how we ended up where we are – but the focus is on spatiality. I am inspired not only by the literature on how globalization rearranges the importance of space to politics, but also by recent developments within archaeology, where temporal analyses of palaeoanthropology are increasingly supplemented by spatial analysis (for example, Smith 2003). Humans turn space into place, and place into sites. As a non-geographer, my definitions of these terms are not terribly sophisticated: By space I mean what Kant meant, by place I mean a slice of territory and by site, which will receive more elaboration below, I mean the more or less planned setting for some socially significant event.

Diplomacy is usually, and usefully, studied from the inside and out. Scholars have looked at the emergent history of European diplomacy (Anderson 1993, Hamilton & Langhorne 1995, Jonsson & Hall 2005, Andersen & Neumann 2012), at other diplomatic systems (Cohen & Westbrook 2000, Jones 1999, Franklin & Shepard 1992, Jennings 1985), and at the theory of diplomacy () (Der Derian 1987, Constantinou 1996, Sharp 2009, Pouliot 2010); they have studied different diplomatic institutions and actors (Sharp & Wiseman 2007, Melissen 1999, Cooper 2008); and they have reported on what it is like to be a diplomat (Nicolson 1963, Murray 2006, Ross 2007, Neumann 2012a). Recently, scholars have also begun to look at the organisational space of diplomacy, by drawing on spatial metaphors such as the interstitial (Special issue of *West European Politics* 2006; Batora 2013) and on the concept of venue, understood as 'the institutional setting in which an official

diplomatic encounter occurs' (Coleman 2013: 167).[2] What they have not done much, however, is ask how diplomacy may simply be understood as that part of everyday social life that goes into dealing with representatives of other polities (but see Cooper, Hocking & Maley 2008). We should enquire about how diplomacy plays itself out as an aspect of, even a function of, social life. That may be religious life, as is the case where founding myths of diplomacy are concerned, it may be life at a king's castle, it may even be life in front of the television screen. Ten years ago, I wrote an article on *Star Trek* (Neumann 2002), and everybody just thought I was having fun. Almost nobody within the discipline of International Relations took seriously my claim that media representations of diplomacy are constitutive of how diplomacy is understood.[3] Even fewer – in fact, to my knowledge, nobody – took up my call to study the site of popular culture in order to gain a broader understanding of diplomacy.

Be that as it may, whatever the site, the point is to tease out how the ever-increasing density of global life keeps changing the old, familiar diplomatic sites and creating new ones by bringing in agents, bringing on new procedures and dismantling old ones (comp. Constantinou and Der Derian 2010: 6).

The three major tasks of diplomacy remain information gathering, negotiation and communication of one's position (Wight 1977: 115-117). To the degree that contemporary diplomacy is new, it is not because of diplomacy's internal dynamics. Neither is it due to the emergence of new core tasks. Newness stems from change in the general political and social fields that surround diplomacy. Sites are, as it were, one place to capture and specify that newness.

[2] The thrust behind using venue to denote something more than 'merely a physical/geographical location' (Coleman 2013: 167) parallels the place into site move discussed below.
[3] For a contrasting example from Geography, see Dittmer 2010.

Sites

In Latin, both *locus* (compare Gr. *topos*) and *situs* denote place, but the meaning of *situs* is tilted towards a place where something happens. When archaeologists talk about an object being *in situ,* they mean that it sits where it was found and, presumably, once used. One of the meanings of site listed in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* is 'place where some activity is or has been conducted'. Typically, a site is local, in the sense that it is a type of place that is, if not ubiquitous, then at least widespread, and that is designated for some specific kind of activity. The campfire and the restaurant are sites for deliberation, whereas the latrine and the bathroom are sites for waste disposal. These are everyday sites for everyday activities.

Typical diplomatic sites would be government offices and negotiation tables. These are the places where we would expect the activities of politics and diplomacy to 'take place', as we say. When it happens elsewhere, it may strike us as being 'out of place'. It seems quaint that the summit between Alexander and Napoleon in 1807, which led to the treaties of Tilsit, took place on a raft at the Neman river. It seems offensive that Lyndon B. Johnson sometimes addressed his interlocutors from a toilet seat, while using that site for its designated function, and of course that was the whole and intimidating point where Johnson was concerned. Matter out of place has an upsetting effect on the social (Douglas 1966, Cresswell 1996).

Immediate physical surroundings are not dead settings for social life. They emerge as the results of human activities, and how we understand them is a result of human negotiation. To use British social anthropologist Tim Ingold's (2000) term, they are the result of human dwelling. As Ingold (1993:154) writes about landscapes,

‘neither is the landscape identical to nature, nor is it on the side of humanity against nature. As the familiar terrain of our dwelling, it is with us, not against us, but it is no less real for that. And through living in it, the landscape becomes a part of us, just as we are a part of it’. In the same article, Ingold suggests we use ‘taskscape’ about an array of related activities. When these activities converge on one place, why not simply call them evented sites?

When we negotiate our surroundings, we do so for a reason. The science of the spatial, geography, arose as a result of Greek military needs to know the terrain for battle; it grew out of specific social requirements. The Western idea that space is empty, in the sense that it is not animated, was hatched by Euclid and resuscitated during the early renaissance (Lefebvre [1974] 1991). Geographers talk about such processes as making place out of space (Keith & Pile 1993). By the same token, Marc Augé (1992, see also Salter 2007) has suggested the term ‘non-places’ for generic public spaces like airports and highways. When events play out in such non-places, and in doing so make them sites, we are typically talking about unplanned or secretly planned events, like a car crash or the 1976 hostage-rescuing at Entebbe airport in Uganda.

Making place out of space is important for politics, since these negotiations quite literally furnish the foundations for social and political life. The vertical topography of power may serve as an example. The idea that the state is ‘above’ society is a cover-all for questions that are to do with scale, generality, hierarchy and distance from nature, and it spawns an everyday understanding of the state as existing on a higher level from which it may legitimately run our lives (Ferguson 2006: 92). It stands to reason that such a representation of the state facilitates diplomatic work. This fact notwithstanding, I think we should background the long-term and somewhat

abstract processes that turn space into place, and foreground the more concrete processes that turn social place into diplomatic site. This move, I think crucially, also brackets the state and diplomacy as being 'up there', for it identifies a certain group of state personnel and turns the scholarly focus not 'upwards', but horizontally, onto what they do every day, on the same level at which we live out our lives, namely the social one. A raft, which is a perfectly ordinary everyday space for waterway transport of goods, may become the site for momentous diplomacy. With the advent of air travel, summit diplomacy mushroomed, and the creation of unusual sites for diplomacy became a growth industry. Take the seemingly impromptu informal meal, one early example of which would be Dwight Eisenhower treating Nikita Khrushchev to a hot-dog in Coon Rapids, Iowa during his 1959 tour. 'Khrushchev was reportedly overwhelmed: 'Upon eating his first American hot dog Khrushchev's review was glowing: "We have beaten you to the moon, but you have beaten us in sausage making."' (Khrushchev 2011). Or take former Norwegian Foreign Minister Thorvald Stoltenberg's systematic use of breakfasts at his home as a way of getting on a one-on-one basis not only with opposite numbers, but also with diplomats and Norwegian citizens. I know from first hand experience how very powerful the blatant use of informality in what was still obviously a formally planned meeting could be, for Stoltenberg once invited me over. At a more orchestrated level, there is the summit. At the end of the Cold War, in 1986, a place like Reykjavik could serve as a site for a summit meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan. Indeed, it has become a regular part of summitry to site some out-of-the-way place.[4]

[4] Talking about Reykjavik, there's an obvious parallel to be drawn to the chess world here; for a popular culture example, cf. the intro song to the Andrew Lloyd Webber musical *Chess.*

A summit is by definition a meeting of politicians, though, and not of diplomats.[5] Both in the preparation of and during summits, diplomats act as sherpas and ground staff (Constantinou 2004: 31-53). This point may be generalized. Diplomatic work is about preparing the ground for others, be those others heads of states, businesspeople, guerrilla leaders, authors on speaking tours or citizens who have lost their passports. Most of what diplomats do is carried out in preparation for some event. Events depend on their sites. The site shapes the event and the event shapes the site. Creating and maintaining sites is, therefore, at the very heart of diplomatic work.

Creating and maintaining sites is mundane and everyday stuff. Infrastructure must be overhauled; transport, sleeping quarters, restrooms. Food and drink must be at hand. Places for what diplomats call bilaterals (conversations *à deux*) and for fringe meetings must be available. Comings and goings must be regulated. Security must be in place. Diplomatic practice is imbricated in general social life.

Social life is conflictual. Diplomats do not have the ground to themselves. Different groups will, in various ways and in various degrees, attempt to access and shape diplomatic sites. The media, the military, the businessmen, the opposition, the activists, they all have stakes in the work of the diplomats. Diplomatic sites are, therefore, always contested. Contestation takes two forms. There are, first, the concrete attempts at shaping sites. To take but one example, when diplomats mediate civil conflicts, one of the most important contributions that they make is to create sites where the two parties may meet. From a state's point of view, and particularly from a military one, these sites must lend themselves to maximum control. Guerrilla

[5] In the literature, the two tend to be mixed up. For example, Henry Kissinger (1994) titled a book *Diplomacy*, although it was actually all about interaction between statesmen. For a discussion of this point, see Clinton 2011.

participants may think differently; the less security, the better the escape routes. For the media, who are always on the lookout for such sites, the more security the better, for it makes the site easier to find. The parties involved may, or may not, be tempted to publicise what is going on, and this will shape their view of what site to choose. And so on, and so forth. In the case of diplomatic peace and reconciliation work, the job of the diplomat is, as always, to mediate between the different actors involved. From the diplomat's point of view, what is at stake is how to lay out the site so that it is optimal for others to use.

The diplomats' own concrete attempts at shaping sites are not the only kind of activity that shapes the phenomenon of diplomacy. Diplomacy is an activity, but it is also a socially produced fact; that is, a phenomenon that we all represent to ourselves and others as being like this or that. What diplomacy is like as a social fact – for example, whether it is seen as a cause of a world war, which was one way of seeing it after the First World War, or whether it is seen as our best hope against world war – sets parameters for activities that diplomats can do, with what ease and at what cost. It goes for all professions, and very much for diplomats, that the more recognized their expertise, the easier it is for them to beat off the competition and get things done their way. A thought that lies close to hand is that diplomats are measured according to their activities, which means that diplomacy as a social fact would be shaped first and foremost by how the media represent diplomats and diplomacy. This seems eminently reasonable. However, news coverage is hardly alone in shaping what diplomacy, or any other phenomenon for that matter, is seen to be. There is also the question of how diplomats are represented elsewhere; in school textbooks, in literature, on TV. These sites may be naturalistic representations of physical sites, they may be what Michel

Foucault (1967) has called heterotopias – utopian sites for fantastical interaction – or they may be places where the physical and the virtual mix – or what Fredric Jameson (1991) calls hyperspatial sites. To take *Star Trek* as an example yet again, it began as a virtual site, and it sports a number of heterotopias (typically recreation planets and space stations), but by dint of fan conventions, expert commentary, and general social reception, it seems to be perpetually emerging as a hyperspatial site.

Hyperspatial sites are physical, and virtual sites have materiality in the sense that they exist by dint of senders, cords, waves and platforms. Most of us, most of the time, are very much aware that we are on a certain site, be that a physical one or a virtual one. Beyond the physical and the virtual, however, beyond the artefact, as it were, there are imaginary landscapes (Appadurai 1996). An important aspect of diplomacy is to inculcate into the other party some kind of vision of how things could be different. This might be done as an act of deterrence, as in 1995, when the American mediators at Dayton ran a simulation of what their air power could do to Serbs, Croats and Bosnians, presumably in the event that they themselves did not sign the peace accord that the Americans put before them. It may also be done by staging an event which is so overwhelming that the guests are simply knocked out. In such cases, sites melt away in an act of sublimation. The rest of this chapter will discuss such attempts to knock one's interlocutor out, what we may call sublime diplomacy. While nothing has only one origin, a key origin of sublime diplomacy must be Byzantine diplomacy. That will be our first example. Example two is a contemporary one, and concerns how one European Ministry of Foreign Affairs plan eating sites during a state visit, with a view to knocking the visitors out.

Example one: Byzantine diplomacy

It is to the Byzantine work *Peri hupsous.* translated into English as ‘about the sublime’, or ‘on sublimity’, that we owe the concept of sublimity being about knocking people out (Russell 1965). This may be done by means of understated excellence of discourse. As the author puts it,

> In ordinary life, nothing is truly great which it is great to despise; wealth, honour, reputation, absolute power, – anything in short which has a lot of external trappings – can never seem supremely good to the wise man; because it is no small good to despise them. People who could have these advantages if they chose but disdain them out of magnanimity are admired much more than those who actually possess them (Russell 1964: 7).

In the context of diplomacy, two things stand out. First, the recommended way to do this is for language to denote and connote is a maximum number of senses. Secondly, there is the power dimension. The great and the good are the ones who have it in their power to be sublime, among other things by *not* blowing their trumpets. This will have an effect only on the educated man, however, so in order for a display to be truly sublime, we may infer that it must speak *both* to the educated man, *and* to the populace. After all, the key is the effect, and so it may be worthwhile for the individual producing the effect to debase himself by using tricks that are really below him, if that is what it takes to produce the effect among a given audience. As the author puts it, ‘When people of different training, way of life, tastes, age and manners all agree about something, the judgement and assent, as it were, of so many distinct

voices lends strength and irrefutability to the conviction that their admiration is rightly directed' (Russell 1964: 8).

These ruminations on the character of sublimity as the art of knocking people out have their direct counterparts in Byzantine diplomacy. After the fall of Rome, the key challenge to Constantinople was to maintain a set of relations between itself and sundry neighbours that embodied and so maintained its imperial status. These neighbours included the Germanic peoples, the Visigoths in Spain, the Franks and the Lombards, the Huns and the Avars, the Bulgars and the Slavs, and also the Arabs. They all lacked a key resource that Byzantium had taken over from Rome: a formalized legal structure that could shore up their claim to being an ordered political entity. As the Byzantine historian Evangelos Chrysos points out, when these peoples achieved settlements and set about forging formal political institutions, they were dependent on the Empire. The road was open for Byzantine diplomacy to draw them into a network of international and interstate relations that was controlled by the Empire. This process revolved around treaty-making, and the treaties often had a formative character for the new states (Chrysos 1989).

Chrysos postulates a three-layered process at work (Chrysos 1992). First, the new ruler was welcomed into the family of kings. Other rulers could be titled *basileus,* even *archibasileus,* and be ranked on a par with the emperor as his brother, as was the Persian shah, but the usual thing was for them to be represented as sons of the emperor. The Ethiopian negus and the Abbasid sultan demonstrated that it was possible to go from being a 'son' to being a 'brother'; this also happened in times of crisis between Persia and Byzantium. The best-known example from the West is the

presentation of the royal crown of Hungary (the crown of St Stephen) to the Hungarian King Geza overseen by Emperor Michael VII Ducas in the 1070s, making him part of the family of kings (Kazhdan 1992: 20; for a somewhat different reading, see Chrysos 1992: 37).

The second way in which Byzantine diplomacy attempted to draw new polities into their network was to try to get them to assimilate Byzantine social attitudes and values. Thirdly, and as a formalization of the second layer of the process, there were laws. In order to drive this process, the Byzantines availed themselves of a range of practices, mostly diplomatic. For example, embassies to Constantinople would often stay on for years. A member of another royal house would routinely be requested to stay on in Constantinople, not only as a potential hostage, but also as a useful pawn in case of changes in the political conditions where he came from. A key practice, however, was to overwhelm visitors by sumptuous displays. I foreshadowed this discussion in chapter two, when I discussed how bishop Liutprand of Cremona was pretty knocked out after his first visit to Constantinople in 949. During a banquet, he was treated to a luxurious meal with an entertainment of acrobatics so stunning that 'I was so bewildered that the Emperor himself noticed my amazement. He therefore summoned an interpreter and asked me which seemed to me the more wonderful' (Norwich 1991: 171).

The effect striven for and the means chosen bear a close resemblance to those Longinus recommends for the orator. The throne was placed as superior height, and it was of superior size. As noted in chapter two, the diplomatic set-piece of having barbarians standing around the throne wearing their native gear (axes held at the right

shoulder for Vikings) and holding rods and swords may be read as a way of broadcasting the vast variety of the world over which the *basileus* held sway. Special care was taken to stimulate as many of the senses as possible to the maximum. Brightly lit things to see, terrifying sounds, wafting perfumes, delicious food, silk and other materials soft to the touch. The technical means used were of necessity different, since what was doing the knocking-out was not the spoken word alone. The lions, the organs and the birds were all powered by compressed air produced by bellows (the organs were occasionally brought along on embassies as well). The body techniques of the acrobats and skills of the cooks were, of course, appropriate to their own domains, and not to that of literature. But the effect sought for, usually successfully, was indeed a knock-out one.

It could be argued that all this is too external, too base, to be subsumed under the rubric of the 'sublime'. Did not Longinus lionize the powerful man who foregoes all these things when he *could have* used them? He did, but as will be seen from Liudprand's description of attire, the Emperor made a point of varying it. He would frequently meet with foreign dignitaries, particularly upon arrival, in plain clothes, in unassuming sites like inside a tent. It would seem that the Emperor was signalling that he did not really need all the props. The awe-inspiring fact of his (sublime) being should be enough.

This element of aesthetics, that things should look a bit random rather than contrived, improvised rather than planned, and that they should be executed smoothly and not stiffly, is definitely culturally specific (there are many times and places where stiffness is valued), but it has remained a stock-in-trade of diplomacy. The diplomatic

habitus is free, not held, and the sited event is supposed to unfold as a seemingly unchoreographed whole, as opposed to a staccato slide show. The flow of the event should be such that, ideally, it engulfs the visiting diplomat in such a degree that he finds himself swept off site.

Byzantium is an early example and, when viewed in light of subsequent developments, and extreme example. That does not mean that practices akin to, even descending from, these do not survive, however. The next example, which concerns how sites are laid in order to have a sublime effect, should bear this out.

Example two: Planning the eating sites of a state visit

This example is taken from the country that I know best – Norway. During state visits, there are meals. These meals are definitely evented sites. The analytical scheme I will apply to catch them in the making is inspired by Guide Michelin, and also by the work of a group of food-oriented Swedish ethnologists. They suggest that the meal be analysed along five different axes, which they, somewhat clinically, refer to as room, meeting, product, atmosphere and management control system. Guide Michelin assesses the meal from the point of view of the guest, understood as an audience. In light of this it makes sense to follow the temporality of the eater. As scholars of diplomacy, however, we want to assess the diplomatic meal from two points of view: that of the performer, and that of the audience. Consequently, I start with the planning, where the general management system is in full flow. What characterises the diplomatic meal is a meeting between classificatory strangers, who

are also representatives of their respective polities. That leaves four aspects, which I will discuss under the headings planning, setting, food and drink, and atmosphere.

Planning

Planners of the meals prepare for state visits over a period of six months. First, a cultural entertainment feature is arranged, chosen to exemplify cooperation and exchange between the two states. For lunch, the dress code is always formal, which in this case means dark suit. The first thing that has to be done is to book the entertainment, for atmosphere. For example, Oslo Camrata and Celio de Carvalho played Grieg and de Abreu during the visit of Brazilian President Lula da Silva in September 2007. European Song Contest winner for Norway Aleksander Rybak, who is Belarussian born and Russian speaking, played during President Medvedev's state visit in April 2010. Akershus Castle, which is the regular setting for state lunches in the capital, is informed, and a caterer is booked. A service corps of 40 to 50 people will be needed, so the caterer is likely to be one of the three largest hotels in the capital. The team will consist of wardrobe attendants, kitchen staff, dish-washers, waiters and housekeepers. They wash the chinaware in advance, polish the candelabras, and later clean the tables and throw away the left-overs.

About three months before the event is to take place, suggestions are received for the invitation lists from the MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] units involved. At this stage, the menu is also discussed: the MFA specialist on visits by heads and other representatives of statesits down with the banqueting chief and perhaps also the hotel's manager and the head chef. They eat and drink, sampling two or three different wines for each course.

Invitation cards have to be printed and sent out, and finally, on the day before the event, the seating of the guests has to be decided. Rules of precedence have been established for internal use, but as the ritual specialist in the Norwegian MFA emphasised in an interview that 'We have to arrange the seating of the guests so that people get the chance to talk to each other. A meal is a great place to meet people. Table arrangements can be time-consuming and difficult, but the rules of precedence are guidelines, not a straitjacket.' In other words, improvisation is expected.

Setting

There are three principal settings for diplomatic meals offered by a host country. The most formal one is the residence of the head of state, in our case the palace of the King of Norway. Note that this is not *strictu sensu* a diplomatic setting, since it is the King and his interlocutor, and not their representatives, who preside. Note also, however, that it is the Lord Chamberlain who extends invitations and bids the guests welcome. Then follows special lodgings, either the head of state's own guest house – in Norway, 45 Parkveien, in the U.S., Blair House or eating facilities – in Denmark, Pakhuset. The most humble setting is a restaurant or some other rented facility. As for field-working diplomats, they have the choice between their own embassy or residences, and the capital's restaurants.

Food & Drink

Then there is food and drink. There seem to be three main strategies here. First, there is the one exemplified by the French, the Italian and the Chinese, which is that 'we

define world cuisine'. Secondly, there are most others, who settle for 'we master world cuisine'. Then there is the third strategy, of which certain small countries like Norway are exponents, which is that 'we do not care about the world cuisine if it is different from our own'. Some diplomatic cooks have indeed defined world cuisine, putting their permanent mark on the history of gastronomy. Chateaubriand – a thick cut of beef tenderloin, served with a white wine sauce – is named after Napoleon's ambassador to St. Petersburg, and it was the ambassador's chef, Montmireil, who invented it.

Atmosphere

There's the décor. There's the music. Ever since the U.S. elected a president who was too short to be taken notice of when he entered his own parties, 'Hail to the Chief' has been played at the White House to mark the appearance of the President at state dinners. String quartets seem ubiquitous. Then there is the welcome. Shaking hands is one of the many practices that mark global diplomacy's principally European origins. At Norwegian state dinners, one queues up to shake hands with the royal family. The handshake should be firm. In South East Asia, though, a firm handshake is out of place. It may even come across as a signal of sexual interest, and that is something better avoided at official dinners, at least at its commencement. Conservative male Muslims want to avoid shaking hands with women. Should this be heeded, or should it not? When the Japanese Emperor hosts, foreign subjects shake his hand, while his own straighten their arms, grab their lower thigh and bow. Shaking the emperor's hand would be out of the question. Then there's the curtsy. Should women ambassadors curtsy to male heads of state, which would be the general thing for a

woman to do, or would that be jeopardizing the representational logic, which dictates that, as her own King's representative, she should be careful with showing deference? Famously, when Britain sent the Macartney Embassy to the Chinese emperor in 1793 and Macartney refused to kowtow, the mission failed. Diplomatic culture has become more dense since then, and the parties know too much about one another for such abject failure to repeat itself, but the problematique of how to calibrate reverence in greetings is still very much alive.

Then there's the placement at table, already mentioned. At large formal affairs, things may be difficult. A friend once told me how the Italian ambassador reacted when he found out that he had been wrongly placed among the NATO delegation in Brussels in the mid-1980s. He stood up, broke his plate in two, and left the building. There's the entertainment. When the Romanian President made his entry at the state dinner in his honour in November 2007, the King's musicians played an entry march by the name of 'Entry of the Boyars'. It was written by Norwegian composer Johan Halvorsen in 1893 as a gesture towards Moldovan and Wallachian boyars, upon his being offered the job as Royal Master of Concert in Bucharest, and made for a nice conversation piece.[6]

There is the welcome speech. There is the return speech. There are the toasts. There is the naming of the food on the menu cards – Greek salad or Turkish? In the Balkans, should coffee be *kava* or *kofe*? In Britain, there is the after dinner speech. In Norway, a similar peculiarity is the thank-you-for-the-food speech. One ambassador's wife, posted to Norway in the 1960s, was famous for wreaking havoc in her own parties. According to diplomatic custom, she would have her table mate on her left. According to Norwegian custom, however, she would have him on her right. Not least

[6] I thank Vebjørn Dysvik for bringing this to my attention in an e-mail dated 10 April 2012.

since the hostess's table mate is also the guest of honour, the placement is a coveted one. In Norway, the hostess's table mate is supposed to deliver a short speech at the end of the meal, and so this perfidious hostess often placed a non-Norwegian diplomat on her left, and a Norwegian – preferably a non-diplomat who would assume that the table placement was according to Norwegian standards or would not even consider an alternative -- on her right. On more occasions than one, she would have both men stand up and fight about her.

Conclusion

Diplomacy is an everyday activity which has been an aspect of social life wherever there have been distinct political entities. Important as they are for international relations, few would argue that globalization should make such an ingrained phenomenon defunct. That said, it cannot fail to have a transformative effect on diplomacy, understood as a social fact. One example of this that is already tangible is the way in which the U.S.-led trend toward more informality and low-context diplomacy is being met with increasing resistance from China in particular. Whether this means a return to a more tightly circumscribed number of diplomatic sites remains to be seen. As of now, the number, and also kinds, of sites where diplomacy plays itself out seems to be mushrooming. Diplomatic sites have an aura of power about them. That aura should not, however, be allowed to blind diplomatic scholars to a key, and often overlooked, fact about diplomacy, which is that it is imbricated in a rapidly changing social life, with its sited events emanating from routinized, quotidian, hard work. Studying the sited nature of diplomacy is a methodological high

road in this regard. If we overlook how diplomatic events are made, we will forever be chasing their afterglow, instead of understanding them in their sociability.

Bibliography

Andersen, Morten Skumsrud & Iver B. Neumann (2012) 'Practices as Models: A Methodology with an Illustration Concerning Wampum Diplomacy'. *Millennium,* 40 (3): 457-481.

Anderson, Matthew Smith. *The Rise of Modern Diplomacy 1450–1919*. London: Longman, 1993.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Modernity.* London and Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Armilla, José. *Negotiate with Feng Shui: Enhance Your Skills in Diplomacy, Business and Relationships.* St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn, 2001.

Augé, Marc. *Non-Lieux. Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité.* Paris: Seuil, 1992.

Bátora, Jozef. 'The "Mitrailleuse Effect": The EEAS as an Interstitial Organization and the Dynamics of Innovation in Diplomacy *Journal of Common Market Studies,* forthcoming

Baudrillard, Jean. *La guerre du golfe n'a pas eu lieu*. Paris: Galilée, 1991.

----. *Symbolic Exchange and Death.* London: Sage, (1976) 1973.

Bell, David & Gill Valetine (1997) *Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat* London: Routledge.Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap, (1982) 1999.

Bruun, Ole. *An Introduction to Feng Shui.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Chrysos, Evangelos. ‘Byzantine Diplomacy, A.D. 300–800: Means and End’ in Jonathan Shepard and Simon Frankling, eds. *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. Cambridge, March 1990*, pp. 25–39. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.Clinton, David. ‘The Distinction between Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in American International Thought and Practice’. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy,* 6, 3-4 (2011), pp. 262-276.

Coleman, Katharina P. ‘Locating Norm Diplomacy: Venue Change in International Norm Negotiations’ *European Journal of International Relations* 19, 1 (2013), pp. 163-186.

Cohen, Raymond, and Richard Westbrook, eds. *Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Constantinou, Costas M. *On the Way to Diplomacy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Constantinou, Costas M.. *States of Political Discourse. Words, Regimes, Seditions.* London: Routledge, 2004.

Constantinou, Costas and James Der Derian, eds. *Sustainable Diplomacies.* Houndmills: Palgrave, 2010.

Cresswell, Tim. (1996) *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Der Derian, James. *On Diplomacy. A Genealogy of Western Estrangement.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.

Dittmer, Jason (2010) *Popular Culture and Geopolitics: Popular Culture, Geopolitics, and Identity.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ferguson, James. *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.

Franklin, Simon & Jonathan Shepard, eds. *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.

Foucault, Michel. 'Des espaces autres', available at:{http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.fr.html} accessed 18 April 2012}, first published 1967.

Hamilton, Keith and Richard Langhorne. *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Ingold, Tim. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Ingold, Tim. 'The Temporality of the Landscape' *World Archaeology*, 25, 2 (1993), pp. 152-174.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Cultural Turn*. London: Verso Press, 1998.

Jönsson, Christer and Martin Hall. *Essence of Diplomacy.* London: Palgrave, 2005.

Jennings, Francis. *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1985.

Jones, C.P. *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Kazhdan, Alexander. 'The Notion of Byzantine Diplomacy' in Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard, eds. *Byzantine Diplomacy Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. Cambridge, March 1990,* pp. 3–21. Aldershot: Variorum, 1992.

Keith, Michael and Steve Pile, eds. Place and the Politics of Identity. London: Routledge, 1993.

Khrushchev, Nikita (1959) 2011. http://www.coldwar.org/museum/documents/Face-to-FacewiththeRedMenaceOppositiontothe1959KhrushchevVisit.htm#_edn5, accessed 23 November 2011.

Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy.* New York: Simon & Shuster, 1994.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Oxford: Blackwell, (1974) 1991.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *Peregrinations. Law, Form, Event.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Marcus, George E. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Neumann, Iver B. *Diplomatic Sites: A Critical Enquiry* London: Hurst, 2013.

Norwich, John Julius. *Byzantium. The Apogee.* London: Viking, 1991.

Nicolson, Harold. *Diplomacy,* third ed. London: Oxford University Press, [1939] 1963.

Pouliot, Vincent. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO–Russia Diplomacy.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Ross, Carne. *Independent Diplomat. Dispatches from an Unaccountable Elite*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Russell, D.A. 'Introduction' in Longinus *Peri hupsus* [On the Sublime], pp. ix–l, Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.

Salter, Mark B. 'Governmentalities of an Airport: Heterotopia and Confession", *International Political Sociology,* 1, (2007) 1, pp. 49-67.

Shapiro, Michael J. *The Politics of Representation. Writing Practices in Biography,*

Photography, and Policy Analysis. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Sharp, Paul. *Diplomatic Theory of International Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Smith, Adam T. *The Political Landscape: Constellations of Authority in Early Complex Polities.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.

Watson, Adam. *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States*. London: Methuen, [1982] 1984.

END

Bionote

Iver B. Neumann (b. 1959), D. Phil. (Oxon, Politics 1992), Dr. Philos. (Oslo, Social Anthropology, 2009) is Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and has a career-spanning affiliation with the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. Among his fifteen books are *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside A European Foreign Ministry* (Cornell University Press, 2012).

Diplomatic Cultures
Author queries – Chapter 4

Queries on your chapter are listed below. There is also a copy of the original chapter file supplied as a PDF – this shows the queries marked as Comments and is for ease of reference only. Please add your responses to the query list – there is no need to mark them on the PDF as well. For the items at the end not in the box, it would be helpful if you could use a different colour to show your responses.

If other changes need to be made to as a result of a response (for example, a spelling being made consistent), I will make the necessary changes throughout the chapter.

Page	Text	Query	Author response

1 Jameson's (1991) Only 1998 in References 1998 IS CORRECT, PLEASE CHANGE
2 Smith 2003 Only 1993 in References 2003 IS CORRECT, PLEASE CHANGE
2 Sharp and Wiseman 2007 Not in References – please provide full info Paul Sharp & Geoffrey Wiseman (eds.) The Diplomatic Corps as an Institution of International Society Harmondsworth: Palgrave, 2007

2 Melissen 1999 Not in References – please provide full info Jan Melissen (ed.) Innovation in Diplomatic Practice. New York: Palgrave, 1999
2 Cooper 2008 Not in References – please provide full info Andrew F. Cooper Celebrity Diplomacy Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
2 Murray 2006 Not in References – please provide full info Murray, Craig (2006). Murder in Samarkand. London: Mainstream.
2 Neumann 2012a Not in References – please provide full info Should not be 2012a, but 2012: At Home with the Diplomats. Inside A European Foreign Ministry Cornell University Press, 2012.
2 Special issue of West European Politics 2006 Not in References – please provide full info West European Politics, vol. 32, n. 2, 2006
2 Batora 2013 Only 2013 in References Jozef Bátora 'The "Mitrailleuse Effect": The EEAS as an Interstitial Organization and the Dynamics of Innovation in Diplomacy' Journal of Common Market Studies Volume 51, Issue 4, pp. 598–613, 2013

2 Cooper, Hocking and Maley 2008 Not in References – please provide full info Andrew F. Cooper, Brian Hocking & William Maley (eds.) Global Governance and Diplomacy London: Palgrave, 2008.
3 Neumann 2002 Not in References – please provide full info "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy" Millennium 32 (3): 627-652
3 Wight 1977 Not in References – please provide full info Martin Wight Systems of States Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977
4 Douglas 1966 Not in References – please provide full info Mary Douglas Purity and danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo New York: Praeger, 1966.
8 The diplomats' own concrete attempts at shaping sites are not the only kind of activity To here OK
8 Fredric Jameson (1991) Only 1991 in References Please change to: 1998 (there is only one jameson ref in ms)
20 Baudrillard, J. (1976[1973]) La guerre du golfe n'a pas eu lieu. Paris: Galilée, 1991.
----. Symbolic Exchange and Death. London: Sage.
Confirm date of second entry is 1991 NO No, the year of original pulication of Symbolic Exchange and Death is 1973 and publ of English-language ed 1996. The year of publ for the French title is 1991. Please change accordingly.

References
The Reference section at the end of each chapter should only contain the works cited in the chapter (so that they are Reference sections, rather than Bibliographies). The following items appear in the Reference section but not in the text. Please indicate for each if it should be deleted from the References or if an in-text citation should be added (and please state where).

Armilla, J. (2001). Negotiate with Feng Shui: Enhance Your Skills in Diplomacy, Business and Relationships. St. Paul, MN: Llewellyn.

Bátora, J. (forthcoming) The “Mitrailleuse Effect”: The EEAS as an Interstitial Organization and the Dynamics of Innovation in Diplomacy, Journal of Common Market Studies
Baudrillard, J. (1976[1973]) La guerre du golfe n'a pas eu lieu. Paris: Galilée, 1991.
Bell, D. & Valetine, G. (1997) Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat London: Routledge.
Benjamin, W. (1999[1982]). The Arcades Project. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
Bruun, O. (2008) An Introduction to Feng Shui. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cohen, R.& Westbrook, R. (eds.) (2000) Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Jameson, F. (1998) The Cultural Turn. London: Verso Press.
Lyotard, J-L. (1988). Peregrinations. Law, Form, Event. New York: Columbia University Press.
Shapiro, M. J. (1988) The Politics of Representation. Writing Practices in Biography, Photography, and Policy Analysis. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Smith, A. T. (1993) The Political Landscape: Constellations of Authority in Early Complex Polities. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Watson, A. (1984[1982]) Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States. London: Methuen.

NOTED! SOME OF THESE SHOULD BE RETAINED WITH THE YEAR CHANGED (SEE ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QS), THE OTHERS SHOULD BE DELETED.

THANK YOUR FOR YOUR GOOD WORK, BEST WISHES,
IVER