

ECONOMIC DIPLOMACY - IMPORTANT COMPONENT OF FOREIGN POLICY OF MODERN STATE

Gulsara ARYSTANKULOVA

Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan
gulsara-a@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the features of the global development in the XXI century, in particular the strengthening of the economic factor in international relations and world politics in the context of the growing interconnectedness and interdependence of states. The paper analyzes the theoretical aspects of the study of economic diplomacy, especially the importance of economic diplomacy in the implementation of foreign policy at the present time.

Keywords: *Economic Diplomacy, Foreign Policy, International Relations, "Smart Power", Geoeconomics, "The New Global Reality"*

INTRODUCTION

Economic diplomacy is traditionally defined as the decision-making, policy-making and advocating for the sending state's business interests. Economic diplomacy requires the application for technical expertise which the effects of a country's economic situation on its political climate and on economic interests. Economic diplomacy is the art of serving economic security and strategic interests of the country by the use of an economic instrument in the conduct of state-to-state relations.

Economic diplomacy is designed to influence policy and regulatory decisions of foreign governments, as well as those of international organizations. It goes beyond trade and investment to the resolution of multiple causes of international conflicts. The agenda of economic diplomacy is comprehensive and includes amongst others issues pertaining to foreign trade and import-export relations, promoting of national economic interests in other countries, informing and updating potential foreign investors on investment opportunities, negotiating economic and trade agreements on economic and trade cooperation, as well as cooperating with a view to eliminating problematic divergences and harmonizing standards in various sectors (economic, social, environmental, educational etc.).

Economic diplomacy is functional at three levels: bilateral, regional and multilateral (Peter & Melissen, 2011). Bilateral economic diplomacy plays a major role in economic relations. It includes bilateral agreements on trade, investment, employment, taxation, as well as a wide range of formal and informal economic issues between two countries (Fedoseyeva, 2002). Bilateral Free Trade Agreements have been the order of the day and are being implemented by many countries around the world. Regional cooperation is of growing importance in economic diplomacy. National interests and economic liberalization are well-served particularly within the context of a particular region. The removal of barriers and opening of markets become easier within a regional framework.

Multilateral economic diplomacy takes place within the framework of World Trade Organization (WTO), as well as numerous international economic and financial organizations such as the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), various UN agencies etc. With the establishment of WTO, there has been a policy shift in the global trading system towards the promotion of economic activities. Sustaining competitiveness, however, continues to represent an important challenge for instruments and mechanisms established by bilateral and multilateral trade agreements (Bayne & Woolcock, 2007).

The features of global development in the 21st century, in the era of the "new global reality" by definition of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan NA Nazarbayev, clearly show that the world has become more interconnected and interdependent. The so-called non-state actors (international organizations, international terrorist organizations, transnational corporations, banks, investment groups, etc.) joined the traditional subjects of world politics-states. This has significantly changed the

structure of international relations as an external environment for the development of the state (Suleymenov, 2008).

The ability of the state to interact with the whole multitude of participants in international relations assumes a decisive importance, determining the success or failure of the country in the context of its foreign policy activity. It follows that no modern state of the world can exist separately, in isolation from other players on the world stage. In this context, the state forms and implements its foreign policy, using a set of various instruments and mechanisms. However, the choice of these tools depends on certain factors.

In political science, as a rule, the instruments and mechanisms of the state's implementation of its foreign policy are united in the concept of "force." That is why, we believe, it is advisable to consider the whole spectrum of the use of the state by "power" - one of the central categories of modern political science.

As you know, the greatest contribution to the theorizing and conceptualization of the concept of "power" was made by the American political scientist J. Nye. Considering the state's implementation of the foreign policy course, he introduced into scientific circulation the two components of the concept of "power" - "hard" and "soft" (Nye, 2014). Despite the fact that this term was introduced in the 1990s, it still remains relevant today, as there is now a clear tendency for states to reconsider the methods of foreign policy maneuvering.

METHODOLOGY

The main idea of J. Nye is that, in essence, military and economic influences in foreign policy are part of the "hard power" because of their violent or coercive nature. After the end of the cold war and the disintegration of the bipolar system of international relations, there was a political and scientific discourse about the decline of the era of global economic and armed confrontations demanding the use of "hard power" tools.

Unlike the "tough" concept, "soft power" is based on a departure from the state's use of economic and military methods. According to J. Nye, this kind of force has the goal, not of coercion, but conviction (Nye, 2014). The influence on the state, thus, is carried out by political, diplomatic, cultural and other peaceful methods.

At the same time, like any other large-scale concept in political science, the category "force" has a multifaceted, complex character. Therefore, one should not limit ourselves to operating only one of its components.

After the end of the cold war and the disintegration of the bipolar system in the world, confidence arose that the period of acute ideological confrontation between states ended in connection with the spread of liberal-democratic values of the Western model in the world (Fukuyama, 2006). In political and scientific discourse there was an opinion about the decline of the era of global economic and armed confrontations. However, the further course of history, especially the last decades, proved the inconsistency of such approaches. A unipolar world that was regarded as an ideal and the only true model of a new world order proved to be untenable (Palmer, 2002).

At the beginning of the 21st century, it became obvious that the structure of the world structure with the presence of a single center is gradually moving into a multipolar one. At the same time, the formation and consolidation of new centers of world politics marked the active use of "tough" foreign policy instruments along with already widespread non-violent methods.

That is why the concept of "smart power", which is a combination of both forces (rigid and soft) in the implementation of the state's foreign policy course, has been actively used by politicians and scientists in the last two decades (Nye, 2014). The concept of "clever force" was first introduced by the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, S. Nossel. In an article published in 2004 in the journal *Foreign Policy*, the American diplomat put forward the idea that diplomacy, international aid, trade and the dissemination of values (meaning American values) play as important a role as a military force. (Nossel, 2004).

In the future, this concept was theoretically developed by J. Nam. According to the author's definition, "smart power is a combination of a solid force for coercion and retribution with a soft power in the form of persuasion and attraction." At the same time, the specific feature of this type of force is a clearly defined goal, the transformation of resources into an effective result, the existence of a strategy or plan for achieving the goal, experienced leadership.

The "smart power" strategy was adopted by the administration of the US President Barack Obama. So, according to E. Shapiro, the deputy secretary of state for military and political affairs, "the concept of" smart power "- a reasonable combination and system of relations between diplomacy, defense, development assistance and other means of hard and soft power - is the essence of the political vision of President Barack Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton."

At the same time, according to the acknowledgment of J. Nye himself, in spite of the fact that the concept of "clever force" was used by the administration of Barack Obama, its application is by no means limited to the US alone. The political scientist believes that it is small states that are often more skilled in applying the strategy of smart power. So, historically and at the present stage, "rising" states (for example, China) use "smart power" with great benefit for themselves (Nay, 2014).

The history of the development of international relations in the last quarter of a century after the collapse of the bipolar system shows that states could not completely abandon the use of "hard power" (economic sanctions, diplomatic pressure, military intervention, etc.). Currently, we see an example of the active use of "hard" instruments in the situation around Ukraine.

At the same time, the priority of "soft" ways of doing business in the international arena is unambiguous. Therefore, the concept of "smart power" can be considered very organic in the current international system of relations. Its specificity lies in the fact that, thanks to its complex character, it presents new demands to the states, including on the formation and implementation of the foreign policy strategy.

In other words, a modern state striving for its adequate positioning in the international arena should not limit itself to the choice of foreign policy mechanisms and instruments. Among them, we consider it important to single out diplomacy, which is one of the key components of the foreign policy of any state. There are many definitions of the concept of "diplomacy", which contain both a narrow and broad interpretation of this phenomenon.

From an applied point of view, if we summarize and generalize all existing definitions, diplomacy is a mechanism for implementing the state's foreign policy, consisting of a set of non-military activities, techniques, and methods used in the context of specific conditions and challenges (Bayne, 2011). On the other hand, diplomacy is the official activity of representatives of states and specialized foreign ministries in solving specific goals and tasks on the agenda of the state, the region or the world.

Thus there is a great number of classifications of diplomacy. For example, lately along with traditional diplomacy public diplomacy got distribution. The new types of diplomacy also are digital, catalytic, transformation. It is accepted to distinguish such types of diplomacy, as bilateral, multilateral, regional, diplomacy on high and higher levels. In our view, there is another essential classification of diplomacy that touches her varieties according to the used methods and decided tasks. Among them, an important place is occupied by economic diplomacy.

Economic diplomacy and trade diplomacy preceded to her, as the phenomenon of intergovernmental cooperation, in practice international relations known of yore (Bergeijk& Peter, 1994). The evolution of this phenomenon during centuries took place within the framework of the development of world economy and diplomacy. It stipulated application by her wide arsenal of instruments, that on the modern stage plugs in itself international trade and economic approvals, creation of regional trade and economic blocks and modes, management by international financial streams, use of external debt, direct foreign investments, providing of economic and humanitarian aid, manipulation activity of international financial organizations (Kessler, 1999).

Being base on different going near interpretation of economic diplomacy, we are inclined to examine this category as complex of the foreign-policy events (both in regard to methods and processes of acceptance of foreign-policy decisions), related to the transfrontal economic activity (export, import, investments, crediting, economic aid of and other) conducted by the state and non-state subjects of worldwide policy in the modern world (Bayne, 2011).

In our view, in present realities, the economic type of diplomacy appears the most prime example of "clever force", as unites in itself both the elements of hard influence and specific of non-violent methods of realization of foreign policy.

By virtue of specific of present мироустройства economic diplomacy comes forward the системообразующим component of the foreign policy of the modern state. Obviously, that in the conditions of the modern division of labor in the context of globalization international relations экономизировались, and an economy was politicized.

Strengthening the interdependence of the economy and politics is primarily due to the prevalence of the economic factor in the current system of international relations. This is confirmed by the increased development of such megatrend of modernity as globalization, the main driving force of which is precisely the economy.

In theoretical and applied aspects, economic diplomacy provides the complete description of the interrelationship of politics and economics in international relations. Thus, the French diplomat and economist, the author of the monograph "Economic diplomacy: diplomat and market" G. Carron de la Carrière asserts that "not everything is in the economy, but nothing is done without taking into account economic factors, and this is the essence of the changes. Diplomacy is not exhausted by economic diplomacy, but diplomacy can no longer ignore the economic side of what it does (Degterev, 2010).

One of the major lessons in the history of diplomacy is that the personal factors continue to play a key role. As far back as in seventeenth century, a great Frenchman in diplomacy, François De Calliers wrote: "The good diplomat must have an observant mind, a gift of application which rejects being diverted by pleasures or frivolous amusements, a sound judgement which takes the measure of things as they are and which goes straight to the goal by the shortest and most natural paths without wandering into meaningless and endless refinements and subtleties. The diplomat must be quick, resourceful, a good listener, courteous and agreeable. Above all, the good negotiator must possess enough self-control to resist the longing to speak before he has thought out what he actually intends to say. He must have a calm nature, be able to suffer fools gladly, which is not always easy, and should not be given to drinking, gambling or any other fantasies. He should also have some knowledge of literature, science, mathematics, and law."

At the threshold of the twentieth century, another famous author, the British diplomat Ernest Sato, described diplomacy as an application of intellect and tact to conduct foreign affairs. As a whole, diplomats are very good at preserving the traditions of their profession. However, there is a lot of the legacy of the past that diplomacy has to abandon. Unfortunately, despite changes of huge significance to diplomacy that have taken place in recent years, the mechanisms of traditional diplomacy have barely begun to adjust. The Cold War has gone out of diplomacy, but in many cases, diplomatic behavior remains loyal to it. This includes, among other things, thinking only in terms of power equilibrium. Methods of diplomacy are still strongly influenced by military thinking - diplomacy as the war by other means, or as a zero-sum game.

To become an efficient tool of good global governance diplomacy needs first to overcome the stereotypes of ideology and military confrontation (Kenneth, 2001). Its task today is to search not for the balance of power, but for the balance of interest. The top priority today is to reinvigorate in full scope traditional methods of diplomacy - the search for compromise solutions. The all or nothing mentality no longer works. A partial and balanced approach is an answer to the new geopolitical and economic realities.

According to the political stereotypes of the Cold War, diplomats of different countries are considered to be opponents, each trying to reach his goal at the expense of the other. No doubt, the primary

mission of a diplomat is to protect the national interests of his country. However, we all have a common aim - good governance both on global and national levels. We all strive for a better world, a world without violence and poverty, a world that provides security and justice for all. Thus, diplomats must learn to co-operate without sacrificing the national interests of their countries. In many other professions, one can witness the existence of a corporate spirit. Unfortunately, it does not happen often among diplomats. However, such club relations could be of great help to each and all of them.

The corporate spirit of the diplomatic community does not mean that corporatism should prevail over the national interest of the country which a diplomat represents. By articulating the national interests of his country the diplomat provides the possibility to better understand its position. This makes the country predictable in its international behavior which is of supreme importance in our time of change (Diamond, 1999). Attempts to please both a foreign government and his own government render disservice to the diplomat.

The international diplomatic partnership is now more feasible than before, in particular, because of the gradual unification of the national styles of diplomacy. International organizations and multilateral diplomacy are effective "melting pots" of cultural differences. Diplomatic methods are becoming universal. However, national styles still exist and should be studied and taken into consideration in the practical diplomatic work. The national style is difficult to define though it is an important ingredient of the art of diplomacy. But of course, a national style should not be mixed up with an inappropriate behavior when a so-called diplomat disregards local cultural, religious and specific features of other nations.

Another stereotype concerns confidentiality in diplomacy. Diplomacy is often accused of too much secrecy and indeed, for centuries diplomacy was conducted entirely in private. The Cold War has tremendously strengthened this pattern of behavior. However, in the world of openness and free information flows, the cult of diplomatic confidentiality looks rather archaic. Though every professional diplomat knows that in certain situations confidentiality is unavoidable, it does not mean that the profession requires him to keep quiet (Scott, 1999). Lack of openness and in particular misconstruing the truth is incompatible with modern diplomacy. This leads to the important problem of interaction between diplomacy and mass media which deserves particular attention nowadays.

Multilateral diplomacy is often considered to be a type of superstructure over bilateral diplomacy. The interaction between bilateral and multilateral diplomacy creates a new pattern of political behavior (Jervis, 1976). A good example is the negotiation of a nuclear test ban. In the past test ban treaties were the result of bilateral Soviet-American negotiations. Only CTBT has been worked out at the Conference on Disarmament. Multilateralism has not excluded bilateralism or other types of negotiation.

More than that, multilateral negotiations, despite their being time-consuming, are a very effective safeguard against hegemonistic and similar intentions (Gellner, 2009). This has become more evident at the dawn of multilateral diplomacy. When the series of congresses which followed the treaty of Vienna of 1815, at last, came to an end, the British Foreign Secretary, Canning, returning from conferences, was said to have praised a state of normal bilateral diplomacy which he summed up as "each for himself and God for us all." Undoubtedly multilateral diplomacy drastically limits the egoistical aspirations of the states.

Although multilateral negotiations are basically similar to bilateral, a number of sophisticated methods and techniques have been developed in multilateralism to cope with extensive diplomatic interactions. In the United Nations and other multilateral fora, there is an official hierarchy of committees and sub-committees and a semi-official system of groups of states formed on the basis of geographic or economic proximity. For example, there are the groups of African, Latin American and Arab States, the EU States or the Group of 77 developing countries which actually comprises more than one hundred states.

Perhaps, the major peculiarity of the multilateral talks is the importance of the rules of procedure. When, as in the case of the United Nations, 185 delegations have to communicate with each other at the same time, there must be some rather clear and strict rules to maintain orderly interactions. As the

well-known British historian, Harold Nicolson once noted during a large international conference - the matters of organization and procedure become no less important than the political issues. If poorly handled they can become a major disintegrating factor.

FINDINGS

Today, the world system is in the process of actively forming a new trade and economic world order by forming large blocks around competing global centers. For a certain number of scientists, this circumstance testifies to the advent of a new era - the era of geo-economics aimed at increasing the competitiveness of the state in conditions of a qualitatively new level of development of the world economy and integration processes.

Geo-economics is understood as a new geopolitics from the standpoint of the economic strength of the state, ensuring achievement of foreign policy goals, world or regional power in an economic way (Braterskiy, 2014). In the scientific revolution, the term *geo-economics* was introduced in the 1960s. American historian E. Luttwak. Geo-economics was especially popular on the background of globalization processes, as it justifies the primacy of neo-liberal economic processes in the formation of a new paradigm of international relations and state activity in this system.

In this context, a number of scientists believe that since geo-economics predominates over geopolitics, the modern world order should be viewed as an order geo-economic (Carron, 1998). In their opinion, it is *geo-economics* - as the newest paradigm of world development - that should become the fundamental basis, the theoretical and methodological base for the development of more sophisticated instruments of economic diplomacy (Luttwak, 1987).

However, the dominant role of geo-economic strategy in the Arsenal of instruments of international policy may not mean the disappearance of the notion of "force". The relevance of the category of "power" remains, this raises the need for scientific understanding of the importance of its various aspects, such as marginalization of the military factor in favor of the economic search economic power, a strategic goal of both developed and developing countries in the new world order.

So, today in the "new global reality" economic diplomacy is an important instrument of foreign policy and its international activities. As an example, the state consistently uses the Arsenal of economic diplomacy, we can consider the Republic of Kazakhstan, where the first days of independence, foreign policy is one of the most important instruments of ensuring the national interests, including competitive advantages of the country in the global market (Luttwak, 2010).

At the dawn of independence, the Republic of Kazakhstan as the main way of development chosen by the evolutionary model according to the principle "first economy, the policy", which spread to the field of foreign policy. This approach includes the use of methods of economic diplomacy, has enabled the implementation of two phases of the modernization of Kazakhstan, the main result which can fairly be called integration into the global economy among top 50 competitive States of the world taking into account the national and historical characteristics, the availability of significant natural resources, transit-transport and communication potential of the country.

Effective use of economic diplomacy in the practice of Kazakhstan is facilitated by a number of factors. Key among them is consistency of policies on sustainable development in accordance with strategic programs ("Kazakhstan-2030", "Kazakhstan-2050", new economic policy "NurlyZhol", the national Plan - "100 steps", "the national technology initiative 2025"), which along with the main objectives clearly defined objectives, directions and solutions.

Today on the threshold of a new stage of development, designated by President Nazarbayev as the "Third modernization" Kazakhstan faces the challenge of a new economic model designed to ensure the global competitiveness of the state, namely the top 30 most developed countries of the world (Nazarbayev, 2017).

In our view, the new imperatives of modernization stipulate the necessity of perfection of tool and methods of economic diplomacy in accordance with geo-economic realities of new world order. Thus the key tasks of Kazakhstan economic diplomacy it is been bringing in of foreign investments and

front-rank technologies within the framework of innovative-technological and transport-infrastructure modernization; opening of export potential of home business; increase of business activity in the conditions of membership in WTO; participating in regional integration and geo-economic projects, coming from national - especially pragmatic - interests.

It is obvious that in new conditions more "economisirea" the foreign policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan should combine as traditional methods of economic diplomacy and new conceptual approaches that best contribute to the achievement of the goals of the "Third modernization."

Thus, in the period of global transformations, the economic diplomacy as an integral component of foreign policy activity is important in the context of defining strategies for further development of the States, hence the relevance of studying this phenomenon in the scientific-theoretical and applied aspects.

Science and technology (S&T) play a critical role in a range of foreign policy issues, from driving economic development to responding to hostile governments and rogue organizations. Discoveries in nanotechnology, synthetic biology, and earth sciences offer new opportunities to improve human health, provide food and clean water, and issue warnings of impending natural disasters. Advances in information and communications technologies are having remarkable impacts on every walk of life. International cooperation in science and technology is rapidly becoming an important element of foreign policies of nations throughout the world. The U.S. State Department is a critical focal point for bringing S&T to bear on an ever-growing array of challenges, from cyber-crime to climate change. To carry out its mission more effectively, the department should strengthen and continuously update its science and technology capabilities, says *Diplomacy for the 21st Century: Embedding a Culture of Science and Technology Throughout the Department of State*, a new report from the National Research Council.

A 1999 report by the National Research Council, *The Pervasive Role of Science, Technology, and Health in Foreign Policy: Imperatives for the Department of State*, urged the State Department to increase its attention to the science and technology dimensions of foreign policy goals. Partly in response to that report, the State Department upgraded its S&T capabilities, including establishing its Office of the Science and Technology Adviser and issuing periodic directives concerning the S&T components of important foreign policy issues.

While during the past 15 years the department has taken important steps to strengthen S&T capabilities in Washington, progress at the embassies has lagged seriously behind, and at some posts has declined. The department should address this by increasing foreign service officers' preparation to assume S&T-related responsibilities within the embassies and by strengthening the role of science envoys – leading American scientists and engineers who can engage local scientific leaders and stimulate the launch of new activities. Both in Washington and abroad, the department should incorporate S&T considerations into an even broader range of activities. From senior officials to desk officers and from ambassadors to junior embassy diplomats, understanding the potential of science and technology can present new opportunities for international cooperation.

A culture change is needed throughout the State Department and its embassies so that competence in science and technology should be considered equal in importance to language fluency and area expertise as a critical aspect of diplomacy that will be practiced throughout the world in the 21st century (Kissinger, 1979). The department should strive to utilize the department's S&T resources more effectively in responding to dramatic changes in the global landscape, upgrade the S&T capabilities of U.S. embassies on the front lines of diplomacy, and increase the stature and capabilities of department officials responsible for S&T capabilities.

As the State Department works to foster a culture of science and technology within itself, it should also reach beyond itself. The department should use a "whole of society" approach to diplomacy that also taps the capabilities of non-governmental entities – research institutions, foundations, universities, nongovernmental organizations, and private-sector companies – that are deeply vested in science and technology. These entities are extending their international reach and playing increasingly important roles in expanding U.S. interests abroad, while at the same time often influencing S&T-driven

international policies and programs of the United States. Public and private-sector organizations from around the country can play important diplomatic roles in many areas involving S&T, such as internet governance, global scientific research, and humanitarian assistance (Brzezinski, 1997).

Maintaining a long-term view of S&T developments and related diplomatic issues will also be important. Currently, the State Department's diplomatic efforts are driven largely by immediate issues confronting the department in Washington and the U.S. embassies. A broader foresight perspective, with particular attention to S&T-related developments, could complement the department's near-term focus and provide the basis for foreign policy initiatives that can address future S&T-related trends (Agnew, 2003).

The report recommends specific steps the State Department should take to enhance its S&T capabilities and better incorporate understanding of S&T developments into the nation's foreign policy, including the following actions.

- Elevate the organizational status of the S&T Adviser to be equivalent to an Assistant Secretary. Such elevated status would allow the S&T Adviser to support policy development and implementation related to S&T issues within the department. This enhanced status would also better enable the S&T Adviser to improve links between the department and external organizations that can provide important perspectives on S&T developments throughout the world.
- Establish a Science and Technology Advisory Board of independent experts to provide insights on S&T-laden non-defense issues that are related to the department's foreign policy agenda, complementing the role of the International Security Advisory Board. The board's primary activity should be to identify S&T issues that will soon be on the department's agenda but are not receiving adequate attention at present (Soilen, 2013). Topics of possible interest are the search for better energy storage devices, dealing with outbreaks of infectious diseases, and developments in synthetic biology, among others.
- Conduct S&T-oriented foresight assessments that synthesize actionable conclusions of over-the-horizon S&T assessments and bring them to the attention of appropriate department officials. While the department and other organizations currently conduct assessments, there is no established process for transforming observations from such studies into action-oriented recommendations for consideration by the department's leadership. The program should not just identify challenges; advising officials on what to do is critical.
- Maintain and increase when appropriate the S&T counselors at embassies where S&T issues are particularly important components of the bilateral relationship (Blackwill, 2016). In most cases, these counselors will be outstanding Foreign Service Officers with extensive experience in S&T-related issues and other qualifications such as language fluency, regional expertise, and excellent diplomatic acumen. Some S&T counselors might be drawn from the department's cadre of civil servants or exceptionally qualified outsiders. The department should also enhance the outreach capabilities of the embassies by increasing the number of outstanding American scientists, engineers, and medical experts serving as science envoys.
- The Secretary should continue to provide both leadership and guidance on S&T-related policies and programs for addressing priority global issues and advancing U.S. bilateral and multilateral interests. Articulation of department-wide policies on priority issues can be very helpful, and the S&T Adviser should bring to the attention of the Secretary and other senior officials opportunities for such statements. The Secretary's initiatives in underscoring the importance of climate change in 2013 and of education diplomacy in 2014 are good examples of this approach.
- Increase efforts to understand the composition, reactions, and influences of large foreign audiences the State Department is now reaching through new dialog mechanisms such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube. The department maintains about 1000 official social media accounts around the world, representing hundreds of ambassadors, embassies, consulates, Washington Bureaus, and the department as a whole. The department's combined social media audience is over 40 million

people worldwide. Assessments of the composition of audiences, their reactions, and their impacts are overdue.

- While the most important factor in supporting S&T engagement should continue to be the advancement of science, engineering, and health capabilities in the United States and partner countries, the State Department and USAID should give greater weight in determining allocation of funds for S&T engagement to the secondary impacts in the development and strengthening of civil society and good governance in partner countries. Scientists, engineers, and medical specialists often have considerable experience in managing important organizations and are significant members of civil society, frequently serving as cabinet ministers and other leaders of government. Scientists from a number of middle and low-income countries are increasingly committed to internationally accepted principles of responsible science based on transparent, objective, and evidence-based decision-making, which are important attributes of good public-sector governance.
- Continue efforts to increase staff in order to increase the time available for training and professional development of both Foreign Service and Civil Service officers (Mearsheimer, 2003). This step will allow employees with special S&T interests to stay abreast of advances and allow officers interested in other specialties to update their capabilities. To expand the knowledge base and provide opportunities for continuing education for all department employees wherever they are located, the Foreign Service Institute should continue to broaden the scope and number of its classes and online offerings with significant S&T content.

Following these recommendations will open new opportunities for the State Department to draw upon the expertise and ingenuity of the nation's S&T assets, which are embedded in many institutions both within and outside government. Enhancing the department's capabilities will require some but not many resources, and the return on a modest investment will be substantial.

CONCLUSION

As for the role of multilateral institutions with regard to consensus building on policy issues, and setting norms and standards, it should be strengthened through increased attention to monitoring in all fields. Take, for example, human rights. The commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration needs a greater emphasis on practical implementation, which requires us all to be even more penetrating about the legal obligations.

At the same time, diplomacy should not monopolize conflict prevention and solution (Halberstam, 1993). For example, the legal tools could be used more extensively. The International Court of Justice which was created precisely to help to resolve conflict situations is currently considering only nine cases, mainly territorial or commercial disputes. However, the court has a considerable potential for conflict settlement. Let's take, for example, the settlement by the court of the dispute between Hungary and Slovakia concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project. In the beginning, the conflict had obvious and dangerous ethnic overtones with heated polemic in the media. After the involvement of the court, it was quickly transformed into a purely technical matter.

Last observation concerns the interaction between global and regional structures. When international organizations are mushrooming and multilateralism is invading all walks of life, there is a need to set up a mutually supportive and reinforcing system of international organization to develop complementarily among them (Schelling, 1967). The UN can and should play a more active role as a facilitator among the regional structures; the time has come for the Security Council to read a new Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, written when only two regional structures, the OAS and the LAS existed.

The United States Deputy Secretary of State, S. Talbott, was absolutely right when he stated that "regional co-operation is a positive force if and only if it enhances the positive aspect of global interdependence and combats the negative ones."

The UN is doing a lot to achieve this aim. The annual meeting of the Secretary-General with heads of regional organizations, tripartite meetings between the Director-General of UNOG, the Secretary-General of the OSCE and the Council of Europe are good examples. The United Nations has

developed several forms of co-operation with regional structures. However, it is not enough. Everyone would agree that we are only at the beginning of the process. We have some way to go before establishing a coherent pattern of mutually beneficial co-operation between the United Nations and the panoply of institutions involved with regional affairs.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, J. (2003). *"Geopolitics – Re-visioning World Politics"*, Routledge.
- Bayne, N. (2011). *Woolcock S. The New Economic Diplomacy: Decision-making and Negotiation in International Economic Relations*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Bayne, N., & Woolcock, S. (2007). *"The New Economic Diplomacy: Decision-making and Negotiation in International Economic Relations"*.
- Bergeijk, V., & Peter, A.G. (1994). *"Economic diplomacy, trade, and commercial policy: positive and negative sanctions in a new world order"*.
- Blackwill, R. D. (2016). *"War by Other Means: Geoeconomics and Statecraft"*.
- Braterskiy, M. (2014). *"Rastsvet ekonomicheskoy diplomatii, nadolgo li"*. Retrieved from <http://russiancouncil.ru>.
- Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *"The grand chessboard. American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives"*, Basic Books.
- Carron de la Carrière G. (1998). *"La diplomatie économique: Le diplomate et le marché"*, Paris.
- Degterev, D.A. (2010). *"Ekonomicheskaya diplomatiya: ekonomika, politika, pravo"*, Moscow: Navona.
- Diamond, J. (1999). *"Guns, Germs, and Steel"*.
- Fedoseyeva, G.A. (2002). *"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye ekonomicheskiye otnosheniya"*.
- Fukuyama, F. (2006). *The End of History and the Last Man /F. Fukuyama. – N.Y.: Simon and Schuster*.
- Gellner, E. (2009). *"Nations and Nationalism"*.
- Halberstam, D. (1993). *"The Best and the Brightest"*.
- Jervis, R. (1976). *"Perception and Misperception in International Politics"*.
- Kessler, M-Ch. (1999). *"La Politique étrangère de la France. Acteurs et processus"*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Kissinger, H. A. (1979). *"White House Years & Years of Upheaval"*.
- Luttwak, E. (1987). *"On the Meaning of Victory: Essays on Strategy"*, Cambridge: Touchstone Books.
- Luttwak, E. (2010). *"Free Trade Doesn't Work: What Should Replace it and why"*, New York: U.S. Business and Industry Council.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *"The Tragedy of Great Power Politics"*.
- Munoz, M. (2017). *"Advances in Geoeconomics (Europa Economic Perspectives)"*.
- Nay, S. (2014). *"Dzhozef mladshiy. Budushcheye vlasti"*, Moskva: AST.
- Nazarbayev, N.A. (2017). *"Poslaniye narodu Kazakhstana - Tretya modernizatsiya Kazakhstana: global'naya konkurentosposobnost"*. Retrieved from <http://www.akorda.kz>.
- Nossel, S. (2004). *"Smart Power"*, Foreign Affairs, 83.
- Palmer, T.G. (2002). *"Globalization is Great"*, CATO Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.cato.org/pubs/letters/palmer-catoletters.pdf>.
- Peter, A. G., Maaike, O.-H., & Melissen, J. (2011). *"Economic Diplomacy: Economic and Political Perspectives Paperback"*.
- Schelling, T. (1967). *"Arms and Influence"*.
- Scott, J. (1999). *"Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed"*.
- Soilen, K. S. (2013). *"Geoeconomics"*.
- Suleymenov, T.S. (2008). *"Kazakhstan i strany Vostochnoy Yevropy: osnovnyye napravleniya i perspektivy sotrudnichestva"*, Astana.
- Waltz, K. N. (2001). *"Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis"*.