How do Ambassadors play games of Diplomacy?

Ambassadors, Signalling and Renaissance Italy

By The Keyboard Diplomat

Introduction

Diplomacy is definable as “the management of international relations by negotiation; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist (Nicolson, 1963, p15).” At the heart of it, then, lies people. Diplomatic agents are responsible for the execution and very existence of diplomacy. It is not state visits that constitute the bulk of a relationship between states but the daily round of meetings and events between national representatives where most business is conducted (Cohen, 1987, p158). The everyday activities of such national representatives must therefore be understood if we are to fully understand diplomacy. But who are these national representatives? In the vast majority of cases, it is the same, highly skilled and often charismatic diplomatic agent who takes on such tasks: the resident ambassador. *A Dictionary of Diplomacy* (Berridge and James, 2001) describes him as “a diplomatic agent of the highest rank… In most cases… the head of a diplomatic mission to a foreign state” (p8). He not only manages international relations by negotiation, but he personifies those relations, embodying the qualities and culture of his state in a way required of no other actor (Rana, 2005) and playing a vital role in diplomacy through his frontline presence in foreign capitals (p23). The term ambassador, however, is also used to designate permanent representatives to some international organisations such as the United Nations. However, since most diplomacy is conducted via bilateral missions (Berridge and James, 2001), this paper will exclude such actors when employing the term. In addition, heads of missions between Commonwealth countries are referred to as ‘high commissioners’ rather than ambassadors, but for simpler reading, this paper will include such agents in the term ‘ambassador’. All in all, “the ambassador is the personification of international relations between states” (Rana, 2005, p23) and as such, he is a central, if not *the* central figure in diplomacy.

This has been recognised by numerous theorists in the literature on diplomatic studies (including Wicquefort (1690) and Callieres (1716)). However, analysis, instead of surrounding the ambassador's everyday activities and what they achieve, has largely focused on the qualities of the archetypal ambassador, the legalities of his role (Behrens, 1936) and the context in which he is operating (e.g. Machiavelli and Kissinger (Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte, 2002)). There is a clear gap in the literature for investigations into the ambassador's preoccupations. Having said that, there is a relatively new, underdeveloped research area of diplomatic studies, known as 'diplomatic signalling' (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999; Cohen, 1987; Jonsson, 2016), which confronts practice and daily activities more directly. Diplomatic signalling defines diplomacy as a communication forum between governments in which dialogue is a system of signals founded on a code shared by actors in the diplomatic profession (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999). Signals are those media through which verbal and non-verbal acts of communication are translated into messages via a process of interpretation of the act by the receiver. A diplomatic agent will perform a communicative act, say, inviting his foreign counterpart to an impressive venue, and through this will give off signals, such as to imply the prestige and power of his nation. What message is received is down to interpretation (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999). Diplomatic signalling as a research area has dissected various communicative acts, some of which exemplify an everyday ambassadorial activity. These include attending or boycotting events (Cohen, 1987) such as games and leisure activities (Arcangeli, 2017), performing symbolic rituals in meetings or ceremonies (Faizullaev, 2013) and exploiting language to portray virtues and manipulate perceptions (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999; Cohen, 1987; Maxson, 2017) among others. However, diplomatic signalling theorists have not ascertained the unique signalling of the ambassador. Instead they have tended to either focus on the signalling of statesmen (Cohen, 1987) or signalling adopted by a variety of diplomatic agents (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999). Since the ambassador and his activities are central to diplomacy and diplomatic signalling accounts for the bulk of diplomatic activity (characterised in communicative terms), it would be suitable to investigate how the ambassador signals in order to better understand such a nuanced and highly complex art: the art of diplomacy (Callieres, 1716). This will be the pursuit of this paper.

By pursuing this question, having identified the immense importance of the activities of the ambassador to diplomacy, this paper seeks to contribute to a clearer understanding of the role of diplomacy in the 21st century at a time where fast paced technological change and globalisation has left many disillusioned and concerned about what, if anything, diplomacy can achieve (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2015). The world is in a of

rapid state of flux. The nature of diplomatic practice is changing, with shifts in the context and domain of the trade and new actors and tools appearing. This is largely due to the changing nature and diminishing relevance of the state (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2015) as well as the speed at which information now travels across the world (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999). Some theorists, such as Der Derian (1987) have called for more ideas to be derived from history to help diplomats understand how to approach drastic global change but, on the whole, diplomatic studies in the 21st century has concerned itself with finding ways to completely restructure diplomatic practice in order to meet the demands of the new era (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2015). This paper will counter this trend by drawing on the golden age of modern diplomatic practice - the Italian Renaissance (Azzolini and Lazzarini, 2017) - and applying it to the contemporary world. In doing so it will re-envision diplomacy as a resilient and timeless method of managing international relations with one transcendent individual at its core; the ambassador.

Methods

The investigative method employed is case study methodology. A case study is a research technique which attempts to observe an idea within a real-life context (Yin, 1981). A case might be an individual, a group, an institution or perhaps a community and can be studied individually, also known as ‘within-case analysis’, or comparatively, also known as ‘cross-case analysis’. Case studies may be carried out with either qualitative evidence, quantitative evidence (Vietorisz and Harrison, 1970), or a mixture of the two (Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein, 1971). Although both types are useful for explaining a phenomenon, in certain circumstances, one may be more relevant than the other. Qualitative methods boast a number of advantages. They allow researchers to carry out investigations where statistics and experiments may not suffice; they do not rely of rigid methods; they acknowledge the nuances and complexities that exist beyond the scope of statistics and they go beyond such empirical findings to see the informal reality of the context (Gillham, 2000). This paper will utilise qualitative methods, boasting these advantages, since it is the most useful for studying the nuances of diplomatic activity; experiments and statistics would not suffice. Cross-case analysis between the signalling of ambassadors in Renaissance Italy and that of contemporary ambassadors will be employed to illuminate the ambassador as a

timeless and geographically unspecific entity within diplomacy. Renaissance Italy is particularly applicable to these investigations for a number of reasons.

The European Renaissance was a period of major social, cultural and political change that marked the transition from the Medieval to the Modern Europe (Fletcher, 2015). It began in Italy in the fourteenth century, where new institutions and behavioural modes formed and lasted until the seventeenth century (Fletcher, 2015). The Italian Renaissance witnessed the formation of a new style of diplomacy and is generally accepted as the birth place of the modern state (Mattingly, 1955, p55). Diplomacy in its modern style - 'permanent diplomacy' which refers to the stationing of an embassy with a resident ambassador - was the creation of Renaissance Italy (Mattingly, 1955, p55). Because of this influence, since the 1800s, the Italian Renaissance has been central to diplomatic research (Azzolini and Lazzarini, 2017, p1). In recognition of its significance to the formation of the ambassador (the central figure of our research) and in continuation of this research tradition, Renaissance Italy will be the first case with which the everyday activities of ambassadors are studied. By performing cross-case analysis, 'the ambassador' as an entity will be discerned, with potentially consistent practices being drawn between his earliest manifestation in Renaissance Italy and the contemporary ambassador. This will allow for the identification of the everyday activities of the ambassador and an understanding of what these achieve, ultimately to answer the question: how do ambassadors play games of diplomacy? First, however, these investigations must be placed within a literary context to identify how they learn from and develop that which has already been said. The relevant academic approach is diplomatic studies.

Diplomatic Studies

Diplomatic studies is an academic approach under which ideas, principles and concepts behind the (normally) official channels of communication by members within a system of states are examined (Sharp, 2002). It has been a concern for several esteemed political philosophers, including Niccolo Machiavelli, Hugo Grotius and Francois de Callieres to name a few (Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte, 2002). Under diplomatic studies, a

wide range of practical and conceptual issues have been analysed to produce a body of work with immense scope and diverse projects (Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte, 2002). However, in general it can be organised into two main approaches: agent-centred studies and context centred studies. This chapter will review the literature in diplomatic studies chronologically, exploring how these approaches were adopted by different writers and examine the extent to which diplomatic studies, in total, has addressed the everyday activities of the ambassador and what they achieve.

Arguably the most influential political philosopher in diplomatic studies was Niccolo Machiavelli (Nicolson, 1963). A late 15th century political advisor and diplomat, Machiavelli contributed two major works to the development of this academic approach: *The Prince* (Machiavelli and Bondanella, 2008) and *The Discourses* (Black, 2013). He argued that a good politician is not one who incorporates core Christian values of mercy, tolerance and benevolence into his work, but one who knows how to enrich, defend and bring honour to the state (Black, 2013). For Machiavelli, the state was the central feature of political writing. Thus, his approach was largely context-centred. His primary intention was to warn against the danger of a weak government. Famously claiming that "it is… better to be feared than to be loved, if one cannot be both" (Machiavelli and Bondanella, 2008, pxxxv), Machiavelli, argued that a politician should make judicious use of what he termed "virtu" (Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte, 2002). This concept encompasses desirable qualities, including strength, courage, wisdom, strategy and sometimes ruthlessness. In addition to describing the qualities of a good politician, Machiavelli sets out practical rules for ambassadors in his 1522 letter entitled *Advice to Raffaello Girolami when he went as Ambassador to the Emperor* (Machiavelli and Gilbert, 1989), including fine details from the contents of his reports to the motions of negotiation. However, on the whole, he demonstrated more interest in military than diplomatic technique, and so the only aspect of his writing which does explicitly confront the everyday activities of ambassadors and what they achieve is this letter (Berridge and James, 2001, p153).

In the sixteenth century, diplomatic studies shifted from the Machiavellian project to an agent-centred one. It focused almost entirely on two main issues, both regarding diplomatic agents. First, the qualities of the 'perfect ambassador' and second, the legal position of this entity (Behrens, 1936). Together, these interests dominated discussions of diplomacy until the late seventeenth century. The notion of 'the perfect ambassador'

focused on his virtues, behaviours and qualities. It was completely unrelated to his duties “except insofar as these duties afforded an opportunity for the display of the virtues in question” (Mattingly, 1955). This was the case even in the writing of Grotius (1925), the leading jurist of the time, who focused more on the status of resident envoys than their activities and the practice of negotiation. The focus, then, during this period in diplomatic studies, was the ambassador; but little reference was made to his practice or everyday activities. This subject was virtually ignored (Mattingly, 1955).

During the eighteenth century, however, the analytical focus of diplomatic studies shifted back to the context in which diplomatic agents operate. Described as the second phase of diplomacy by R. B. Mowat in *Diplomacy and Peace* (1936), this analytical period followed the European states system and was inaugurated by Abraham de Wicquefort in *L’Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions* (1690). With this text, Wicquefort aimed to set out the actual roles and functions of the ambassador, but after recognising the immenseness of this feat, instead settled on what he considered the less daunting task of establishing maxims similar to moral laws for ambassadorial behaviour (Callières, Keens-Soper and Schweizer, 1983). Nevertheless, with this work, Wicquefort established post-Westphalian Europe as the key to understanding diplomatic practice and asserted the primacy of French practice. In doing so, he laid the foundation for the principal proponent of this ‘second phase’ of diplomacy: Francois de Callieres (1716).

Callieres, author of the seminal *De la Maniere de Negocier avec les Souverains* (1716), asserted the significance of the political context (Westphalia) and the centrality of the ambassador. His goal was to fix attention on the character of the state system (the one he described was based on Europe) as restrictive of peaceful coexistence and cooperation, yet capable of exhibiting order since profound bonds existed between independent states because they were all part of the same civilisation. In such an environment, Callieres noted, it is crucial that the ambassador displays qualities of honesty, trustworthiness and intelligence to avoid misunderstandings and mitigate clashes. In total, Callieres proposals all derive from his belief that a more professionally designed and better equipped cadre of diplomats could improve the existing state order (Lauren, 1979). This, ‘intelligent diplomacy’ (Callières, Keens-Soper and Schweizer, 1983) mitigates discord and clashes of interest between independent states. Callieres’ discussions of the ambassador, then, similarly to sixteenth century writers, was limited to his qualities and paid little attention to

his practice or everyday activities. Callieres stressed that the practice of diplomats could achieve mitigated discord between independent states, as we have noted, but this practice was left unscrutinised.

The two central figures in diplomatic studies of the 20th century, Ernest Satow (Satow and Gore-Booth, 1979) and Harold Nicolson (1963), also viewed diplomacy as a profession requiring certain skills and qualities. Political and social contexts may change, but the elements of sound diplomacy and the benefits of training and professional practice do not. This wisdom was translated into what has effectively become the modern diplomat's practical handbook: Satow's *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (Satow and Gore-Booth, 1979). However, unlike Callieres, Satow's writing was agent-centred. Written in 1917, the book has witnessed seven editions, the most recent of which was published in 2017 for its centenary (Roberts, 2017). Since the publishing of its first edition, this seminal work has received the unique and formidable status of being one of the classics of diplomatic studies; so much so that it is now simply referred to as *Satow* (Roberts, 2017). Each edition is an updated version of the previous one in which the content reflects the new political and diplomatic context. The contents of the book are shaped to benefit the diplomat who wishes to optimise his practice. This means that, as well as providing the basic knowledge he must have, *Satow* explains what the practice of the diplomat involves. For instance, a section on 'the language and forms of diplomatic intercourse' (Satow and Gore-Booth, 1979, p38-54), outlines frequent acts of communication, such as 'Notes' written between an ambassador and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of his state and another section on 'Consular matters' (p211-216) discusses the functions and activities of consuls.

Finally, the central figure in contemporary diplomatic studies is Henry Kissinger (Berridge, Keens-Soper and Otte, 2002). His contribution has reclaimed the context-centred approach. In *Diplomacy* (1994), Kissinger addresses the problem of the US' outdated approach to foreign policy in today's world. He argues that the US must alter its foreign policy to reflect the current world order in which a strategic enemy is not as easily identifiable. Rather, with a handful of states who are equally able to influence events (as opposed to the bipartite world order of the Cold War), there are only two ways to have stability: by hegemony or equilibrium. Kissinger's main point is to emphasise that, in the world into which we are moving, with numerous superpowers as opposed to just two, the US must always act in the service of some defined national interest. Without this, it will find itself trapped in more situations which turn out to be not as worthwhile as they seemed. Throughout the book, Kissinger analyses

a number of international systems, discussing how they prospered and why they eventually collapsed. He focuses largely on the Cold War period and the contemporary world. Ultimately, then, his analytical focus is the context in which diplomacy is operating, namely, the international system. *Diplomacy* does not address the everyday practices of ambassadors and what they achieve.

In conclusion, it is clear that diplomatic studies has paid very little attention to the everyday activities of ambassadors and what they achieve. Machiavelli (Machiavelli and Gilbert, 1989), Wicquefort (1690) and Satow (Satow and Gore-Booth, 1979) made attempts to address this, however, they were minimal. Machiavelli's attempt is only to be found in a letter he wrote in 1522 and not his major works (Berridge and James, 2001, p153), Wicquefort intended to confront the roles and functions of ambassadors but this did not materialise (Callières, Keens-Soper and Schweizer, 1983) and Satow managed to directly address the practice of diplomats, illuminating some of the activities of ambassadors, but this is only a minor part of his work. Agent-centred approaches have managed to recognise the centrality of the ambassador in diplomacy, but analysis was often limited to the qualities that the 'perfect ambassador' should possess and the legalities surrounding his role as opposed to his practice (Behrens, 1936). Some context-centred approaches (such as those of Callieres (1716) and Wicquefort (1690)) have also recognised the centrality of the ambassador, but their ultimate focus is on the political context in which the ambassador is operating and hence much of their writing is centred around international relations and foreign policy (see Kissinger (1994)). It is clear, then, that there is a gap in the literature for investigation into the everyday activities of ambassadors and what these achieve.

There is, however, a recent and highly understated approach within diplomatic studies developing which investigates this. This is known as diplomatic signalling (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999). Diplomatic signalling examines practices within diplomacy, including those of the ambassador and adopts a unique analytical framework with which to do this. Through dissecting the acts of diplomatic agents (including ambassadors, foreign ministers etc) and their effects, theorists in diplomatic signalling have directly confronted the everyday activities of ambassadors and what they achieve. Therefore, the next section is dedicated to exploring this approach and examining how it may be relevant to the goal of this paper: to understand how ambassadors play games of diplomacy.

Diplomatic Signalling

Diplomatic signalling is a research area of diplomatic studies based on communication. Its analysis is built upon a conception of diplomacy that is universally recognised by its theorists: diplomacy as “a system of communication between governments” (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999, p151). Although definitions may differ, one thing is clear: diplomacy is about communication and without communication there can be no diplomacy (James, 1980; Constantinou, 1996, p25). With this in mind, theorists define diplomatic dialogue as “a system of signals, based on a code shared by the members of the profession” (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999, p151). Essentially, in order to communicate, diplomats send signals to their counterparts which convey certain messages and in order to receive these messages, interpretation of the signal must be conducted by the receiver (Jonsson, 2016). These signals may be verbal or non-verbal (Rana, 2001) which means they can be words or gestures (Jonsson, 2016) and so what diplomats do is just as weighted with messages as what they say. In fact, theorists in diplomatic signalling find that the actions of diplomats cannot avoid producing a message and that ultimately, sending signals is the core of diplomacy (Jonsson, 2016). These signals, however, are not always intentionally sent.

Although the tendency on the receiving end is to look for messages in all actions or behaviour, signalling does not imply intentionality. Yet even unintended, unconscious behaviours or non-behaviours are subjected to the intentionality assumption in a diplomatic setting (Jonsson, 2016, p80). Hence, theorists in diplomatic signalling ascribe signalling wherever a case of behaviour or non-behaviour by one actor is perceived and decoded by another. Moreover, meaning does not reside in the actual message but instead is generated by the interactive process between the sender and receiver. Messages are encoded at the sending end and decoded at the receiving end; it is with careful intuition, then, that diplomats fulfil their role (Jonsson, 2016). Nevertheless, diplomatic dialogue has rules and regulations. As a system of signals, it is based on protocol, or a shared code (p151). Protocol is a body of rules that governs diplomatic practice. It “provides a framework within which the representatives of different countries can meet in harmony” (Cohen, 1987, p142) and so permits dialogue in the presence of cultural communicative differences (Cohen, 1987, p103). From sartorial rules to dining etiquette (Foreign Service Institute, 2011), protocol governs how a diplomat should behave in any particular circumstance when engaging with his counterparts. Deviation from these rules may send positive or negative signals (Jasim, 2011,

p28). Additionally, non-protocol governed acts, such as instances in which an ambassador entertains of his own volition may also send signals (Cohen, 1987, p147). Finally, diplomatic signalling is largely symbolic. For instance, agents may symbolically perform rituals or give gifts with unique symbolic relevance (Faizullaev, 2013) and this communication can involve silence and inactivity. Diplomats are aware that whatever they say or do not say, will be decoded by their counterparts and that the foreign policy achievement to be gained from exploiting this can be major.

In sum, then, diplomacy is a communication system with numerous verbal and non-verbal behaviours and non-behaviours. The communication exists between the indiscriminate roles of sender and receiver and the dialogue that takes place is a system of signals based on a shared, often symbolic and protocol-ridden code, where acts are interpreted and messages extracted on the assumption of intentionality (Jonsson, 2016). However, diplomacy (and hence diplomatic signalling) is not unique to ambassadors. So why is this approach so crucial to this paper? To put it simply, diplomatic signalling provides diplomatic studies with a coherent analytical framework with which to understand its subject. The ambassador has been central to diplomatic studies throughout the centuries; recognition of this figure as a key diplomatic player is clear in diplomatic studies, yet the scrutinization of his practice is scant. Diplomatic signalling, despite not focusing on the ambassador, by presenting a framework in which specific acts or practices in diplomacy *are* scrutinized, is a useful tool with which such gaps in the literature may be filled. It is a tool with which we may examine the everyday practices of ambassadors and what they achieve. A case study is crucial to such explorations because, as Kishan Rana (2005) explains, “the way language and signals in diplomacy are used needs empirical study to draw conclusions on usage and improved practices” (p115). Hence, the following section will be dedicated to exploring the signalling of the earliest manifestation of the ambassador- the ambassador of Renaissance Italy. In doing so, it will draw on both the wisdom of classic diplomatic studies which identifies the ambassador as central to diplomacy and the analytical superiority of diplomatic signalling in order to develop a conceptual and analytical foundation upon which to answer the question: how do ambassadors play games of diplomacy?

How did Ambassadors Signal in Renaissance Italy?

Renaissance Italy was characterised by a collection of city-states, each with its own unique ruler- the Pope in Rome, the Sforza family in Milan, the Doge in Venice etc (Mattingly, 1955)- and this system prompted a complicated web of diplomatic practice. From the bitter struggle of Milan, Florence and Venice; to the papacy's reviving temporal power and the conflicting claims to Naples; ambassadors were perpetually preoccupied with an array of issues and acted to fulfil their three main duties: representation, negotiation and gathering information (Maxson, 2017, p42). Overall, the ambassador was to represent his state and his principal in all his honour and magnificence, and to negotiate and gather information on his behalf, aiding the advancement of his political goals (Fletcher, 2015). According to Bernard du Rosier (Hrabar, 1906), the business of the ambassador is multifarious. The reasons for sending a diplomat are numerous as are the advantages to be obtained. Reasons include "to pay honour to religion… and the imperial crown, to protect the rights of kingdoms, to offer obedience…to confirm friendships… to make peace… and remove the cause for future unpleasantness" (Mattingly, 1955, p34) among others. In attempt to achieve these objectives, everyday diplomacy was composed of a series of communicative acts (Lazzarini, 2017, p42) that signalled something to the representatives of the other state. Much of this signalling was the preoccupation of the ambassador. From the literature on diplomacy in Renaissance Italy, we can draw four main signalling tactics, or methods by which ambassadors performed signalling acts conveying messages to their counterparts: the performing of rituals, diplomatic oratory, gift-giving, and general sociability including the attendance of games and leisure activities as well as hospitality. This section will examine each of these signalling tactics in turn, exploring how they were carried out, what signals they sent and which duties (representation, negotiation or gathering formation) they served.

The first signalling tactic to be explored was the performance of rituals. A ritual, though difficult to define, can be generally understood as something that encompasses a string of formalized, institutionalized, collective and repetitive acts (Muir, 2005, p3). They reflect a set of established protocols and are guided by rules of behaviour. In diplomatic rituals, actions and objects are ordered and classified and signals sent off are received and interpreted with reference to a shared set of conventions or assumptions between the two (or more) parties (Azzolini, 2017, p151). Every aspect of the ritual, down to the finest details, could send off specific signals. For instance, even the material or colour of clothes worn by the ambassador

at times indicated role, status and hierarchy (p151). A classic example of ritualistic behaviour by an ambassador during an embassy was his participation in ceremonies within the host state; in particular, the welcoming of his embassy upon arrival. Upon arrival into the host state, ambassadors and their embassies were welcomed with a ceremonial public procession in which they were escorted into the presence of the ruler of that state (Mattingly, 1955, p37). This tradition was common throughout Renaissance Italy. The streets might be hung with garlands and banners, the procession accompanied by music and a booming cannon and the whole procession would wind up with a public stately feast (Mattingly, 1955, p38). Much of this ceremony was symbolic. In Rome it was a means for European princes to assert their power (Fletcher, 2015, p59). The ambassador signalled to his diplomatic counterparts on behalf of his principal using several techniques. He would act out his role to an audience and perform three ceremonial duties at the papal mass: carrying the pope's train, carrying the papal canopy and bringing water for the pope to wash his hands (Fletcher, 2015, p68). Such techniques, among others, were used to convey the prince's character, particularly his honour (acts demonstrating respect for the host ruler and even sycophantism were deemed honourable by an accepted social standard) and beneficence, through offering a helping hand (Fletcher, 2015, p67). Rituals, on the whole, were used largely by ambassadors throughout Renaissance Italy (Azzolini, 2017) for similar purposes. The ambassador was to embody his principal, send signals conveying his characteristics (the most important of which was honour) (Fletcher, 2015), and thereby fulfil the duty of representation. An important source on the topic of representation is the collection of five treatises by Giovanni Pontano (Roick, 2017) which discerns five crucial social virtues diplomats were to express on behalf of their principals: beneficence, liberality, splendour, magnificence and conviviality. Rituals would serve to display these.

Another signalling tactic adopted by ambassadors in Renaissance Italy was the use diplomatic oratory (O'Malley, 1979); an example of which is provided by the opening oration of a new diplomatic mission. Ambassadors, also at the occasion of meeting their host ruler, faced the task of delivering an opening oration to an audience including the host ruler (Maxson, 2017). These orations rarely addressed policy or political issues directly. Rather, they were panegyrics, aimed at praising the host ruler to convey the principal's honour and imply his intentions (Milner, 1995). The language in which these orations were delivered was crucial to the signal being sent. Choosing to speak in Latin as opposed to the vernacular, reflected acknowledgement of the host ruler's omnipotence (Maxson, 2017, p28). This rule permeated diplomatic oratory, not just opening orations. In fact, Latin eloquence was "one of the most respectable weapons of statecraft" (Mattingly, 1955, p38). With the prestige of Latin

reflecting the status of the diplomatic host, this language was reserved for only the most powerful sovereigns, including the pope, the king of Naples and the king of France. Other rulers, such as those of Venice, Florence and Milan, generally received speeches in the vernacular (Maxson, 2017, p28). The length of the speech also signalled rank and status. Ambassadors to 'minor' locations delivered short vernacular orations with some praise, whilst those to more prestigious locations (locations with a more powerful ruler) adopted more lengthy ones, in Latin, using more costumed and elaborate words and complimented the ruler profusely, particularly through the use of metaphor (Maxson, 2017, p29). The length of speeches could range from five minutes to over one hour (Maxson, 2017, p28) and, for more powerful rulers, metaphors were used to draw comparisons between past heroes and the ruler (p29). Overall, delivering an opening oration to an audience and the host ruler upon arrival into the host nation was a signalling act in which an ambassador would signal perceived rank and status, conveying messages of how the negotiating relationship or friendship was understood by the principal, and honour, by praising and hence demonstrating respect for the host ruler. In such orations, the signals sent served to fulfil the ambassadorial duty of representation, as the principal's honour was represented, but also of negotiation indirectly, as how the relationship was interpreted by that ambassador's principal was signalled by the oratorical techniques employed (Maxson, 2017, p29). However, diplomatic oratory also served directly in the actual negotiations.

In addition to representation, both rituals and diplomatic oratory were employed in negotiations. This is exemplified by the negotiating process that led Venice, Milan, Florence, Naples and the Papacy to agree to being part of the Italian League (Lazzarini, 2017, p44). This process took place over six days and was divided into two segments: interactions before the king and private interactions between ambassadors. Signals were sent in interactions before the king through ritualised seating arrangements. Ambassadors would seat themselves directly before the king as opposed to being at a distance with the chancellors and secretaries in order to signal intentions to engage in a direct and private political discussion (despite the event being public at that point) (Lazzarini, 2017, p45). Once in the private ambassadors' meeting, ambassadors employed oratorical techniques in their negotiations. The use of such techniques was so prevalent that the different goals and strategies represented by each ambassador ultimately merged into a common discourse in which each and every word contributed to some act of verbal signalling. This meant that acts of initiative or improvisation by ambassadors did not occur and the discussion amounted to a stream of verbal signals being sent and received by each ambassador, based on a shared communicative code (Lazzarini, 2017, p46). Such rigid communication was common in

negotiations in Renaissance Italy as the signalling tactic of diplomatic oratory- with use of the specific techniques mentioned in particular - was pervasive and diplomatic culture was highly ritualistic (Maxson, 2017). Sources generally point towards rituals and diplomatic oratory being used for the ambassadorial duties of representation and negotiation (Azzolini, 2017), but the uses of such tactics could, of course, be much broader (see Muir (2005) and Milner (1995)).

Another signalling tactic adopted by ambassadors in Renaissance Italy was gift-giving. Gift exchange was a common practice that was adopted by princes, who competitively exchanged extravagant gifts with one another (Hibbert, 1979) and ambassadors who would ceremonially give and receive gifts in the persona of their rulers, signalling friendship and liberality (Fletcher, 2015, p152), but most importantly honour (Fletcher, 2015). Honour is a recurrent theme in the literature on gift exchange. Alain Derville, for instance, comments that the study of gift-giving encourages the scholar to recognise the importance of honour (Derville, 1974) while Marcel Mauss claims that honour was expressed in gifts within the primitive societies he examined (Mauss and Douglas, 2001) and Natalie Zemon Davis argued that gifts given by a local seigneur in Renaissance France to his superiors served to demonstrate his honour (Davis, 2010). However, gift-giving by ambassadors could also serve to signal other, less common ends; perhaps a unique political purpose or negotiating intention. In such cases, the way in which these gifts were presented was a crucial aspect of sending off signals. The Lucca gift, for instance, was decorated with the arms of the city, those of the Holy Roman Emperor and those of Henry VIII. This decoration was symbolic and sent signals to the receiver conveying the messages that the republic valued its political alliances and wished to maintain an Anglo-Imperial alliance rather than an Anglo-French one. Giving a gift, in this case then, allowed the republic to point to its preferences – to signal interests and intentions - without directly criticising the king of England (Fletcher, 2015, p152). Gift-giving might also signal rank, depending on the gift's nature. The gift of wild fowl, for instance, had major cultural significance in Renaissance Italy. It was considered a noble food by princes and when a gift of wild fowl was presented by an ambassador, it signalled recognition of the high social standing of the receiver (Fletcher, 2015, p152). In total then, gift-giving was a fluid signalling tactic which could serve all three of the main ambassadorial duties, depending on the nature of the gift and the context in which it was given (Fletcher, 2015).

Ambassadors in Renaissance Italy also used sociability as a tool with which to signal. This aspect had two components; attending games and leisure activities (Arcangeli, 2017) and hospitality (Fletcher, 2015). The ambassador's three duties of representation, negotiation and gathering information required his presence at and sometimes participation in games and leisure activities that were part and parcel of everyday life in the host state (Arcangeli, 2017, p255). These provided opportunities for the ambassador to signal the ruler's wealth, power, skills and taste as his representative (Arcangeli, 2017, p255). Three common social activities an ambassador took part in were dancing (Nevile, 2008), jousting and hunting (Arcangeli, 2017). The second component of sociability was hospitality (Fletcher, 2015). Ambassadors would invite representatives of the host nation to their accommodation when on a mission. Through hospitality, the ambassador was to reflect the virtues of his principal, notably magnificence and splendour (Roick, 2017), fulfilling his duty of representation. Lavish hospitality, for instance through the provision of plentiful food, would reflect positively on the honour of the ambassador's principal (Fletcher, 2015, p138). An important tool used within a dinner party or event hosted by an ambassador to signal splendour and magnificence was silverware (Taylor, 2005). The importance of having "sizeable quantities of silverware" (Sicca, 2002, p186) was a subject of much documentation (Fletcher, 2015, pp.142-143). In fact, table presentation in general was important for signalling splendour and magnificence. In *De splendore*, Pontano emphasised this, commenting that Roman emperor Alexander Severus was reprimanded for his mediocre goblets and lack of gold plate (Roick, 2017). In addition to representation, signalling through socialising also served the third main ambassadorial duty: gathering information. By attending cultural or daily activities within a host state and hosting banquets or other social events for its representatives, the ambassador signalled interest in learning about that state, which served to gather information and intelligence that would then be reported back to his principal (Fletcher, 2015, p141).

In conclusion, diplomatic signalling was a daily occurrence for ambassadors, who used an array signalling techniques to communicate with their counterparts. As the chapter on diplomatic signalling explained, diplomatic dialogue is "a system of signals, based on a code shared by the members of the profession" (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999, p151). Hence, in order to communicate, these ambassadors sent signals to their counterparts which conveyed certain messages to be extracted by the receiver (Jonsson, 2016). This section has discerned four commonly used signalling tactics in Renaissance Italy: rituals, diplomatic oratory, gift-giving and sociability. Within these tactics, various communicative techniques were employed; for instance, different oratorical techniques used in diplomatic oratory to send unique signals and different ambassadorial roles

might be served. The three main ambassadorial duties being representation, negotiation and gathering information (Maxson, 2017, p42), each signalling tactic served to fulfil at least one duty. For rituals, diplomatic oratory and gift-giving it was primarily representation and negotiation whereas for sociability it was representation and information gathering.

A few disclaimers must be made, however, before this case study is applied to the research question. Firstly, it must be mentioned that these four signalling tactics were not the only ones adopted by ambassadors. Fashion, for instance, was of signalling importance to ambassadors who would often use clothing and adornment to signal political affiliation (McCall and Roberts, 2017). However, the signalling tactics discussed in this chapter are the most recorded in historical sources and signalling through material culture was generally documented as the prince's pastime (McCall and Roberts, 2017). Secondly, signals were not always as general as honour, status or rank. For representation purposes, signals were usually general, as rulers wanted to be seen in a similar light (Roick, 2017). However, in information gathering and negotiation cases, signals were often unique to a particular policy or alliance intention (recall the Lucca gift case (Fletcher, 2015, p152)). The links between signalling tactics and ambassadorial roles made in this chapter reflect trends found within the literature and provide a general overview of how ambassadors signalled in Renaissance Italy and what this achieved. With this overview we can turn to examining how contemporary ambassadors signal and to exploring the similarities and differences between the ambassadors of now and those of Renaissance Italy. This will allow us to fully illuminate 'the ambassador' as a timeless entity and to extract his everyday activities and discern what they achieve, in order to understand ultimately, how ambassadors play games of diplomacy.

How do Ambassadors Play Games of Diplomacy?

This section will explore how ambassadors signal in contemporary diplomacy, with contemporary diplomacy referring to the diplomacy of the late 20th and 21st centuries. The signalling repertoire has altered significantly from Renaissance Italy. In particular, three main factors have contributed to a signalling shift in the contemporary world: the advent of nuclear weapons, the invention of television and globalisation (Aggestam and Jonsson,

1999). With nuclear weapons, the power of protection upon which state authority was based was jeopardized (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999, p153). Statesmen had to adopt new signalling techniques such as acts of minor violence and force demonstrations to manage crises (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999, p154). With television, statesmen learnt to signal to wider audiences through what has been dubbed 'media diplomacy' (Karl, 1982; Riley, 2014) and with globalisation, globalised markets have meant that diplomats must bargain with firms and enterprises as well as other diplomats (Strange, 1994). However, these changes have disproportionately affected the signalling of statesmen, including foreign ministers and national leaders. The signalling practices of ambassadors, on the other hand, are very similar to those of ambassadors in Renaissance Italy. In addition, the principal functions of negotiation, representation and gathering information are certainly equivalent, though sometimes described differently. Kishan S. Rana (2005), for instance, outlines the functions of the 21st century ambassador as "negotiation, promotion and outreach" (p76), where promotion and outreach are intertwined forms of representation and information gathering is an element of the negotiation process and general political work (p77-8). Overall, the signalling of contemporary ambassadors can be analysed in four categories: rituals (a general feature prevalent in verbal and non-verbal signalling), verbal signalling or diplomatic language, diplomatic body language (which incorporates the gift-giving and sociability aspects discussed in the case study) and imagery- the latter two of which are both forms of non-verbal signalling. This section will explore these elements in turn and in doing so, will outline the everyday activities of ambassadors and what they achieve.

Arguably the most salient element of signalling is rituals. "Diplomacy without ritual is inconceivable" (Kertzer, 1988, p104) and many conventions in diplomatic communication today stem from ritualistic practice in early, Renaissance diplomacy (Faizullaev, 2013, p104). Welcoming ceremonies of new embassies in many countries still contain ritualistic signalling acts performed by ambassadors, such as the use of special transportation, 'solemn entry', greeting protocol, accompaniment, the presentation of credentials, wearing official or national dress and so on (Faizullaev, 2013, p105). By performing rituals, diplomats communicate through symbols and these (conventional) symbols dominate diplomatic dialogue and hence diplomacy. As Mary Douglas explains, "Social rituals create a reality which would be nothing without them. For it is very possible to know something and then find words for it. But it is impossible to have social relations without symbolic acts" (Douglas, 1966, p62). These rituals serve political interests when adopted by the ambassador. They may be used to reflect existing power relations but also to misrepresent existing power relations to propagate a desired political order by introducing it into the symbolic realm (Da Matta, 1977, p259). Ultimately, ambassadors aim to assert their

interests in a symbolic and often highly dramatic way. “The vividness of the symbolism makes the ritual more memorable… while the emotional excitement produced… focuses attention on these symbols and discourages more critical inquiry into what is being asserted” (Kertzer, 1988, pp.88-9). Rituals are commonly used by ambassadors in both verbal and non-verbal signalling. However, the nature of diplomacy has changed since Renaissance Italy and so ambassadors are less occupied with the glorification of their leader and more so with international issues such as environmental protection, nuclear proliferation and human rights (Faizullaev, 2013, p104).

Another signalling tactic employed is diplomatic language. Diplomatic language refers to “the actual language that is employed by diplomats, or technical phrases that became part of the diplomatic vocabulary, or- in the most common sense- guarded understatement that enables users to express sharp views without being provocative or impolite” (Faizullaev, 2013, pp.100-101). It is characterised by constructive ambiguity (Aggestam and Jonsson, 1999), the use of legal terminology, non-redundancy (Faizullaev, 2013, p101) and the use of code words. Often code words are used to summarise international issues. Phrases like ‘social standards’ and ‘fair trade’ are used normally to mean something alternative to their literal meanings. Those who recognise this and are aware of what such deeper meanings are, have the upper hand in discussions (Rana, 2001). In fact, a series of conventional idioms and expressions have been developed over time which are amiable at face value but convey messages that are (usually) clearly understood. For instance, the claim that the ambassador’s government ‘cannot remain indifferent to’ a particular international occurrence is understood to signal intervention (Jonsson, 2016, p82). The context in which the verbal communication takes place is also of significance, potentially giving the words a supplementary meaning. For example, an idea communicated outside of a negotiation process, in a social setting, may indicate an attempt to gauge the views of the other side whilst retaining potential deniability. Additionally, the tone of voice used is of signalling importance. However, this aspect is culture-specific. In the United States, overloudness may reflect enthusiasm, whereas in China it is associated with anger but for Arabs it demonstrates sincerity (Cohen, 1987, p102).

The actual language adopted by ambassadors in speeches or negotiations does not follow an explicit signalling formula as it did in Renaissance Italy. However, making the effort to learn the local language of one’s host country can signal intentions, particularly if these efforts are clearly visible to representatives within that country. In the 1990s, an informal group of about twelve Japanese-speaking ambassadors on mission in

Japan constituted a group named ‘Heisei-kai’, endorsed by the Foreign Ministry, in which they organised outings several times a year to practice their Japanese language skills (Rana, 2005, p173). These ambassadors managed to signal intentions to build strong relations with Japan, and as such have received benign treatment from their host. Members of the royal family agreed to meet with them and they were taken on special outings and a leading Japanese daily even commented that “The dispatch of Japanese-speaking ambassadors shows the stance of these countries to place importance on their relations with Japan” (Rana, 2005, p173). By signalling intentions through language, members of Heisei-kai, which has lasted for many years following its establishment, have managed to secure special treatment in discussions by Japanese officials. For instance, in March 2011, Secretary General of the Democratic Party of Japan Katsuya Okada met exclusively with the ambassadors of Heisei-kai to discuss the response to the Tohoku Pacific earthquake and tsunami (www1.dpj.or.jp, 2011). Overall, diplomatic language is a highly utilised signalling channel, whether it refers to technical phrases employed by diplomats or the actual language spoken. Techniques have been honed to a meticulous precision that has left every word and phrase assumed to carry a weighty message (Cohen, 1987, p153). Such messages may also be carried by non-verbal signalling techniques; notably body language.

Diplomatic body language covers a wide range of non-verbal signalling, encompassing body language in the literal sense of bodily gestures but also a number of other gestures, from handshakes to the manipulation of military forces (Jasim, 2011, p27). Non-verbal communication is a crucial aspect of diplomatic signalling. As Raymond Cohen, author of various works on non-verbal diplomatic signalling, asserts “States have become adept at extra-linguistic forms of communication…[these] do not replace language, rather they complement, illuminate and supplement it” (Cohen, 1981, p32). Often non-verbal signals are governed by strict protocol. In the signalling cases of gift-giving and sociability (commonly used in Renaissance Italy), there are still rules of etiquette and general protocol governing the ambassador’s behaviour. Gift-giving is generally governed by culture and social conventions in the host country. For instance, flowers are commonly presented gifts but the type and colour can be extremely important. Mums are funeral flowers in Italy and so at a dinner party these may be ill-received (Foreign Service Institute, 2011, p13). The US Department of State’s Foreign Service Institute (FSI) lays down ten general courtesies to be used to signal hierarchy in social situations (for instance, reserving the right end of a sofa for ranking guests) (Foreign Service Institute, 2011, p11) as well as strict etiquette rules for being a guest and entertaining. When formally entertaining, it is suggested that “When many high-ranking officials are expected to attend the event, if

possible, seat them in a manner such that many hold a seat of honor. An excellent way of doing this is to use round tables" (p19). However, despite such instances of protocol or etiquette governed practice, protocol has been significantly relaxed since the days of Renaissance Italy. In fact, in recent years, the easing of protocol has resulted in the widening of the body language signalling repertoire. A wider range of gestures are now adopted and are applied with much flexibility (Jasim, 2011, p28).

Gestures of salutation are a common signalling tool, adopted by ambassadors and statesmen alike, the most ubiquitous of which is the handshake (Cohen, 1987, p91). Sociologist Deborah Schiffrin (1981) describes the handshake as an 'access ritual'. It symbolically attests to the regard and respect that each party holds for the other. Extending and accepting a handshake ritualistically demonstrates respect but also confirms, as a prelude to negotiations, that the basic etiquette and conventions will be sustained during the meeting (Cohen, 1987, p92). The absence or avoidance of a handshake equally carries signals. Omission can take two forms: basic avoidance or an active snub. While both signal disapproval of the rejected party and a disturbed relationship, the former carries hope for future restoration of the relationship whereas the latter involves a more serious denunciation (Cohen, 1987, p92). Other gestures of salutation include the 'inconvenience display' (Morris, 1977) which involves showing excessive hospitality towards a guest or one's negotiating equal. Practices may include greeting a guest at the entrance of the building or seeing a negotiating equal to his or her car after a meeting, essentially performing a minor inconvenience (Cohen, 1987, p98). By going beyond protocol and common etiquette this signals even greater respect for that party.

A non-verbal signalling tactic more unique to ambassadors, however, is the practice of absenting oneself from events (Cohen, 1987). An ambassador is invited to various high-status events by officials within the host country. In diplomacy, to celebrate with is to associate with. Therefore, when an ambassador declines to grace such occasions with his presence, he is signalling dissatisfaction and dissociation (Trevelyan, 1973). Absence can take three forms: sending a junior official instead, staying away completely, or attending and then walking out. The first is the mildest way of signalling dissatisfaction. The second- the 'diplomatic boycott'- makes stronger implications (Cohen, 1987, p161). A prominent example of this came in 1981 when regular violations of Sweden's territorial waters by the USSR culminated in a Soviet submarine lurking nearby the Swedish shore. In response, Swedish ambassadors across the globe boycotted celebrations of the October Revolution among other Soviet

festive occasions. Norway and Denmark joined this boycott to signal Nordic solidarity (Cohen, 1987, p162). The final form of absence is the 'walk-out' (Cohen, 1987). Since walking out during an event happens in front of a number of guests, it is the most dramatic option. Walk-outs usually occur when something almost unforgivable happens during the event. Perhaps something unacceptable was said, an unacceptable and unexpected guest was invited or protocol was breached. When an unacceptable guest has been invited, the walk-out is conducted to signal non-recognition of the country represented. For instance, in 1954 the Burmese ambassador in Moscow organised a dinner for all heads of mission in Moscow in the hope of developing international understanding. He carelessly seated the envoy of China on the same table as the American ambassador and the representative of East Germany with the British ambassador. In order to avoid signalling recognition, the British and American ambassadors left (Parrott, 1977). In the case of a breach of protocol occurring, the ambassador must decide whether this was an error or a malicious gambit since an unwarranted reaction may ridicule him (Cohen, 1987, p163).

One final way in which contemporary ambassadors signal is through images. Symbols have always been present in diplomatic activity, whereby actors signal honour, beneficence and liberality among other virtues (Roick, 2017). However, technological developments have induced new trends in diplomatic practice, such as 'digital diplomacy' which involves the use of the internet, social media and other new information communication technologies to achieve objectives (DiploFoundation, 2002). With the onset of such trends, the communication channels of diplomacy have been enhanced, and this has affected the symbolic landscape of diplomacy immensely (Faizullaev, 2013, p97). In the past, few individuals could access diplomatic interactions which employed symbols, but these interactions are now displayed on television, the internet and many social networking sites for millions to see. As such, contemporary ambassadors exploit these new platforms for signalling purposes. They often display symbolic images on their social networking sites- some even using romantic images expressing certain emotions- usually to endorse something or represent the state (Faizullaev, 2013, p97). On the whole, image making has become central to contemporary diplomacy. Modern imaging tools such as photoshop have raised image making to a new, sophisticated level. Images are usually visual and may include flags, pictures of national leaders, impressive buildings, holy places and more but image making can also be auditory and gustatory (taste) whereby ambassadors host events as they did in Renaissance Italy, in which national songs may be sung or national cuisine cooked for representation (I Am the Ambassador, 2016), but also to signal splendour and magnificence (Roick, 2017).

To summarise, contemporary ambassadors signal in much of the same ways as the ambassadors of Renaissance Italy. They perform rituals, language and its manipulation is crucial to their communication and non-verbal signalling, including protocol-governed tactics such as gift-giving and sociability, are still major aspects of their work. The signalling repertoire, however, has expanded over the centuries due to technological growth and other factors which have increased and altered the forums through which ambassadors signal. Images increasingly feature in the work of ambassadors due to the signalling opportunities provided by social media, television and other new forums. Additionally, the documentation of non-verbal signalling has extended beyond traditional tactics such as gift-giving and sociability to include a multitude of tactics, normally encompassed by the term 'body language' (Jasim, 2011). The examples covered were gestures of salutation and absence from events as these are highly documented, but others, such as the wearing of particular attire can also be significant (Cohen, 1987). In total, the signalling techniques employed by contemporary ambassadors, though expressed differently to ambassadors in Renaissance Italy, have remained very much the same but with adaptability to the new world. From these empirical studies, clear consistencies are extractable and with them, the signalling of ambassadors can be reduced to three investigative areas: rituals, diplomatic language and non-verbal signalling.

Conclusion

It is clear from the unity of the historical and present-day case studies that diplomacy is a classic method of the management of state relations which has stood the test of time. Over the past century alone, it has survived two world wars, a cold war, the development of nuclear weapons and the fastest pace of technological change the world has ever seen (Fletcher, 2015). With it, has survived its central figure, an individual who lies at the heart of international relations: the ambassador. The resident ambassador was the invention of Renaissance Italy. His activity was marked by several key moments, including the welcoming ceremony upon arrival into the host state, daily negotiations in front of public and private audiences and information and intelligence gathering in both formal and informal settings. His daily life was thus filled with everyday activities through which he was integrated into the local political society (Lazzarini, 2017, p42-3). The contemporary ambassador partakes in the very same

everyday activities. Though these take a different form, the ambassador's preoccupations; his duties of representation, negotiation, and information gathering (Azzolini and Lazzarini, 2017) and essentially his everyday activities and what they achieve, remain constant.

The everyday activities of the ambassador and what these achieve can be analysed using a signalling framework. Signalling understands diplomacy to be the communication system of international society (James, 1980). Though others may define diplomacy in different, non-communicative terms, and some may even see communication as being just one aspect of diplomacy, understanding diplomacy itself to be communication allows for the close scrutinization of diplomatic practice, including that of the ambassador, that has not occurred in diplomatic studies. The definition of diplomacy referenced at the outset of this paper is "the management of international relations by negotiation; the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys; the business or art of the diplomatist" (Nicolson, 1963, p15). In defence of diplomatic signalling, this definition can be broken down into three parts, each of which can be characterised communicatively. 'The management of international relations by negotiation' involves the communicative (whether verbal or non-verbal) process of negotiation, 'the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed' is communication, and 'the business or art of the diplomatist' is communication. Key to communication is people. Given that "the ambassador is the personification of international relations between states" (Rana, 2005, p23), he has been the focus of this paper.

This paper set out to demonstrate the continuity of diplomacy and to explore how such a viable component of international affairs can be of use in the 21st century. The signalling tactics of ambassadors – rituals, diplomatic language and non-verbal signalling – encapsulate this. Ambassadors signal by performing rituals, whether verbal or non-verbal, epitomised by ceremonies within the host nation; manipulating diplomatic language through either the adoption of a particular language for certain audiences or the employment of linguistic techniques common to the diplomatic realm; and finally by a multitude of non-verbal techniques, including classic examples which have stood the test of time such as gift-giving and sociability, or more generally, those encapsulated by the term 'diplomatic body language' (Jasim, 2011), as well as the use of images (Faizullaev, 2013). The foreign policy achievements from these everyday activities vary from negotiating successes to closer bilateral ties, but first and

foremost, they serve the ambassadorial roles of representation, negotiation and information gathering. These, in turn, serve foreign policy objectives in broad and unique ways.

Finally, this paper sought to bring to light a place in diplomatic studies for closer examination into the practices of the ambassador, arguably the most influential figure in diplomacy. The development of the research field of diplomatic signalling is an excellent way to embark on such examinations but it also extends beyond the ambassador to diplomatic practice in general. The analytical framework of diplomatic signalling allows for the dissection and close scrutiny of diplomatic practice today which may help overcome the difficulties many are facing in terms of understanding the role of diplomacy in a world characterised by such fast-pace change (Cooper, Heine and Thakur, 2015). All in all, diplomacy is an art that transcends space and time. It's key player, the ambassador, has remained in-tact after centuries of tumultuousness and war. With closer examination into his activities and what they achieve, we can begin to understand how ambassadors play games of diplomacy and as a result, to embark on the 21st century diplomatic scene with renewed vigour and improved understandings. However, the research much first be done. It is time for diplomatic studies to recognise this.

Bibliography

Aggestam, K. and Jonsson, C. (1999). Trends in Diplomatic Signalling. In: J. Melissen, *Innovation in Diplomatic Practice.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press. pp.151-170.

Arcangeli, A. (2017). Games and Leisure Activities. In: M. Azzolini and I. Lazzarini, *Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.255-269.

Azzolini, M. (2017). Ritual. In: M. Azzolini and I. Lazzarini*, Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.150-172.

Azzolini, M. and I. Lazzarini, I. (2017). *Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.1-10.

Behrens, B. (1936) 'Treatises on the Ambassador written in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries', *English Historical Review*. pp.617-19

Berridge, G. and James, A. (2001). *A Dictionary of Diplomacy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Berridge, G., Keens-Soper, M. and Otte, T. (2002). *Diplomatic theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. Basingstoke, Hampshire [u.a.]: Palgrave.

Black, R. (2013). *Machiavelli*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

Callières, F. (1716). *De la manière de négocier avec les souverains*. Paris: Chez Michel Brunet, salle du Palais, Au Mercure Galant.

Callières, F., Keens-Soper, H. and Schweizer, K. (1983). *The art of diplomacy*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Cohen R. (1981). *International Politics: The Rules of the Game*. London, New York: Longman.

Cohen, R. (1987). *Theatre of power*. New York: Longman Inc.

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

Cooper, A., Heine, J. and Thakur, R. (2015). *The Oxford handbook of modern diplomacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Da Matta, Roberto (1977). Constraint and license: A preliminary study of two Brazilian national rituals. In Sally F. Moore and Barbara G. Myerhoff, eds., *Secular Ritual*, pp.244-64. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Davis, N. (2010). *The gift in sixteenth-century France*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

Der Derian, J. (1987). On diplomacy: *a genealogy of Western estrangement*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Derville, Alain (1974). 'Pots de vin, cadeaux, racket, patronage. Essai sur les mecanismes de decision dans l'etat Bourguignon', *Revue du Nord* 56, pp.341-64

DiploFoundation. (2002). *Digital Diplomacy | E-diplomacy | Cyber diplomacy*. [online] Available at: https://www.diplomacy.edu/e-diplomacy [Accessed 16 Mar. 2018].

Douglas, Mary (1966). *Purity and Danger*. New York: Praeger.

Faizullaev, A. (2013). Diplomacy and Symbolism. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, [online] 8(2), pp.91-114. Available at: http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/content/journals/10.1163/1871191x-12341254?showFullText=pdf [Accessed 23 Jan. 2018].

Fletcher, C. (2015). *Diplomacy in Renaissance Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foreign Service Institute (2011). *Protocol for the Modern Diplomat*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of State.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. London and New York: Continuum, pp.1-15.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. and Bernstein, M. (1971). *Implementing Organizational Innovations*. New York: Basic Books.

Grotius, H. (1925). *De Jure Belli ac Pacis Libris Tes, Book II.* Translated by F.W. Kelsey. Washington: The Classics of International Law.

Hibbert, C. (1979). *The rise and fall of the house of medici*. London: Penguin.

Hrabar, V. (1906). *De Legatis et legationibus tractatus varii*. Dorpat: Mattiesen.

I Am the Ambassador. (2016). [film] Directed by E. Hansen. Denmark: Netflix.

James, Alan (1980) 'Diplomacy and international society', *International Relations,* 6(6) pp. 931-48.

Jasim, A. (2011). *Body Language in Diplomatic Communication*. Kiev: Embassy of the Republic of Iraq in Ukraine, pp.26-31.

Jonsson, C. (2016). Diplomacy, Communication and Signaling. In: C. Constantinou, P. Kerr and P. Sharp, ed., *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy*. SAGE publications Ltd, pp.79-91.

Karl, P. (1982). Media Diplomacy. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 34(4), pp.143-152.

Kertzer, D. (1988). *Ritual, politics, and power*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kissinger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lauren, P. (1979). *Diplomacy*. New York: Free Press.

Lazzarini, I. (2017). The Conduct of the Embassy. In: M. Azzolini and I. Lazzarini, *Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.42-56.

Machiavelli, N. and Bondanella, P. (2008). *The prince.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Machiavelli, N. and Gilbert, A. (1989). *The chief works and others*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mattingly, G. (1955). *Renaissance Diplomacy*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Mauss, M. and Douglas, M. (2001). *The Gift*. Milton: Taylor & Francis.

Maxson, B. J. (2017). Diplomatic Oratory. In: M. Azzolini and I. Lazzarini, *Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.27-41.

McCall, T. and Roberts, S. (2017). Art and the Material Culture of Diplomacy. In: M. Azzolini and I. Lazzarini, *Italian Renaissance Diplomacy: A Sourcebook*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, pp.214-233.

Milner, Stephen. J. (1995). Political Oratory and the Public Sphere in Early Quattrocento Florence, *New Readings* (I): pp.41-64.

Morris, D. (1977) *Manwatching.* Harry N Abrams: New York.

Mowat, R. (1936). *Diplomacy and peace*. New York: McBride.

Muir, E. (2005). *Ritual in Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p3.

Nevile, J. (2008). *Dance, Spectacle, and Body Politick, 1250-1750*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nicolson, H. (1963). *Diplomacy*. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press: London.

O'Malley, J.W. (1979). *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric Doctrine, and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450-1521.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Parrott, C. (1977). *The Serpent and the Nightingale.* London: Faber and Faber, p75.

Rana, K. (2001). Language, Signaling and Diplomacy. In: K. Kurbalija and H. Slavik, ed., *Language and Diplomacy*. Malta: DiploProjects, pp.107-115.

Rana, K. (2005). *The 21st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Riley, P. (2014). *Media Diplomacy: Public Diplomacy in a New Global Media Environment*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, I. (2017). *Satow's diplomatic practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roick, M. (2017). *Pontano's Virtues: Aristotelian Moral and Political Thought in the Renaissance*. [S.I]: Bloomsbury Academic.

Satow, E. and Gore-Booth, D. (1979). *Satow's guide to diplomatic practice*. London: Longman.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1981). Handwork as ceremony: the case of the handshake; in Kendon A (ed) *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction, and Gesture.* Mouton: The Hague, pp.237-250.

Sharp, P. (2002). Review: The Theory of Diplomacy and the Naming of Its Parts. *International Studies Review*, [online] 4(3), pp.212-216.

Sicca, C. (2002). 'Consumption and trade of art between Italy and England in the first half of the sixteenth century: The London house of the Bardi and Cavalcanti company'. *Renaissance Studies, 16*(2), 163-201.

Strange, S. (1994). Rethinking Structural Change in the International Political Economy: States, Firms and Diplomacy. In: R. Stubbs and G. Underhill, ed., *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*. London: Macmillan.

Taylor, V. (2005). 'Banquet plate and Renaissance culture: a day in the life', *Renaissance Studies* 19(5). pp.621-33

Trevelyan, H. (1973). *Diplomatic Channels.* Gambit: Boston, pp.59-125.

Vietorisz, T. and Harrison, B. (1970). *The Economic Development of Harlem*. New York: Praeger.

Wicquefort, A. (1690). *L'Ambassadeur et ses Fonctions*. Cologne: Pierre Marteau.

www1.dpj.or.jp. (2011). *The Democratic Party of Japan*. [online] Available at: http://www1.dpj.or.jp/english/news/index.html?num=19905 [Accessed 12 Apr. 2018].

Yin, R. (1981). The Case Study Crisis: Some Answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 26(1), pp. 58-65.