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ABSTRACT
In a successful realization of foreign policy strategies, diplomatic and intelligence services play a pivotal role. These two services are the most responsible for preparing the information on which the strategy for a particular country or region is based on. Much unlike those of the powerful countries, the activities of small states are mainly focused on protecting their sovereignty and territorial integrity and cooperation with friendly countries and international organizations.

The necessity of coordination the activities of diplomacy and intelligence services in obtaining information concerning national interests of the country is something that every small state should practice. Therefore, properly trained diplomatic personnel qualified to recognize information and events of interest to the national counterintelligence is one of the most important elements of the security system of the country. This paper attempts to highlight basic connections between diplomatic and intelligence services in terms of their ability in accumulating and processing valuable and necessary information.
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POVZETEK
V uspešnem izvajanju zunanjepolitičnih strategij imajo diplomatske in obveščevalne službe ključno vlogo. Te službe so najbolj odgovorne za zbiranje informacij, na katerih so osnovane strategije njihovih držav. Za razliko od velikih držav so male predvsem usmerjene na zaščito svoje suverenosti in ozemeljske celovitosti ter sodelovanje s prijateljskimi državami in mednarodnimi organizacijami.


KLJUČNE BESEDE: diplomacija, obveščevalne službe, diplomati, male države, veleposlaništva, ministrstvo za zunanjé zadeve
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INTRODUCTION

Diplomatic and intelligence services are two of the main tools of every modern state, regardless of its size, military power and economic development, for achieving its foreign policy goals as well as protecting its national interests and security. Although these are two different institutions, the spheres of interest in their activities create a link that connects and leads them to the same goal, which is collecting and analyzing information for strategic planning of states’ foreign affairs and activities regarding other countries or groups of countries and international organizations.

From a historical point of view, the beginnings of these two institutions date back to ancient times. The need for mutual communication between the rulers created the need for appointing representatives such as messengers, orators, legates, proxies, consuls and ambassadors who, on behalf of their rulers, had been sent to foreign kingdoms. With technological advancements and better means of transportation, states had expanded their interests in mutual collaboration which, in turn, has resulted in the establishment of many consular and diplomatic missions. The main functions of these newly formed diplomatic offices were: representation of their state, negotiation with official representatives of the receiving state, protection of the interests of their state, and ascertaining the conditions and developments of the receiving state. In addition, diplomatic and consular representatives were also instructed to cover the economic situation, the capabilities of armed forces and the military industry, technological development, science and other spheres of social life.

In the Middle Ages, the development of diplomatic missions continued. According to Encyclopaedia Britannica 2020 “In the 15th century, the Italian city-states began to establish permanent embassies in foreign capitals. The used such outposts as intelligence sources and even developed codes and ciphers by which information could be secretly communicated. By the 16th century, other European governments had followed suit”.

Mattingly (1955, p 12) pointed out in his work Renaissance Diplomacy
that “The institution of a resident ambassador had been fully developed on the territory of the Apennine Peninsula in 1450, and a few decades later, around the year 1500, it has been spread to other parts of Europe. Their development continued throughout the period until 1914, when it finally came to an end.”\(^3\) Hence, this period can be called the beginning of modern diplomacy.

Unlike diplomacy and its diplomatic services, there were much less historical records and literature about intelligence services before the Great War. Andrew (2018, pp 1-12) states “The historian S. Kent, the founding father of the US intelligence analysis, complained that intelligence was the only profession without a serious literature. From my point of view this is a matter of greatest importance. But it doesn’t mean that intelligence is from the new era. On the contrary, the role of a spy is as old as civilization itself. Knowledge has always been power – right back to the earliest settlements and the need of every ruler to find out what his enemies are doing, thinking and planning. Whilst the role of a spy has remained constant throughout the centuries, the means by which agents can steal, learn and acquire secrets has been transformed beyond all recognition.”\(^4\)

From the historical point of view, formation of the first intelligence centers began during the 16th and 17th centuries. Encyclopedia Britannica 2020 - Pre Modern intelligence – Intelligence and rise of nationalism, gives the following chronological order: “The rise of nationalism was accompanied by the growth of standing armies and professional diplomats as well as by the establishment of organizations and procedures for procuring foreign intelligence. Queen Elizabeth I (reigned 1558–1603) of England maintained a notable intelligence organization. Her principal state secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham (c. 1532–90), developed a network of intelligence agents in foreign countries. He recruited graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, developed the craft of espionage, including tools and techniques for making and breaking codes, and engaged in much foreign political intrigue. Later, Armand-Jean du Plessis, cardinal and duc de Richelieu (1585–1642), and Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658)—whose intelligence chief, John Thurloe (1616–68), is often cited as an early master spy—developed notable intelligence systems.

---

intelligence operations of the Great Powers also included secret channels of communication, the penetration of émigré circles, and the assassination of enemies of the state.”

The latest stage in the development of the intelligence services continued with the division of the world by formation of military alliances such as the NATO Pact (1949) and the Warsaw Pact (1955), led by the United States and former USSR respectively. Guided by the idea of creating a greater sphere of influence in the world, these two superpowers created a bipolar world, followed by the Cold War.

The Cold War (1947-1989) was conducted, to a greater extent than ever before, as a war of espionage; the intelligence services were used to both, gauge the strength of enemy forces and shore up various political systems. The collapse of the Warsaw Pact in the 1990s heralded a further paradigm change for the world’s intelligence agencies, which are now forced to deal with industrial espionage and since 2001, the threat posed by international terrorism.

**Definition and Functions of Diplomacy and Intelligence Services**

In contemporary literature, we can find various types of diplomacy interpreted in several different ways. This means that there are different ways of conducting diplomatic activities such as: military diplomacy, economic diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, public diplomacy, summit diplomacy, to name a few, that all serve different aspects of interest and cooperation between states, but fall under the same general meaning. Due to this fact, it is tough to nail down a single unified definition for the term diplomacy.

Diplomacy does not have a single definition because the term itself has multiple meanings and interpretations. It can be treated as a state activity, a function or a body, as a skill for conducting negotiations and protecting the interests of the state as well as a profession or art, a science or practice. In this direction (Boichev 1998) offered the following descriptions: “1) diplomacy is a means of conducting state affairs in the field of foreign policy through official relations with other countries and international organizations; 2) it is the form and

---


content of the relations between the states, through official contacts, in order to regulate the mutual problems and interests and to conclude mutually acceptable agreements; 3) diplomacy is a practiced activity of the bodies for external representation of the state (head of state, prime minister, foreign minister, diplomatic missions, etc.) during official visits, international conferences, etc.; 4) ability, knowledge and skills to conduct negotiations with other countries, but also to conduct negotiations and mediation in the regulation of international conflicts, finding compromise and acceptable solutions, as well as to expand and deepen international cooperation; 5) diplomacy is a frequently used synonym for operational government department - the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; 6) it is a profession and a career, that belongs to the circle of people who are engaged in foreign policy and represent their own country in relations with other international entities."7

Furthermore, in modern science, diplomatic law is defined as a set of all norms of international law relating to the rights and duties of states regarding diplomatic relations, functions, immunities, privileges, and other statutory and functional aspects of diplomatic representation. That right is codified in the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (VCDR), which in Article 3 determines:

“1. The functions of a diplomatic mission consist, inter alia, in:
(a) Representing the sending State in the receiving State;
(b) Protecting in the receiving State the interests of the sending State and of its nationals, within the limits permitted by international law;
(c) Negotiating with the Government of the receiving State;
(d) Ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the Government of the sending State;
(e) Promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations.
2. Nothing in the present Convention shall be construed as preventing the performance of consular functions by a diplomatic mission."8

The process of change in international relations, which started in the last decades of the XX century and especially at the beginning

---

7 Божечев, Душан, Дипломатски Речник, ТИВ-ТОП. ДОО, Скопје 1998.
of the XXI century, in terms of democratization, modernization, and dependence among states led to the creation of modern diplomacy. The reasons that have led to this transformation are: a) the democratic changes in southeastern Europe that took place with the fall of communism; b) the creation of several new international entities (newly formed states and international regional organizations; c) the emergence of new participants in international relations, represented in non-governmental organizations (NGOs); interested business groups, individuals and civic associations; d) the creation of public diplomacy; and e) the development of information technology, the Internet and the creation of global (real-time) media houses. (Markovski 2017, p. 9).

Regarding the changes in modern diplomacy, Melissen (2009, p 18) states that “Multiple changes in the official diplomatic environment of the profession have added new tasks. In addition to the list of diplomatic functions in the VCDR, additional tasks have emerged or gained more emphasis, and other skills are needed, such as management, coordination, and mediation between different players within a complex government bureaucracy, lobbying and dealing with the media.”

Much like for diplomacy, there is no universal definition for intelligence services. In continuation, there are several different examples of what the intelligence services entail.

Stajić (2003, p 183) states that “today, the intelligence service is defined as a specialized and relatively independent institution of the state apparatus. It is authorized by legal, but also secret means and methods to collect significant intelligence and information about other states or its institutions and possible internal opponents of its state. This also includes undertaking actions in peace and war and implementing a part of the state and political goals of the country by its activity, independently or in cooperation with other government bodies.”

On the other hand, according to Milosevic (2001, p 23) “intelligence services represent a specialized organization of the governmental structure which, by specific methods and means, conducts intelligence, security, subversive and other activities intended to protect internal
and external securities and the realization of strategic goals of its state, as well as protection of interests.”\textsuperscript{11}

Furthermore, Bimfort (1958, p. 76) alleges “the US Central Intelligence Agency CIA in one of its definitions describe Intelligence as the collecting and processing of that information about foreign countries and their agents which is needed by a government for its foreign policy and for national security, the conduct of non-attributable activities abroad to facilitate the implementation of foreign policy, and the protection of both process and product, as well as persons and organizations concerned with these, against unauthorized disclosure.”\textsuperscript{12}

As for the functions of intelligence services, it is safe to say that they are an integral part of the definitions themselves. “The intelligence cycle consists of five interconnected aspects: (1) establishing collection requirements; (2) the collection itself; (3) processing and exploitation of the collected materials; (4) analysis and production of the result, and (5) dissemination of the product to the decisionmaker”. Bruneau (2008)\textsuperscript{13}

Furthermore it should be noted that intelligence service has a time factor. Important information must be quickly collected, analyzed, and delivered in time for the user to act upon it.

It is important to note that unlike diplomacy, which conducts its functions transparently, the intelligence services have a much more covert approach to its activities. That is why today there exist: intelligence services, counterintelligence services, military intelligence, economic and industrial intelligence, cyber intelligence, police intelligence, etc. who create a security community.

It is self-evident that an intelligence service without a valuable intelligence for a country’s national security cannot justify its existence. Although 90% of the intelligence of the external Services comes from open sources, such as media, the internet, public statements etc., it is the 10% of the collected secret intelligence which creates the added value of the Services. Without secret intelligence, external intelligence

\textsuperscript{11} Milošević Milan, Sistem državne bezbednosti, Policijska akademija, Beograd, 2001, p 23.


services would not differ from institutes of foreign policy analysis. The equivalent for a diplomatic service would be to rely solely on the media for its country reporting. External services seek intelligence about the national security of the target country. It is precisely the intelligence that the target country wants to protect (Apostolidis 2007).14

In today’s world we are witnessing organized security system has been build from various agencies and government institutions responsible for different area of interest like international terrorism, proliferation of weapon of mass destruction, fight against narcotics, Islamic fundamentalism, as well as industrial espionage, money laundering etc. A system of mutual cooperation between countries has been developed, especially in international organizations such as the European Union or NATO.

Vitkauskas, (1999), argues that: “one type of espionage that has not declined but rather expanded after the end of the Cold War is economic espionage. In the competitive global economy on the verge of the next century, acquiring scientific and technological information for the purpose of gaining an economic advantage has become increasingly important for many countries. Economic espionage can be defined as the use of, or facilitation of, illegal, clandestine, coercive or deceptive means by a foreign government or its surrogates to acquire economic intelligence. Economic espionage exposes the targeted state’s companies to unfair disadvantages, jeopardizing the jobs, competitiveness of the state, and hampering its research and development investment.”15

INSTITUTIONAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DIPLOMACY AND INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

Keeping in mind that this is a complex system that serves the strategies and goals of states, diplomatic missions are only one segment of a much larger apparatus, therefore, special attention will be given to particular points of connection that sheds light on the formation of the relationship between diplomacy and intelligence. It is important to note that the intelligence services in some countries have been known to be utilized by several different institutions. In addition to this, each of the institutions has a different approach to intelligence services due to the fact that each has a different field of interest. Having said that,
it becomes clear that it is impossible to give intelligence services one uniform shape. This is also supported by the fact that each country creates and tailors their intelligence services to its political, economic and military status, as well as its interests in international affairs.

As a norm, every modern state has developed and established some form of intelligence service. The level of development is directly dependent on several factors. The most important are policy (peaceful, expansionist, nationalistic etc.), resources and other advantages or disadvantages which dictate the conditions of its work. The Super Powers have intelligence systems that are composed of separate services which specialize in different areas. However, this does not mean that the overall activity of these services is decentralized. In fact, it is quite the contrary; the necessity for coordination of the intelligence services from one center is of upmost importance and is the basic precondition for their effectiveness and efficiency.

Furthermore, intelligence services can be self-contained and installed in individual governmental institutions and departments such as the Ministries of Interior, the Ministries (or departments) of Defense, and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFA). Usually, these departments include separate intelligence units and individuals. However, sometimes they can be found operating within independent legal institutions.  

This type of organizational structure can sometimes result in parallelism of the performance of tasks and lead to irrational use of available potentials and material resources. Therefore, the handling of these services is usually entrusted to senior management officials with diplomatic statuses within the ministries. These tasks are also related to other governmental institutions, especially in the collection of data, assessments, and certain analyzes on important issues or situations of wider interest. But it is important to mention that their primary task is to act accordingly to the needs of their departments. However, if needed, they can expand their activities at the request of the central intelligence service.

16 The Service for investigation and Documentation (SID) of the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs of the SFRY was legally defined as part of the state security system; it was intelligence, but also counterintelligence. It has operated through Yugoslav diplomatic and consular missions. They were not classic secret agents but persons involved in diplomatic missions abroad. In some cases, Secret services of the host country knew about them. They were mostly cultural, economic attachés, embassy political secretaries, etc. See more in Croatian weekly magazine Nacional, NOVA SAZNANJA O DJELOVANJU BEOGRADSKIH TAJNIH SLUŽBI UZ KOS i Udbu, i SID je uhodio u Hrvatskoj, published in magazine Nacional, nr. 538, 2006-03-06.
Given that this is a complex system which serves the foreign policy strategies of states, which diplomatic missions are a part of, it is important to focus on certain points of connection from which the institutional relationship between the diplomacy and the intelligence arises. Diplomatic and consular offices do not have uniformity in their structures because they differ from state to state. Unlike small or developing countries, the great powers have much more advanced diplomatic missions, both organizationally and functionally. The size of expanded deployment of diplomatic missions is in direct correlation with the type of the receiving State, especially on its geostrategic position, the role it plays, or could play in international relations, military power, natural resources, economic potential, or internal policy.

Markovski (2002)\textsuperscript{17} claims that, in principle, the structure of a well-developed diplomatic mission consists of several main organizational units:

“The political department usually headed by the deputy chief of mission deals with matters relating to the overall socio-political life of the receiving State. This department is responsible for following the political events and media in order to be able to establish and maintain contacts with important political figures, representatives of government institutions, representatives of the political parties in power or opposition as well as with prominent individuals from social, political, and cultural life in the country. At the same time, it is responsible for creating biographical profiles of influential and powerful individuals from the receiving state. The activity of the department, due to its scope and content, is directly dependent on intelligence purposes.”

An economic department consists of several diplomats responsible for: commercial, scientific, technical, agricultural, or civil aviation to name a few, and is responsible to follow the overall economic life of the receiving State.

A consular department is responsible for the protection of the interests of the sending state. Under its domain fall the visa regime, official (identification) documents and issues of an administrative-legal nature, citizenship, and legal protection. Therefore, it has a regular contact with the state and local authorities, police, and immigration

\textsuperscript{17} Марковски, Данчо, Дипломатија, организација и практика, Кинематика, Скопје, 2002, p. 28.
representatives, as well as with the services that are responsible for protection from international terrorism and organized crime. This department also monitors the movement of foreign persons of special security interests, who are registered on the list with special police measures.

An administrative department includes security officers, operators and other personnel responsible for maintaining the communication as well as coded communication systems with their own country.

Diplomatic missions include also military attachés and military intelligence units. In recent years, many states started the process of signing mutual agreements for exchanging intelligence officials. Sending this personnel to the embassies is most common in the format of contact officers, police attachés, etc.\textsuperscript{18}

Besides the proclaimed principle of equal importance of diplomatic missions, in practice, their political influence is conditioned by the power of the state they represent. This is broadly influenced by establishing an institutional relationship between diplomatic and intelligence services. Some countries with developed intelligence positions abroad, attempt to regulate these institutional relations and to coordinate their activities.

The need to incorporate the intelligence component into diplomatic missions, among other things, stems from the convenience that diplomacy provides. Hence, the privileges and immunities of diplomatic representatives, the inviolability of the premises of the representative offices, documentation, archives, and property stipulated by the VCDR\textsuperscript{19}, provide ample opportunities for uninterrupted performance of official functions, and also to cover certain intelligence tasks entrusted to state institutions. Taking into consideration that diplomatic representatives use legitimate opportunities to gather information, it is very difficult to recognize the elements of intelligence in their work. Monitoring and analysis of daily newspapers and publications, use of information from the media, directly observing events, and institutions of interest, contacts with scientific, cultural and other institutions, with celebrities from the public and political life of the country, are

\textsuperscript{18} North Macedonia signed this type of agreement with 40 countries, primarily in Europe, the Middle East, and Eurasia. Богдановски, Андреја, Управување со безбедносно – разузнавачките служби во Македонија, Analitica 2012 p.12 https://www.analyticamk.org/images/stories/files/report/r01_mak.pdf.

part of wider opportunities for diplomats to get the required data. The channels published through WikiLeaks\(^{20}\) have made it clear that the subjects of interest of diplomats extend to all spheres of the social and political life of the receiving State, and public figures.

Media is a very important source of information for diplomats. The obtained information is always analyzed thoroughly. Diplomats usually do this through direct contact with individuals/persons who are familiar with the relevant issues. Thus, operational information is prepared by comparing and analyzing data obtained from multiple sources. The durability of the content of the operative materials is directly dependent on the skills of diplomatic representatives.

Diplomatic missions also make use of clever propaganda activities, as means to gain extra influence in the receiving state. For that purpose, cultural and information centers are established in all major cities of the receiving states. The aim of these centers is to attract as many local people as possible through organizing various activities and cultural events. These centers can be established and organized by diplomatic missions with varying degrees of independence in their work. The main goal is to provide the highest possible level of presentation of the country they represent. This is why public diplomacy has become such an important tool in more recent decades.

However, it is important to note that intelligence centers are not established in all diplomatic missions. On the contrary, most diplomatic missions have no direct connection with intelligence activities. Also, the duties and limits of the activities of diplomats and consuls are defined by international law. This means that diplomats, in the fulfillment of their functions, have to remain within the framework determined by international law.

**The Role of Diplomacy and Intelligence Services of Small States**

Small states cannot work miracles in the globalized world still dominated by great powers, but they can study what has worked in the current world order for fellow Lilliputians. Yet, major successes for small states in the face of globalization are relatively few. What has given small states their occasional successes against the agendas of larger states, however, are concentration of limited resources in the

most critical arenas, the ability to focus on key goals, better knowledge on the issues than that of larger powers, and an exquisite sense of when to act (Corgan 2008).\textsuperscript{21}

Consequently, small states are at a great disadvantage. Ignorant of the trends in other countries, they are unable to predict; they are thus unable to prepare for international events bearing on their security. Conversely, larger nations, with adequate information about the developments in the small states, can work to manipulate these developments to their own advantage. In this sense, Teirila (2015) reminds that Edward Snowden’s leaks and revelations concerning the United States’ National Security Agency (NSA) might not have revealed anything new or astonishing about the ancient techniques of diplomacy, but they have awakened Europeans to the reality of life with first-class superpower(s).\textsuperscript{22}

Cohesion often accompanies smallness. This assists in creating common purpose and consistency in the foreign policies and diplomacies of small states. It can reduce complications in governance arising from the competing or conflicting interests and perspectives of a complex and diverse society. Yet resource constraints mean that small states often have fewer resources necessary for effective interaction with other states. Resources required for gathering and analyzing relevant information, for elaborating and projecting positions and points of view, and for marshalling and deploying alignments and circumstances in support of their positions may be in short supply.\textsuperscript{23}

Talking about the security of small states, Maniruzzaman (1982) highlights the importance of diplomacy. “Since the small states by definition lack an adequate traditional war capability, they must make up for their deficiency by excellence in diplomacy. They cannot, therefore, afford to have ebbs and flows in their diplomatic excellence. For a small state, high quality diplomacy must be a constant phenomenon in its external relations. Constant quality is best assured by developing institutions such as a foreign office, and a professional diplomatic service manned by skilled and competent diplomats who,


together, can bring expertise, experience and a long view to bear the efficient and effective formulation and implementation of foreign policy.”24

Unlike powerful and developed countries, small states are faced with limited opportunities in terms of military might, economic power and human resources. Regardless, almost as a norm, every modern state has developed and organized an intelligence service to some extent. The level of development of a security system very much depends on the countries’ national policies (peaceful, expansionist, nationalist, etc.), material and other possibilities of the countries which in turn condition the work done in intelligence spheres. Often, the position of intelligence systems in small states is defensive. Their activities are mainly focused on protecting their sovereignty and territorial integrity, cooperation with friendly countries and international organizations as well as security systems.

The disappearance of the era of colonialism and the establishment of the United Nations, the European Union, the OSCE, as well as many other organizations at the global and regional levels, has a positive impact on small states in terms of their international position. Gashi (2016) sees this as an opportunity. The only way to avoid the insecurity, which is for small states in international relations much greater than for large states, is their association with international organizations, because in this way they perform two functions: first, they “control” the rigid stand of large states through joint rules and valuable principles for all. Second, these institutions provide a chance for small states to express their opinions in the last instance, and to use the veto against important decisions which are of a national interest.25

In this context, Gacinovic (2018, p 169-183) states the following: “The security of each state is based on the elements of its national potential which are primarily: the size of the territory; economic strength; geographical position; raw materials; dependence on foreign markets; technical and technological capacity; national character; the efficiency of government to implement decisions; production power; reserves; the educational level of the population and national morality and internal solidarity. Given that small states are very vulnerable in terms


of security, greater efforts are made to build elements of national power.” He also argued that “assumptions based on which “small state” would be safe depend on its powerful allies; significant natural resources that it wisely exploits, '/', and continuously build a national identity, it invests in science and culture and the democratization of society.”26

The constitutional provisions of many small states provide the following important functions: security and the protection of national sovereignty; securing and protecting the independence and territorial integrity; conducting international policy and exercising and protecting the fundamental freedoms and rights of citizens. For example, the Macedonian secret service (The Intelligence Agency (AR)) is defined as a special body of state administration and is, in compliance with the law on AR, authorized for collection, analysis and processing of the intelligence information relevant for security, defense, political, economic and other interests of the Republic of North Macedonia.27

Mellon (2007, p. 8) states that “the decision to establish intelligence services depends on many factors, including the specific needs of the government, the potential threats facing the state and its population, the human and financial resources available to the intelligence services, and the political will to engage in intelligence activities. Further, he explained that most countries around the world have established at least one of four types of intelligence services: domestic, foreign, criminal, or military. In some countries, one organization may play the role of two or more intelligence services, however, either for legal reasons or to protect the different specifics and mandates of each service, most democracies avoid establishing intelligence services that play more than one role.”28

Here, it is noteworthy to look into the creation and establishment of intelligence services in the states that were part of former Yugoslavia. After its dissolution, these newly created small states had to overhaul their internal mechanisms that were up to that point a Yugoslav central service. In doing so, these states were forced to abandon the

communist systems, as well as political processes against “domestic enemies” in which diplomatic and consular staff was involved. A number of diplomats, given their ideological affiliation, were subjects of lost confidence by the new governments.

Akrap and Tudman (2014), in their research paper,\textsuperscript{29} analyzed Service for investigations and documentations (SID) as a part of former Yugoslav intelligence system. SID acted as a foreign intelligence service of the SFRY. As a “priority, SID was gathering intelligence about “unwanted emigration” abroad (especially about the Croats, Serbs and Kosovar Albanians). That was the reason for creating several agent networks abroad. Members of SID were, quite often, members of the SFRY’s diplomatic and consular missions. According to the information that authors obtained during interviews with former employees of Yugoslavian Intelligence Community (IC), about 60% of all intelligence about persons that were, by communist authorities, treated as “dangerous emigrants”, was collected through the SID agent networks.”

Another example of a major change in diplomatic staff for these reasons was Bulgaria, which fired a significant number of diplomats.\textsuperscript{30} In the Western Balkan countries, the security and intelligence systems are mainly composed of one civilian and one military service. Usually, civilian services have the status of autonomous institutions established by a special law, while military services are placed within the ministries of defense and are regulated, in most cases, by defense laws (Stevanović 2016, p 6).\textsuperscript{31}

The foundation of intelligence services and diplomacy took place in a complex process, in which democratic and professional conditions and joint collaboration in their activities had to be incorporated.

The intelligence systems of three countries—the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom—have been used as general models for the organization of most other intelligence services. The American

\textsuperscript{29} Akrap, Gordan, & Tudman, Miroslav, From totalitarian to democratic intelligence community – case of Croatia (1990-2014); pp.80-90.

\textsuperscript{30} P. Blagojević Izvor Južne vesti | NIŠ 23.02.2011. Bulgarian consul worked for the secret service? Due to the disputed past, apart from Yurukov and Dimitrov, the Government has initiated the procedure of dismissal of as many as 40 high diplomatic representatives from all over the world. Among the names proposed to Bulgarian President Georgi Parvanov for dismissal include ambassadors to Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan, Britain, the Vatican, Russia, Switzerland, Greece, Bosnia, Kosovo, the Vatican, and even Bulgaria’s ambassadors to UNESCO and the United Nations.

\textsuperscript{31} Stevanović, Andrej, LEGAL ORGANIZATION OF SECURITY SERVICES IN THE WESTERN BALKANS: BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, MONTENEGRO, ALBANIA, MACEDONIA AND KOSOVO, Unagraf, BEOGRAD, June 2016, p 6.
system was adopted by many of the countries that came under the U.S. influence after World War II; that of the Soviet Union was instituted in most communist countries, and that of the United Kingdom was used by most countries with parliamentary governments.32

In small states, Ministries of Foreign Affairs, with their diplomatic networks, have an important role in matters of national security. By collecting security information, creating operational analysis, monitoring the political, economic, and other issues in a particular state, which has a reflection of the national interest and provides appropriate steps or attitudes of the government to intercept and respond accordingly.

Limited human and financial opportunities do not a priori mean that small states have quite limited security potential, especially if we take into account their defensive policies, unlike the big players in the international community. The necessity of creating professional, well trained diplomats emerged as an important condition for Ministries in fulfilling their tasks.

This is a relevant factor in a country’s security system. Most South East European (SEE) countries have managed to make significant changes and meet the required standards in their diplomatic services.

Practically, education has to be focused on: mastering diplomatic techniques and tactics in fulfilling tasks at work; Going through security courses and raising the capability level of personal security culture; the ability for personal counterintelligence protection and protection of the diplomatic mission; training for conversations, analyzing and transferring and requesting information; way to create a business, social and friendly relationships, observation of important political events, etc.

One of the most important elements in the work of diplomats is the creation of operational documents, such as telegrams, information, analysis, reports, and reminders. It is a complex process involving the diplomats’ operational activities. These documents provide all the information gathered by diplomats. The collection of quality information and their transformation into usable operational documents is one of

the most important indicators of the success of an embassy, as a relevant and useful segment in the security system of the country.

By its very nature, diplomacy is the first line of defense for any country, especially for small states. However, this conclusion needs to be taken conditionally because it depends on several factors such as organized central service (MFA), developed diplomatic network, highly trained diplomatic staff, and above all, built analytics. Analytics is the most important segment in the work of any MFA. It is a service that ensures the dynamics and interoperability of the work of embassies and senior diplomats within the ministry. During their public appearances or conversations with foreign officials, it analyzes relevant information concerning the area of national security and the interest of the state. Under the authority of the ministry, it cooperates with state bodies, scientific institutions, and competent individuals, and prepares analysis, information, and operational materials on certain issues of high-security interest. Department for Analytics is in charge of planning the activities of the embassies/diplomats, the preparation of the work-action plans, the reports, and the analysis that are submitted to the highest representatives of the state. This directorate also prepares proposals for the country’s foreign policy strategy in international relations. It is a mirror that reflects the organization’s structure and success in implementing its foreign policy strategy and goals.

Analytics department is a place where thousands of telegrams flow, containing a variety of information from a variety of sources. This information needs to be professionally classified based on its significance and appropriately processed to the extent of useful informative-operational material that has multiple purposes according to its intelligence character (political, military, economic, etc.). As a rule, the prepared analytical materials are submitted to the competent bodies. Most often, small countries have a so-called National Security Council, where the competent ministers hold meetings, review information and take a stand. Usually, these bodies are under the authority of the Prime Minister or the President of the country. The reached operational conclusions are within the competence of the secretariat in which deputies had been usually nominated.

On the other hand, by its nature and importance, analytics is the contact point for the intelligence services of small states. Unlike the intelligence services, the opportunities available to diplomacy to gather
information on various areas, events, institutions, and individuals are much greater. The information and knowledge processed by the analysis of its quality and quantity is a useful platform for intelligence work. Well-established cooperation in the exchange of information, as well as compliance with certain security activities, should be the formula for success in the country’s security protection.

However, in practice, a different situation can be encountered. It is usually caused by two factors: First, the absence of an established mechanism for the manner of delivery and processing of telegrams and operational materials; and second, the lack of a two-way communication, like joint coordination and cooperation. In both cases, there is a negative impact on the foreign policy of small states and their security. In the first case, we have a mechanical distribution of telegrams without knowing where and how they ended up and whether they aroused interest or so called “shot in the dark”. Second, the absence of response means that the MFA and embassies have spent unnecessary resources. Such uncoordinated activities of diplomats could lead to their passivation/passiveness and disinterest.

The reasons for such situations are of various natures, ranging from poor institutional set-ups, the perception of the security component by the responsible representatives of the state, to the mutual distrust and rivalry of the institutions. A situation that negatively affects the already limited security systems of small countries, whether they are in the NATO or EU system or not.

Therefore, the creation of a professional and efficient diplomatic service should be imperative for small states as V. Patterson states “diplomacy is a machine for gathering information.”33 Nevertheless, it should be added that its success depends on the established institutional cooperation and coordination.

---

CONCLUSION

Diplomatic services are facing increasing demands for implementation of new sophisticated tools that require a change in the current way of bilateral representation. These new changes stem from the need to protect the interests of citizens and to achieve nations’ goals through collecting and analyzing data, conduct of negotiations and, in particular, to promote its interests in all areas both bilaterally and internationally.

In this direction, the role of the embassies of the small states should be considered from various angles. Their activities are beyond the basic function given by VCDR. The modern embassy is a center for creating public opinion/image of the sending state through public diplomacy. The Embassy sets tone and dictates the dynamic of the bilateral relations.

Diplomats, especially ambassadors, are requested to be engaged in cultural and scientific cooperation, organizing various events across the country and establishing connections of prominent persons from both sides. Embassies provide necessary tourist information about its state. They also provide assistance for domestic and foreign companies for establishing economic and trade cooperation.

In a word, an Embassy is a hotspot for all relevant information that is collected all year round. The possibility of regular communication with the highest officials of the receiving state implies that diplomats are closest to the source of information. Through their daily activities, diplomats collect around 80 percent of intelligence information using legal means. The question is how and in what way this information has been used by the intelligence community of their country. What is the readiness of the intelligence service to cooperate with the Embassy? Is there willingness for mutual exchanging information and coordination of certain activities of national interest activities? This and other similar issues are of great importance to small states. Failure to comply with the established rules means a serious breach of the country’s security system. Unfortunately, in some small states, these problems can be encountered. The reasons for this should be sought in the absence of a developed state apparatus, lack of trained staff, the rivalry between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the intelligence services, disrupted democratic processes and abuses of the security services, etc.
Most Ministries of Foreign Affairs have instructed their Embassies to abandon the classical model of diplomacy, over a decade ago. Instead, they have begun to utilize a new approach in the methods of their work. Efforts of nations to secure the most favorable position on the international stage and the supremacy of their relations to gather as much information as possible in all areas of interests have without a doubt expanded the boundaries of modern diplomacy. From there, it becomes clear that in order for diplomacy to achieve all the given tasks it must have an increasingly close relationship with the intelligence services.
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